Voprosy Filosofii

(Journal of PROBLEMS OF PHILOSPHY)

SELECTED ARTICLES

1952

This is a publication of STC — SPC — DD(CP).
October 2026.

Source: Selected Articles from АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК, СССР ИНСТИТУТ ФИЛОСОФИИ, ВОПРОСЫ ФИЛОСОФИИ, 1952

Language: Russian

Produced by transcription, manually edited and prepared as an e-book. Translated into English using Gemini, Google Translate and Yandex Translate.

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

October 2026.

Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
Doğrudan Demokrasi (Komünist Parti)
Άμεση Δημοκρατία (Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα)
Прямая демократия (Коммунистическая партия)
www.directdemocracy4u.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

Table of Contents

1. THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL DISCUSSION AND THE TASKS OF SOVIET PHILISOPHERS. 10
2. THE 19TH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND IDEOLOGICAL WORK.....34
I.....34
II.....41
III.....49
IV.....54
3. J. V. STALIN'S WORK "ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE USSR" – A PROGRAM FOR THE BUILDING OF COMMUNISM.....69
ACAD. G. F. ALEKSANDROV.....69
1.....69
2.....74
3.....88
4.....114
4. ON THE CONSCIOUS APPLICATION OF LAWS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT UNDER SOCIALISM.....121
G. E. GLEZERMAN.....121
5. ON THE QUESTION OF THE NATURE OF CONTRADICTIONS IN SOVIET SOCIETY.....163
V. E. KOZLOVSKY.....163
6. On the Role of Political and Legal Views in the Development of Society.....189
I. S. KON (Leningrad).....189
7. Marxism-Leninism—The Scientific Basis of Soviet Foreign Policy.....231
N. L. RUBINSHTEIN.....231
8. The Place and Role of Philosophy in Social Life.....278
M. A. LEONOV.....278

1. Philosophy — a Component Part of the Superstructure.....278
2. Specific Features of Philosophy as a Constituent Part of the Superstructure.....296
3. Features of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy as a Constituent Part of the Socialist Superstructure 306
9. Development of the Law of the Struggle of Opposites in K. Marx's *Capital*.....324
M. M. ROSENTHAL.....324
I.....324
II.....329
III.....354
10. MAIN FEATURES OF SOCIALIST IDEOLOGY.....366
F. V. KONSTANTINOV.....366
7. N. V. GOGOL ON ART.....418
S. N. DURYLIN.....418
8. ON THE ESSENCE OF THE REALISTIC ARTISTIC IMAGE 453
V. A. RAZUMNY.....453
10. GANGSSTERISM IN THE SERVICE OF US MONOPOLIES 486
B. S. NIKIFOROV.....486
1.....486
11. IDEALISTIC COVERAGE OF QUANTUM MECHANICS IN HEISBERG'S NEW ARTICLE.....511
A. P. POLIKAROV (Sofia).....511
12. RIGHT-WING SOCIALISTS OF AUSTRIA – AGENTS OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM.....519
A. I. TER-ZAKHARYAN.....519
13. FOR THE LENINIST TEACHING ON MOTION.....544
D. I. BLOKHINTSEV.....544
14. ON THE THEORY OF RELATIVITY.....549
P. G. KARD (Tartu).....549

15. ON THE CONTENT OF MODERN PHYSICAL THEORY OF SPACE AND TIME.....571
Ya. P. TERLETSKY.....571
16. A NEW BOOK ON LOGIC FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. 588
M. N. ALEKSEEV.....588
17. ON THE NEW EDITION OF THE SHORT PHILISOPHICAL DICTIONARY.....602
I. D. ANDREEV, V. I. GAZENKO, M. I. IMSHENIN (Ivanovo), V. P. ROZHIN, M. N. RUTKEVICH (Sverdlovsk), P. V. TAVANETS.....602
18. FOR A SCIENTIFIC ILLUMINATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE ORGANS OF SOVIET STATE POWER BODIES.....631
R. A. ZLOTNIKOV (Chernikovsk).....631
19. AGAINST TALMUDISM AND VULGARIZATION OF MARXISM IN A LOGIC TEXTBOOK FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS.....649
B. M. KEDROV.....649
20. AN OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF CREATIVE MARXISM 672
A. I. SOBOLEV.....672
22. DISCUSSION OF THE PROSPECTUS FOR THE BOOK “DIELECTICAL MATERIALISM AND MODERN NATURAL SCIENCE”.....727
N. F. OVTCHINNIKOV, L. N. PLYUSHCH.....727
APPENDIX.....744

1. THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL DISCUSSION AND THE TASKS OF SOVIET PHILISOPHERS

In June of this year, it will be five years since the day of the philosophical discussion on G. F. Alexandrov's book *A History of Western European Philosophy*. This discussion, conducted by the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party in the spirit and in accordance with the decisions of the party on ideological issues and the direct instructions of I. V. Stalin, opened an era of creative discussions in biology, linguistics, the physiology of higher nervous activity, and cosmogony. All these discussions took place under the guiding influence of the Bolshevik Party; they ensured the defeat of obsolete, outdated views and the fruitful development of the corresponding branches of science. The instructions of Comrade Stalin, as well as his personal participation in the discussion on linguistic issues, determined the high ideological and theoretical level of the creative discussions conducted by the party.

Through the works of I. V. Stalin, and especially his work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, Marxist-Leninist science has been raised in this five-year period to a new height by the decisions of our party.

The historical decisions of the party on ideological issues, the discussions and deliberations organized by the party, armed our theoretical cadres, creative workers in the field of literature and art, and the Soviet intelligentsia with a powerful weapon, ensuring a new upsurge in ideological work.

Together with the entire intelligentsia, our philosophical cadres fought for the implementation of the party's decisions on ideological issues, for the implementation of the instructions of the great Stalin. A certain improvement in the work of the country's philosophical institutions outlined recently is a direct result of the philosophical discussion and all subsequent measures of the party to raise ideological work in the country, a direct result of the unflagging attention and care of the Bolshevik Party, its Central Committee, and personally I. V. Stalin toward improving philosophical work.

* * *

At the 1947 philosophical discussion, G. F. Alexandrov's book *A History of Western European Philosophy* was subjected to criticism. It was noted that the author in this book violated the principle of party spirit (*partiinost'*), paid tribute to "professorial quasi-objectivism." The discussion revealed that the book contained other flaws and shortcomings, in particular, the completely unjustified absence of an exposition of the history of Marxist philosophy, as well as the non-inclusion of the history of the development of Russian philosophy in the book.

The philosophical discussion established that the mistakes made in G. F. Alexandrov's book were not an isolated phenomenon, but reflected a serious state of distress in the philosophical sector of the ideological front. Among philosophers, creative discussions, criticism, and self-criticism were absent.

Philosophical activity turned out to be monopolized in the hands of a small group of philosophers, while the majority of philosophers, especially peripheral ones, were not drawn into executive philosophical work. Philosophers stopped noticing facts of unprincipledness and lack of ideas in their work, facts of neglecting contemporary themes, servility and obsequiousness toward bourgeois philosophy. Monographs and articles on philosophy were a rare phenomenon. An unattractive picture was presented by the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. It did not unite workers of the periphery and was not connected with them, and therefore was not in fact an institution of a Union-wide character. Matters were no better in other major philosophical institutions of the country. In philosophical work, neither a fighting spirit nor Bolshevik paces were felt. And natural was the comparison made by A. A. Zhdanov of the philosophical front with a quiet backwater or a bivouac located somewhere far from the field of battle.

At the discussion, the roots of the erroneous views of a number of leading workers of the philosophical front were uncovered. It was shown that the most important source of errors committed by philosophers was their insufficient assimilation of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and the presence of traces of the influence of bourgeois ideology.

Indicating with Bolshevik principledness and uncompromisingness the lag of the philosophical sector of the ideological front, the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the leader of the party and the Soviet people I. V. Stalin

gave an expanded program of action for Soviet philosophers and indicated the paths for realizing this program.

The party demanded a radical turn toward resolving new questions and tasks that the practice of communist construction daily sets before philosophers. "It is time," said A. A. Zhdanov, "to boldly advance the theory of Soviet society, the theory of the Soviet state, the theory of modern natural science, ethics, and aesthetics. We must put an end to petty-bourgeois cowardice. To allow stagnation in the development of theory means to dry up our philosophy, to deprive it of its most valuable feature—its capacity for development, to turn it into a dead, dry dogma."

The CC of the AUCP(b) pointed out the need, along with generalizing the experience of socialist construction, to lead the work on generalizing the experience of the struggle for socialism in the European countries of people's democracy, the experience of building people's democracies in the countries of Asia, the experience of the revolutionary-liberation movement in capitalist countries. The CC of the AUCP(b) drew the attention of Soviet philosophers to the elaboration of such a most important law of the development of socialist society, discovered by I. V. Stalin, as criticism and self-criticism. "In our Soviet society," said A. A. Zhdanov, "where antagonistic classes are liquidated, the struggle between the old and the new, and, consequently, the development from lower to higher occurs not in the form of a struggle of antagonistic classes and cataclysms, as takes place under capitalism, but in the form of criticism and self-criticism, which is the true driving force of our development, a powerful instrument in the hands of the

party. This, undoubtedly, is a new form of movement, a new type of development, a new dialectical law."

The CC of the AUCP(b) emphasized the necessity of establishing close cooperation between philosophers and natural scientists, organizing systematic work on the theoretical generalization of the latest achievements of natural science.

Tasks of immense importance were set before historians of philosophy. The party called upon them to develop a scientific history of philosophy, the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, to study questions of the history of Russian philosophy and the philosophy of the peoples of the USSR, as well as to elucidate the history of philosophy of the peoples of Asia. It mobilized Soviet philosophers for launching an offensive struggle against reactionary imperialist philosophy, the center of which after the Second World War shifted to the USA.

The CC of the AUCP(b) demanded from the leading workers of the philosophical front that they put an end to the vicious practice where the interests of friendly relations are placed above the interests of the people. The Central Committee pointed out to Soviet philosophers the necessity of conducting broad creative discussions and took measures to unite and organize philosophical cadres, for the fastest correction of the situation on the philosophical front.

One such measure of the CC of the AUCP(b) was the creation of the journal *Voprosy Filosofii* (*Problems of Philosophy*).

* * *

Over the past five years, Soviet philosophers have carried out a certain amount of positive work on implementing the program formulated by the party in the philosophical discussion. The most important philosophical institutions of the country and the overwhelming majority of Soviet philosophers have fundamentally revised the themes of their works. As a rule, philosophers are now working on urgent questions connected with the practice of communist construction.

A certain amount of work has been done to unite the philosophical cadres of the country. Increasingly wider distribution is gaining among Soviet philosophers socialist mutual assistance. By the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, tens of scientific workers, including philosophers from the periphery, were drawn into creating a two-volume history of philosophy and a history of philosophy of the peoples of the USSR, books on dialectical materialism. Drafts of both volumes of the history of philosophy were subjected to broad discussion.

Connections between philosophers working in central philosophical institutions and workers of the periphery are being established, although still very slowly. A certain contact of philosophers with Soviet natural scientists has been outlined. This made it possible to significantly improve the content of published and prepared-for-publication works. The method of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism, the method of creative discussions is increasingly being introduced into scientific practice.

The country's philosophical institutions have carried out significant work in training highly qualified cadres of

philosophers—candidates and doctors of sciences. Over the past five years, in the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR alone, 90 candidate's and 18 doctoral dissertations were defended. In total across the country over five years, over 500 candidate dissertations were defended.

Currently, we have about 600 philosophers engaged in pedagogical work. There has occurred not only a quantitative, but also a qualitative growth of philosophical cadres. It is especially important to note that young philosophers, who have grown up over the past five-year period, have published a number of useful works and articles. In the journal *Voprosy Filosofii* alone over these years, about 60 articles were published by authors appearing in print for the first time. In the past five-year period, immense scope was gained in our country by the propaganda of philosophical knowledge. In the Soviet periodical press, in the organs of our party *Pravda* and *Bolshevik*, and in republican and regional newspapers and journals, thousands of articles on philosophical topics were published. Significant work on the propaganda of philosophical knowledge and the publication of popular scientific philosophical literature was carried out by the All-Union Society for the Dissemination of Political and Scientific Knowledge. In higher educational institutions, evening universities of Marxism-Leninism, permanent lecture series, seminars, and circles, as well as independently, millions of Soviet people study philosophy, Marxism.

The amount of published philosophical literature has significantly increased. Over the last two years, several dozen monographs, collective works, and collections on issues of

philosophy have appeared. Among these works, special mention should be made of books awarded a high assessment by the Soviet government—the awarding of Stalin Prizes: A. A. Rubashevsky's *The Philosophical Significance of the Theoretical Heritage of I. V. Michurin*, V. S. Kruzhkov's *The Worldview of N. A. Dobrolyubov*, G. V. Platonov's *The Worldview of K. A. Timiryazev*, G. E. Glezerman's *Laying the Foundations for Eliminating Exploiting Classes and Overcoming Class Differences in the USSR*, D. I. Chesnokov's *The Worldview of Herzen*. The following books were published: *Historical Materialism* edited by F. V. Konstantinov, *Bourgeois Morality—Weapon of Imperialist Reaction* by A. F. Shishkin. A number of useful collections on issues of dialectical and historical materialism and the history of philosophy were published: *On Soviet Socialist Society*, *The Great Power of the Ideas of Leninism*, *On Soviet Patriotism*, *Problems of Dialectical Materialism*, *From the History of Russian Philosophy*, *Problems of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy*, *Philosophical Problems of Modern Biology*, and others.

Philosophical workers have carried out serious work to popularize and propagate the brilliant work of I. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*. The Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences published the collection *Problems of Dialectical and Historical Materialism in the Work of I. V. Stalin "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics"* and prepared for print a second collection. A large number of philosophical articles devoted to this work of I. V. Stalin were published in the organs of the Soviet press.

The very nature of the works performed over the past five-year period testifies to the fact that the neglected state of a number of sectors of philosophical work is beginning to be overcome. Works have been published on urgent questions of historical materialism, the history of Russian philosophy, and the philosophy of the USSR, and on criticism of foreign reactionary idealist philosophy.

Major tasks in deploying criticism and self-criticism and creative discussions, in uniting Soviet philosophers, developing, and propagating Marxist philosophy were entrusted by the party and Soviet public to the journal *Voprosy Filosofii*.

At first, the journal coped unsatisfactorily with the tasks set before it and permitted a number of gross errors. On the pages of the journal was published the anti-scientific, anti-patriotic article by Z. Kamensky. The journal took incorrect positions on issues of biology and controversial issues of modern physics in connection with the article by M. A. Markov "On the Nature of Physical Knowledge," and others. Later, the journal committed a gross error, speaking shortly before the discussion on linguistics against comrades who subjected to justified criticism the vulgarizing theory of N. Ya. Marr in linguistics.

Inestimable help in overcoming the committed errors and improving the work of the journal was rendered by the Central Committee of the AUCP(b) and the party press, which subjected the shortcomings in the work of the journal to sharp and principled criticism. Analyzing a number of published issues of the journal, the newspaper *Pravda*, the journal *Bolshevik*, and the newspaper *Kultura i Zhizn* spoke out. This

Bolshevik criticism helped and is helping the journal *Voprosy Filosofii* improve its work and strengthen its connection with philosophers of the periphery.

However, in the work of the journal *Voprosy Filosofii*, serious shortcomings still exist. The journal still publishes insufficiently theoretically mature articles. Few articles are published on issues of Marxist ethics and aesthetics. The department of dialectical materialism works unsatisfactorily. The department of criticism and bibliography is weakly organized.

Discussions organized by the journal are often conducted spontaneously, without proper theoretical preparation, and are impermissibly drawn out.

The work done by Soviet philosophers cannot satisfy the Soviet public. Philosophical output is still unnaturally poor compared to the needs of our country. I. V. Stalin has repeatedly pointed out that our Marxist philosophy is not the philosophy of single individuals, but the philosophy of the working class, the philosophy of the masses of the people. Millions of Soviet people study philosophy in our country; their demands on the quality of philosophical literature are constantly increasing. And we, Soviet philosophers, do not yet satisfy these growing needs of the people of our country.

Philosophers in their research work still insufficiently study new phenomena in social life, weakly generalize the achievements of modern natural science. Books written at an insufficiently high theoretical level, and even books containing gross errors, still see the light of day. A number of publications

were subjected to sharp criticism on the pages of our press (B. Kedrov's *On Paths of Development of Natural Science*, M. Rozental's *Philosophical Views of N. G. Chernyshevsky*, M. Baskin's *Anglo-American Sociology in the Service of Imperialism*, I. Kuznetsov's *The Principle of Correspondence in Modern Physics and Its Philosophical Significance*). Substantial shortcomings were noted in M. Leonov's book *Outline of Dialectical Materialism*, A. Maximov's *Essays on the History of the Struggle for Materialism in Russian Natural Science*, D. Troshin's *Dialectics of Development in Michurinist Biology*, and in some others.

The work of the country's philosophical institutions needs serious improvement. In the first years after the philosophical discussion, the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR was slow to restructure its work and did not fulfill plans for scientific research work. Criticism and self-criticism were weakly deployed at the institute, and cooperation with other scientific institutions of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR was not established. Recently, the Institute of Philosophy has significantly intensified its work and published a number of useful books mentioned above. Of the five philosophical works awarded the Stalin Prize, four were prepared for print by the Institute of Philosophy. Work on creating a two-volume history of philosophy is nearing completion. In the near future, its first volume will be released. Preparation for print of the most important, second volume is also being completed.

However, the institute's collective still has to exert a lot of effort for the further improvement of work, the development of

criticism and self-criticism. The Institute of Philosophy has not yet created complete textbooks on dialectical materialism, historical materialism, history of philosophy, and logic. The book *Historical Materialism* edited by Prof. F. V. Konstantinov, playing an undoubtedly positive role in propagating Marxist philosophy, needs, as its discussion showed, serious improvement to become a full-fledged textbook satisfying all requirements.

Matters are especially unsatisfactory with the elaboration of questions of dialectical materialism. Philosophical institutions of the country and the Ministry of Higher Education must pay attention to the preparation, through postgraduate and doctoral studies, of specialists in dialectical materialism, for their current number clearly does not satisfy the country's needs. The sectors of dialectical materialism of the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences and other institutes, as well as the journal *Voprosy Filosofii*, face immense work to unite philosophers specializing in the field of dialectical materialism, to elaborate the most important questions of the theory of knowledge.

Questions of Marxist ethics and aesthetics, the history of philosophical and social thought of the peoples of the USSR, and the history of philosophy in Eastern countries are being developed even more weakly. In the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences and other philosophical institutes of the country, the experience of building socialism in the European countries of people's democracy and the experience of creating a new order in the countries of people's

democracy that arose in Asia are completely insufficiently summarized.

A number of useful collections and monographs were prepared by the philosophy chairs of the Academy of Social Sciences under the CC of the AUCP(b). Attention is drawn, however, to the huge disproportion between the number of prepared dissertations and published works. The same situation takes place at the philosophy chairs of Moscow State University and other universities of the country. Philosophy chairs should raise the standards required for dissertations submitted for defense and improve work on preparing defended works for publication.

Positive work on publishing lectures on dialectical and historical materialism is carried out by the chair of dialectical materialism of the Higher Party School under the CC of the AUCP(b). However, it cannot be considered normal that this large chair has not prepared a single monograph on philosophy in five years.

One should note the weakness of scientific research work in the institutes of philosophy of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, the Belorussian Academy of Sciences, the Georgian Academy of Sciences, at the philosophy chairs of Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev Universities, as well as other universities and higher educational institutions of the country.

The Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, over the five years that passed after the philosophical discussion, besides several collections and small pamphlets and articles, has not published a single major work.

The institute does not rely on the numerous cadres of philosophers existing in Ukraine, and does not unite them around itself. Criticism and self-criticism in the institute are weakly developed.

Matters are even worse at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Belorussian SSR. The institute in five years published, if one does not count articles, two works by P. Kiryushin—*Racism: Weapon of Imperialist Reaction* and *The Vatican in the Service of Reaction*—containing the grossest errors and vicious propositions. Like the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Belorussian SSR does not unite around itself not only philosophers of the republic, but even philosophers of Minsk. It must be said directly that the sharp, principled criticism by the party press of Ukraine and Belorussia of the shortcomings in the work of the philosophy institutes of the Academies of Sciences of the Ukrainian and Belorussian SSRs has not been fully taken into account by the collectives of these institutes, and they have not yet been able to radically restructure their work.

Some work has been done by the collective of the Institute of Philosophy of the Georgian SSR. It has released several books on the history of Georgian philosophy and logic. Attention is drawn, however, to the fact that Georgian comrades work little on questions of dialectical and historical materialism. It should also be noted that philosophical works prepared by the institute are published, as a rule, only in Georgia and in the Georgian language. It is time for Georgian philosophers to step out into

the All-Union arena. It is necessary to overcome a certain insularity in the work of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian SSR, which prevents a broad exchange of opinions on issues being worked on by the Institute of Philosophy.

Soviet philosophers, critically evaluating their work for the time that has passed since the philosophical discussion, must eliminate existing shortcomings in the shortest possible time.

* * *

The immense ideological work carried out by the Bolshevik Party in the past five-year period, the completion of the publication of the fourth edition of the *Works* of V. I. Lenin, the publication of the *Works* of I. V. Stalin, new works by I. V. Stalin and especially his work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* determined the further growth of the ideological and theoretical level of our cadres, in particular our philosopher cadres. Soviet philosophers, under the leadership of the Communist Party, are learning a creative understanding of Marxist theory, applying Marxism to various branches of science, and pushing forward the development of dialectical and historical materialism.

Guided by the creative principles of Marxism-Leninism, Soviet philosophers must resolve tasks of exceptional importance set before them by the Bolshevik Party and personally by I. V. Stalin, and must decisively part with elements of dogmatism in their work. "Marxism does not recognize immutable conclusions and formulas obligatory for all epochs and periods. Marxism is the enemy of any dogmatism." I. V. Stalin teaches

theoretical cadres to mercilessly fight against rote learning and Talmudism. Soviet philosophers must constantly be guided by these instructions of I. V. Stalin.

In the field of historical materialism, it is necessary to continue theoretical elaboration of issues connected with the gradual transition from socialism to communism: on the nature of the economic laws of socialism; on the driving forces of the development of socialist society; on paths for overcoming the differences that still remain between town and country, between mental and physical labor; on paths for erasing boundaries between the working class and peasantry, between these classes and the intelligentsia; on the characteristics of the development of Soviet socialist nations; on the laws of development of Soviet socialist culture, etc.

Immense tasks face philosophers in the field of summarizing the experience of socialist construction in the European countries of people's democracy, as well as summarizing the experience of creating a new order in the Chinese People's Republic, Korean, and Vietnamese People's Democratic Republics.

Soviet philosophers must reveal more deeply and fully than they have done so far the contrast of the socialist economic system to the capitalist one, showing the innumerable advantages of socialism over capitalism. In particular, this must be done on the basis of revealing the contrast between the laws of socialism and the laws of capitalism.

A comprehensive theoretical analysis must be applied to the alignment of struggling forces on the international arena, the

struggle of the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism headed by the USSR against the imperialist and anti-democratic camp headed by the United States of America. It is necessary to show the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, in particular, to characterize the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism, and to reveal in full measure the process of growth and intensification of all contradictions of the imperialist world.

Our philosophers working on issues of historical materialism study little that is new which arises in the process of the development of class conflicts at the present stage in capitalist countries, especially in England and the USA. The exceptional importance of democratic movements (the struggle for peace, the struggle against the fascitization of the political system, etc.) should not lead to forgetting the importance of the class battles of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. In connection with this, of special theoretical and political interest is the question of the relationship between socialist and general-democratic tasks in the class struggle of the proletariat. In the era of imperialism, much that is new appears in this relationship compared to the period of pre-monopoly capitalism.

All these and other tasks Soviet philosophers can resolve only on the basis of a creative approach to their resolution, on the basis of a deep study of life, close cooperation with economists, historians, legal scholars, and representatives of other branches of social science.

As before, a lagging sector of the philosophical front is the area of ethics and aesthetics. In five years, not a single monograph

devoted to communist morality has been published. Articles on issues of morality still do not give a deep analysis of the communist attitude toward labor, Soviet patriotism, friendship of peoples, selflessness, and heroism of Soviet people. The subject of analysis in articles on ethics should be the field of daily life, which has undergone a radical change in connection with the victory of socialism, and other spheres of relations and spiritual life of Soviet people. One must not forget that the spiritual world of the personality in socialist society and the character of its relationships are incomparably richer than under capitalism.

Another shortcoming of all published articles on ethics consists in the fact that they weakly reflect the struggle of the new with the old in the behavior of Soviet people, contradictions and conflicts, the resolution of which by methods of the Soviet public ensures communist education, communist tempering of Soviet people. It is necessary to show the tenacity of survivals of capitalism in the consciousness of people and the importance of the struggle against them.

Overcoming the shortcomings existing in our articles on ethics, Soviet philosophers will help writers illuminate more deeply and richly the life of Soviet man, more boldly uncover conflicts existing between people who are in the captivity of various prejudices, and advanced Soviet people.

Our philosophers develop the fundamental problems of the aesthetics of socialist realism completely unsatisfactorily. The most important aesthetic problems find almost no place in the works of Soviet philosophers; it is impermissible that the discussion of the question of the subject of aesthetics, of the

place of art in the sphere of the superstructure, has been delayed for so long. At the same time, such questions as the essence of the principles of socialist realism, characteristics of the artistic depiction of reality, the relationship of form and content in art, and others, were almost not developed by philosophers.

Soviet philosophers working in the field of dialectical materialism need, on the basis of mastering the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, to comprehensively develop materialist dialectics and philosophical materialism.

Comrade Stalin in his work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* pointed out the necessity of a creative approach to theory on the example of the development of the law of transition from an old quality to a new one and other examples. Guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, summarizing the experience of communist construction in the USSR, the new historical experience of social development, and the latest achievements of natural science, it is necessary to develop all principles and categories of the Marxist dialectical method. It is necessary to create monographs devoted to the main features of the Marxist dialectical method and the most important categories of materialist dialectics. Special attention should be turned to developing the Marxist doctrine on law, questions of the struggle of the new with the old, on the irreversibility of the new, on the nature of leaps, etc.

The development of modern physics, chemistry, biology, physiology, and other sciences urgently demands from philosophers a philosophical interpretation of the question of the forms of movement of matter, the development of the

theory of reflection based on the latest data of the physiology of higher nervous activity, the disclosure of the role of language in the process of cognition in connection with Pavlov's doctrine on the second signal system, etc.

Completely intolerable is the fact that philosophers working in the field of dialectical materialism have so far not created serious works on the question of the relationship between language and thought in light of the works of I. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*. A paramount task of Soviet philosophers and Soviet linguists is the creation of monographic studies and articles on the relationship between language and thought, on the role of language in the process of cognition. Close cooperation between philosophers and linguists is an indispensable condition for the successful resolution of this task.

Exceptional importance has been acquired by issues of developing the history of Marxist philosophy, as well as the history of the development of philosophical and social thought of the peoples of the USSR and countries of the East: the Chinese People's Republic, India, Japan, etc. Special attention should be paid to studying the influence of progressive philosophical trends of the peoples of the USSR and countries of the East on the development of science and philosophy in the West. Great tasks face historians of philosophy in the field of developing the history of ancient and Western European philosophy. One cannot consider normal the situation where in recent years there were almost no dissertations or works devoted to these questions, and the training of cadres for this very important area of philosophical science virtually ceased.

Immense tasks were set by the party before Soviet philosophers in the field of an offensive struggle against decayed, reactionary bourgeois ideology. At the 1947 philosophical discussion, A. A. Zhdanov said: "Who, if not us—the country of victorious Marxism and its philosophers—should lead the struggle against decayed and vile bourgeois ideology; who, if not us, should deal it crushing blows?" This task is carried out by Soviet philosophers so far unsatisfactorily. Criticism of reactionary bourgeois philosophy bears an insufficiently purposeful, insufficiently deep character. In the majority of cases, individual statements are subjected to criticism, sometimes individual works of ideological henchmen of imperialist reaction. But this is, undoubtedly, not enough. It is necessary to uncover all the ideological poverty and reactionary essence of modern bourgeois ideology, to criticize and smash all reactionary philosophical trends appearing in bourgeois countries under new fashionable names. The country's philosophical institutions must prepare and specialize cadres capable in articles and pamphlets of accessibly and convincingly exposing modern idealist schools, consistently propagating the scientific worldview of dialectical materialism.

The theoretical work of Soviet philosophers is inseparable from their propaganda and agitation work. Millions of Soviet citizens study Marxist philosophy. As we advance toward communism, the circle of readers of philosophical literature will expand more and more. Our country needs numerous educational and popular propaganda literature on philosophy. Of especially important significance has acquired the question of creating full-fledged educational literature designed for

various contingents studying Marxist philosophy. Already at the philosophical discussion, the party pointed out the importance of creating a full-fledged Marxist textbook on the history of philosophy and defined the requirements it must satisfy. Famous work in this direction is being conducted by the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences. As already noted, production of a two-volume work on the history of philosophy is nearing completion, a draft book on dialectical materialism is being published, and a second edition of the book *Historical Materialism* is being prepared. But even the completion of these works will not yet solve the problem with educational literature, for the book on the history of philosophy being prepared, by its nature and volume, is not designed for persons who are just beginning the study of the history of philosophy. The book on dialectical materialism must be tested in the practice of pedagogical work. The creation of textbooks on Marxist philosophy continues to remain a paramount task facing philosophers.

It is completely incomprehensible why the Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR, the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR, and the Committee on Arts Affairs under the Council of Ministers of the USSR are indifferent to this important question, showing no interest in the setup of scientific research work at philosophy chairs of universities and institutes. Meanwhile, it is completely obvious that without well-directed scientific research work at philosophy chairs, it is impossible to genuinely, radically improve the setup of teaching Marxist philosophy in higher educational institutions.

One cannot consider correct the situation where the preparation of textbooks on dialectical and historical materialism is conducted mainly by the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, whose workers are little connected or not connected at all with pedagogical work. The philosophy chairs of universities have every opportunity to create full-fledged textbooks on dialectical and historical materialism. Suffice it to say that the teaching staff of the philosophy faculty of Moscow University in numbers equals the collective of workers of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and is sufficiently qualified to create high-quality study aids.

A matter of honor for leading workers of philosophy chairs, primarily of Moscow and Leningrad Universities, is the creation of textbooks on historical and dialectical materialism and the history of philosophy.

Great tasks facing Soviet philosophers can be resolved only on the condition of close cooperation between philosophers of Moscow and philosophers of the periphery, cooperation of philosophers with representatives of other social sciences and natural science. The rallying of philosophical cadres and the further expansion of criticism and self-criticism, the holding of creative discussions and creative deliberations on as-yet-unresolved questions of science, the persistent struggle for the implementation of party decisions on ideological issues and the instructions of I. V. Stalin are the main conditions ensuring the fulfillment of these tasks.

Great responsibility rests on the journal *Voprosy Filosofii* in the matter of the further development of creative discussions,

uniting philosophical cadres, developing and propagating the Marxist-Leninist worldview, in the matter of the struggle against decayed, reactionary imperialist ideology. The journal, which arose out of the philosophical discussion, is an All-Union tribune of Soviet philosophers. It must in every way assist the development of the struggle of opinions and freedom of criticism, act as an initiator in deploying creative discussions on issues of philosophy and methodological issues of science. The editorial board of the journal will take all measures to ensure that the pages of the journal systematically cover the life of the country's scientific institutions, give a critical analysis of the organization of work of philosophical institutions and their scientific output, and illuminate the experience of teaching philosophical disciplines in higher educational institutions.

Responsible and gratifying are the tasks set by the Bolshevik Party before Soviet philosophers. The Party of Lenin–Stalin has armed us, Soviet philosophers, with everything necessary for their successful and rapid resolution. To the everyday help and care of the Bolshevik Party, the army of Soviet philosophers will answer by improving all of its work, by a persistent struggle for the complete resolution of the tasks set before them.

2. THE 19TH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND IDEOLOGICAL WORK

I

The congresses of the party of Lenin and Stalin are outstanding events in the political and ideological life of our country and the international working class. Each regular congress of the Communist Party resolved new great tasks, arming our party, the working class, and the entire Soviet people ideologically and politically to fulfill these tasks.

The 19th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union occupies one of the most prominent places in the history of our party, in the lives of the peoples of the USSR, and of the working people across the entire world. It summarized the results of the party's activities over a most important historical period filled with great events in the life of our socialist Fatherland and the working people of the world. The victoriously concluded Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against fascist aggressors; the popular revolution in a number of countries in Europe and Asia that led to the breakaway of these countries from the imperialist system and the establishment in them of a people’s democracy regime; the successful restoration of the country's national economy destroyed by the enemy on a new, even more advanced technical basis; a new powerful upsurge in the entire national socialist economy and socialist culture—all these are facts of enormous, world-historical significance.

The Communist Party, led by the Stalinist Central Committee, by our great teacher and leader Comrade Stalin, arrived at its congress as a party of victors, a party of builders of communism, as the greatest, most advanced historical force of modern times. The Communist Party came to the 19th Congress monolithic and united around its Central Committee, around its wise leader Comrade Stalin, who led our party, our people, and our Fatherland to the greatest victories.

The Communist Party came to its congress surrounded by the love and boundless trust of the people. In close, unbreakable bond with the people, the party of Lenin and Stalin has always seen and continues to see the main source of its strength. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union appeared before the international working class as the most battle-tested Marxist party, faithful to the end to the sacred principles of proletarian, Leninist internationalism.

The world-historical significance of the 19th Congress of the Communist Party is determined by the most important tasks of building communism that were discussed and resolved at it. A grand event in the ideological life of the party and the entire Soviet people was the publication on the eve of the congress of the brilliant work of I. V. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*. This theoretical work represents the most outstanding event in the ideological life of our party since the publication of Stalin's book *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.): Short Course*—this encyclopedia of Marxist knowledge. The brilliant propositions and great ideas of this new Stalinist work illuminated with a powerful light all the work of the 19th Party Congress. They served as the ideological and theoretical

foundation for all its decisions. Stalin's work armed our party with a scientific knowledge of the laws of development of socialist society, and the laws and conditions for building communism.

In the remarkable report by the Secretary of the CC CPSU, Comrade G. M. Malenkov, at the 19th Party Congress, a deep analysis was given of two lines of economic development characteristic of two opposing camps—the socialist and the capitalist.

"The general picture of the world economic situation," says Comrade Malenkov, "is currently characterized by the presence of two lines of development.

One line is the line of continuous rise of the peaceful economy in the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, an economy that knows no crises and develops in the interest of ensuring the maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of society. This economy ensures a systematic rise in the living standards of the working masses and full employment of the labor force. Characteristic of this economy is friendly economic cooperation among the countries making up the democratic camp.

The other line is the line of capitalism's economy, whose productive forces mark time in place; an economy struggling in the grip of the ever-deepening general crisis of capitalism and constantly recurring economic crises; the line of militarization of the economy and one-sided development of branches of production working for war; the line of competitive struggle between countries, and the enslavement of some countries by

others. Such a situation is created as a result of the fact that this economy develops not in the interest of society, but in the interest of ensuring maximum profits for capitalists through the exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of the majority of the population of a given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward ones, and finally, through war and the militarization of the national economy."[1]

In the USSR, the volume of industrial production in 1951 reached 1,266% relative to 1929, that is, it increased almost 13 times. The steady development of USSR industry along an ascending line takes place on the basis of peaceful production development. Socialist production relations are the greatest driver of the development of productive forces. This regular pattern finds its confirmation in the countries of people's democracy as well, which are successfully building socialism.

In the European countries of people's democracy, despite having suffered from the war significantly more than the capitalist countries of Western Europe, the pre-war level of industrial output was surpassed in 1951: in Poland by 2.9 times, in Czechoslovakia by 1.7 times, in Hungary by 2.5 times, in Romania by 1.9 times, in Bulgaria by 4.6 times, and in Albania by more than 5 times. Great successes in the development of the national economy were achieved by the German Democratic Republic. The economy of the People's Republic of China is developing rapidly.

---

[1] G. Malenkov. *Report to the 19th Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 7. Gospolitizdat, 1952.

An opposite picture is presented by the economy of the countries of the capitalist camp. Here, productive forces are in a state of stagnation. In the majority of capitalist countries of Western Europe, industry marks time around the 1929 level. In the USA, the level of industrial production increased from 1929 to 1951 by only 2 times, and this growth occurred due to the Second World War, from which the American bourgeoisie enriched itself, and due to the war in Korea, from which Wall Street magnates continue to enrich themselves turning the blood and tears of the Korean people into gold. The current situation in US industry is maintained through the militarization of the economy and the arms race. Not without reason, the Anglo-American bourgeoisie fears peace more than anything else and kindles and whips up war hysteria in every way.

The state of decay of productive forces in the camp of capitalism, industrial stagnation, growth of unemployment, and other crisis phenomena in the capitalist economy serve as confirmation of the most important proposition in Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* stating that old production relations, such as capitalist relations are today, represent a brake and an obstacle to the development of productive forces.

Comrade G. M. Malenkov demonstrated through vivid and convincing examples the operation of the two opposite basic economic laws discovered by Comrade Stalin—the basic economic law of modern capitalism and the basic economic law of socialism. In capitalist countries, the impoverishment of the working masses grows while simultaneously profits of

capital magnates grow. In socialist society, a process of steady growth in the material well-being and cultural level of all working people takes place.

In all capitalist countries, there exists permanent unemployment, and a huge number of people are condemned to partial unemployment. In the USA, for example, fully unemployed people number around 3 million. The living standard of working people systematically drops, wages decline, and the consumption of food products and other goods shrinks. In England, real wages are below the pre-war level by 20%; in France and Italy, they constitute less than half of the pre-war level. The cost of living in the USA compared to 1939 has increased almost 3-fold. Data on the growth of inventories in retail trade point to a reduction in goods consumption in the USA.

All these and numerous other facts testify to the fact that the law of absolute impoverishment of working people in capitalist countries operates relentlessly and leads to a systematic decline in the living standard of the working masses. At the same time, profits of monopolists grow to unprecedented levels. Thus, profits of US monopolies increased from $3.3 billion in 1938 to $42.9 billion in 1951, that is, by 13 times. 1,565 English companies in the first 5 months of 1952 received 16% more profits than last year. In this, the operation of the basic economic law of modern capitalism discovered by Comrade Stalin is manifested.

Internal and external contradictions in the camp of imperialism grow and sharpen; the foundations of capitalism crack and

shatter. Imperialists seek a way out of the current situation along the paths of unleashing a new war. War for capitalists is the best business, a source of maximum profits. It is precisely this goal that the militarization of the capitalist economy serves.

Ideologists of imperialism concoct Malthusian and racist theories designed to give justification and excuse for the aggressive policy of imperialists. Especially reactionary theories are developed by apologists of American imperialism, who strive to establish world domination of the USA. The leitmotif of all American imperialist ideology is contempt for the people, contempt for working people.

Opposite economic conditions and a different basic economic law exist in socialist society. This law conditions completely opposite results than in capitalist countries. Comrade G. M. Malenkov cited in his report vivid facts and figures demonstrating Stalinist care of the party and the Soviet state.

National income in our country grows continuously. On this basis, the material well-being of workers, employees, and collective farmers systematically rises. Real earnings of workers and employees grew in 1951 compared to 1940 by approximately 57%, and real incomes of collective farmers by 60%. The network of hospitals, sanatoriums, nurseries, creches, and other healthcare institutions grew significantly.

Favorable material living conditions for the peoples of the USSR opened possibilities for continuous population growth. Thus, over the last three years, the net population growth in our country amounted to 9.5 million people.

The imperialist bourgeoisie and its ideologists see the cause of all evils of capitalism, the source of poverty and suffering of the working masses, in allegedly excessive population growth. Deceiving the working masses, modern Neo-Malthusians want to shift responsibility for the hardships of the masses from capitalism and transfer it to nature. This is a cunning trick of bankrupt bourgeoisie.

In the country of socialism, an unprecedented population growth does not lead to overpopulation or unemployment. The Soviet government encourages population growth in every way. The fact of unprecedentedly fast population growth in the absence of unemployment, alongside a steady rise in the material well-being of the entire society, shatters to pieces all monstrous Neo-Malthusian drivel.

Two worlds, two lines of development, and two opposite ideologies: reactionary, imperialist on the one hand, and advanced, socialist on the other. One expresses the position and interests of the reactionary bourgeoisie; the other, the interests of the working class and working people of all countries. And whichever question of modern times we take, everywhere we encounter these two opposite ideologies, opposite views.

II

In the report of Comrade G. M. Malenkov, and in the work and decisions of the 19th Party Congress, questions of developing socialist culture and socialist ideology, and questions of fighting against bourgeois reactionary ideology occupied a prominent place. Directives adopted by the Party Congress on the five-year plan for the development of the USSR mapped

out a grandiose program of economic and cultural construction of communism in our country. This plan marks a major new step in the movement of socialist society toward communism.

In the adopted Party Rules of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, it is stated: "Now the main tasks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union consist in building a communist society through a gradual transition from socialism to communism, continuously raising the material and cultural level of society, educating members of society in the spirit of internationalism and establishing fraternal ties with working people of all countries, and strengthening in every way the active defense of the Soviet Motherland against aggressive actions of its enemies."

To successfully carry out the grand tasks of economic and cultural construction set before the Soviet country by the 19th Party Congress, as well as tasks of gradual transition to communism, it is necessary to raise even higher the level of ideological work in the country, the level of socialist consciousness of the builders of communism, and to overcome survivals of capitalism in the consciousness of people. The resolution of all these tasks put forward by the 19th Congress before the party and workers on the ideological front will allow us to move forward even more successfully.

Comrade Stalin in his new work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* gave a deeply profound scientific substantiation of the main preliminary conditions for a gradual transition from socialism to communism. There are three such conditions. It is necessary to ensure continuous growth of all

social production with a predominant growth of production of the means of production; through gradual transitions, to raise collective farm property to the level of public property, and gradually replace commodity circulation with a system of product exchange; and to raise the cultural level of the people to a stage that would ensure all members of society the opportunity to comprehensively develop their physical and mental abilities.

I. V. Stalin points out that "before transitioning to the formula 'to each according to his needs,' it is necessary to pass through a series of stages of economic and cultural re-education of society, during which labor, from a mere means of supporting life in the eyes of society, will be turned into the primary vital necessity, and public property into the inviolable and sacred foundation of society's existence."[2]

Powerful development of productive forces and the corresponding development of socialist production relations are the main factors determining the gradual transition of socialist society to communism. But this is not the only condition. The building of communism and the transition to communism require a high level of communist consciousness and the overcoming of capitalist survivals in people's minds. It is necessary to raise to a new, higher level the ideological and cultural level of the builders of communism and to transform all people into active agents of society. All this assumes a

[2] I. Stalin. *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 66. Gospolitizdat. 1952.

grandiose scope of work regarding the communist education of broad masses of people.

In the report at the 19th Party Congress, Comrade G. M. Malenkov noted the greatest achievements of the Soviet country in the sphere of cultural development. Socialism has created unprecedentedly favorable conditions in history for the physical and mental development of the Soviet person, his abilities and talents, which manifest themselves so dynamically in material production, science, and art.

In exercising its guiding and directing role in communist construction, the party tirelessly cares for the comprehensive development of Soviet society and the cultural growth of the Soviet person. The spiritual life of society, according to the teachings of Marxism, cannot be detached from material conditions. People who denied the significance of social ideas in the development of society were exposed by the party as vulgarizers of Marxism-Leninism.

Comrade Stalin in his work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* teaches that new social ideas and theories arise on the basis of the development of the needs of society's material life. However, having arisen, they exert a reverse influence on the development of society. "New social ideas and theories arise precisely because they are necessary for society, because without their organizing, mobilizing, and transforming work, the resolution of urgent tasks in the development of society's material life is impossible,"[3] points out I. V. Stalin.

[3] I. Stalin. *Problems of Leninism*, p. 547. 11th ed.

Guided by this proposition of Marxist science, the Party resolves tasks regarding the spiritual development of society and the communist education of the people. The development of material conditions of life in socialist society is unthinkable without the spiritual perfection of people, without overcoming capitalist survivals in their minds. Since the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution, major changes have taken place in the spiritual life of our society. Socialism fundamentally transformed not only the material foundation of society, but also the spiritual character of the people. It was precisely this that allowed Comrade Stalin to state that "the modern Soviet citizen, free from the chains of capitalism, stands a head above any foreign high-ranking official who drags the yoke of capitalist slavery on his shoulders."[4]

The nationwide ideology of Soviet society is the most advanced scientific ideology—Marxism-Leninism. Under the banner of this great ideology, the Soviet people achieved their great world-historical victories—overthrew the power of the bourgeoisie and established Soviet power, built a socialist society, defended their socialist Fatherland in the Great Patriotic War, and routed malicious enemies. Socialist ideology is the ideological basis of the moral-political unity of Soviet society and the friendship of peoples. Such a powerful driving force behind the development of socialist society as Soviet patriotism is an integral part of socialist ideology. In socialist ideology, Soviet people drew and continue to draw strength and confidence in the victory of the great cause of communism.

---

[4] I. Stalin. *Problems of Leninism*, p. 590.

Socialist ideology illuminated and continues to illuminate for the Soviet people their path to communism.

Socialist ideology across the whole world opposes the reactionary ideology of the bourgeoisie, the ideology of warmongers. The Communist Party, the CC CPSU, and Comrade Stalin have always paid immense attention to questions of ideological work, conducted and continue to conduct an uncompromising struggle against manifestations of bourgeois ideology hostile to us, and ideologically arm the party and its cadres with the battle-tested ideology of Marxism-Leninism.

"Ideological work is the primary duty of the party, and underestimating this work can cause irreparable damage to the interests of the party and the state. We must always remember that any weakening of the influence of socialist ideology means a strengthening of the influence of bourgeois ideology."[5]

Noting the triumph of our great socialist ideology and the monumental victories of Marxism-Leninism, we must not forget about those existing in certain sectors of the broad front of culture, science, and art, manifestations of survivals of bourgeois ideology.

"In our Soviet society," says Comrade G. M. Malenkov, "there is not and cannot be a class basis for the dominance of bourgeois ideology. In our country, socialist ideology holds sway, the unbreakable foundation of which is Marxism-Leninism. But we still have preserved remnants of bourgeois

---

[5] G. Malenkov. *Report to the 19th Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 94.

ideology, survivals of private-property psychology and morality. These survivals do not die away on their own; they are very tenacious, can grow, and a decisive struggle must be conducted against them. We are also not insured against the penetration from outside of views, ideas, and attitudes foreign to us, on the part of capitalist states, and from within, on the part of remnants of groups hostile to Soviet power that were not fully crushed by the party. It must not be forgotten that enemies of the Soviet state try to spread, heat up, and fan all kinds of unhealthy attitudes, ideologically decomposing unstable elements of our society."[6]

We are all aware of serious breakthroughs in a number of fields of knowledge, where certain people tried to plant anti-Marxist views hostile to Soviet society. Concepts foreign to socialist ideology crept into philosophy, biology, physiology, linguistics, political economy, as well as into art and literature. The Soviet intelligentsia, guided by the Communist Party, overcame and continues to overcome these theories and views hostile to socialism. The task consists in developing vigilance in every way and in being able to spot negative phenomena at their very origin and resolutely suppress them.

In our society, there are still people who represent the remnants of routed anti-Leninist groups, unstable elements subject to the influence of bourgeois ideology; there are foreign people trying to push their line, reviving and spreading various kinds of non-Marxist "viewpoints" and "concepts." In an editorial article in the newspaper *Pravda* of January 13, 1953, it is pointed out

6 Ibid.

that in our country exploiting classes were liquidated long ago, but there still remain carriers of bourgeois views and bourgeois morality—living people, hidden enemies of the Soviet people. The more successful our advance forward, the sharper will be the struggle of enemies of the people who are doomed to destruction and driven to despair. People who take the stance of the "extinction" of class struggle break with Marxism and assist enemies of communism.

To completely eliminate hostile elements and any possibility of wrecking, it is necessary to wage a struggle against complacency and blithe carelessness in our ranks, and to stand for the strengthening of revolutionary vigilance in all areas of our life and activity.

The presence of a hostile capitalist encirclement and uncrushed hostile elements inside the USSR obliges workers on the ideological front to increase vigilance in their work a hundredfold, and to launch an offensive against all manifestations of ideology hostile to Marxism. The Communist Party demands that workers on the ideological front raise even higher the level of all ideological work and, on the basis of an uncompromising struggle against enemies of socialism, achieve new successes in the matter of communist education of the Soviet people.

The basis of all our ideological work consists of a deep, creative mastery of Marxism-Leninism by broad cadres of the Soviet intelligentsia. Of the greatest significance in the ideological and theoretical struggle against reactionary bourgeois ideology, including reactionary bourgeois

philosophy and sociology, is the work of Comrade Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*.

III

In his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Comrade Stalin raised Marxist political economy to a new, higher level. After Karl Marx's *Capital* and V. I. Lenin's work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, I. V. Stalin's work on economic problems is the most outstanding event in political economy. In this Stalinist work, a comprehensive scientific analysis is given of the laws of social production and distribution of material goods in socialist society, the scientific foundations for the development of socialist economy are defined, and the laws, conditions, and paths for a gradual transition from socialism to communism are charted.

However, Comrade Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* is a great contribution not only to political economy, but also to the treasure trove of Marxism as a whole. Being devoted to economic problems, this work of I. V. Stalin, like K. Marx's *Capital*, represents a deeply philosophical work. In this brilliant work of creative Marxism, answers are given to the great questions of modern times posed by the course of society's development and the course of development of Marxist science.

Comrade Stalin in this work subjects subjective-idealist views on the regularity of nature and society to devastating criticism, and provides further comprehensive substantiation of the Marxist teaching on the objective character of the laws of development of nature and society, and a deep scientific

analysis of the objective character of economic laws of development of socialist society.

In the work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, further development was received by materialist dialectics, its laws, basic features, and categories: problems of the internal connection of phenomena, their interaction; the concrete-historical approach to phenomena of reality; progressive development of society; the struggle between the new and the old; contradictions, oppositions, and conflicts arising in capitalist society; and the special character of contradictions in socialist society; the problem of gradual development—leaps without explosions under conditions of socialism—and, proceeding from this, the problem of a special connection between form and content under socialism; the problem of essence and phenomenon, possibility and reality, freedom and necessity, chance and regularity—all these and other most important problems of materialist dialectics received further creative development in the work of Comrade Stalin on the basis of philosophical generalization of new facts and practical activity of our party, arming it ideologically in leading the construction of communism.

In I. V. Stalin's work, it is shown that in different socio-economic formations general economic laws operate that have force for all stages of society's development, as well as specific laws inherent only to a given formation. To the category of general economic laws operating across all social formations belongs, for example, the law of obligatory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces. To the category of specific economic laws inherent only to a given

social formation belong, for example, such laws as the basic economic law of modern capitalism or the basic economic law of socialism. Different social economic formations not only differ from one another, but are also connected with one another. This connection is proved by the presence of general economic and sociological laws.

In Comrade Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, further creative development was received by the problem of the dialectics of productive forces and production relations. Comrade Stalin gave a further scientific substantiation of the economic law of obligatory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces, revealing the operation of this law in various social formations, and especially under conditions of socialism. Comrade Stalin showed that the law of obligatory or full correspondence operates in all social formations, and not only under socialism, as was erroneously understood by philosophers and economists.

Comrade Stalin also pointed out another error in the understanding by philosophers and economists of the law of full correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces. Full correspondence was interpreted by many as absolute, excluding contradictions between developing productive forces and socialist production relations. This error gained currency in economic and philosophical literature, and found expression on the pages of the journal *Questions of Philosophy* in articles by M. T. Iovchuk, V. E. Kozlovsky, and others, in the book *Historical Materialism* edited by Prof. F. V. Konstantinov, in *On Soviet Socialist*

Society, and in other publications. Comrade Stalin explained that full correspondence between productive forces and production relations in socialist society does not exclude contradictions between them.

Enormous significance in the development of Marxist science on society is held by the essential proposition of Stalin's work stating that new productive relations are the main driver of the development of productive forces.

In the new work of I. V. Stalin, further creative development was received by the problem of base and superstructure; the essence of the economic base was revealed, and the role of the political superstructure (Soviet power) in the construction of socialism was shown, as well as its utilization of such an economic law as the law of obligatory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces.

Comrade Stalin, revealing the objective character of economic laws, demonstrates what importance their discovery and utilization in the conscious activity of society, in the policy of our party, and in the building of communism possess. In Comrade Stalin's work, a further development of the question regarding the correlation of objective laws, historical necessity, and conscious creative activity of the masses, classes, party, and individual historical figures is thus given. Historical materialism, as well as all Marxist philosophical science, was raised by Comrade Stalin to a new, higher level.

The outstanding significance of Stalin's work on economic problems also consists in the fact that in it a deep scientific analysis of new phenomena of modern capitalism was

conducted: the further sharpening of its crisis, the deepening of its contradictions, the disintegration of a single world market, and the narrowing of the base of capitalist production. Comrade Stalin substantiated in his work the inevitability of further sharpening of contradictions between imperialist powers and the danger of new imperialist wars.

All these most important problems, touching upon the historical destinies and interests of peoples, are of paramount importance in the ideological struggle of our era.

The bourgeoisie, which once came forward under the flag of liberalism, democracy, and national independence, has long become a reactionary force. It has thrown overboard the banner of democracy and national independence. Reactionary ideologists of the bourgeoisie preach fascism and renunciation of national sovereignty.

The banner of democracy and national independence is now raised by communist and workers' parties of capitalist countries, uniting under this banner the broadest popular masses.

The work of Comrade Stalin, as well as his historic speech at the 19th Party Congress, deals a crushing blow to all reactionary bourgeois ideology and ideologically arms the cadres of communist builders, all communist and workers' parties in their struggle against imperialist reaction, for peace, democracy, national independence, and socialism.

IV

The works of Comrade Stalin teach all of us how to creatively resolve new philosophical questions on the basis of generalizing new data of social development, on the basis of new scientific data.

In the works *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* and *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Comrade Stalin points to the specific manifestation of laws of dialectics under conditions of socialism. However, the attention of philosophers has not yet been drawn to the necessary extent toward developing these problems posed by I. V. Stalin. A significant portion of economists and philosophers surrendered to oblivion the most important proposition of Marxist philosophy on the objectivity of laws of socialist society's development. For example, planning was interpreted as an economic law of socialism, failing to distinguish objective economic laws from laws having merely legal force.

Comrade M. A. Suslov, in the article "Regarding the Articles of P. Fedoseyev" published in *Pravda* on December 24, 1952, noted that "it was precisely on the question of the character and operation of economic laws of socialism on the part of a significant portion of Soviet economists and philosophers that the greatest confusion was permitted, consisting mainly in a subjectivist, voluntarist interpretation of the regularities of socialist economy."

As Comrade M. A. Suslov points out, "the elementary duty of every party member consists in not glossing over committed errors, not dodging them, but honestly and openly

acknowledging one's errors and correcting them." This instruction directly applies to the journal *Questions of Philosophy*, in which a series of articles containing erroneous propositions on the laws of development of socialist society was published. Thus, in L. B. Alter's article "On the Character of Economic Laws of Socialist Society," printed in No. 2 of the journal *Questions of Philosophy* for 1949, planning is treated as an economic law and a parallel is drawn with the law of full correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces. An erroneous proposition of the same order is also contained in C. A. Stepanyan's article "On Certain Regularities of the Transition from Socialism to Communism," published in No. 2 of the journal *Questions of Philosophy* for 1947.

Philosophers dealing with problems of dialectical materialism have not produced a single book or a single brochure over recent years on the question of the objective character of scientific laws. Over all these years, only one doctoral dissertation was written on the law, and even that has not been published to this day. It is necessary to create monographs, write brochures and articles devoted to the problem of the objective character of scientific laws.

The development of categories of dialectical materialism has been almost completely forgotten by philosophers. Comrade Stalin showed the great cognitive and transforming importance of the dialectical law of struggle between the new and the old, and categories of possibility and reality, form and content, essence and phenomenon, freedom and necessity. I. V. Stalin revealed new aspects in the understanding of these categories

of dialectics as applied to conditions of socialism. All this obliges philosophers to deeply comprehend the development by Comrade Stalin of problems of dialectical materialism, and on the basis of this, to launch scientific work and subject to criticism errors in the interpretation of a number of questions.

Unfortunately, in our country the development of questions of materialist philosophy is still often conducted in detachment from life, from practice, and in detachment from the development of modern natural science and concrete social sciences. As a result, sometimes under the title of philosophical Marxist works, something absurd and scholastic is concocted. Take, for example, the doctoral dissertation of the Director of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian SSR, Comrade S. B. Tsereteli. The dissertation is entitled *Toward a Marxist-Leninist Understanding of the Logical*. In the abstract of the dissertation, S. B. Tsereteli writes: "The very process of changing qualitatively finite objects is also such an infinity that is always finite, but never has an end; it is larger than the finite, as the non-finite, but is not infinity" (p. 22).

"Definiteness means that something is this, and not another." "Consequently, every definiteness contains within itself a certain 'non-'; without this moment, it would not be any definiteness" (p. 4).

"Everything is a certain definiteness, in which 'non-' is not absolute, but relative" (p. 5).

"Abstraction and the abstract make sense depending on what they are abstracted from; 'plant' makes sense thanks to 'non-plant'" (p. 4).

"That which is asserted by internal negation, i.e., the negation of that which asserts it, is infinite. The negation of the infinite relies upon it and substantiates its negation" (p. 23).

"Hence, positivity must contain negation within itself; negation negates precisely it as positive, but containing internal negation is positive, which negates this negation" (p. 27). And further in the same spirit. The entire abstract, which is the quintessence of the submitted defense of the dissertation, is written in a purely Hegelian, scholastic spirit. Comrade S. B. Tsereteli is not an ordinary person, but the director of a scientific institution. In the spirit of his philosophy, he apparently also educates his employees.

Manifestations of Hegelianism bear witness to the fact that we must be vigilant, that idealist views have not yet been overcome everywhere among us. Individual elements—carriers of anti-Marxist views—try to drag us backward and revive the old idealist rubbish of long-routed classics of Marxism-Leninism idealist schools and trends.

One of the sources of errors and shortcomings in the development of questions of philosophy by scientific workers is shallow knowledge of Marxism and detachment from concrete fields of knowledge, from socialist practice. In our literature, there still occur survivals of old, Hegelian terminology. Undoubtedly, to such survivals belongs the formula of identity of opposites, which has nothing in common

with the law of struggle of opposites, struggle between the new and the old, struggle between the emerging and developing with the old, dying out.

The formula of identity of opposites, which occupies a prominent place in the abstract of Comrade Tsereteli, is unclear; it is capable of confusing people, disarming advanced forces in their struggle against the old, obsolete, reactionary forces. Take, for example, such opposites as the new and the old, war and peace, revolution and reaction, life and death, socialism and capitalism, etc.—what kind of identity can there be here? Between them a struggle goes on, a struggle for overcoming, destruction by forces of peace of the forces of war, by advanced forces—of the forces of reaction, by forces representing the new, developing—of the forces of the old, obsolete. This regular pattern is expressed by the Leninist-Stalinist formula of struggle of opposites. Precisely this proposition of V. I. Lenin was reproduced by I. V. Stalin in his work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* in characterizing the main features of materialist dialectics. Propositions on the struggle of the old and the new, the positive and the negative found brilliant and deep substantiation in the works of V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin. Theoretical workers—Marxists—must be guided by these propositions.

Relying on the work of Comrade Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, philosophers must first of all expose and overcome committed errors in theoretical work, in published books, brochures, and articles.

Life puts forward new and ever newer tasks, urgently requiring from philosophers the ability to constantly capture this new and theoretically comprehend and generalize it. The works of Comrade Stalin enrich Marxist science with new ideas, arm us with knowledge of new laws of socialist society's development, and help us more deeply understand the most important phenomena of life and significantly improve all our theoretical work. To raise the quality and ideological-theoretical level of all philosophical work is currently the main task of the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the journal *Questions of Philosophy*, and philosophy departments of higher education institutions, of all philosophical workers.

Subject of further creative development must be questions regarding the character of economic laws under socialism, the connection between general sociological laws and specific laws that arose on the basis of economic conditions of socialist society, the three main preliminary conditions for the gradual transition to communism, and the overcoming of essential differences between town and country, and between mental and physical labor. For philosophical workers, of particularly urgent significance becomes the development of questions of communist education of our country's working people in close connection with tasks of gradual transition from socialism to communism, and with tasks of successful execution of the decisions of the 19th Congress of the CPSU.

Philosophical workers, in particular the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, do not study or develop problems of class struggle in capitalist countries at the present stage. This is a major omission in our work. Of

particularly vital significance is a systematic struggle against bourgeois reactionary ideology. All multifaceted work of philosophers must be imbued with a consistent struggle against various forms of bourgeois ideology. Modern ideology of imperialism, its philosophy and sociology are in a state of unprecedented marasmus and decay; they preach anti-human, corrupting ideas and are directed toward justifying imperialist wars, serving as an instrument for the spiritual enslavement of the working masses in countries of capital.

Over recent times among certain writers, critics, and also philosophers, there was an attempt to impose on Soviet literature an anti-Marxist concept of "conflictlessness" in drama and in art as a whole. This "theory" caused huge harm to Soviet literature, as it distracted writers from the most important task of exposing and eradicating survivals of capitalism in people's minds, and distracted from the struggle against negative phenomena of life. A writer must not violate the most important requirement of socialist realism—to truthfully reflect reality, guided by tasks put forward by the Communist Party.

Philosophers failed to timely expose the falsity of the "theory of conflictlessness" and help writers avoid errors in their creative work. Moreover, erroneous propositions of certain philosophers feed these erroneous views in the field of aesthetics. Thus, for example, Comrade V. P. Chertkov, in the article "Certain Questions of Dialectics in Light of I. V. Stalin's Work *On Linguistics*" (published in the collection *Questions of Dialectical and Historical Materialism in I. V. Stalin's Work 'Marxism and Problems of Linguistics'*), erroneously asserts

that "the old under socialism does not turn into a brake on development and for the first time in history is more and more eliminated in accordance with the maturity of processes taking place in life" (p. 189). The Party exposed the harmfulness of the "theory of conflictlessness" and indicated the path to a correct solution of important problems of socialist aesthetics.

For a long time among figures of literature and art, the problem of the artistic image and the problem of the typical in art were debated. A most profound resolution of this problem was given by Comrade G. M. Malenkov in the report at the 19th Party Congress. "Typicalness is not only that which is met most frequently," said Comrade Malenkov, "—but that which with maximum completeness and sharpness expresses the essence of a given social force... The problem of typicalness is always a political problem."[7]

Problems of Soviet aesthetics must constantly be in the field of vision of Soviet philosophers. Philosophers are obliged to render necessary aid to figures of art and literature in the development of new problems arising in the course of the development of Soviet art.

Further development of scientific philosophical work urgently requires overcoming dogmatism and pedantry. The posing of new philosophical questions and their resolution are possible only on the basis of a creative attitude toward science. I. V. Stalin teaches us that only on the basis of a creative approach to phenomena of reality is it possible to find new things in life

[7] G. Malenkov. *Report to the 19th Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 73.

itself, to generalize these new things, and thereby further develop science.

In scientific research philosophical work, it is required to decisively eradicate elements of vulgarization. To overcome vulgarization, there is only one path—a deep creative mastery of Marxist science and the development of skills for a concrete-historical approach to phenomena of nature and society.

Comrade Stalin warns us against a superficial attitude toward reality. Often scientific workers do not penetrate into the essence of vital processes, but limit themselves to considering only external aspects of reality. For example, certain people, failing to notice the sharpening and growth of contradictions between capitalist countries, asserted that contradictions between socialism and capitalism are stronger than the contradiction between capitalist countries, and, proceeding from this, denied the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries. Comrade Stalin showed the error of such a viewpoint. Comrade Stalin points out that theoretically, contradictions between socialism and capitalism are stronger than contradictions between capitalist countries. However, concrete-historical conditions of the development of capitalist countries testify to a continuous growth of contradictions between them, and to the fact that these contradictions are practically stronger than contradictions between the camp of socialism and the camp of capitalism, which makes wars between capitalist countries inevitable. People asserting the opposite are mistaken, writes Comrade Stalin. "They see external phenomena flashing on the surface, but do not see

those deep forces which, although operating imperceptibly for now, will nonetheless determine the course of events."

From this instruction of Comrade Stalin stems the requirement to study vital processes in all their versatility and depth, and not limit oneself to sliding along the surface.

To overcome serious shortcomings and errors in theoretical work, as in any other sphere of activity, there is one great, irreplaceable tool—the development of criticism and self-criticism. Criticism and self-criticism among philosophers, particularly in philosophical institutions, have not yet acquired the significance and role assigned to them by the Communist Party. Many philosophical workers are in deep debt to the people and to the party. They lag behind the tasks put forward by the party in the sphere of developing our philosophical theory, and in the sphere of struggling against corrupting reactionary bourgeois ideology. There are quite a few philosophy departments in universities and institutes that are large in terms of numerical composition but take no part, or almost no part, in philosophical theoretical work. The Department of Dialectical and Historical Materialism of the Faculty of Philosophy at Lomonosov Moscow State University, numbering about 40 people, has not published a single philosophical book over the last ten years. Members of this department almost never appear in print. Insufficient participation in scientific work is taken by philosophy departments of the Academy of Social Sciences and the Higher Party School under the CC CPSU, whose collectives conduct research work inside departments, but participate weakly in all-Union philosophical events. Institutes of philosophy in the

union republics—Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, etc.—take almost no part in all-Union philosophical work.

In deep debt to the country is the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. The institute has not yet resolved many serious tasks posed before it during the philosophical discussion of 1947. It is known that a two-volume work on the history of philosophy has been in creation for five years now, but this work is still not completed. Impermissibly slowly proceeds work on a two-volume work on the history of philosophy of the peoples of the USSR. Two years ago, a collective of philosophical workers prepared a book on historical materialism. In the Soviet press, its essential shortcomings were pointed out. Before the author collective, the task was posed to finalize the book in accordance with requirements presented to a textbook on historical materialism. However, the author collective to this day has failed to fulfill this requirement of the public. It is necessary, relying on the new work of Comrade Stalin *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, to raise the theoretical level of the book *Historical Materialism*, eliminate errors, and accelerate its release. As of today, there is no solid textbook on dialectical materialism.

The Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR does not display promptness in its work and poorly involves not only peripheral workers, but also philosophical cadres working in Moscow, in the development of new questions. Moreover, many employees of the Institute work idle; for years they work and produce nothing. On the eve of the 19th Party Congress, several monographs on philosophical

questions were released, which are the result of serious work by individual philosophers. But this is completely insufficient. The Soviet reader expects monographs on many urgent philosophical problems.

The Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the journal *Questions of Philosophy* have failed to involve broad philosophical cadres in joint creative theoretical work. In our country, many philosophical workers have grown up who are able and willing to actively participate in general theoretical work, but often they do not possess sufficient creative courage and do not receive the necessary help and guidance. The Institute of Philosophy must attract teaching cadres of philosophy and, together with them, achieve a decisive rise in the ideological and theoretical level of philosophical work.

Serious flaws exist in the training of philosophical scientific cadres. After the philosophical discussion of 1947, attention was drawn to the training of scientific workers in historical materialism and the history of Russian philosophy. In this direction, certain positive results were achieved. At the same time, things are completely unsatisfactory regarding the training of cadres in other branches of philosophical knowledge, in particular, very few cadres are trained for work in such fields as dialectical materialism, aesthetics, criticism of modern bourgeois philosophy and sociology. It is necessary to immediately take measures and achieve the provision of scientific cadres for all the most important sectors of philosophical work. The Ministry of Higher Education and the USSR Academy of Sciences must seriously engage in

regulating the training of scientific theoretical philosophical cadres for individual branches of philosophical knowledge.

Over the last five years, a significant growth in Candidates of Philosophical Sciences has occurred. Only 27 doctoral dissertations in philosophy were defended, but most of them have not been published. Many Doctors of Philosophical Sciences not only do not appear in print with books or monographs, but also do not publish articles. Some, apparently, consider that it is important first of all to get an academic degree, and then one can rest on one's laurels.

We have in our country a large number of Candidates of Philosophical Sciences who have a candidate's tenure of 10 to 15 years. Why do these comrades not write doctoral dissertations? Partly because scientific departments, institutes, and academies do not demand this of them and do not help comrades or monitor their research work. Improving the training of philosophical cadres is our urgent task.

* * *

The 19th Party Congress set the task of further expanding ideological work, strengthening the struggle to cleanse the consciousness of Soviet people from various survivals of capitalism, further developing communist consciousness in the masses, and educating them in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and internationalism, in the spirit of vital care for the interests of the state, confidence in the victory of our cause, and readiness to overcome any difficulties. Comrade G. M. Malenkov emphasized that it is necessary to "put an end to underestimating ideological work, wage a decisive struggle

against liberalism and carelessness regarding ideological errors and distortions, systematically raise and perfect the politico-ideological training of cadres; direct all means of ideological influence—our propaganda, agitation, and press—toward the cause of communist education of Soviet people; raise Soviet science to a higher level, expanding criticism and the struggle of opinions in scientific work, remembering that only in this way can Soviet science fulfill its mission—to take first place in world science."[8]

These tasks of ideological work formulated by Comrade G. M. Malenkov in the report at the 19th Party Congress determine the direction of activity for all philosophical cadres and philosophical institutions of the country. They oblige us to reorganize philosophical work so that its results best answer the tasks of communist education of working people and the further flourishing of all branches of science.

The 19th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the new works of our great teacher Comrade Stalin created the most favorable conditions for an upsurge in scientific, teaching, and propaganda activities of philosophers. To raise the ideological-theoretical level of all our philosophical work, to make it more fruitful and militant, rapidly answering the demands of the party and the needs of working people—such is the task of Soviet philosophers.

Armed with a deep knowledge of Marxist-Leninist science, Soviet philosophers are faithful helpers of the Communist

---

[8] G. Malenkov. *Report to the 19th Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 98.

Party in realizing the world-historical tasks put forward by the decisions of the 19th Party Congress. Ardent propaganda of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism is the most noble task of Soviet philosophers. "The teaching of Marx—Engels—Lenin—Stalin gives our party an invincible strength, the ability to blaze new paths in history, to clearly see the goal of our movement forward, and to win and consolidate victories faster and more securely."[9]

[9] Ibid., p. 107.

3. J. V. STALIN'S WORK "ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE USSR" – A PROGRAM FOR THE BUILDING OF COMMUNISM

ACAD. G. F. ALEKSANDROV

1

The peoples of our Fatherland, led by the Communist Party, consciously create the history of socialism and communism. Directing the conscious creativity of the masses of the people, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union unfolds its multifaceted activity on the basis of Marxist-Leninist science regarding the laws of social development. Every time when a new stage opened in the development of our country, the founders and leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, gave the Party and the people a clear plan for further actions based on a profound Marxist analysis of the achieved stage of social development, thanks to brilliant scientific insight into the future. Characterizing the great role of Comrade Stalin's works in the building of communism in the USSR, Comrade Malenkov said in his remarkable report at the 19th Party Congress: "...The Party's plans for the future, which define the prospects and paths of our movement forward, rely on knowledge of economic laws, rely on the science of building communist society developed by Comrade Stalin"[10].

[10] **G. Malenkov.** *Report on the work of the CC of the VKP(b) at the XIX Congress of the Party*, p. 103. Gospolitizdat. 1952.

At the present time, the USSR is undergoing one of the most important periods in its history. Having restored the economy and healed the deep wounds after the Great Patriotic War, having advanced far forward in the development of productive forces, the economy, and culture, having further strengthened the Soviet state and socialist society, the Soviet people have engaged with all their strength in the struggle for the gradual transition to communism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union sets as its main goal the building of a communist society through a gradual transition from socialism to communism, by continuously raising the material and cultural level of society, educating members of society in the spirit of internationalism and establishing fraternal ties with the working people of all countries, and thoroughly strengthening the active defense of the Soviet Fatherland against the aggressive actions of its enemies. Thus are defined the main tasks of the CPSU in the Party Statute adopted by its 19th Congress.

For the realization of the gradual transition to communism, the Communist Party required a scientific substantiation of the main direction and paths of further development of the Soviet country, as well as those basic prerequisite conditions that must be fulfilled in order to achieve this great goal. Comrade Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, which the Party laid at the basis of the decisions of its 19th Congress and at the basis of the Party Program currently being revised, gives a clear, scientifically grounded program for the building of communist society.

In Marxist classical literature, there had not yet been a work in which, so vividly and deeply, in concise and scientifically proven propositions, the complex and immense process of the law-governed development of society toward communism was revealed. In this Stalinist work, with unprecedented depth and consistency, the most complex questions regarding the objective process of the communist mode of production from its lower phase to its next, higher phase are examined.

Marxism teaches that human history is not a chaotic, meaningless accumulation of events, but a strictly defined process subject to objective laws independent of the consciousness and will of people. Denying the objective character of the laws of social development, bourgeois sociology thereby denies the possibility of a science of society. Recognizing the objective character of the laws of social development, Marxism-Leninism holds that these laws can and must be known by the advanced forces of society; that, consequently, the science of society and the laws of its development is as exact a science as, for example, biology. Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the position that, by mastering the science of society, one can construct one’s activity on its basis—on the basis of exact knowledge of the objective laws of social development.

Marxism has always conducted a consistent struggle against all kinds of subjectivist interpretations of the laws of social development. Unfortunately, a subjectivist, non-Marxist interpretation of the objective economic laws of socialism gained currency among a significant portion of economists and philosophers prior to the publication of Comrade Stalin's work

Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR. Scientific workers in the field of philosophy published a number of articles containing crude errors along the lines of voluntaristic and metaphysical interpretations of the objective laws of socialism. Erroneous views of this kind, as correctly noted in the article by Comrade M. Suslov "On the Occasion of the Article by P. Fedoseyev," published in the newspaper *Pravda* on December 24, 1952, were advocated on the pages of the journals *Bolshevik*, *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, and *Planovoye Khozyaystvo*. For the work of *Bolshevik* prior to July 1949 and the fundamental errors committed by its editorial board, responsibility is also borne by the author of the present article, who was then a member of the editorial board. This is all the more necessary to emphasize because subjectivist-voluntaristic views were held in a number of works by employees of the Institute of Philosophy.

In his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Comrade Stalin dealt a deadly blow to subjectivist-voluntaristic "viewpoints" and "concepts" regarding the laws of socialism.

For the cognition of objective laws of social development, a superficial acquaintance with facts, their description, and their systematization are insufficient. These laws express essential relations between social phenomena, between processes occurring independently of the will of people; objective economic laws express the development of fundamental, underlying forces and tendencies in the life of society; they express the *historical necessity* in the development of society. The laws of social development show the deepest processes occurring in the depths of society. In his classical work

Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, Comrade Stalin teaches the cadres of the Communist Party and the Soviet state to see behind external events these deep-seated processes, behind surface phenomena—the laws of motion of society, and behind individual facts—historical necessity. Marxist analysis, writes Comrade Stalin, requires conducting a "strict distinction between the development of an economic process and its form, between deep-seated processes of development and surface phenomena..."[11] Comrade Stalin teaches that the Communist Party must know both the general laws of social development and the laws of development of each given historical epoch, in order to utilize the operation of these objective laws in the interests of society.

In Comrade Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Marxist-Leninist science on society—and especially the doctrine of the laws of development of socialist society and the laws of building communism—is advanced further and raised to a new, higher level.

The objective economic laws of socialism discovered by Comrade Stalin ideologically equip the Party in its activity in guiding the building of communism in the USSR. To deny the objective character of economic laws means to eliminate the principle of scientifically managing affairs in industry, transport, and agriculture, to manage economic life blindly, substituting "eyeballing" and "chance" for science, and to

[11] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 53. Gospolitizdat. 1952.

disarm the cadres of Soviet management and economic workers.

In order for the revolutionary class to act consciously and faultlessly, Comrade Stalin teaches, two conditions are required: first, one must *deeply know the objective laws* of social development; second, one must *know how to apply* these laws, laying them at the foundation of the activity of the Party and the people. The first condition is achieved through Marxist-Leninist science; the second, in the process of all the practical, organizational, political, and ideological activity of the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

2

Comrade Stalin created an integrated doctrine of the communist formation. He creatively developed the further directives and propositions of Marx, Engels, and Lenin on the two phases of development of communist society and those general and specific objective features inherent to both its first stage, socialist society built in our country, and its higher stage —communism proper, which the Soviet people are currently building with success.

Lenin noted that Marx, advancing the proposition on two phases in the development of communist society, consistently applied materialist dialectics—the doctrine of development— and gave "an analysis of what could be called the stages of economic maturity of communism"[12].

[12] **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 442.

The first phase of communism—**socialism**—did **not** arise **on its own basis**, but on the economic, moral, and intellectual foundation of the old society, from which it retains the "birthmarks" and remnants of capitalism in the economy and in the minds of people.

The higher phase of communism, Marxism teaches, develops on its own foundation, on the basis of a constructed socialist society. Since socialism and communism do not represent two different formations, but are grounded on a single mode of production at different stages of its historical development, the transition from socialism to communism occurs **gradually**, as the necessary material and other conditions are prepared. This specific character of the dialectical process of social development under socialism was scientifically revealed and substantiated by Comrade Stalin. In *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, we read: "...Under our socialist conditions, economic development proceeds not by way of upheavals, but by way of gradual changes, when the old is not simply abolished outright, but changes its nature in application to the new, retaining only its form; while the new does not simply destroy the old, but penetrates into the old, changes its nature and its functions, without breaking its form, but utilizing it for the development of the new"[13].

Since socialism and communism are a single socio-economic formation, both of its phases have a number of fundamental common features and regular patterns of development. Since socialism and communism are two different phases of

---

13 **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 53.

development of one and the same communist mode of production, each of them has its own fundamental differences in the economy as well as in culture.

What socialism and communism have in common is, above all, that the basis of both is **public ownership of the means of production**, although appearing in different forms. Public ownership is what distinguishes both phases of the new society from all antagonistic social formations. Revealing the laws of the first stage of communist society—socialism—Lenin wrote in his brilliant work *The State and Revolution*: "Insofar as the means of production become *common* property, the word 'communism' is also applicable here, providing we do not forget that this is not *complete* communism"[14].

Further, at the first stage of the communist formation, already constructed in our country, as well as at its higher phase, exploitation and oppression of human beings are absent. This means that under socialism, as under communism, everyone works for their own people, for society, for themselves, since working time is no longer divided into necessary and surplus labor, which constitutes the source of exploitation and enrichment for the class of capitalists. Comrade Stalin points out that it is "strange now to speak of 'necessary' and 'surplus' labor: as if under our conditions, labor given to society for the expansion of production, the development of education, healthcare, the organization of defense, etc., were not just as necessary for the working class, which is now in power, as

[14] **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 442.

labor spent on covering the personal needs of the worker and his family."

It should be noted that Marx, in his work *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, where he investigates no longer capitalism, but the first phase of communist society, recognizes labor devoted to society for the expansion of production, education, healthcare, administrative expenses, formation of reserves, etc., as just as necessary as labor spent on covering the consumer needs of the working class[15].

In the first and second phases of development of communist society, the goal of all social production consists in raising the material well-being and cultural level of the people. Ensuring the maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the whole of society through the continuous growth and perfection of production on the basis of higher techniques is the basic economic law of the development of society in the epoch of socialism.

Under both socialism and communism, the worldview of society, which guides it in all its activity, is Marxism-Leninism.

Without breaking with Marxism, one cannot oppose and separate by an impenetrable wall the first stage of development of communist society from its second stage. Such opposition, which sometimes took place in pedagogical practice, is a gross theoretical and political error. Opposing socialism to communism contains within itself the assumption that upon the

---

15 **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, pp. 18–19.

transition to communism, a change in the socio-governmental system that developed under socialism must supposedly occur. In any case, this opposition postpones the transition to communism into a distant, indefinite future. It is clear how theoretically erroneous, practically untenable, and harmful such views are.

However, for a Marxist it is insufficient to establish only the general features of different phases of development of one and the same communist formation. It is necessary to clearly see the fundamental differences between these two phases. Only under this condition can one correctly evaluate the path already traveled by our country, correctly determine what still remains to be done, and at what stage of development of the communist formation our country currently stands.

Of course, prior to the victory of socialism, and even more so during the period of our Party's struggle for the socialist revolution in Russia, engaging in detail with the question of the difference between socialism and communism meant straying from pressing revolutionary tasks into the realm of abstract theorizing, which was always alien to the Communist Party. V. I. Lenin said that it was ridiculous to bring this question to the forefront under the conditions of capitalism. But Lenin also noted in his book *The State and Revolution* that the difference between the lower and higher phases of communism would in time, probably, be tremendous. Now the time has come about which Lenin spoke. Now, when communism is being successfully built in the USSR, the question of what exactly distinguishes communism from socialism, and what steps must

be taken by the Party and the people to effect the transition from socialism to communism, has arisen in all its magnitude.

Communism signifies a fundamental transition to a higher level of economy in society compared to socialism.

With society's transition to the economy of communism, social production will have not two sectors—state and collective-farm—but one all-people's sector of the economy; commodity circulation will be replaced by product exchange. The transition to this higher economy will mean that social production, fully expanded, is capable of satisfying all reasonable needs of culturally developed people. The principle of socialism—"from each according to his ability, to each according to his labor"—is replaced by the principle of communism—"from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

It is precisely the highest development of productive forces and productive relations, as well as the culture of all society, that leads to overcoming the essential differences between town and country, between mental and physical labor, to the disappearance of class differences between workers and working peasants, and to the disappearance of differences between them and the intelligentsia. Along with the further rise of culture in society and the development of polytechnic education, people will acquire the opportunity to freely choose a profession, rather than being bound for life to a single profession due to the existing division of labor.

From this it is evident that one must not only not oppose, but also not identify the lower and higher stages in the development of communism.

A failure to understand the qualitative differences between socialism and communism leads to confusing the tasks of the first phase of communism with the tasks of building its second phase, leads to the demobilization of the Party and the people, for it proceeds from the premise that the differences between these two phases are negligible and need not be reckoned with. To hold such a point of view means grossly simplifying the tasks of transition to communism, causing harm both to theory and to the practice of communist construction.

* * *

A great historical achievement of Marxism is the scientific substantiation of the law-governed development of society toward communism. Subjecting utopian, metaphysical views of communism—as a certain invention of reason and an unchanging, albeit perfect social system—to sharp criticism, Marx always viewed communism as the natural-historical, law-governed result of all preceding social development, and at the same time as a fundamental turning point in the development of society, the beginning of a new era in human history. It is precisely in the sense that communism cannot be replaced by any other social organization of production that Marx and Engels considered the communist formation "the final form of organization of the human race"[16]. By this, Marx and Engels opposed communism to all past antagonistic forms of society.

---

16 **K. Marx and F. Engels.** *Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 585. 1931.

The founders of Marxism did not limit themselves to such an opposition. They developed in their works the idea that communism opens up unprecedented prospects for humanity for a rapid rise and development in all spheres of economic and cultural life. The goal of production under communism was considered by Marx to be man himself, the all-round development of his abilities, and the satisfaction of his needs.

Noting the fact that the path to socialism and communism had not yet been traveled by a single nation, and that the Soviet people were the first in world history to embark on this path, Lenin said that we do not know and cannot know through what stages or through what practical measures humanity will advance to communism. And he further pointed out that it was necessary to grasp how infinitely lying is the bourgeois conception of socialism as a stagnant, once-and-for-all fixed system, whereas in reality only with socialism begins a rapid, truly genuine, mass movement forward in all spheres of public and personal life, taking place with the participation of the majority of the population, and then of the entire population.

Now the Soviet country has accumulated world-historic experience in the victorious building of socialism. Thanks to the theoretical generalization of this experience in the works of Comrade Stalin and in the decisions of the CPSU, the Soviet people and all progressive humanity know by what paths, stages, and practical measures humanity will proceed to its ultimate goal—communism.

This great experience of the USSR, summarized in the works of J. V. Stalin, forms the basis of one of the most outstanding

scientific discoveries of our time—the discovery of the basic economic law of the development of socialist society.

The basic economic law of socialism took shape and unfolded its operation in the course of socialist construction in the USSR, in the process of creating the socialist mode of production. Throughout this entire historical period, Comrade Stalin gave scientific substantiation to individual aspects and propositions of this law. Thus, in the report at the XVII Party Congress, Comrade Stalin criticized those people who did not understand the objective laws of building socialist society and did not see the primary goal of organizing socialist production. Comrade Stalin emphasized then that socialism means the eradication of poverty and deprivation among working people, and the organization of a prosperous and cultured life for all members of society. Comrade Stalin noted that socialism can be built only on the basis of the rapid growth of the productive forces of society, on the basis of an abundance of products and goods, on the basis of a prosperous life for working people, and the growth of their culture, for Marxist socialism means not the restriction of material needs, but their every possible flourish and expansion, not the refusal to satisfy these needs, but the all-round and full satisfaction of all needs of culturally developed people.

A complete, all-round disclosure of the basic economic law of socialism is given in Comrade Stalin's new work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*. In this work, Comrade Stalin writes: "The essential features and requirements of the basic economic law of socialism might be formulated roughly as follows: the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the

constantly growing material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous growth and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques"[17]. Comrade Stalin contrasts this objective economic law of the development of society, inherent to socialism and arising on the basis of new economic conditions, to the laws of development of modern capitalism. He points out that while modern capitalist production is subordinated to securing maximum profits, socialist production is subordinated to securing the maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of society.

It is no accident that in the reports of the governments of the main capitalist countries—the US government to Congress, the British government to the House of Commons, the governments of France, Italy to their parliaments—the main indicator of the state of affairs in industry is the amount of profits made by monopolies. This is understandable, for the bulk of national income in these countries is scooped up by financial magnates and industrial barons.

Comrade Malenkov presented in his profound and vivid report at the XIX Congress of the Communist Party characteristic figures: even according to understated official data, the profits of US capitalist monopolies increased 13-fold from 1938 to 1951, amounting to 42.9 billion dollars in 1951. During the years of World War II, American billionaires and millionaires received 115 billion dollars in net profit; in the 7 post-war years, they received profits of nearly 220 billion dollars. And

---

17 **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 40.

this occurs alongside the rapid growth of mass poverty, increased taxes, frozen wages, and rising prices for food and industrial goods. In the USSR, however, the national income grew by 83% from 1940 to 1951. Three-quarters of the national income is received by our working people for the satisfaction of their personal material and cultural requirements. Under the Fifth Five-Year Plan, the national income of the USSR will grow by no less than 60%. The growth of real wages of workers and employees in the USSR is a vivid indicator of the operation of the basic economic law of socialism. In the fifth five-year period, the real wages of workers and employees, taking into account the reduction of retail prices, will increase by no less than 35%, and the income of collective farmers by no less than 40% (in monetary terms).

Developing and deepening further the scientific analysis of modern capitalism, Comrade Stalin shows that capitalist production proceeds from expansion to crisis and from crisis to expansion, while the development of capitalist industry, as revealed by Comrade Stalin, includes periods of depression of a special kind, periods of stagnation. Comrade Stalin notes that the growth of production in capitalist countries occurs now and will occur in the future on a narrowed basis, as the volume of production in these countries will consequently decrease. In this fact, the operation of the objective law of necessary conformity of production relations to the level of development of productive forces at the modern stage of capitalism manifests itself vividly, when bourgeois production relations act as a colossal brake on the further development of productive forces.

Due to periodically recurring crises of the capitalist economy, as well as the general crisis of the capitalist system, the industry of capitalist countries, despite bloated military production, either treads water or develops extremely slowly, and then mainly in branches producing armaments. Indicative is the index of industrial production in the USA: in the first quarter of 1952 it was equal to the index of the first quarter of 1951, and in the second quarter of 1952 it was only 94% compared to the data of the second quarter of 1951. From 1929 to 1951 industrial production in the USA grew by only 2 times, in Britain by one and a half times, and in France it remained at the same level. For socialist society, continuous growth of production is characteristic. Socialist production knows no halts, shutdowns, or interruptions in development. Over this same period, USSR industrial production grew 13-fold. The successful implementation of the fourth five-year plan and the first two years of the fifth is vivid evidence of the continuous growth of social production in the USSR.

Periodic stagnations in the development of technology in capitalist countries, accompanied by the destruction of productive forces, as Comrade Stalin points out, are replaced under socialism by the continuous perfection of production on the basis of new techniques, which ultimately ensures the steady development of the entire socialist mode of production.

Thus, Soviet socialist society has reached the stage in its development where the basic economic law of socialism, formulated by Comrade Stalin, has unfolded and operates at full strength; this law is successfully utilized by the Party and the people in building the higher phase of communism. This

basic economic law expresses the goal of Soviet social production and the means to achieve this goal; it determines every task that the Communist Party and the Soviet people subordinate to social production under socialism.

The question of the goal of social production in the USSR needed to be emphasized with all strength, especially since home-grown "economists" appeared among us who began to argue at random about whether "primacy" in Soviet society belongs to production or consumption. Comrade Stalin ridiculed and overturned such scholastic exercises, pointing out that if we were to reason in the manner of people who consider that working people produce under socialism not for the satisfaction of their needs, but for the sake of production, we would fail to see the fundamental difference between capitalist production—in which man is not taken into account—and socialist production, whose entire purpose and meaning is the satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of the people. Advancing the thesis of the so-called "primacy" of production over consumption, the pseudo-economist L. Yaroshenko broke with Marxism, attributed to socialism features inherent to capitalism, and proved to be entirely in the grip of bourgeois ideology.

A feature of the scientific, Marxist generalizations and discoveries of Comrade Stalin is his brilliant insight into the deepest processes taking place at present. At the same time, in the works of J. V. Stalin, the future of socialist society in its law-governed movement is revealed. A remarkable example of deep insight into the future is Comrade Stalin's indication that under communism, the quantity of labor spent on the

production of products will be measured not in a roundabout way, not through value and its forms, but directly and immediately by the number of hours spent on the production of products. Comrade Stalin also notes that the distribution of labor among branches of production will be regulated by the growing needs of society for products. "This will be a society," teaches Comrade Stalin, "where production will be regulated by the requirements of society, and accounting of the requirements of society will acquire primary importance for planning bodies"[18].

In the communist formation, social production in all periods and at all stages of its development has one main goal: the satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural requirements of the whole of society. This goal welds together all social production under socialism and communism, subordinating it to one common task.

This means that the basic economic law of socialism discovered and scientifically substantiated by Comrade Stalin creates the objective conditions for the implementation of the basic principle of communism.

The basic economic law of socialism discovered by Comrade Stalin defines all the main aspects and processes of development of socialist society. It determines, for example, the operation of such an important economic law, discovered by Comrade Stalin, as the law of planned (proportional) development of the national economy of the USSR.

---

[18] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 23.

This law arose as a counterweight to the specific capitalist economic law of competition and anarchy of production. In the USSR, where as a result of the socialist revolution the means of production were socialized, the law of competition and anarchy of production lost its power. New objective conditions of social development brought to life another law—the law of planned development of the national economy. Thereby, in Soviet society, the objective possibility was created to correctly plan social production. "But possibility," Comrade Stalin teaches, "must not be confused with reality. They are two different things. In order to turn this possibility into reality, one must study this economic law, master it, learn to apply it with full knowledge of the matter, and draw up plans that fully reflect the requirements of this law"[19].

Uncovering the operation of the objective economic laws of socialism and utilizing these laws, the Communist Party and the Soviet state lead the Soviet people with confidence toward communism.

3

To build communism means first of all to develop the communist mode of production from its first phase—socialism—to its higher phase—communism. The mode of production is characterized by two inseparably linked aspects. Productive forces, as Comrade Stalin teaches, express the relation of society to natural forces, in struggle with which society obtains necessary material goods. Production relations—the other side of social production—express the relation of people to one

[19] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, pp. 8–9.

another in the process of production. Both of these different sides of social production are interconnected. They cannot be torn apart from one another, nor identified with one another. Both the one and the other deprive one of the possibility to understand the operation of the most important law of social development, discovered by Marx and thoroughly substantiated and concretized by J. V. Stalin—the law of obligatory conformity of production relations to the character of the productive forces. Comrade Stalin points out: "And precisely because they are different sides of social production, they can act upon one another. To assert that one of these sides can be absorbed by the other and turned into its component part means to commit a grave sin against Marxism"[20].

The existence of the indicated two sides of social production has a universal character; it is inherent to any social system, whether slave-owning, feudal, capitalist, or communist. People, classes, and social groups cannot enter into relations with natural forces, nor utilize them, without entering into definite relations with one another, into production relations. Only through production relations does man's relation to nature take place.

The transition from a lower, less developed and developed stage of social development to another, higher and more developed one, has as its source the development of productive forces. Comrade Stalin concretizes this general proposition of Marxism as applied to Soviet socialist society and at the stage of its transition to communism. To prepare the transition to

---

20 *Ibid.*, p. 63.

communism, it is necessary to raise all social production to a higher level, and first of all the productive forces of Soviet society. At the basis of his profound analysis of the fundamental preliminary conditions for the transition to communism, Comrade Stalin laid this requirement of Marxist science regarding society. Comrade Stalin characterizes the first main preliminary condition for the transition to communism as follows: "**It is necessary, in the first place, to firmly ensure the rational organization of productive forces, the continuous growth of all social production, with a primary growth in the production of the means of production**." Comrade Stalin says further that the primary growth of the production of the means of production is necessary not only because it must provide equipment both for its own enterprises and for enterprises in all other branches of the national economy, but also because without it, expanded reproduction is generally impossible[21].

The brilliant formula of Comrade Stalin on the first main preliminary condition for the transition to communism rests on a deep insight into the objective, law-governed process of social development under socialism. Comrade Stalin builds his conclusion by relying on the well-known proposition of Marx on expanded reproduction. Comrade Stalin developed the fundamental propositions of Marxian theory of reproduction: the propositions on the division of social production into the production of the means of production and the production of articles of consumption, on the primary growth of the

---

[21] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, pp. 66–67. (*Emphasis mine. — G. A.*)

production of the means of production under expanded reproduction, on the correlation between the first and second subdivisions of production, on the formation and purpose of public funds, and on accumulation as the sole source of expanded reproduction. These propositions were concretized by Comrade Stalin and applied to the conditions of socialist reproduction.

1951 was the first year of the fifth five-year plan. The published data for this year on the development of socialist industry speak eloquently of the immense successes of our country on the path to fulfilling the first Stalinist main preliminary condition for the transition to communism. These data show that industry producing means of production exceeded in 1951 the pre-war level by 2.4 times, and in 1952 this level will be exceeded by 2.7 times. In 1952, 25 million tons of pig iron will be produced in the USSR, which is 70% more than in 1940. Such a growth rate of production was not and is not known by a single country in the world. In 1952, 35 million tons of steel will be produced—90% more than was produced in 1940. In the same year 1952, 300 million tons of coal will be mined—80% more than was mined in 1940. 47 million tons of oil will also be produced—50% more than in 1940. Machinery and equipment will be produced 3-odd times more than in 1940. Over the five-year period, an increase in the total capacity of power plants by three times will take place.

The successes of all branches of the socialist national economy represent a live, real embodiment in practice of the first preliminary condition for the transition to communism. Fulfilling the fifth five-year plan, as stated in the directives of

the 19th Party Congress, will mean a major step forward on the path of implementing the gradual transition from socialism to communism. In the fifth five-year plan, an average annual growth in the production of the means of production of 13% and of consumer goods of 11% is planned, with an average gross annual product growth of 12%. The actual fulfillment of the national economic plan for 1952 exceeded the targets planned for this year. In 1951 and 1952, the annual increase in gross output was 14% instead of 12% according to the plan, with the annual increase in the production of the means of production being 15% instead of 13% according to the plan. A manifestation and embodiment of that same process of realizing the Stalinist program is the unfolding of the great construction projects of communism.

In the 35 years of Soviet power, our country has increased its industrial production 39-fold. Comrade Beria noted in his speech at the XIX Party Congress that to increase industrial production 39-fold, Great Britain, for example, required 162 years (from 1790 to 1951); France over 90 years increased its industrial production only 5.5-fold; and the USA over the last 35 years increased industrial production by only 2.6 times.

Simultaneously with the rapid and primary development of the production of the means of production, the production of consumer goods is growing at rapid rates in the country of socialism. In 1952, the growth of production of consumer goods will exceed 13%, against 11% according to the plan. In the entire history of our country, as much product has never been produced as was produced in the elapsed year of 1952. For the first time in the country, 8 billion poods of grain were

harvested. In preceding years, the largest figure was over 7 billion poods. For 1951–1955, the gross grain harvest will be increased by 40–50%, including wheat by 55–65%.

Thus, in full accordance with the propositions of historical materialism and political economy, and with the proposition of Comrade Stalin on the first preliminary condition for the transition to communism, a continuous growth of social production with a primary growth in the production of the means of production is ensured in the country of socialism. The successes of Soviet industry are so grandiose that even the reactionary bourgeois press, although with fear and gnashing of teeth, is nevertheless forced to recognize and rate them highly. Recently, the bourgeois Dutch newspaper *De Tijd* wrote: "It must be admitted that the new five-year plan of the Soviet Union is gigantic in its scale of production. The realization of this plan will lead to such achievements as the world has not known. The new five-year plan will further strengthen the Soviet Union and raise the standard of living of the Soviet person. All this must be reckoned with."

* * *

The law-governed transition from socialism to communism presupposes not only the all-round development of productive forces, but also the corresponding development of production relations—the second necessary aspect of social production.

Comrade Stalin subjected to sharp criticism those vulgarizers of political economy and anti-Marxists who asserted that the further development of society is possible without the development of production relations and even generally

without them, without an economic basis, which can allegedly be absorbed by productive forces. It is not difficult to understand that such pseudo-economists thereby discarded the basis of socialist society, that is, that which constitutes the very essence and greatest superiority of socialism over capitalism. Such pseudo-economists break with the foundations of Marxism, assuming that society is possible without its economic basis. Comrade Stalin teaches that "every social formation, including socialist society, has its own economic basis, consisting of the sum total of the production relations of people"[22].

The fundamental propositions of Marxism on the basis, its role in the development of society, and the laws of development of production relations are brilliantly developed by Comrade Stalin in his new work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, which substantiates the program for building communism in our country.

Marxists cannot imagine affairs in such a way as if, in the process of transition to communism, the relation of people to nature (productive forces) will improve and rise to a new stage, while the basis of society (the relations of people to one another in the process of production) gets stuck at one point. The basis of society and its production relations will also develop and be perfected upon the transition to communism. If matters were otherwise, if our Party did not care about constantly bringing production relations into accordance with the growth of productive forces, then production relations

[22] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 61.

under socialism would lag so far behind the development of productive forces that they would come into conflict with them, and this would undermine the very existence of the socialist system.

The enemies of the Soviet people, fighting against the socialist industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture, staked on delaying the development of productive forces and socialist production relations, and thereby undermining the power and strength of the Soviet social and state system. But, as is known, the Communist Party utterly smashed and eliminated these bitter enemies of the Soviet people and took measures to ensure that socialist production relations permanently triumphed in the country, so that the basis of socialism developed, perfected itself, and gave full scope to the development of the productive forces of our country, both in industry and in agriculture.

The Communist Party and the Soviet state take timely measures for the further development of socialist production relations and thereby eliminate the contradictions arising between productive forces and production relations in the epoch of socialism.

Through a most profound scientific analysis of the objective laws of social development, Comrade Stalin enriches the Marxist theory of the basis of society and gives the fullest and deepest classical definition of production relations. To production relations, Comrade Stalin teaches, belong: "a) the forms of ownership of the means of production; b) the position of various social groups in production arising therefrom and

their mutual relations, or, as Marx says: 'mutual exchange of their activity'; c) the forms of distribution of products that are entirely dependent on them"[23].

The Stalinist scientific analysis of production relations is of immense importance for the scientific understanding of the development of the basis of any society. It deepens Marxist knowledge of the economic relations of people and equips Party and state cadres with a scientific method for studying the content of a given economic basis and the laws of its development.

For the building of socialism, which is the first phase of communist society, it was necessary to eliminate the multi-sector nature of the Soviet economy, to eliminate capitalist production relations, to transition the small-scale commodity and patriarchal economy onto the socialist path of development, and to establish socialist production relations throughout the country. To prepare the transition to communism, it is required that the economy be uniform not only in the character of production relations and the basis of society, but that these production relations have an equally high level of socialist maturity, so that society transitions from two forms of socialist ownership to a single, all-people's form of ownership.

Characterizing the second main preliminary condition for the transition to communism, Comrade Stalin teaches: "**It is necessary, in the second place, by means of gradual transitions effected with advantage to the collective farms**

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

and, consequently, for the whole of society, to raise collective-farm property to the level of all-people's property, and to replace commodity circulation, also by means of gradual transitions, with a system of product exchange, so that the central authority or some other social-economic center could cover all the production of social production in the interests of society"[24].

The first and second main preliminary conditions for the transition to communism, elaborated by J. V. Stalin and taken in their unity, ensure the rapid development of all social production.

The second main preliminary condition for the transition to communism encompasses all sides of production relations: both forms of ownership of the means of production, and the relations between various social groups in production arising therefrom, and forms of product distribution.

In his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Comrade Stalin emphasizes that at present we have two main forms of socialist ownership: state, or all-people's, and group, or collective-farm, which cannot be called all-people's. State all-people's property is based on the fact that in state enterprises both the means of production and all production produced constitute the property of all the people, state property. In collective-farm production, two decisive elements of social production belong to the state: land and machinery. As for the results of production, i. e., the output obtained by

---

[24] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 67. (*Emphasis mine. — G. A.*)

collective farms, it belongs exclusively to the collective farm. The production output belongs to the collective farm because the labor and seeds in the collective farms are their own. This means that the state can dispose entirely of output produced in state, all-people's enterprises, and can plan its distribution, but the state cannot dispose, as its own property, of output produced in collective farms, and, consequently, cannot fully encompass it with its planning. The collective farm disposes of this output. Since under modern conditions collective farms accept ties with the town only through the exchange of their goods for urban manufactures, through purchase and sale, "commodity production and commodity circulation are just as necessary for us at present as they were, say, thirty years ago, when Lenin proclaimed the necessity of maximum development of commodity circulation"[25].

At the present stage of development of Soviet society, the presence of two forms of socialist ownership gives full scope to the development of production. However, the rise of productive forces in the course of the gradual transition to communism cannot but lead—and actually does lead—to the emergence of a contradiction between them and production relations, conditioned by the presence of two forms of socialist ownership.

Some of our economists and philosophers held that since socialist production relations give full scope to the development of productive forces and are in complete conformity with them, they cannot enter into contradiction with

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 16–17.

them and prove to be a brake on the development of productive forces. Explaining the error of such a view, Comrade Stalin points out that at present, group, collective-farm property and the commodity circulation associated with it "are successfully utilized by us for the development of the socialist economy and bring undeniable benefit to our society. Undoubtedly, they will bring benefit in the near future as well. But it would be unpardonable blindness not to see that these phenomena are at the same time already beginning to brake the powerful development of our productive forces, since they create obstacles to the full coverage of the entire national economy, especially agriculture, by state planning. There can be no doubt that the further we go, the more these phenomena will brake the further growth of the productive forces of our country. Consequently, the task consists in eliminating these contradictions through the gradual transformation of collective-farm property into all-people's property and the introduction of product exchange—also by way of gradualness—instead of commodity circulation"[26].

One of the most important prerequisites ensuring success in raising collective-farm property to the level of all-people's property is the **moral-political unity** of Soviet society. The fundamental interests of workers and collective farmers fully coincide. Workers and collective farmers are active builders of communist society, united around the same historical tasks, fighting under one banner, under the banner of the Communist Party. In the USSR, the opposition between town and country has been eliminated. Noting the importance of this fact,

---

[26] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 68.

Comrade Stalin points out that in our country tremendous aid was rendered to the peasantry by the socialist town, by the working class in eliminating landlords and kulaks, that "systematic supply of the peasantry and its collective farms with first-rate tractors and other machines turned the alliance of the working class and the peasantry into friendship between them"[27].

All this is an important condition for the gradual rise of collective-farm property to the level of all-people's property. To solve this task, a further grandiose expansion of the production of urban manufactures is required, along with the consistent unfolding of direct product exchange between town and country. Comrade Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* indicates the paths for solving this historical task.

Comrade Stalin notes in this work that individual economists propose, instead of advancing collective-farm production forward, to retreat from it, as it seems to them, in a simpler way, namely: to nationalize collective-farm property, declaring it all-people's property after the example of how it was done once with capitalist property. Comrade Stalin warns the Party against the inadmissibility of such incorrect proposals. Collective-farm property is socialist property. We cannot, says Comrade Stalin, treat this property as capitalist property.

In connection with this, Comrade Stalin considers the question of socialist property in the epoch of the victory of socialism on a world scale. Marxism teaches that socialism will win in the

---

27 *Ibid.*, p. 26.

end in all countries. Already now, one third of the population of the globe has been torn from imperialist captivity. Some of the peoples who have embarked on the path of creating a free and happy life, such as the Chinese people, are creating conditions for building socialism; others, such as in the European countries of people's democracy are building socialism; while the great Soviet people, blazing the trail into the future for all countries and peoples, is successfully building communism. The victory of socialism in other countries will lead to the requirement for a state eventually, in time, disappearing. The state will wither away, but society will remain. All-people's property is called all-people's precisely because this Marxist concept expresses not only that stage of development of communist society when the state is preserved and property is state property, but also that stage when the state will no longer exist, and property will remain and belong to all of society.

No less harmful than the proposal to nationalize collective-farm property is the proposal of economists Comrades Sanina and Venzher to sell machine-tractor stations to collective farms so that the state relieved itself, as the authors write, of the burden on its shoulders and transferred all care for the development of modern techniques to the collective farms themselves. Comrade Stalin turned this incorrect and harmful viewpoint upside down. Selling MTS to collective farms would not only put collective farms in a special, exceptional position such as no single group of the population has, but would also undermine the development of collective farms.

Comrade Stalin showed that carrying out such proposals into life would ruin the collective farms, halt the development of agricultural machinery, and inflict immense damage on our cause.

Comrade Stalin indicates the paths for the gradual implementation of replacing commodity circulation with product exchange, characteristic of the higher stage of communist society. It is necessary to gradually exclude surplus collective-farm production from the system of commodity circulation and include it in the system of product exchange between state industry and collective farms. Surplus collective-farm production is currently thrown onto the market and included in the system of commodity circulation. This circumstance prevents, under modern conditions, raising collective-farm property to the level of all-people's property, and therefore it is precisely from this end that work must be unfolded to raise collective-farm property to the level of all-people's property.

Comrade Stalin, as a great theorist of Marxism, scientifically defined the further path of development of socialist production relations in the countryside, brilliantly discerning and fully evaluating all the immense significance that product exchange between town and country must have.

Through his brilliant analysis of the paths of development of collective-farm property to the level of all-people's property, Comrade Stalin gives a new, remarkable model of applying Marxist dialectics to phenomena of social life and scientific foresight on this basis. As is known, we do not yet have a

developed product exchange between town and country, but rather an expanded commodity circulation through purchase and sale. But in the country there are already seeds of product exchange, known as the bartering of agricultural products for urban goods. However, the word "barter," says Comrade Stalin, is an unfortunate word; it should be replaced by another —"product exchange."

Comrade Stalin foresees how further development in this area will proceed. That which is now in an embryonic state will gradually unfold and become the main element in economic relations between town and country. "The task consists," writes Comrade Stalin, "in organizing these seeds of product exchange in all branches of agriculture and developing them into a broad system of product exchange, so that collective farms receive for their products not only money, but primarily necessary manufactures"[28].

Comrade Stalin warns that fulfilling this task will require a colossal increase in urban production, in view of which the system of product exchange will have to be introduced without haste, as urban manufactures accumulate. "But it must be introduced unswervingly," teaches Comrade Stalin, "without hesitation, step by step reducing the sphere of action of commodity circulation and expanding the sphere of action of product exchange." This will serve as the preparation of conditions for the transition to communism, "will facilitate the transition from socialism to communism," and "will make it possible to include the basic property of collective farms, the

---

[28] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 94.

output of collective-farm production, into the general system of all-people's planning. And this will be a real and decisive means for raising collective-farm property to the level of all-people's property under our present conditions"[29].

The Stalinist plan for raising collective-farm property to the level of all-people's property is of decisive importance for overcoming the essential difference between town and country, between industry and agriculture. The elimination of this essential difference between town and country will mean, as Comrade Stalin showed, the raising of collective-farm property to the level of all-people's property. Of great importance in this process is the development of old and the emergence of new towns as centers of maximum growth of culture, industry, processing of agricultural products, and powerful development of all branches of the food industry. This circumstance will facilitate the cultural growth of the countryside and **lead to the evening out of living conditions in town and country**[30].

Developing the Marxist propositions on the paths of development of town and country under socialism, Comrade Stalin showed that the elimination of the essential difference between industry and agriculture does not lead to the disappearance of all difference between them. Under communism, non-essential differences between town and country will remain, since working conditions in industry and agriculture are different.

---

29 **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 94.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 26.

Such is the brilliant Stalinist plan for the further perfection of socialist property, a plan for eliminating the essential difference between town and country, based on the deepest knowledge and active, all-round utilization of the objective economic laws of the development of socialism.

* * *

The development of the USSR toward communism presupposes not only the further growth of productive forces and the raising of the economic maturity of the basis of socialist society. Marxism teaches: whatever the mode of production of a society is, such is society itself—its ideas, theories, political views, and institutions, its culture.

The working people, led by the CPSU, know that the transition to communism requires a high level of culture of the whole of society, the broadest dissemination of scientific knowledge, and the mastering by multi-million masses of working people of the Marxist-Leninist worldview.

The **third main preliminary condition** for the transition to communism, advanced and scientifically substantiated in the work of J. V. Stalin *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, gives an expanded characterization of the position of labor and, consequently, the development of productive forces and production relations in the epoch of the gradual transition from socialism to communism; it is a remarkable concretization and development of Marxist theory on the paths of development of socialist culture in this historical period.

Comrade Stalin writes: "**It is necessary, in the third place, to achieve such a cultural growth of society as would ensure for all members of society the all-round development of their physical and mental abilities, so that members of society have the opportunity to receive an education sufficient to become active agents of social development, so that they have the opportunity to freely choose a profession and not be tied for life, owing to the existing division of labor, to any single profession**"[31].

Decisive importance is attached by J. V. Stalin to serious changes that must be made in the current status of labor. Here we have a great example of the all-round creative development of the brilliant observations of Marx regarding the status of labor under communism.

Marx's critique of the Gotha Programme of the German socialists, his remarks on Bakunin's book *Statism and Anarchy*, the *Unpublished Manuscripts of K. Marx*, published in Nos. 11 –12 of the journal *Bolshevik* for 1939, and other works of his show that Marx thoroughly elaborated the question of what will happen to the status of labor after the liquidation of capitalism and the victory of the socialist system. However, none of us, the propagators of Marxism, was able to analyze the brilliant propositions and sketches of Marx as applied to the conditions of socialist society in the USSR. In his brilliant and all-round creative development of Marxist teaching on the

---

[31] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, pp. 68–69. (*Emphasis mine. — G. A.*)

change in the status of labor upon the transition to communism, on communist culture, its construction, and development, Comrade Stalin gave a vivid and great model of how Communists must creatively master Marxist-Leninist science, and how they must be guided by this science when deciding questions of theory and practice.

We remind the reader of Marx's statement on the decisive change in the status of labor under communism. Uncovering the fundamental contradiction of the bourgeois mode of production, expressed in the social character of production and private character of appropriation, and characterizing the status of labor in socialist society, Marx writes: "...The working mass must appropriate its own surplus labor. Once it does this—and free time thereby ceases to exist in an antagonistic form—on the one hand, necessary working time will be measured by the needs of the social individual, and on the other hand, the development of productive forces will proceed with such rapidity that, although production will be calculated for the wealth of all, free time for all will increase"[32].

Comrade Stalin, developing the ideas of Marx, teaches that precisely the rapid development of productive forces for the sake of satisfying the requirements of working people serves as the basis for changes in the status of labor.

"...**Real wealth,**" Marx continues his analysis of communism, "**is the developed productive force of all individuals. Then**

---

[32] Journal *Bolshevik* No. 11–12 for 1939, pp. 63–64.

the measure of wealth will no longer be working time, but free time"[33].

Despite reducing the working day to a minimum, the tremendously increased productive forces and productivity of labor will not only maintain the rates of development of social production inherent to socialism, but will significantly increase them. Since the goal of social production under communism, as under socialism, is man himself, the satisfaction of his constantly growing needs, the liberation of more and more time from obligatory labor for the all-round development of the personality constitutes a necessary feature of the communist system.

Comrade Stalin elaborated a comprehensive program for the cultural growth of society, at the foundation of which lie serious changes in the present status of labor. For the realization of this task, teaches Comrade Stalin, it is necessary first of all to shorten the working day at least to 6, and then to 5 hours. As a result of the implementation of this, members of society will have sufficient free time necessary to receive an all-round education.

Comrade Stalin develops the directives of V. I. Lenin on the development of polytechnic education as an important condition for changing the status of labor under communism. Lenin required working out a practically accessible program of transition to polytechnic education. The basis of such an education Lenin considered compulsory for all children of both sexes up to 16 years of age, with acquaintance in theory and

---

[33] *Ibid.* (*Emphasis mine. — G. A.*)

practice with the main branches of production. Lenin noted, for example, that illiterate people will not approach electrification, and even literacy alone is not enough here. "Here it is insufficient to understand what electricity is: one must know how to technically apply it both to industry and to agriculture, and to individual branches of industry and agriculture. One must learn this oneself, one must teach this to the entire rising working generation"[34].

Lenin held that polytechnic education does not mean teaching children everything; it requires teaching the foundations of modern industry.

So that members of society have the opportunity to freely choose a profession and not be tied for life to any single profession, Comrade Stalin outlines the introduction of universal compulsory polytechnic education.

A tremendous role in the cultural growth of society will be played by a fundamental improvement in housing conditions, raising real wages of workers and employees by at least double, if not more. J. V. Stalin indicates the only correct path for the further rise of real wages. This path is direct increase in money wages, as well as especially the further systematic reduction of prices on consumer goods.

Under socialism, all development of society, all plans for the rise of the economy and culture are subordinated to the interests and needs of society, of the masses of the people, and are successfully carried into life. Here are some characteristic

---

[34] **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 264.

data on the growth of material well-being and culture of Soviet society. In 1952, the national income of the USSR increased compared to 1950 by 25%. Retail trade turnover, showing the increase in the volume of goods reaching the population through state and cooperative trade, rose over this same period by 27%. In the fifth five-year plan, output of light and food industries will increase by no less than 70%. In the country, a grandiose housing construction is unfolding. In the five-year period (1951–1955), about 105 million square meters of new housing space will be brought into service. Universal seven-year education is implemented in the country, and by the end of the fifth five-year plan, a transition to universal ten-year education in the capitals of republics, cities of republican subordination, regional, territorial, and major industrial centers will be carried out. Already in the next five-year plan, universal secondary education will encompass all other cities, as well as rural localities. In the country, work on healthcare is improving, real wages of workers and employees are steadily rising, and incomes of collective farmers are growing.

In the fifth five-year plan, a major step will be taken on the path of rising culture of the entire Soviet society. That which by the Communist Party and Marxist theory was always advanced as the great goal of the world working-class revolutionary movement was elaborated by Comrade Stalin as a practically already implemented program of building communism. Members of communist society, having accomplished a tremendous rise in cultural terms, must become active agents of social development. The level of their communist consciousness will rise under these conditions to an

unprecedented degree. This will be reflected in all aspects of productive, social, and personal life of the workers of communist society. Labor will become the primary vital necessity, and fulfilling duties before society will bring full satisfaction.

A high level of culture and communist consciousness will also mean a clear understanding by all workers not only of their role in social production and the cultural life of society, but also of those results to which the activity of each individual worker and society as a whole leads. Precisely the conscious and diverse participation in the life of society, based not simply on activity, but on great knowledge in the field of various branches of labor and science, makes the builder of communist society an active agent of the social process.

These qualities of members of future society are based on a communist attitude toward public property. Already in the period of socialism, public property as the economic basis of society is sacred and inviolable. An ever larger portion of members of socialist society understands that public property serves as the fundamental foundation of socialism, of social well-being, the basis of the strength of the Soviet system, and therefore displays concern for it, guarding public property like the apple of their eye. But at the first phase of communism—under socialism—the very position of labor is different than under communism, and far from all members of society have absorbed high communist consciousness. In the period of socialism, there are still quite a few people in society with old habits and views, and therefore not a few encroachments on public property. Hence stems one of the most important tasks

of the Soviet state under socialism: to stand guard over public socialist property, to protect this property against any encroachments—from idlers and parasites, thieves, swindlers, and all other embezzlers of public property. A change in the status of labor under communism, a further rapid growth of culture and communist consciousness of all working people will make unnecessary the protection of public property by the state. Under communism, all members of society will view public property as an immutable and inviolable basis for the existence of society. This will be the highest expression of high communist consciousness of people in this great historical epoch.

The elimination of the essential difference between mental and physical labor in the course of building communism constitutes one of the most important aspects of the brilliant Stalinist plan for the further development of socialist society. Relying on the experience of the Soviet country, Comrade Stalin sets a great task: to raise the cultural-technical level of all workers to the level of engineering and technical personnel. The result of carrying out this world-historical task will be the raising of our industry to a height unreachable for the industry of other countries.

However, the disappearance of the essential difference between mental and physical labor—the gap in cultural-technical level between workers and engineering-technical staff—does not mean the complete disappearance of non-essential differences between mental and physical labor, points out Comrade Stalin. "...Some difference, albeit non-essential, will nevertheless remain, if only because working conditions for managerial staff

in enterprises are not the same as working conditions for workers"[35].

The elaboration by Comrade Stalin of the question of paths for overcoming essential differences between mental and physical labor is of immense theoretical and political significance and is an outstanding contribution to Marxist science on the building of communism.

Comrade Stalin teaches that all three main conditions for preparing the transition to communism must be examined in their unity.

"Only after *all* these preliminary conditions are fulfilled, taken together, can it be hoped that labor will be transformed in the eyes of members of society from a burden into 'a primary vital necessity' (Marx), that 'labor from a heavy burden will turn into a delight' (Engels), that public property will be regarded by all members of society as an immutable and inviolable basis of the existence of society.

Only after *all* these preliminary conditions are fulfilled, taken together, will it be possible to transition from the socialist formula—'from each according to his ability, to each according to his labor'—to the communist formula—'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs'"[36].

Such are the main features of the brilliant Stalinist program for preparing the transition of Soviet socialist society to communism.

---

35 **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 29.

36 **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 69.

From this directly follows the conclusion regarding the fundamental economic advantages of socialism over capitalism. From this follows also that the socialist economy is constructed in the interests of peace and friendship among peoples, that it does not need external conquests, fully expanding its power to maximally satisfy the constantly growing needs of the working masses. This is beginning to be understood even by certain bourgeois figures who are not yet fully blinded by false demagogy and slander coming from the USA. Thus, the Swiss newspaper *Gazette de Lausanne* wrote after the publication in the USSR of directives on the five-year plan in an article titled "For whom is time working?": "Soviet Russia indeed, as indicated by its five-year plan, can increase its primary production by 13% annually. It extracts from this such production capacity and such wealth as no conquest can bring it... Consequently, time works for the USSR. If this country raises over a five-year period its industrial production level by 70%, and maintains that same pace, if possible, then this will triple its output in fifteen years! Consequently, time works for Russia!"

4

J. V. Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* aroused immense interest and widespread discussion in all countries of the world.

Two fundamental features of the brilliant Stalinist work attracted the closest attention of advanced forces bearing joy of liberation from oppression and bondage to peoples: the

expansion of democracy, the establishment of national equality, and state sovereignty.

It is a matter of a masterful Stalinist analysis, on the one hand, of the objective laws of development of modern capitalism, giving rise to further decay of the imperialist camp, sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism, and the objective laws of development of the communist formation, on the other.

The scientific conclusions of the leader of peoples J. V. Stalin on the modern state of the system of world capitalism, confirming the inevitability of its collapse, as well as conclusions on regular, progressive, ascending development of socialism, strengthened fear and uncertainty in the camp of warmongers, in the camp of imperialist masters, and above all in the USA, Great Britain, and France. At the same time, these conclusions inspired the advanced forces of all countries of the world for further decisive struggle for the interests of peoples, for peace, democracy, and socialism.

Just a few days after the release of J. V. Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, new facts became known to the world, testifying to the growth of deep contradictions and an inevitable explosion in the camp of imperialist beasts. Internal contradictions within the aggressive North Atlantic bloc made themselves felt again. Even among certain bourgeois circles of Great Britain and France, ever sharper and bolder voices are raised against the enslavement of their countries by American monopolists, against the restoration of aggressive German-Fascist Wehrmacht. Powerful demonstrations and actions of working people in Japan and

Western Germany against the reactionary policy of the USA and its satellites vividly showed the whole world how unstable the occupational regime established in these countries by the American military clique is. The growing ferment in colonies and dependent countries on the USA, England, and France ever more strongly shakes the ground under imperialist world alliances directed against the working masses, toward inciting a new world war. The conclusion of J. V. Stalin that capitalist countries—Western Germany, England, France, Italy, Japan—having fallen into the clutches of the USA, will not submissively fulfill the dictation of American monopolists, but "will try to break out of American captivity and step onto the path of independent development," is confirmed[37].

The bourgeois press is full of statements about the doom of the adventurous policy of its governments; ever more frequently admissions are heard of the type that "the nation experiencing an era of chronic fear hears the tread of its approaching death," or statements that, "thinking of communism, we think of what we might lose. When masses think of communism... they think of what they might gain."

A vivid and profound substantiation by Comrade Stalin of the objective character of the laws of socialism and the laws of communism is of major international significance.

Proof of the fact that the laws of development of socialist society have the same objective significance as the laws of any other society, confirmation of the conclusion of Marxism on the communist formation as a law-governed higher phase in the

---

[37] **J. Stalin.** *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 33.

history of humanity, deals a crushing blow to all fabrications of ideologists and politicians of the imperialist bourgeoisie regarding the proletarian revolution and socialism as allegedly a "deviation" from the main direction of social development, their chatter about a "Russian experiment," about "unacceptability" of our path for other countries, etc. The substantiation of the objective and general character of economic laws of socialism for all countries and peoples confirms the outstanding fact that the movement of society to communism is a historical necessity, that the laws of development of socialism are not invented nor created by the whim of people, but are fully determined by new material conditions of life of society.

The communist formation is just as universal, obligatory in the historical development of all peoples as any of the preceding socio-economic formations; this formation arises and develops according to objective laws. From this proposition, established by Marxism and now fully and irrefutably confirmed by history, flows the conclusion: all peoples of the world will arrive at communism. This is an objective and universal historical necessity that cannot be transformed, altered, or eliminated. It expresses such objective truth, as does the proposition on the law-governed replacement of primitive-communal society by slave-owning, slave-owning by feudal, feudal by capitalist.

Precisely because the laws of development of socialist society in the USSR are objective and universal for the communist mode of production, they are inherent to any socialist society in any country, general to all of them, just as the objective laws of

development of capitalism are general to all bourgeois countries. From the objective and universal character of these laws flows the possibility and necessity of using the great experience of the USSR in building socialism by all peoples breaking with capitalism and entering upon the socialist path of development.

In his historical speech at the XIX Congress of the Communist Party, Comrade Stalin gave a vivid and deep Marxist-Leninist substantiation of the international significance of the great experience of the CPSU and the Soviet people in building communism. He showed that the interests of our Party merge with the interests of peace-loving peoples, while the interests of the Soviet Union in general are inseparable from the cause of peace in the whole world. The CPSU fights for the bright future of all peoples. This role of the CPSU is vividly expressed in that "representatives of fraternal parties, admiring the courage and successes of our Party, bestowed upon it the title of 'Shock Brigade' of the world revolutionary and labor movement"[38].

Comrade Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* contains in a generalized form the historical experience of overthrowing the rule of capital, the victorious building of socialism, and the unfolding of the struggle for the gradual transition to communism. Guided by this experience, the advanced forces of all countries of the world, at whatever

---

[38] **J. V. Stalin.** *Speech at the XIX Congress of the Party*, p. 8. Gospolitizdat. 1952.

stages of social development these countries may find themselves, operate and will operate with success.

The great ideas of Comrade Stalin unite the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism even more firmly, inspiring progressive people of all countries to fight for their just cause. The advanced press of many countries notes that every work, every speech, every article, and every statement of Comrade Stalin finds the most vivid response in all corners of the globe: Comrade Stalin's works illuminate the path for progressive forces of all peace-loving humanity toward peace and a better future, raise in the broadest masses of the people unprecedented energy, and strengthen their will to fight, their faith in victory over the sworn enemies of peace and friendship among peoples.

In Comrade Stalin's new work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, a classical Marxist analysis of the experience and prospects of development of socialist and modern capitalist worlds is given. Just as Marx in *Capital* gave a scientific, all-round analysis of the development of industrial capitalism and ideologically prepared the working class for a decisive struggle against its sworn enemy—the bourgeoisie—and just as Lenin unmasked the laws of development of capitalism in its imperialist stage and the development of Soviet society in the transition period from capitalism to socialism, so Comrade Stalin gave in his new work a full scientific solution to the most complex questions of social development in the epoch of transition from socialism to communism and the development of modern capitalism. Comrade Stalin's work stands in the rank of the great creations

of Marxist thought, is a model of creative Marxism, and demonstrates hitherto unseen victories and successes of Marxist-Leninist theory.

4. ON THE CONSCIOUS APPLICATION OF LAWS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT UNDER SOCIALISM
G. E. GLEZERMAN

The construction of socialism and communism represents an unprecedented process of conscious transformation of society in its scope and depth. The working class of the USSR, led by the Communist Party, rallied broad working masses behind it and, having secured the victory of socialism, accomplished a fundamental upheaval in the entire structure of societal life.

A necessary prerequisite that made the realization of this upheaval possible was the conscious application by the party of the working class of the laws of social development. Comrade Stalin teaches that the Communist Party must be guided in its practical activity not by any random motives, but by the laws of development of society, by practical conclusions from these laws. Guided by the laws of social development discovered by Marxism-Leninism, the Bolshevik Party led the revolutionary struggle of the working masses and ensured the transformation of capitalist society into a socialist one. Our further movement toward communism is also carried out by the conscious efforts of millions of workers, led and organized by the party of Lenin –Stalin, armed with the knowledge of the laws of social development.

* * *

With the victory of socialism in the USSR, a new society was created, the laws of development of which fundamentally differ from the laws of development of all preceding societies. However, the specific nature of the laws of socialist society does not mean that general laws of historical materialism do not operate in this society. Such laws of historical materialism as the law of the determining role of the mode of production in the development of society, of changes in relations of production depending on and in accordance with changes in productive forces, etc., continue to operate in socialist society as well. These laws, as well as other most general laws of historical materialism, belong to the category of "sociological laws relating to all phases of social development" [39]. But in each socio-economic formation, general laws manifest themselves uniquely, in connection with which each of them inherently possesses special, specific economic laws of its own.

The most general sociological laws are the propositions formulated by I. V. Stalin in his work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* regarding the three features of production. They allow us to understand the development of society as a natural-historical process, i.e., as a process subject to objective laws independent of the will and consciousness of people. At the same time, they provide the key to understanding the relationship between objective laws of social development and the conscious activity of people.

Historical materialism teaches that the development of society is determined by the development of modes of production,

[39] I. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 165.

which encompass both productive forces and the production relations of people. A change in productive forces, representing the most mobile and revolutionary element of production, historically out of necessity entails a change in relations of production. However, relations of production do not change immediately following changes in productive forces. The peculiarity of changes in relations of production consists, firstly, in the fact that they are transformed in accordance with the nature of altered productive forces only some time after changes in the latter, and, secondly, in the fact that the replacement of one system of production relations by another does not occur spontaneously, but is accomplished in an antagonistic society through the conscious revolutionary struggle of advanced classes against obsolescent classes.

The transition from one social system to another was always carried out in the course of a fierce class struggle, in which advanced classes more or less consciously sought to overthrow outdated social orders. But this transition was prepared by the spontaneous development of production. By introducing countless changes into social production, perfecting and developing production, people did not realize at all that they were preparing this upheaval in the entire social system. And since it was production, developing spontaneously, that determined, in the final analysis, the development of society, as a result, blind forces of social development dominated over people.

Marxism was the first to discover what causes determined in the past the dominance over people of spontaneous forces and under what conditions the spontaneous course of economic

development can be transformed into a conscious, targeted effort by millions of people.

In his brilliant work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, I. V. Stalin points to two reasons due to which the emergence of new productive forces and corresponding production relations occurred spontaneously, unconsciously, independently of the will of people.

This is explained, first of all, by the fact that people are not free in their choice of productive forces and production relations, which form the basis of their history. Each generation, entering into life, finds already ready-made productive forces and production relations created not by them, but inherited from previous generations. It is therefore compelled at first to accept all that it finds ready-made in the realm of production, and to adapt to existing conditions in order to continue the production process.

The spontaneity of the emergence of new productive forces and corresponding production relations was also explained by the fact that, participating in the process of production, people realized only their immediate interests and did not foresee the ultimate social results of their actions. They introduced changes in the process of production, improved and created new instruments of production, without even thinking about what social consequences their actions would entail. Their conscious activity was limited to the narrow framework of everyday interests. As Comrade Stalin points out, "improving one instrument of production or another, one element of productive forces or another, people do not realize, do not understand, and do not think about what social results these

improvements may lead to; they think only of their everyday interests, of making their labor easier and obtaining some immediate, tangible benefit for themselves"[40].

However, after the character of productive forces changes as a result of these actions, people find themselves forced to change accordingly their own production relations in order to bring them into accordance with the productive forces. This change becomes a historical necessity, for productive forces can develop successfully only if relations of production correspond to their character. Operating here is the economic law of the necessary conformity of relations of production to the character of productive forces, according to which relations of production, no matter how far behind they lag from the development of productive forces, "must—sooner or later—come into conformity with—and actually do come into conformity with—the level of development of productive forces, with the character of productive forces" [41]. This law clears its path despite the resistance of obsolescent forces of society, reactionary classes, which are the carriers of old production relations that have turned into fetters for the development of productive forces. On the basis of this law (though without knowing it), advanced classes in the past also carried out the revolutionary transformation of society, broke old orders, and established new orders in the sphere of production relations.

By liquidating capitalist relations of production and creating socialist relations of production, the working class at the head

---

40 I. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, pp. 559–560, 11th ed.

41 I. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 553.

of its Marxist party consciously applied this very economic law. Derived from this law, first discovered by Marxism-Leninism, was the necessity of bringing production relations into conformity with the social character of productive forces grown within the womb of capitalism. And for this it was necessary to liquidate private ownership of the means of production and replace it with social ownership. As a result of the socialist transformation of the economy, production relations in the USSR were brought into full conformity with productive forces.

In the development of socialist society, as in any other, of decisive importance in the final analysis is production. That is why the most important condition for the transition from socialism to communism is the comprehensive development of socialist production, the creation of the material-technical base of communism. Depending on the development of the productive forces of socialist society, its production relations also change during the transition to communism, which is expressed in the development of public ownership, in the further transition to a single all-people's ownership, in overcoming the differences between town and country, between mental and physical labor, etc. Productive forces in socialist society remain the most mobile and revolutionary element of production.

One of the features of the socialist system consists in the fact that here the resolution of urgent tasks of developing the material life of society occurs in a timely manner, without being dragged out for a long period, as takes place in other societies. Here there are no longer obsolescent classes clinging

to outdated relations; there exist only conservative elements whose resistance can be overcome without any violent revolution. Even Engels foresaw that in a more or less distant future, people would know in advance the necessity of changing the social system caused by changes in relations, and would desire this change before it was forced upon them against their consciousness and will [42] .

The resolution of urgent tasks in the development of the material life of society, which previously occurred as a result of spontaneously matured social contradictions, is now achieved on the basis of conscious and organized leadership. Thanks to this, Soviet society is saved far away from social upheavals, and life is built on rational principles, in accordance with the achievements of science, with societal expediency.

The development of production is carried out here by the conscious efforts of millions of workers building communism.

Does this mean that the economic development of socialist society is determined by the consciousness of people? Can one draw the conclusion from what has been said that development has ceased to be an objective process?

No, such a conclusion would be deeply erroneous.

Under capitalism, economic development represents an objectively governed process that occurs spontaneously, independently of the will of people. Under socialism, economic

[42] F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 326, 1950.

development of society remains a process subject to objective necessity, but loses its spontaneous character.

As noted above, two reasons in the past determined the fact that the emergence of new productive forces and corresponding production relations had not only an objective, but also a spontaneous character: first, the fact that people were not free in their choice of mode of production, since each generation, entering life, found ready-made productive forces and production relations as the result of the work of previous generations; second, that people did not realize the social results of those changes in production that they introduced.

The first of these reasons speaks to the material conditionality of the historical process. "Thanks to the simple fact," Marx pointed out, "that every succeeding generation finds productive forces acquired by the preceding generation, and these productive forces serve it as raw material for new production, —thanks to this fact a connection is formed in human history, a history of humanity is formed..." [43].

The operation of this fact, which speaks to the objective character of the process of social development, continues under socialism as well. This is evidenced by the fact that here too people cannot choose their productive forces at their own discretion, but must proceed from the level of their development already achieved. The difference lies only in the fact that those same productive forces, which previously were the result of spontaneous development, now more and more represent the result of conscious efforts and labor of Soviet

[43] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XXV, p. 8.

people. When, for example, we set out to build a socialist society, we willy-nilly had to start from the level of development of productive forces that we inherited from old Russia. Now, when socialist society develops on its own socialist base, we rely on the material prerequisites created in the course of socialist construction. It is clear that this immeasurably expands the objective base upon which people can rely in their further conscious activity. But this does not change the fact that the will of people under socialism is also determined, and people can set before themselves only such goals and tasks for which the necessary conditions and prerequisites exist, corresponding to objective possibilities.

As for the second reason that determined the spontaneity of the emergence of new productive forces, its operation under socialism is more and more restricted and overcome, but does not disappear completely. In contrast to preceding societies, here the managing subject is the entire society, organized as a whole and led by the socialist state, the party of Bolsheviks. Planning certain changes in production, our state and party organs foresee in advance their social results and ensure that the entire people understands them. Therefore, when creating new hydroelectric stations, canals, and irrigation systems, carrying out the electrification of agriculture, Soviet people know what impact these innovations will have on social relations, how, in particular, they will affect the overcoming of differences between town and country, between mental and physical labor, etc. Built upon the foresight of the social results of these changes in production and based upon them is our plan for building communism. And only under the condition of such

foresight does the subordination of spontaneous forces of social development to the will of people become possible.

Of course, it would be mistaken to understand this in such a way as if everything and anything could be foreseen in plans. All remote technical and social consequences of some major innovation (such as, say, the use of atomic energy for industry and transport) cannot be calculated in advance. But the more far-sighted the leadership of society is, the more fully it can foresee these consequences and prepare in advance the necessary changes in the organization of social production, and thanks to this avoid those social upheavals that are inevitable under spontaneous development.

Changes in socialist production are introduced not only from above, according to a plan drawn up in advance, but also from below, as a result of the initiative of individual workers. The socialist system provides wide scope for such initiative, unleashes the initiative of the working person. In socialist society, unlike preceding societies, a worker, introducing one improvement or another into the production process, is guided by a general goal toward which the entire nation strives and for which it fights. And yet, not all social consequences introduced by him into production can be foreseen by him. Analyzing the significance of the Stakhanovite movement, I. V. Stalin emphasized that it opens up for us the only path by which alone one can achieve the highest indicators of labor productivity necessary for the transition from socialism to communism. The Stakhanovite movement was born of the creative initiative of workers—innovators of production. But the Stakhanovites themselves who initiated this movement did not foresee what

scope it would gain and what its social consequences would be. "Did Stakhanov and Busygin think about this great significance of the Stakhanovite movement when they began to break old technical norms?" Comrade Stalin said.— "Of course, not. They had their own concerns—they sought to bring the enterprise out of a bottleneck and overfulfill the economic plan. But in achieving this goal, they had to smash old technical norms and develop high labor productivity, surpassing the advanced capitalist countries" [44].

The genius of Stalin discovered in the Stakhanovite movement the sprouts of communism and showed the initiators of this movement themselves its great historical significance. The Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state headed the Stakhanovite movement and helped spread it far and wide to all regions and districts of the USSR.

The example of the origin and development of the Stakhanovite movement shows that in socialist society creators of material goods consciously make history, display unprecedented initiative in labor, that the initiative of advanced workers is quickly picked up by masses of workers, giving birth to whole social movements. But the initiative of advanced production workers, embodied in their deeds, brings not only the realization of those immediate goals that they set before themselves, but also gives birth to more remote social consequences that their initiators did not foresee initially. In previous societies, the fact that people did not foresee the social consequences of their productive activity was a result of

[44] I. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 497.

the spontaneity of the development of production as a whole. In a socialist society, where movement toward communism is consciously directed by the party and state, these social consequences are accounted for in the general process of building communism. The party, as the leading force of socialist society, armed with advanced theory, helps the entire people to realize the prospects of development of society. It insightfully discerns the significance of sprouts of the new created by popular creativity and provides them with powerful support.

The people make history. Millions of workers and peasants, through their daily activity, constantly introduce something new into the life of our society. To successfully guide the development of society, state and party organs must carefully study the processes occurring in the depths of life, which are the result of the activity of millions of people who make history. At the same time, some time is always required to realize these new processes, evaluate them, and draw the necessary practical conclusions. "Is it possible," noted I. V. Stalin, "that the ruling party can immediately grasp new processes occurring in life, and just as immediately reflect them in its practical policy? I think it is impossible,—noted I. V. Stalin.—Impossible, because at first there are facts, then their reflection in the consciousness of the most advanced elements of the party, and only after that comes the moment of realization of new processes in the minds of the mass of party members... In other words: consciousness somewhat lags behind facts" [45]. But such a lag of consciousness by no means

[45] I. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 12, p. 232.

condemns the party to a passive following behind events. Guided by knowledge of the laws of social development, carefully studying life, the leadership of the party has the opportunity to foresee the further development of events, to "understand the meaning of events in time, the meaning of new processes, and then skillfully direct them in accordance with the general trend of development" [46].

As we advance toward communism, the importance of conscious leadership over the development of society grows. The higher the level of development achieved by socialist society, the more fully people come to know the laws of nature and society, and the more they are able to direct their further development and manage it.

But even under communism, the development of the material life of society will present people with new tasks that could not be foreseen in advance in their full scope. The consciousness of people will more fully reflect their being, never exhausting it completely. And here the correct proposition of Lenin remains: "From the fact that you live and conduct your affairs, bear children and produce goods, exchange them, an objectively necessary chain of events, a chain of development is formed, independent of your social consciousness, never fully encompassed by it" [47].

In pre-socialist formations, this objectively necessary chain of events was formed as a result of the activity of many millions of scattered producers. Under conditions of socialism and

---

46 I. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 37.

47 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 311, 4th ed.

communism, it is formed as a result of the activity of millions of producers united by conditions of collective production. But it would be the utmost idealism to suppose that this objectively necessary chain of events disappears under socialism and is replaced by social connections established by people at their own discretion. Under socialism, too, there remains a vital necessity for people to work, to produce, and on this basis objectively necessary relations independent of their will are formed between them. The state organizes the labor efforts of millions of people, directs them into a certain channel, using their personal material interest in the results of their labor, cultivating in them new social incentives for labor, an awareness of the necessity to work for society. But each of the millions of workers of socialist society, even if he realizes the character of production relations into which he enters, is not free to establish these relations at his own discretion.

Relations of production in socialist society remain objective, i.e., existing independently of the will of people, primarily because the character of these relations is determined by the achieved level of development of productive forces. Let us pose the question to ourselves: why, in the process of conscious construction of socialism and communism, are relations between members of society established precisely as such, and not as other relations of production? It is clear that these relations are built in accordance with the social character of the process of production, which historically took shape, and was not created by our wish. Underlying socialist relations of production, as relations of comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance, lies public ownership of the means of

production, which corresponds to the social character of productive forces. This state of affairs was not established by itself, nor by way of spontaneous development, but as a result of the conscious struggle of the working people under the leadership of the party of the proletariat for the socialist transformation of the country's economy. But to build new production relations consciously does not mean to establish them at will. Consequently, overcoming spontaneity in the development of the mode of production does not abolish the objective character of relations of production under socialism, does not alter the fact that they represent an objective reality existing independently of the will of people.

* * *

A necessary condition for human mastery over both the spontaneous forces of nature and the spontaneous forces of social development is the cognition and conscious use of laws governing these forces. Laws of the external world, taught Lenin, are "the foundation of human purposeful activity" [48]. Cognition of laws gives the possibility of foreseeing the results of the action of objective forces, and knowing in advance these results and using this knowledge in practical activity, man can consciously, according to plan, achieve the realization of his goals.

Marxism-Leninism, in opposition to subjectivism and idealism, considers the laws of science as objective, i.e., reflecting processes taking place in nature and society independently of the will and consciousness of people. According to Lenin's

---

[48] V. I. Lenin, *Philosophical Notebooks*, p. 161.

definition, "law is a reflection of the essential in the movement of the universe" [49], "law is relation... Relation of essences or between essences" [50]. Consequently, laws in nature, as well as in society, express an essential, necessary causal connection flowing from the nature of things. This connection of phenomena carries not a random, but a necessary character, and therefore is not a fleeting, passing one, but a permanent, stable one.

Attempts by bourgeois philosophers and sociologists (Machists, neo-Kantians, etc.) to deny the objective character of laws of nature and society met a decisive rebuff from Lenin and Stalin. When, for example, the notorious P. Struve attempted to declare the law of value a "phantom" and came out with the assertion that the idea of natural law in political economy "suffered total collapse," Lenin noted that in the interest of refuting scientific socialism, the reactionary Struve denied science altogether. Spoken in this skepticism is the property inherent in the bourgeoisie, as in all declining and decaying classes, of a fear of science. Lenin emphasized that in reality science "in all fields of knowledge shows us the manifestation of basic laws in the seeming chaos of phenomena" and that "the expulsion of laws from science is in fact merely smuggling in the laws of religion" [51]. These words of Lenin point out most accurately the reactionary essence of the arguments of modern bourgeois philosophers and sociologists, such as Russell, Pflüger, Trevelyan, etc., calling

---

49 *Ibid.*, p. 127.

50 *Ibid.*, p. 128.

51 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 181, 182.

for the abandonment of cognition of objective laws of nature and society.

Denial of the objectivity of laws is a denial of science itself, and hence of the possibility of using science as an instrument for transforming the world. Exposing the reactionary essence of agnosticism, Lenin and Stalin upheld the well-known proposition of materialism that "the laws of science represent objective truth" [52]. From the recognition of the objective character of the laws of the entire material world, it follows that social life is also subject to objective laws. "If the connection of phenomena of nature and their mutual conditionality represent the laws of development of nature,"—teaches Comrade Stalin,—"then it follows from this that the connection and mutual conditionality of phenomena of social life represent not a random matter, but laws of development of society" [53].

These general propositions, which are indisputable for Marxists, apply fully to socialist society, the economic laws of which also carry an objective character. Sometimes, however, the opinion is voiced that in socialist society, since the economy is built by people consciously, there can be no question of the objectivity of economic processes taking place independently of the will of people. On this basis, the objective character of the laws of political economy under socialism is denied. Supporters of such a view claim that the policy of the socialist state shapes and creates the economic laws of socialism. Instead of showing that the economic policy of the

---

52 I. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 544.

53 *Ibid.*

socialist state is a scientific policy, which rests on the cognition and conscious utilization of economic laws, they view these laws themselves as an expression of policy, thus depriving policy itself of a scientific basis. Such a view, signifying a slide into voluntarism, inevitably leads to adventurism in policy.

The error of these comrades consists primarily in the fact that they imagine as if people can, at their own will, establish or abolish the laws of science. But such a notion fundamentally contradicts the Marxist view, according to which the laws of science represent the reflection of objective processes taking place independently of the will of people. Since the laws of science have an objective character, people are not powerless to abolish or create them. They can only discover laws and, having learned their operation, use them in their own interests.

It is precisely on the basis of knowing objective laws that people obtain the opportunity to foresee the results of the action of forces of nature, as well as the results of their own practical activity, which gives them the opportunity to act purposefully, multiplying their power. When laws are not understood, and the practical activity of people is built without accounting for their action, people find themselves helpless before the face of spontaneous forces. But having learned laws and skillfully using them in their interests, people obtain the opportunity to curb spontaneous forces and subject them to their power, putting forces of nature at their service.

Thus, for example, in his productive activity, man acts upon the geographical environment. If in doing so, due to ignorance of the laws of nature or for selfish interests, people ignore the objective connection between various elements of the

geographical environment, their activity entails an intensification of the spontaneous destructive forces of nature. When, say, capitalists predatorily cut down forests and exhaust the soil, as a result of this the water balance is disrupted, "man-made deserts" appear, and the harmful effect of drought intensifies. And, on the contrary, when forest shelterbelts are created in our country, reservoirs are built, and the ley farming system of agriculture is introduced, etc., then thanks to the correct consideration of the objective connection of natural phenomena, people curb its destructive forces. By systematically acting on certain aspects of the geographical environment, for example, by regulating run-off, i.e., the movement of water in the earth's crust and on the surface of the earth, we have the opportunity to exert a desired effect for society on climate, soil formation, vegetation, etc.

Thanks to knowledge of the laws of nature and their conscious application, people free themselves from subordination to spontaneity and become masters of nature.

"Freedom does not consist in an imagined independence from the laws of nature, but in the knowledge of these laws and in the possibility made possible by this knowledge of systematically making the laws of nature work toward definite ends" [54],—said Engels. This remains true in application to the laws of development of society, which, just like the laws of nature, carry an objective character, although unlike the latter manifest themselves in the activity of people endowed with consciousness and will.

---

[54] F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 107.

The laws of social development are not established by people, but reflect objective relations that take shape between social phenomena independently of the will of people. Such an objective character is possessed, for example, by economic laws determining the connection between the quantity of money required for commodity circulation and the sum of prices of commodities, as well as the velocity of money circulation, etc.

As already noted above, economic laws of development are not immutable. The liquidation of capitalism and the building of socialism led to the fact that in the Soviet country economic laws of capitalism ceased their operation and economic laws of socialism came into operation. But this does not mean that laws change at the discretion of people. They lose force and yield place to new laws only as a result of new economic conditions; they are determined by these conditions, and not by the will of people. And under socialism, laws are determined by objective economic conditions achieved by society at a given stage of development.

Objective conditions also determine the character of the action of economic laws. In socialist society, as a result of the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the establishment of public ownership, the character of the action of economic laws changes significantly.

In pre-socialist formations, where people were divided by private ownership of the means of production and class contradictions, economic development took shape as the resultant of a multitude of mutually conflicting interests and aspirations. Hence the discrepancy between the goals of people

and the objective results of their activity, which in the majority of cases did not correspond at all to their intentions. This means that development was spontaneous in character, while economic laws operated like a blind force. Engels pointed out that, for example, the law of value in capitalist society breaks its way "in the only way in which economic laws can break through in a society of private producers, i.e., as a blindly operating law of nature, inherent in the very relationships and independent of the will and intentions of the producers" [55]. Such economic laws, even when known, do not cease to operate under capitalism as a spontaneous force. When the rulers of bourgeois states, not knowing and not wishing to reckon with these laws, act contrary to them, their intervention in economic life not only fails to curb, but, on the contrary, repeatedly amplifies the action of the spontaneous destructive forces of capitalism.

Especially sharply revealed are the contradictions of spontaneous development in periodic economic crises, which are inevitable under capitalism. The senseless destruction of consumer goods at a time when millions of people are starving, idle machines and factories at a time when masses of unemployed cannot find application for their powers—such are the glaring contradictions of capitalism exposed by crises. In doing so, every attempt by bourgeois figures to "escape" from crises entails a new aggravation of contradictions, an accumulation of new prerequisites leading to even more severe crises. Graphic confirmation of this is the current state of affairs in the leading imperialist countries, and above all in the

---

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 296.

USA. With the help of the "Marshall Plan," imperialist circles of the USA attempted not only to suppress the independent economic development of European countries and turn them into an appendage to the US economy, but also to save their own economy from an impending crisis. Billions of dollars are spent in the USA on expanding the war industry, which leads to astronomical enrichment of capitalist monopolies and even greater impoverishment of the working people; arms production is inflated beyond measure by reducing the production of consumer goods. But can such a policy deliver imperialist predators from severe economic shocks? Of course not! As Comrade L. P. Beria noted in his report on the 34th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution [56], the militarization of the economy in capitalist countries "cannot fail to lead in the near future to an economic collapse," while the drive of US imperialists to subject the economies of other capitalist countries to themselves cannot fail to entail a sharp aggravation of contradictions in the camp of capitalism.

Attempts by bourgeois figures to manage economic development are futile. As long as the foundation of the social system is private ownership of the means of production, while material production—the most important and essential sphere of social life—is subject to the drive of capitalists to extract maximum profit, people cannot escape the rule of spontaneous forces of social development. Under these conditions, even their ability to subject the spontaneous forces of nature to themselves turns out to be limited. If, for example, to this day

---

[56] L. P. Beria, *34th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, p. 28. 1951.

in capitalist countries natural resources are used in a predatory manner, as a result of which the ultimate results of people's productive activity turn out to be in glaring contradiction with the interests of society, the reason for this, of course, lies not in ignorance of the laws of nature, but in the selfish interests of private owners.

Under socialism, public ownership of the means of production unites the interests and aspirations of people; the absence of class antagonisms and the establishment of moral-political unity engender a commonality of goals of millions of producers of material goods. Hence the alignment of goals and aspirations of people with the achievable results of their activity. And this means that development has lost its spontaneous character, while economic laws, being understood, are consciously utilized by people.

Only under a system where public ownership of the means of production exists does the development of production become subject to the interests of society and, consequently, account is taken not only of immediate, tangible benefits, but also of more remote consequences of the productive activity of people.

"The conditions of life,"—predicted Engels,—"surrounding people and hitherto dominating them, now fall under the power and control of people who for the first time become real and conscious masters of nature, because they become masters of their own social life. The laws of their own social actions, confronting people hitherto as foreign laws dominating them, will be applied by people with full knowledge of the matter, and consequently will be subordinated to their rule. Social being, confronting them hitherto as imposed from above by

nature and history, now becomes their own free deed. Objective, foreign forces that dominated history hitherto fall under the control of man himself. And only from this moment will people begin to consciously make their own history themselves; only then will the social causes set in motion by them have in a significant and ever-increasing degree the consequences they desire. This is humanity's leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom" [57].

With the destruction of the capitalist system of economy and the establishment of public ownership of the means of production, anarchy of production is eliminated, and planned leadership of the development of production becomes possible and necessary. Public ownership unites all enterprises into a single national economy, requiring unified leadership. Expressed in the plan is the conscious formulation of urgent tasks and needs of development of the material life of Soviet society.

"Unlike capitalist countries,"—notes V. M. Molotov,—"where blind laws of spontaneous economic development dominate and set the tone, with inevitable periodic crises and ever-increasing aggravation of social antagonisms, the Soviet state is built on completely different foundations. In our country, thanks to the socialist revolution and the subsequent liquidation of exploiting classes, a planned upsurge of the entire national economy has been established, of which not a single capitalist state can dream" [58].

---

[57] F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 267.

[58] V. M. Molotov, *Stalin and Stalinist Leadership*, p. 28. Gospolitizdat. 1949.

Organized according to plan, the upsurge of the entire economic life of the USSR is directed toward the maximum satisfaction of the growing material and cultural needs of society. Continuous growth of socialist production and its improvement on the basis of higher technology ensure the progressive development of socialist society and its transition into a communist society.

Thus, under conditions of socialism, the relationship between objective economic laws and the conscious activity of people has changed. Spontaneously operating laws of capitalism—precisely because they are spontaneous—confront people like a blind, alien, or hostile force. On the contrary, the laws of development of the socialist economy, being laws of the conscious activity of tens of millions of people carrying out production, are used and applied consciously in the policy of the socialist state, which acts as the organizer of the entire economic life of Soviet society.

From this it is clear that it would be a fundamental mistake to consider the economic laws of socialism as spontaneous laws and derive their objective existence from the spontaneity of their action. Such a view, taking its roots from the long-shattered party theory of "drift" in socialist construction, perverts the nature of the economic laws of socialism.

By learning the laws of economic development, people obtain the opportunity to use them in the interests of society and, thanks to this, free themselves from the destructive consequences of spontaneous economic development. But the economic laws themselves remain objective laws. They do not

depend on the will and consciousness of people; on the contrary, they determine their will and consciousness.

Thus, for example, for socialist society, as for any other, the proposition remains in force that social labor must be distributed among branches of industry in certain proportions (varying for each stage of historical development). Marx pointed out that the "necessity of distributing social labor in definite proportions cannot at all be destroyed by a definite form of social production; only its form of manifestation can change. Laws of nature in general cannot be destroyed. What can change in historically different conditions is only the form in which these laws manifest themselves" [59].

In capitalist society, this distribution of labor among branches of the economy is carried out spontaneously through the law of value, the law of the average rate of profit—through constant price fluctuations, forcing capital to rush into those branches that promise it the highest profit. All development of the national economy occurs under these conditions extremely unevenly, accompanied by severe economic shocks and crises.

Under socialism, as is known, the distribution of labor among branches of the national economy is regulated not in the interests of extracting high profit, but by nationwide interests, the needs of society. The distribution of social labor among branches of production is carried out consciously, in a planned manner. The very proportions in which labor is distributed here differ fundamentally from those proportions that would be established in a spontaneous manner. However, it would be

---

[59] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 208.

incorrect to think that in our society these proportions can be established at will: they are determined by the achieved level of development of society and those tasks that of necessity arise before it.

This objective connection of economic phenomena is revealed most clearly in the balances of the national economy, which play a major role in planning. Balances are drawn up in accordance with planned tasks, with the policy of the socialist state. But at the same time they express certain relationships between branches of the national economy, between volume of production and volume of commodity turnover, between accumulation and consumption, etc., which carry an objective character and are determined not by our wish, but by the achieved stage of development of society. The state cannot ignore this relationship between various aspects of the economic life of socialist society.

All this shows that the economic laws of socialist society are consciously utilized by people, but are by no means established by them at their own discretion.

Distribution according to labor represents, for example, an economic necessity for socialist society. The mode of distribution depends, according to Marx's definition, on the character "of the social-productive organism itself and the stage of historical development of the producers" [60]. Necessary for socialist society is the distribution of produced products according to labor, which has as its prerequisite the dominance of public ownership of the means of production, excluding the

---

[60] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 208.

possibility of appropriating someone else's labor. If public ownership of the means of production exists, then the produced product represents common property and must be directed toward satisfying public and personal needs of members of society. The necessity of distributing that part of the product intended for personal consumption in proportion to labor contributed by each producer to social production is conditioned by the achieved socialist level of development of productive forces, as well as the degree of socialist consciousness of the working people themselves. It is known that distribution according to labor is by no means our ultimate ideal, but for us it is an economic necessity determined by the objectively achieved stage of development of socialist society, still excluding the possibility of distributing produced products according to needs.

The setting of specific forms of implementing the socialist principle of distribution, varying in collective farms and state enterprises, is not arbitrary. The party of Lenin–Stalin, generalizing the experience of collective farm construction, discovered a form of distribution corresponding to the nature of the collective farm system, establishing the necessity of evaluating the labor of collective farmers in workdays (*trudodni*). The workday, as a measure of labor and consumption in collective farms, was discovered and introduced consciously, and did not arise by way of spontaneous development. But its introduction was by no means the result of our subjective discretion, but of the fact that the nature of cooperative-collective farm property in the

countryside, conditions, and patterns of its development were correctly understood.

We see, therefore, that if public ownership of the means of production is the basis of socialist relations of production, then it is an objective necessity that requires planned development of the national economy, this requires at a given level of productive forces distribution according to labor, etc. This connection of phenomena carries an objective character. Independently of our will and desire, we are forced to act in this way and not otherwise.

If, on the other hand, we do not reckon with this objective necessity or fail to correctly realize and understand it, it, of course, does not disappear, but then unwanted and unforeseen spontaneous consequences manifest themselves, and the results of our activity turn out not to correspond to our intentions. Thus, for example, at the beginning of the collective farm movement, when a measure of labor and consumption in collective farms such as the workday had not yet been found, when egalitarian distribution was applied in some collective farms, which did not correspond to the economic nature of socialism, this entailed a decline in labor productivity, a weakening of labor discipline. Had not the party, Comrade Stalin, discovered the most expedient form of distribution in collective farms, objectively corresponding to the nature of cooperative-collective farm property, the economy of collective farms would have been undermined.

Or another example. Modern agricultural production, equipped with powerful technology, requires a corresponding organization of labor for this technology, which is an objective

necessity. Some of our workers, failing to understand this necessity, began to plant links (*zvenya*) in grain farming, which hindered the full utilization of tractors, combines, and other complex machines. This entailed undesirable spontaneous consequences, a lag in agriculture in these areas, as was exposed by the Central Committee of the AUCP(b) in 1950.

From this it is evident that objective necessity, expressed in the laws of development of the socialist economy, does not cease to exist if we, for one reason or another, due to errors made, do not wish to reckon with it. But in that case, its action manifests itself in consequences undesirable for us.

From this it is also evident that planned leadership of the national economy is by no means achieved by itself, automatically, but requires from us the ability to correctly realize economic necessity and act in accordance with it.

A socialist national economy cannot develop otherwise than according to plan. But in order to carry out truly planned leadership, it is necessary to draw up such plans that fully meet the requirements of planned, proportional development of the national economy. Thus, for example, if an increase in steel smelting is planned, it is necessary to foresee a corresponding growth in pig iron production, as well as materials needed by steel-making plants, deliveries of machinery equipment required by ferrous metallurgy, supplying enterprises with sufficient electric power, etc. Account must be fully taken of the objective connection and interdependence among various branches of the national economy, for without this, production cannot be carried out uninterruptedly. One of the important tasks of planning, teaches I. V. Stalin, consists in correctly

distributing means of production and labor power among branches of the national economy and enterprises, and not allowing disproportions, while covering possible temporary partial disproportions with the help of creating necessary reserves. The objective necessity of planned, proportional development of the national economy imposes, therefore, definite demands on our plans, demands with which we are forced—whether we want to or not—to reckon.

Consequently, conscious leadership over the development of social life does not mean that people are liberated from the laws of economic necessity. They merely consciously apply these laws, thanks to which they obtain the opportunity to direct according to plan the process of their social development. The mutual connection between various aspects of economic life appears here, in Marx's expression, not as a blind law that spontaneously imposes itself on individuals engaged in production, but as "a law which, being comprehended by their collective mind and therefore subject to it, brings the process of production under their common control" [61].

* * *

Conscious management of the development of socialist society finds its expression in that guiding and directing role played in the life of the country by the policy of the socialist state and the Bolshevik Party. Under the guiding influence of this policy, both the economy and culture of socialist society develop. The

[61] K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 267. 1950.

policy of the Bolshevik Party represents, according to Stalin's definition, the vital basis of the Soviet system.

This definition further develops, as applied to new conditions, the general proposition of Marxism-Leninism on the primacy of politics over economics. Marxists recognize the primacy of politics over economics not only under conditions of the Soviet system, as some comrades think, but also under conditions of capitalism. Not for nothing did Lenin call this proposition the ABC of Marxism [62]. Policy cannot fail to have primacy over economics, since the fundamental economic interests of classes can be satisfied only by way of conquering or holding political power. Therefore, Marxism-Leninism teaches that under conditions of capitalism, too, the main, decisive form of class struggle is the political struggle.

The question of political power is decisive for every class. For the oppressed classes of capitalist society, for the proletariat and its allies, this question is of paramount importance, since the conquest of political power by the proletariat is the main condition for their liberation from exploitation. For the ruling classes of capitalist society, this question also has decisive importance, since only thus can they preserve economic dominance, intensify exploitation of the working people of their country, enslave and rob peoples of other countries, and maximally multiply their profits by holding political power in their hands.

But under conditions of capitalism, neither the policy of ruling classes, nor even less the policy of oppressed classes, can

---

[62] See V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, p. 62.

manage the process of economic development of society. Although political power and means of production are in the hands of ruling classes, they cannot subject the economic development of society as a whole to themselves, but, on the contrary, are forced to adapt to the spontaneous development of the economy. Characterizing the relationship between state and economy in capitalist society, I. V. Stalin pointed out that economy in the proper sense of the word "is little concerned with the capitalist state, it is not in its hands. On the contrary, the state is in the hands of the capitalist economy" [63].

Under conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, after the proletariat has become the ruling class, the relationship of state to economy changes fundamentally. Having won political power, the proletariat uses it as a lever for destroying the old economy and building a new one. Without using such a powerful lever as the power of the proletariat, the socialist transformation of the economy is impossible. The victory of socialism cannot be ensured by drift (*samotek*); the possibility of building socialism does not turn into reality by itself. In order to realize the possibility of building socialism and liquidate the possibility of restoring capitalism, Comrade Stalin teaches, a number of conditions are necessary, among which the most important role is played by the policy of the party of the proletariat in power. History has irrefutably proven that the treacherous policy of Trotskyite-Bukharinite traitors could lead only to the restoration of capitalism in our country. Only thanks to the Leninist-Stalinist policy of industrialization of the country and collectivization of agriculture was the victory of

[63] See V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, p. 62.

socialism won in the USSR. Dependent on the correctness of the policy of the Communist Party, consequently, were the fates of socialism in the USSR, the fates of the Soviet state.

The victory of socialism in the USSR, won thanks to the correct policy of the Bolshevik Party, in turn multiplied its reserves and immeasurably strengthened its power. As the directing and guiding force of socialist society, the party of Bolsheviks guides the development of all aspects of life of Soviet society. The state in socialist society, being the owner of the most important means of production, manages the national economy of the country. The development of economy and culture is directed by the state plan, in which the policy of the Communist Party is embodied. This new role of the state and party in the development of society is reflected in the Stalinist proposition on policy as the vital basis of the Soviet system.

However, this proposition by no means signifies as if policy plays a determining role in socialist society in relation to the economic base and can no longer be considered a superstructure. On the contrary, it is precisely the character of the economic base of the Soviet system that determines the direction of its policy. Lenin taught that "...the deepest roots of both internal and foreign policy of our state are determined by economic interests, the economic position of the ruling classes of our state" [64].

The policy of the Soviet state is precisely a correct policy because it accurately expresses the interests of these classes and reflects the urgent needs of the economic development of

---

64 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 27, p. 329.

society. Alien to any adventurism, it strictly takes into account the achieved stage of economic development of society, real relations between classes of our society, as well as between Soviet society and societies surrounding it.

From this it is clear that it is impermissible to counterpose the active role of policy of the socialist state to economic necessity. Fundamentally erroneous are voluntaristic notions according to which the socialist state at its own discretion determines the direction and rates of economic development.

The socialist state outlines the direction and rates of economic development not at its own discretion, but in accordance with the needs of development of society, with the achieved level of development of productive forces. Thus, for example, putting forward at the 18th Congress of the AUCP(b) the task of overtaking economically the main capitalist countries, I. V. Stalin pointed out that time, and quite a lot of it, is needed for this, that this task cannot be solved in two or three years. In connection with this, I. V. Stalin noted regarding some workers of Gosplan of the old composition who proposed already by the end of the second five-year plan to overtake economically the main capitalist countries in pig iron production: "This was, of course, fantasy, day-dreaming, if not worse" [65]. Comrade Stalin suggested abandoning day-dreaming and standing on real ground, projecting an annual increase in pig iron smelting not in the amount of 10 million tons, as proposed by these Gosplan workers, but in the amount of 2 ½ million tons.

---

[65] I. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 579. 11th ed.

The active influence of the party and socialist state ensures the acceleration of economic development of the country, turns the possibility of rapid growth of production provided by the socialist system of economy into reality. But this, of course, does not mean the admissibility of establishing in our plans any rates of development depending merely on our desire.

In the policy of the socialist state, economic necessity finds conscious expression. That is precisely why its policy is a correct policy. The wisdom and insight of this policy, which leaves no room for subjective arbitrariness, consists in the fact that the party, its Central Committee, knows how in time to realize urgent tasks of developing the material life of society and direct the efforts of the people toward accomplishing these tasks, which are determined by economic necessity.

This is clearly evidenced, for example, by the history of preparation and implementation of such an epochal turn in the development of Soviet society as the transition from an old, bourgeois-individual economy in the countryside to a socialist collective farm system. Our country embarked on the path of collective farm construction because collectivization was an economic necessity for it. To overcome the lag of agriculture behind industry, to provide cities and the army with bread, it was necessary to transition in agriculture to large-scale production capable of utilizing tractors and agricultural machinery, and to increase the marketability of grain farming. And since the capitalist path of enlarging agricultural holdings, onto which Bukharinite traitors tried to push the party, could lead only to the restoration of capitalism and the ruin of the Soviet system, there was no other path for the party except

creating large socialist holdings in the countryside on the basis of cooperatizing small peasant holdings. This path was the only one that answered the interests of the peasantry itself. "The most urgent economic necessity, popular need demanded a transition to the path of collectivization. And the party of Bolsheviks under the leadership of Stalin correctly understood this urgent economic necessity, managed to turn the million-strong masses of peasantry onto the path of collectivization" [66].

When it comes to an upheaval affecting the living conditions of millions of people, it should be kept in mind that such an upheaval cannot be determined by anyone's subjective desire. "History in general does nothing substantial without special necessity for it" [67],—teaches I. V. Stalin. And the task of the party consists in timely recognizing, realizing, and reflecting in policy this necessity, so as then to mobilize the energy and will of millions of workers and organize them for the struggle to accomplish historically mature progressive, revolutionary transformations in conditions of the material life of society. The strength of our state transforming society, the strength of its policy, is determined by the fact that it acts not contrary to historical necessity, but in accordance with it.

A graphic example showing that the activity of the state and party reflects economic necessity can also serve as the work carried out recently on enlarging small collective farms. The enlargement of collective farms became an economic necessity for us, since small collective farms, which arose in the first years of collectivization on the basis of simple pooling of

---

66 *Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin. Short Biography*, p. 115. 1948.

67 I. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, p. 10.

peasant implements of labor, turned out to be unable to fully utilize that new technology with which agriculture is now equipped. Organizing work on enlarging collective farms, the party and state relied on the famous law of Marxism regarding the advantages of large-scale economy over small-scale. Experience confirmed that large collective farms have the opportunity to develop public economy faster in all its diverse branches, better utilize machines, possess sufficient resources for building reservoirs, power stations, irrigation systems, etc., and can more fully utilize cadre specialists.

The policy of the socialist state, expressing urgent needs of development of the material life of society, at the same time answers the interests of working people, the interests of the people. That is precisely why it is a real policy, finding support for itself among the masses of working people and consciously implemented by them. "In politics,"—noted Engels,— "only two forces have decisive significance: the organized force of the state, the army, and the unorganized, spontaneous force of the popular masses" [68]. In all societies preceding socialism, these forces, as a rule, opposed each other: the state suppressed the aspirations and activity of the popular masses, carried out violence over them, while the popular masses, striving to free themselves from exploitation, fought against it. Only under conditions of the Soviet system did these forces unite with each other: the activity of the state, acting as the initiator of accomplishing urgent tasks of development of the material life of society, finds support from below, from the popular masses, while the creative activity and initiative of the masses building

[68] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XVI, part 1, pp. 475–476.

a new society are supported and organized by the state. This ensures the planned development of socialist society, its successful movement forward, to communism.

Under conditions of socialism, when the socialist system encompasses all branches of the economy, when the masses wholeheartedly support the policy of the party, success in the further construction of communism depends primarily on the political and organizational leadership of the party, on the preparedness and ideological equipment of its cadres. And this means that in the development of socialist society the significance of the subjective factor, the role of leadership, increases colossally; the conscious principle acquires decisive importance.

From this, however, it does not follow at all that the development of socialist society is determined by consciousness, views, and ideas of people, while the objective conditions of their life have lost their significance. As is known, the successful realization of tasks facing humanity in its historical development always depends on the presence of corresponding objective and subjective conditions. Thus, for example, for the realization of a proletarian revolution, both objective prerequisites (maturity of development of capitalism, presence of a revolutionary situation) and subjective ones (ability of the proletariat to take revolutionary actions, strong enough to break the old power, its consciousness, organization, leadership of the party, etc.) are necessary. If objective conditions for a revolutionary upheaval have matured, the conquest of victory acquires subjective conditions. The fate of the revolution in this case almost entirely depends on the

preparedness of the proletarian party, on the correctness of its policy and leadership. But objective conditions for victory do not always exist, and therefore a correct policy of the party does not in all cases lead to an immediate victory over the enemy. I. V. Stalin noted, for example, that in 1905, despite the correctness of the policy of the Bolshevik Party, the revolution suffered defeat, because feudal remnants and autocracy turned out at that time to be stronger than the revolutionary movement of workers. From this I. V. Stalin drew the general conclusion: "A correct policy by no means must always and necessarily lead to immediate victory over the enemy. Immediate victory over the enemy is determined not only by a correct policy, but also and primarily and mainly by the balance of class forces, a clear preponderance of forces on the side of the revolution, a split in the camp of the enemy, a favorable international situation"[69].

Otherwise takes shape the correlation of objective and subjective factors under conditions of socialism, when a decisive victory over the enemy inside the country has been won, when the enemy has been shattered and liquidated. Under these conditions, further movement forward depends primarily on our own consciousness and organization. Here the subjective factor acquires paramount importance. But not because we can fail to reckon with objective conditions and act as we please, but because favorable objective conditions already exist, and consequently, success depends on ourselves, on our ability to fully utilize these conditions.

---

[69] I. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 345.

In his speeches at the conference of business executives in 1931, in his speech *On Work in the Countryside* in 1933, and elsewhere, I. V. Stalin showed what these favorable objective conditions consist of, and with exceptional force emphasized the necessity of fully utilizing them. Explaining the conditions for fulfilling economic plans, I. V. Stalin noted that all objective conditions for this exist in our country. Consequently, decisive importance is acquired by the ability to utilize these conditions, to organize the masses, to put forward necessary management cadres for this, to establish vital leadership. I. V. Stalin noted that the fulfillment of the production plan "depends now exclusively on ourselves, on our ability and our desire to utilize the richest possibilities available to us" [70].

Thus, the growth of the role of the subjective factor under conditions of socialism is explained precisely by the presence of all objective conditions for further successful movement forward, to communism, i.e.:

1. by the victory of socialist forms of economy and a fundamental change in the balance of class forces in favor of socialism;
2. by the nature of the Soviet social and state system, opening boundless possibilities and providing all objective conditions for rapid movement forward;

[70] I. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 13, p. 80.

3. by the growth of the strength and influence of the party, its authority, the wholehearted support of its policy by the popular masses.

The socialist system creates all objective possibilities for conscious, purposeful leadership over the development of society. But at the same time it demands the ability to fully utilize these possibilities. Without conscious leadership, socialist society cannot develop. Conscious management over the development of the economy is for socialist society just as necessary as spontaneous development for capitalism. That is why I. V. Stalin emphasizes the impermissibility of drift in socialist construction.

The conscious utilization of economic laws determining conditions of life and productive activity of millions of people is impossible through scattered efforts. It requires combining efforts and organizing the entire people around a single goal. Such an organizing force is the socialist state, led by the party of Bolsheviks. Relying on the support of the masses, the socialist state overcomes difficulties, fights against remnants of capitalism, and directs the development of our society toward communism.

5. ON THE QUESTION OF THE NATURE OF CONTRADICTIONS IN SOVIET SOCIETY
V. E. KOZLOVSKY

Unlike capitalist society, torn by antagonistic contradictions and the struggle of antagonistic opposites based on relations of domination and subjection, Soviet socialist society is characterized by unprecedented cohesion developed on the basis of relations of comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance.

Comrade Stalin, in the report to the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), pointed out the main feature of Soviet society that had formed as a result of the fact that the means of production with us belong to the whole people:

"The feature of Soviet society today, as distinct from any capitalist society, is that it no longer contains antagonistic, hostile classes; that the exploiting classes have been eliminated, while the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, who make up Soviet society, live and work on the basis of friendly cooperation. While capitalist society is torn by irreconcilable contradictions between workers and capitalists, between peasants and landlords—which leads to an unstable internal situation—Soviet society, freed from the yoke of exploitation, knows no such contradictions, is free from class conflicts, and presents a picture of friendly cooperation among workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. On the basis of this community there have developed such driving forces as the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, Soviet patriotism."[71]

[71] J. Stalin. *Problems of Leninism*, p. 589, 11th ed.

Unlike private ownership of the means of production, which divides people, generating the exploitation of man by man, public socialist ownership unites the whole Soviet people. Full correspondence between relations of production and productive forces, the harmonious combination of public and personal interests, the moral and political unity of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia bound by socialist ideology, inspired by Soviet patriotism, the unification of all nations into a single fraternal family of peoples of the USSR—this is what is specific to our society in contrast to a society of an antagonistic type, which is characterized by fragmentation, irreconcilable contradictions, an irreconcilable struggle between hostile classes, competition, antagonistic contradictions between town and country, between physical and mental labor.

The unity of socialist society is born of the common ownership of the means of production. This unity not only unites the workers, peasants, intelligentsia, all the working people of our country into a single friendly collective, but also ensures the continuous and rapid forward movement of our society. It is precisely this unprecedented unity in history, expressing the commonality of goals, interests, and will of the entire Soviet people, that is now the decisive force ensuring the victory of the new over the old in the development of our society from socialism to communism.

"The invincible unity of will and aspirations of the peoples of our country," says Comrade Beria, "the unity of their material and moral forces is one of the main foundations of the might of our Motherland. It is thanks to this unity that our state is

capable of solving such great tasks as could earlier only be dreamed of by the boldest minds of humanity."[72]

The strength of the unity of the Soviet people manifests itself in the remarkable unanimity with which Soviet people fight for the implementation of the Stalinist plan for the transformation and conquest of nature, for high quality and rapid rates of realization of all our plans.

The invincible strength of the unity of our society manifests itself in the nationwide movement for peace, against the instigators of a new world war. Working people of our country, standing in the vanguard of progressive humanity defending peace throughout the world, actively participate in this movement.

From the special character of the laws of socialist society, however, it does not follow that the laws of Marxist dialectics are inapplicable to it, that there are no contradictions in it, that the development of our society occurs without the disclosure and overcoming of contradictions. Lenin wrote: "Antagonism and contradiction are not at all one and the same. The first will disappear, the second will remain under socialism."[73] "The struggle between the old and the new, between the dying and the emerging—this is the basis of our development,"[74] says Comrade Stalin.

Like any society, socialist society develops according to the laws of Marxist dialectics, the most general laws of development of nature, society, and thought. But the concrete

---

[72] L. P. Beria. *34th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, p. 17. Gospolitizdat, 1951.

[73] *Lenin Miscellany XI*, p. 357.

[74] J. V. Stalin. *Works*, Vol. 10, p. 331.

manifestation of these general laws has a qualitatively different, completely special character in socialist society compared to how they manifest in societies of an antagonistic type.

The basis for the development of our society is friendly cooperation, the community of interests of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. On this basis, the struggle between the old and the new, the advanced and the backward, takes place.

In socialist society there is no contradiction between the productive forces and relations of production; meanwhile, the fundamental contradiction of pre-socialist formations runs along precisely this line and is therefore the source of the ruin of these formations. Full correspondence of productive forces and relations of production is the unshakeable foundation of our society. Being a powerful factor in the development of Soviet society, the production relations of socialism generate incentives for continuous expansion of production, growth of labor productivity, the Stakhanovite movement, and the creative initiative of the working masses.

****

In our society, production and distribution are subordinated to the interests of the entire people, which ensures the rapid development of production, leads to a constant growth in the material well-being and cultural level of the working masses of our country, and causes the emergence and growth of ever newer needs.

Under capitalism, the development of production runs into a barrier—the impoverished condition and declining material security of millions of masses of working people, who lack the opportunity to satisfy their needs even within the bounds of an

extreme minimum, which inevitably creates the ground for inevitable crises of overproduction, growth of unemployment, and poverty of the masses.[75]

Socialist society is a rapidly developing society.

We have continuous expanded reproduction; at unprecedented rates, productive forces and relations of production are developing. In the process of expanded reproduction at one stage or another, a specific contradiction for socialist society arises between the achieved level of production and the faster growth of social and personal needs of the working masses of the USSR. This contradiction is successfully resolved through the continuous rise of socialist production in town and country. But this contradiction cannot be resolved absolutely, once and for all, since it is obvious that the growth of people's needs under conditions of the continuous rise of their material well-being and cultural level is limitless.

The contradiction between the achieved level of production and the growth of social and personal needs of the masses is a non-antagonistic contradiction in the development of our society. Constantly arising and being resolved, taking on a qualitatively new character, the contradiction between the achieved level of production and the constant growth of social needs will persist under communism as well. The principle of communism "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" means the comprehensive satisfaction of the needs of every person. But the social needs of people are constantly developing. And these newly arising, qualitatively changing

---

[75] J. V. Stalin. *Works*, Vol. 12, p. 322.

social needs of people will push the development of the productive forces of communist society.

The struggle to satisfy the growing needs of Soviet society impels our people to implement grand measures to transform nature. Unprecedented in human history in scope and rates, the struggle of Soviet people to overcome the contradiction between nature and society is one of the remarkable manifestations of the superiority of socialism over capitalism. Under capitalism, the struggle with nature is conducted to the extent that it corresponds to the interests of profit for the exploiting classes. Under capitalism, production is subordinated not to the principle of improving the material condition of the working masses, but to the principle of securing maximum capitalist profit. That is why under capitalism, wealth and natural resources are used predatory fashion; the development of capitalist society is linked to the destruction of forests, exhaustion of the land, etc.

Only under socialism is the conquest of nature subordinated to the interests of the entire people, the interests of raising the well-being of the working people. With us, society as a whole, united by common ownership of the means of production and moral-political unity, wages a struggle against nature in a planned manner, on scientific foundations. The Great Projects of Communism are a new, remarkable stage in the great endeavor of subordinating nature to Soviet man and creating on this basis the material-technical base of communism. The construction of the world's largest Kuibyshev and Stalingrad hydroelectric stations, the Main Turkmen Canal, the South Ukrainian, and North Crimean canals is a giant leap in the development of our country's productive forces. The

implementation of the Stalinist plan for the transformation of nature provides conditions for the further powerful rise in the living standards of working people and the creation of an abundance of consumer goods necessary for the transition to communism.

The struggle of Soviet society against nature is inextricably linked with the struggle of our scientists for the development of science. It is universally recognized, Comrade Stalin points out, that no science can develop and flourish without a struggle of opinions, without freedom of criticism. Within the framework of the moral-political unity of our society, this struggle is a struggle to overcome bourgeois influences in science, anti-scientific or simply outdated views linked with the solution of various scientific problems.

As a result of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the building of socialism in our country, the ideology of Marxism-Leninism became supreme and established sole dominance. The great ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, taking possession of the masses, turned into a powerful material force. The socialist consciousness of the Soviet people reflects its gigantic successes in the building of socialism and communism, the unity of will and aspirations of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Educating Soviet people in the spirit of communist consciousness, the Bolshevik Party wages an uncompromising struggle against various remnants of old, harmful views, habits, and traditions that hinder the movement of our society toward communism.

The forward movement of our society, the steady development of its productive forces, the growth of communist

consciousness of all people are realized through the struggle of the new with the old, the advanced with the obsolete. One of the concrete manifestations of this general regularity of development is our struggle of advanced, progressive communist consciousness against the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of Soviet people. Comrade Stalin points out that the existence of remnants of capitalism is explained by the lag of people's consciousness behind their social being, that the tenacity of these remnants is maintained by the capitalist encirclement, which strives in every way to preserve and strengthen them.

After the defeat and liquidation of the remnants of exploiting classes in our country, the international bourgeoisie lost any support inside the Soviet Union for its struggle against the Soviet state. However, it strives to use for its own ends the remnants of private-property psychology, remnants of bourgeois morality, the subservience of individual people to the bourgeois culture of the West, manifestations of objectivism, cosmopolitanism, nationalism, etc. Therefore, Comrade Stalin teaches us high revolutionary vigilance and Bolshevik irreconcilability toward ideological distortions of any kind.

Organizing, mobilizing, and directing the activity of the Bolshevik Party in the ideological and political education of the people is a powerful factor in overcoming the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of Soviet people. Lenin and Stalin teach that in the successful implementation of the transition from socialism to communism, a decisive role is played by the communist education of the masses. The Resolutions of the CC C.P.S.U.(B.) on ideological questions

adopted on the initiative of Comrade Stalin are of enormous importance for educating the people in the communist spirit and exert a beneficial influence on the development of science, literature, and art. A historic role in the struggle to overcome the remnants of bourgeois ideology and for the further flourish of socialist culture was also played by discussions on problems of philosophy, biology, physiological teachings of I. P. Pavlov, and linguistics, held under the direct influence of the ideas of J. V. Stalin.

The struggle against the remnants of capitalism is carried out on the basis of the moral and political unity of Soviet people, which ensures the victory of the advanced over the remnants of the past in all spheres of our reality. Moral-political unity acts as the driving force of development in this important area of the struggle of the new against the old as well.

In socialist society, the nature of contradictions has qualitatively changed; remnants of contradictions inherited from capitalism have become completely different. In our society, antagonistic contradictions between town and country, between physical and mental labor have disappeared, although the essential distinction between town and country, the distinction between mental and physical workers still persists here.

The further development of productive forces, electrification, and mechanization of agricultural labor, the application here of all achievements of science and technology, the strengthening of collective farm property—such is the path of gradually erasing essential distinctions between town and country. To overcome essential distinctions between mental and physical workers, it is necessary to ensure the cultural and technical

elevation of the working class to the level of engineering and technical personnel. A decisive prerequisite for solving this task is the further development of the Stakhanovite movement, the further introduction into production of new technology, mechanization, and automation of production processes, measures for the further raising of the educational level of Soviet people. The USSR is proud of its achievements in this area as well. The process of building communism in our country leads to the disappearance of remnants of former oppositions between town and country, between mental and physical labor.

In the process of development of our society from socialism to communism, other contradictions also arise, the overcoming of which ensures our forward movement.

For example, after the First World War, during the period of reconstruction and development of the national economy of the USSR, a temporary shortage of manpower arose. "The question of providing our enterprises and new construction projects with manpower was acute. One could possess such elements for production as money and material resources. But if there is a shortage of manpower, money and material resources will not be used fully, and the production plan hangs in the air"[76]. The organized recruitment of manpower, the planned training of numerous cadres of skilled workers in the system of FZO (factory-workshop training) and trade schools signified the overcoming of difficulties with manpower shortages.

The continuous growth of productive forces under socialism can cause and indeed causes the lagging of existing output

---

[76] A. A. Zhdanov. *29th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, p. 13. Gospolitizdat, 1946.

standards behind increased worker qualifications and technical equipment. New, more advanced technology, new Stakhanovite methods of labor demand higher productivity. Outdated standards hold back the growth of labor productivity. This contradiction is resolved by periodic revision of output standards, bringing them into line with the latest achievements of science and technology, with the experience of Stakhanovite work.

Characteristic of our society is the contradiction that arose between new high levels of development of productive forces and the limited capacity of their utilization in small collective farms. This contradiction is resolved by enlarging collective farms. Overcoming it means a further rise in labor productivity, growth of the public wealth of collective farms, a rise in the material and cultural level of the collective farm peasantry and all Soviet people.

*****

An analysis of contradictions in the development of Soviet socialist society makes it possible to draw concrete conclusions about the main features of these contradictions and their fundamental difference from the contradictions of capitalism. The features of socialist society determine the fundamentally different character of contradictions in our society compared to the character they have under capitalism. Under socialism, by virtue of the sole dominance of public ownership of the means of production and the moral-political unity of the people, all contradictions have a non-antagonistic character. They exist, as already stated, within the framework of full correspondence of productive forces and relations of production. These non-

antagonistic contradictions are overcome with us on the basis of the community of interests of all the people. The unity of the people ensures the successful overcoming of all contradictions in the development of our society.

In capitalist society, underneath, thoroughly woven from antagonisms, the law of struggle between the old and the new manifests itself in the form of class struggle, violent revolutionary upheavals, social shocks, cataclysms. The ruling exploiting classes try in every way to preserve old relations of production, using for this purpose the entire superstructure of bourgeois society. Therefore, the force whose carrier is the working class, forced under the rule of the bourgeoisie to fight its way and assert itself in life in a fierce struggle, breaks through. The irreconcilable contradictions arising at the very foundation of antagonistic society inevitably lead these societies to ruin.

In socialist society, led by the Bolshevik Party, all conditions ensure the victory of the new over the old: growing productive forces, developing socialist relations of production, sole dominance of Marxist-Leninist ideology, new driving forces of development expressing the unity of the people, all the activity of the Soviet state. Therefore, the leading principle of Soviet social structure is the new, the advanced. "The Soviet people carry out great constructive work. Remarkable here is the fact that on all fronts of our great socialist construction, in all branches of the national economy, technology, science, the leading principle is the advanced, the new, the progressive. In this is manifested the enormous advantage of our system."[77]

---

[77] G. M. Malenkov. *32nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, p. 13. Gospolitizdat, 1949.

And under socialism, contradictions are resolved through the struggle of the new against the old. The new in our society develops in struggle against the old, but the old under conditions of socialism qualitatively differs from the old under capitalism, for under socialism behind the old stand no classes or social groups. Against everything old, dying, negative, the Soviet society as a whole wages a struggle. The struggle of the new with the old, the overcoming of the old strengthens our society, contributes to its development. Therefore, everything advanced, progressive that is born in socialist society enjoys the support of all the people.

Contradictions of socialist society are contradictions of growth, of advance, whereas the contradictions of imperialism are contradictions of decline, decay.

Growth of unemployment, chronic underutilization of enterprises, decline in the living standard of working people, intensification of class struggle—such are the incurable ulcers of capitalism. If capitalism manages to temporarily resolve partially these or those contradictions, this is achieved by destroying productive forces, even further worsening the material condition of the working masses, and intensifying the fundamental contradictions of capitalism.

A different character is borne by the difficulties of development of socialist society. "...Our difficulties," says Comrade Stalin, "are not difficulties of decline or difficulties of stagnation, but difficulties of growth, difficulties of rise, difficulties of forward movement. This means that our

difficulties fundamentally differ from the difficulties of capitalist countries"[78].

Overcoming our difficulties is linked with new victories in all branches and on all sectors of the national economy, with the resolution of the main economic task of the USSR. Overcoming difficulties, contradictions provides socialist society with what gives our nation further satisfaction of its growing needs. That is why every Soviet person, the entire people as a whole is interested in the rapid overcoming of these difficulties and contradictions. In this is manifested one of the basic principles of socialist society—the alignment of personal interests with public interests. That is why "our difficulties," says Comrade Stalin, "are such difficulties that themselves contain the possibility of their overcoming."[79]

Under socialism, in conditions of moral and political unity of society, friendship of peoples, bound by Soviet patriotism, conditions and all objective and subjective prerequisites exist for the successful overcoming of all contradictions, all difficulties arising in the process of development of our society.

****

Soviet people treat uncompromisingly all remnants of capitalism, any contradictions that retard the development of socialist society. And in Soviet society, the struggle against contradictions arising on the basis of concrete contradictions has as its goal their complete overcoming, without which forward movement is impossible. In our country, this struggle between the carriers of the advanced, progressive, on the one

---

78 J. V. Stalin. *Works*, Vol. 12, p. 223.

79 J. V. Stalin. *Works*, Vol. 12, p. 301.

hand, and the carriers of the backward, conservative, on the other, occurs within the framework of the moral-political unity of society and therefore bears a non-antagonistic character. As a result of this, the form of struggle of opposites, the form of disclosure and overcoming of contradictions with us is criticism and self-criticism.

"...Our party long ago found and put at the service of socialism that special form of disclosure and overcoming of contradictions of socialist society... that special form of struggle between the old and the new, between the dying and the emerging in Soviet society, which is called criticism and self-criticism."[80]

The character of the mode of production determines the character of the driving forces of society's development. In antagonistic societies, the driving force of development is the irreconcilable struggle of advanced, progressive classes against reactionaries clinging to their old ways. In socialist society, all social strata, all working people are interested in the successful overcoming of contradictions, in eliminating the old and moving forward. Generated by the socialist mode of production, the new driving forces of development—moral-political unity, friendship of peoples, Soviet patriotism—exert a decisive influence on the process of disclosure and overcoming of contradictions. These driving forces are the source of the development of criticism and self-criticism—a powerful tool for identifying and eliminating shortcomings, difficulties, contradictions in the productive work and in all areas of development of our Soviet reality.

---

[80] A. A. Zhdanov. *Speech at the Philosophical Discussion in 1947*. Journal *Voprosy Filosofii*, No. 1, 1947, p. 270.

Criticism and self-criticism, being a powerful weapon of struggle against the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of people, against routine, conservatism on any sector of work, against stagnation in science and art, against all manifestations of dogmatism and talmudism, clear the way for everything advanced, progressive in the development of our society.

In the period of transition from socialism to communism, criticism and self-criticism acquire exceptional significance in the education of the highly conscious person of communist society.

The essence and character of the contradictions of socialist society determine the forms of their overcoming, which are fundamentally different from the forms of resolving contradictions in capitalist society. The antagonistic character of contradictions under capitalism necessitates violent paths and means for their resolution. The sole means of eliminating the main contradiction of capitalism is the proletarian revolution, blowing up and destroying the existing system of ownership relations.

In the work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, Comrade Stalin pointed out that explosions are necessary in a society with antagonistic classes, but are not necessary in a socialist society:

"...The law of transition from an old quality to a new quality through an explosion is inapplicable not only to the history of language development... it is not always applicable to other social phenomena of a base or superstructural character. It is obligatory for a society divided into hostile classes. But it is not

at all obligatory for a society that has no hostile classes."[81] Non-antagonistic character of contradictions of our society determines the non-violent character of the means and methods of their overcoming.

Overcoming the contradictions of our society is not connected with the destruction of political power, with the destruction of the base and superstructure, with which the overcoming of the main contradictions of capitalism is linked. On the contrary, the disclosure and overcoming of contradictions under socialism means the further strengthening of the unity and monolithic cohesion of socialist society. Overcoming the contradictions of socialist society occurs on the basis of creative, constructive labor, on the basis of creating material and spiritual values, leading to further strengthening and development of the socialist base and superstructure, to a further steady rise in the material and cultural level of working people.

By virtue of the fact that the advanced, progressive is leading in our society, by virtue of the fact that development from lower to higher under socialism on the basis of moral and political unity of the entire people is supported from above (by the party, state) and from below (by the broadest masses), the leap from one quality to another is carried out in our country by parts—as new qualitative changes mature on these or those sectors, leading to a new quality. Therefore, characteristic of our society is the leap from one quality to another in the form of the gradual appearance of elements of a new quality, the gradual dying away of elements of an old quality. Precisely for

---

81 J. Stalin. *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, pp. 28–29.

this reason, in our society contradictions do not exacerbate, as is the case under capitalism, but are smoothed out, resolved gradually, and an explosion as a form of transition from one quality to another is not obligatory for our society.

Lenin noted that the exacerbation of the fundamental contradiction of capitalism—between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation—accelerates the downfall of capitalist society, or it causes the exacerbation of the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie. Comrade Stalin also calls attention to this fact: "...The development of capitalism cannot fail to generate conditions that exacerbate the contradictions of capitalism. Precisely because capitalism is unable to resolve these contradictions."[82]

For socialist society, what is characteristic is not the exacerbation of contradictions, but their smoothing out, that is, gradual overcoming as a result of the struggle of non-antagonistic opposites, and this smoothing out accelerates the process of development of our society, its forward movement. J. V. Stalin, emphasizing the advantages of the socialist method of industrialization over the capitalist one, pointed out that the socialist method of industrialization leads not to the impoverishment of millions of masses, as occurs under the capitalist method, but to the improvement of the material position of the masses, "not to the exacerbation of internal contradictions, but to their smoothing out and resolution."

In letters to Comrade Ch-e, Comrade Stalin explains that in this case we are talking not about contradictions between the

---

82 J. V. Stalin. *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 97.

proletariat and the kulaks, but about contradictions between the proletariat and the working peasantry, about non-antagonistic contradictions: "...The talk is about contradictions inside the alliance, which will be smoothed out and favorably resolved as industrialization proceeds, i.e., as the power and influence of the proletariat in the country grows."[83]

The smoothing out, the resolving of non-antagonistic contradictions does not mean a conciliatory attitude toward them, but is a consequence of the gradual overcoming of contradictions as a result of the struggle of non-antagonistic opposites. The smoothing out of contradictions is not the compromise of principles, of opposite tendencies, for as Comrade Stalin points out, "there is not and cannot be a 'middle' line in questions of a principled nature"[84].

****

Contradictions in the development of Soviet society are disclosed and overcome in the process of planned and conscious activity of the working masses under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state. The development of socialist society does not occur spontaneously, as occurs under capitalism, but in a planned manner, on deeply scientific foundations. In socialist society, objective regularities of social development are consciously used by working people in their own interests. As a consequence of this, in the development of our society, in the disclosure and overcoming of contradictions, unprecedented importance is acquired by the subjective factor of the historical process—the activity of the working masses, putting into life the policy of the Communist Party and the

---

83 J. V. Stalin. *Works*, Vol. 13, p. 20.

84 J. V. Stalin. *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 4.

Soviet state, advanced, Leninist-Stalinist ideas that correctly reflect the requirements of the development of the material life of society.

In the consciously organized character of the development of Soviet society lies the greatest historical advantage of the Soviet system compared to the capitalist system, where objective laws operate like a blind, elemental force. Therefore, one of the means of identifying and overcoming contradictions in our society is socialist planning, which is based on a comprehensive accounting of the needs of the development of the national economy. The tasks of socialist planning consist in ensuring the independence of the socialist economy under conditions of capitalist encirclement, consolidating the sole dominance of the socialist system, cutting short all tendencies hostile to socialism and remnants of capitalism in the development of the national economy, and preventing disproportions in the development of various branches of the national economy. With the help of socialist planning, the Soviet state carries out a redistribution of national income, material funds, and manpower in favor of those branches of the national economy whose rapid development is determined by the interests of our society.

Socialist planning determines the correct allocation of productive forces of society, the economic and cultural development of all peoples of our country, directing the paths and means in the cause of conquering nature by the man of socialist society. The solution of this task means the liquidation of the former inequality in the development of various regions and republics and their overall rise. The state plan, constructed

on the basis of accounting for and utilizing objective laws, is the pledge of our successful movement toward communism.

****

The history of Soviet society, the history of the struggle for socialism and communism clearly demonstrates such rapid rates of development, such a change of qualitative conditions, higher ones than no other society knew. Whatever area of Soviet reality we take, everywhere we see the struggle of the new with the old, the developing with the dying. This struggle takes place with us in conditions of moral and political unity of Soviet society, and in this is the source of unprecedentedly rapid rates of our development.

All the new, advanced, progressive developing is headed in Soviet society by the glorious party of Bolsheviks, armed with an invincible weapon—Marxism-Leninism—led by the great Stalin. In this is the guarantee that the new, advanced in our country will always win, bringing us closer to communism.

The Party of Lenin-Stalin, proceeding from the laws of social development, determines, in accordance with the features of each historical stage, the main tasks, the resolution of which ensures the forward movement of our society. The state, putting into practice the policy of the party, overcomes contradictions arising in the process of development of the Soviet economy and culture by realizing possibilities laid down in the Soviet system.

Comrade Stalin points out that possibilities alone, as conditions for the complete victory of socialism, are not enough. To turn these possibilities into reality, party leadership and implementation of the party line are necessary. "The Soviet system gives colossal opportunities for the complete victory of

socialism. But opportunity is not yet reality. To turn opportunity into reality, a whole series of conditions is necessary, among which the party line and the correct implementation of this line play far from the last role"[85].
The Bolshevik Party timely discloses contradictions in the development of socialist society, does not let them grow into acute ones, and mobilizes the efforts of the people in advance for their overcoming. In the report on the 32nd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Comrade Malenkov said: "In the art of leadership, the main thing consists in seeing difficulties and obstacles in advance, those capable of preventing or slowing down development, and directing in advance the efforts toward overcoming these difficulties and obstacles, so as not to allow disruptions and to ensure forward movement"[86].

****

Overcoming internal non-antagonistic contradictions, socialist society takes into account the presence of external antagonistic contradictions between the USSR and capitalist countries. The contradictions between the country of socialism and capitalist states express the opposition of interests of hostile classes: the working people of the USSR, on the one hand, and the exploiting classes of capitalist society, on the other. At the Conference of Representatives of certain Communist Parties in 1947, Comrade Malenkov emphasized that "since in the USSR antagonistic classes have been eliminated and the moral-political unity of Soviet society achieved, the entire sharpness

---

85 J. V. Stalin. *Works*, Vol. 12, p. 339.

86 G. M. Malenkov. *32nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, p. 15.

of class struggle for the USSR has shifted to the international arena," where a struggle between two antagonistic camps is taking place—the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism led by the USSR, and the camp of world imperialism led by the imperialists of the USA.

The imperialists of the USA are preparing a new world war. They are leading an aggressive war in Korea, provocatively violating the borders of China, and frantically trying to knock together a single front of imperialist countries against the Soviet Union and the entire camp of the forces of socialism and democracy. However, a powerful movement of peace supporters in all countries, expanding with every passing day, can prevent the outbreak of a new war. "Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and defend it to the end," pointed out Comrade Stalin in an interview with a correspondent of *Pravda* on February 17, 1951.

On the path of its development to communism means the further strengthening of the might of the Soviet Union. Strengthening the might of the country of socialism instills in the working class of capitalist states and oppressed nations of colonial and dependent countries faith in their strength, revolutionizes them, and mobilizes them for the struggle against capitalist oppression and imperialist enslavement. Overcoming internal non-antagonistic contradictions, socialist society takes into account the presence of external antagonistic contradictions between the USSR and capitalist countries. The contradictions between the country of socialism and capitalist states express the opposition of interests of hostile classes: the working people of the USSR, on the one hand, and the

exploiting classes of capitalist society, on the other. At the Conference of Representatives of certain Communist Parties in 1947, Comrade Malenkov emphasized that, "since in the USSR antagonistic classes have been eliminated and the moral-political unity of Soviet society achieved, the whole sharpness of class struggle for the USSR has moved to the international arena," where the struggle takes place between two antagonistic camps—the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism, headed by the USSR, and the camp of world imperialism led by the imperialists of the USA.

The imperialists of the USA are preparing a new world war. They lead an aggressive war in Korea, provocatively violate the borders of China, frantically try to forge a single front of imperialist countries against the Soviet Union and the whole camp of forces of socialism and democracy. However, a powerful movement of supporters of peace in all countries, which widens with every day, can prevent the outbreak of a new war. "Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and defend it to the end,"—indicated Comrade Stalin in a conversation with a *Pravda* correspondent on February 17, 1951.

If the imperialists manage to unleash a new world war, they will pay for it with the destruction of the whole system of imperialism. "A situation has arisen," said Comrade Molotov, "under which imperialists, unleashing a new world war, will inevitably cause such universal resistance from peace-loving peoples and the entire democratic camp, which will lead not simply to the defeat of these or those aggressive powers, as was

the case until now, but to the liquidation of the entire system of world imperialism."[87]

****

The character and content of internal and external contradictions of socialist society, the paths and means of their overcoming are comprehensively illuminated in the brilliant works of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin. Comrade Stalin gave an exhaustive analysis of concrete contradictions of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism and the period of gradual transition from socialism to communism.

The Leninist-Stalinist teaching on the character, content, and paths of overcoming contradictions in the period of struggle for socialism and communism is a great contribution to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism. It arms our party and people with knowledge of the laws of social development.

The Bolshevik Party in all its conscious work on the building of communist society is guided by the instruction of Comrade Stalin on the necessity of timely disclosure and overcoming of contradictions and achieves new successes on this path.

Communist parties and working people of the whole world in their practical struggle for the elimination of capitalist slavery always remember the conclusion of Comrade Stalin that antagonistic contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie can be overcome only through an irreconcilable, self-sacrificing, revolutionary struggle.

Workers' parties and all working people of the people's democracies moving toward socialism study and utilize the great experience of the October Socialist Revolution, the

---

87 V. Molotov. *Stalin and Stalinist Leadership*, p. 18. Gospolitizdat, 1949.

experience of building socialism, summarized in the brilliant works of Lenin and Stalin.

6. On the Role of Political and Legal Views in the Development of Society
I. S. KON (Leningrad)

Comrade Stalin's brilliant work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, which enriched all Marxist science, including the theory of historical materialism, with a number of new, most important propositions, is of invaluable importance for resolving the question of the role of political and legal views in the development of society. Defining the concept of the superstructure, Comrade Stalin points out that "the superstructure consists of the political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical views of society and their corresponding political, legal, and other institutions"[88]. This definition emphasizes the role and significance of political and legal ideas as one of the constituent parts of the superstructure, and highlights their important role in the life and development of society.

Reflecting a specific economic basis, political and legal views, in turn, actively react upon the basis, contributing to the development and strengthening of their basis and to the destruction of the old basis and old superstructure. In contemporary conditions, the political and legal consciousness of Soviet people, reflecting the socialist basis, is an important ideological weapon in the struggle of Soviet society against corrupt bourgeois ideology; it mobilizes and organizes the

---

[88] J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, p. 5. Gospolitizdat, 1952.

broad masses of working people to fight for the building of communism. Conversely, bourgeois political ideology and legal consciousness play a reactionary role: they strive to strengthen the decayed foundations of capitalism and serve the warmongers of a new war.

What do political and legal ideas represent, how do they differ from other forms of social consciousness, and what is their role in the development of society?

The concept of political ideology encompasses a wide range of social views concerning the relationships and struggle of social classes, and above all, their relationship to state power. The sphere of politics, as Lenin pointed out, "is the sphere of relationships of all classes and strata to the state and the government, the sphere of relationships between all classes"[89]. Politics, according to Lenin, is the relationship between classes, the class struggle in an antagonistic society, and the cooperation of classes in a socialist society. The fundamental question of politics is the question of state power. Lenin emphasized that "...politics is participation in the affairs of the state, the direction of the state, the determination of the forms, tasks, and content of the state's activity..."[90]. From this, it follows that the sphere of political ideology includes all social views expressing the attitude of struggling classes toward state power, toward the political organization of society, and toward its forms, tasks, and activities. Political ideology is the sum total of social ideas, views, and theories regarding the social system and political organization of society.

---

89 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 392.

90 *Lenin Miscellany XXI*, p. 14.

Views on questions of war and peace, the entire military ideology, are also an integral part of the political ideology of a given class.

Legal ideology is inextricably linked with political ideology. Law, as an expression of the state will of the ruling class resting upon the coercive power of the state, always possesses a definite political content and is one of the forms of state policy; therefore, people's legal views and legal consciousness are inevitably linked to political consciousness, of which they are an element. "Legal consciousness," writes Academician A. Y. Vyshinsky, "consists of concrete, historically conditioned concepts of the required, necessary, binding, lawful—concepts formed under the conditions of class struggle, of some classes (the ruling ones) striving to preserve and strengthen their rule, and of other classes (the oppressed ones) striving for the overthrow of this rule"[91]. Consequently, legal views (legal consciousness) concern the question of the methods and forms of organizing social relationships and political power through legal norms[92].

The question of the origin of political and legal ideas is exhaustively illuminated in the works of Comrade Stalin. J. V. Stalin points out that "the source of formation of the spiritual life of society, the source of origin of social ideas, social theories, political views, and political institutions must be sought not in the ideas, theories, views, and political

---

[91] Academician A. Y. Vyshinsky, *The Theory of Judicial Evidence in Soviet Law*, p. 158. 3rd ed.

[92] See G. F. Kechekyan, *The Significance of J. V. Stalin's Work "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics" for the History of Political Theories*, Journal *Soviet State and Law*, No. 3 for 1952, p. 8.

institutions themselves, but in the conditions of the material life of society, in social being, of which these ideas, theories, views, etc., are a reflection"[93]. Concretizing and developing this thought in his work *Concerning Marxism in Linguistics*, J. V. Stalin points out that at the basis of all political, legal, and other social ideas lies a specific economic basis of society, a specific basis. "Every basis has its own corresponding superstructure. The basis of the feudal system has its superstructure, its political, legal, and other views, and their corresponding institutions; the capitalist basis has its superstructure, and the socialist—its own. If the basis changes and is eliminated, then following it, its superstructure changes and is eliminated; if a new basis is born, then following it, its corresponding superstructure is born"[94].

Schematically, the origin of legal and political ideas can be depicted as follows: at the foundation of all social development lies, as is known, the development of productive forces, or they are determined on the basis of the law of necessary conformity of relations of production to the character of productive forces —the economic relations, i.e., the *basis*; these economic relations, refracted in the consciousness of people, generate certain *interests*. As Engels pointed out, "the economic relations of every given society manifest themselves primarily as interests"[95]. These materially conditioned economic interests, inevitably bearing a class character in a class society, demand protection and defense by political power. Therefore, on the

---

93 *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Short Course*, p. 110.

94 J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, pp. 5–6.

95 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XV, p. 68.

basis of these interests, certain political and legal views are developed—concepts of the just, required, binding, political demands aimed at satisfying the material interests of a given class by creating the necessary political institutions, defining forms of organizing state power that ensure the rule of a given class, and by issuing convenient and advantageous legal norms, universally binding rules of conduct relying on the coercive power of state authority.

The entire history of political doctrines confirms the Stalinist thesis that the emergence and development of political ideas are ultimately determined by changes in the basis of society. For example, in Europe in the 17th–18th centuries, the development of capitalist relations took place, manufactories grew, trade expanded, etc. But the existence of the feudal system, guild regulations, feudal statehood, and law hindered the development of new economic relations and held back the growth of productive forces. The bourgeoisie was interested in destroying old feudal institutions. These material interests of the bourgeoisie were refracted in its political and legal views: bourgeois ideologists demanded the abolition of all restrictions on trade and industry; they opposed absolutism with the bourgeois doctrine of popular sovereignty and the contractual origin of state power, striving for the recognition of equality of all before the law, the abolition of the privileges of the nobility, etc. As a result of a series of bourgeois revolutions, the bourgeoisie achieved the implementation of its demands.

Within the framework of one and the same basis, the development and change of political and legal views are likewise determined by changes in the basis. Why, for instance,

in the first half of the 19th century in bourgeois political thought did liberal motives of limiting state power, non-interference of the state in relations between labor and capital prevail, whereas in the second half of the century, especially after the Paris Commune, the bourgeoisie, its ideology—sociologists, politicians, and jurists—fervently demanded the strengthening of state power, the expansion of the powers of government, and the restriction of political rights of citizens? Because in the first period, the capitalist order was still on the rise, and the working class had not yet matured or posed a serious danger to the bourgeoisie; but in the second period, the capitalist system was already beginning to decline, class contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were exposed, and the bourgeoisie now sought salvation from revolution in strengthening state power, in abandoning bourgeois democracy, in establishing a terrorist dictatorship, and in political and ideological reaction.

Speaking of the conditioning of political and legal views by the basis, one must take into account that political and legal views exert a significant influence on various elements of the existing superstructure: forms of state, legal norms, previously emerged political, philosophical, religious, and other ideas. Like other forms of social consciousness, political and legal views possess a certain relative independence; once arisen, they acquire, as it were, an independent existence, although this "independence" is extremely limited. Every political, legal, etc., thinker, while developing some new doctrine, which is ultimately a reflection of certain needs of the economic life of society at a given stage of its development, nevertheless "has at his disposal... specific

material which has formed independently from the thinking of previous generations and has passed through its own independent path of development in the brains of these successive generations"[96]. The transforming role of the economy consists in the fact that it does not create a new political and legal ideology out of thin air, but in the fact that it determines the character, the nature of the new ideology, determines the direction in which political thought must develop. Since we are speaking of the transition from one antagonistic formation to another antagonistic formation, the economy exerted a transforming effect on previously created social ideas, changing them in accordance with the new needs of economic life. A radical break with old views—in political and legal views—occurs only during the transition to socialism. Therefore, the features of a particular political theory or institution can by no means be explained exclusively through economics.

For instance, it is perfectly clear that the basis of inheritance law is economic, but it is hardly possible to explain from economics alone the fact that in England in the 19th century there existed absolute freedom of testation, while in France it was severely restricted. In studying particular political and legal doctrines, it is necessary to take into account the multiplicity of their nuances, conditioned by the fact that even within one and the same class there are always specific groups whose interests do not coincide and are often even opposed. All this proves that the study of political and legal ideas must be approached concretely, taking into account not only the

[96] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, pp. 462–463, 1947.

features of the basis, but also the entire specific nature of the historical circumstances at each given stage of society's development and in each given country.

But whatever influence political and legal ideas may exert on the formation of corresponding political and legal institutions, as well as other social ideas (for example, economic ideas, moral ideas), ultimately the origin, development, and destruction of particular political ideas, views, theories, and institutions are determined by nothing other than corresponding changes in the economic basis, of which these ideas, views, and theories are a reflection. Comrade Stalin teaches that "the superstructure is the product of one epoch, during which the given economic basis lives and operates. Therefore, the superstructure lives for a short time; it is eliminated and disappears with the elimination and disappearance of the given basis"[97]. Thus, there are no eternal and immutable political ideas; they are all historical.

Being the offspring of a specific economic system, political and legal views, in turn, exert a significant reverse influence upon it. Comrade Stalin writes that "the superstructure is created by the basis, but this by no means means that it merely reflects the basis, that it is passive, neutral, indifferent to the fate of its basis, to the fate of classes, to the character of the system. On the contrary, having come into being, it becomes a tremendous active force, actively assisting its basis to take shape and strengthen, taking all measures to help the new system finish off and eliminate the old basis and the old

---

[97] J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, p. 9.

classes"[98].

In what consists this active role? Comrade Stalin teaches that social ideas and theories vary. There are reactionary ideas serving the interests of obsolete forces of society and retarding its development. There are advanced, progressive ideas and theories serving the interests of advanced forces of society. These ideas facilitate the development of society, acquiring all the greater significance the more accurately they reflect the needs of the development of the material life of society.

Political and legal ideas inevitably, by their very nature, bear a class character, for politics itself is, according to Lenin's formula, the relationship between classes, and law is one of the expressions of politics. Every class struggle is a political struggle, a struggle for state power, and this struggle is conducted under specific legal slogans. As Marx writes, "every movement in which the working class confronts the ruling classes as a class and tries to compel them by 'pressure from without' is a political movement... i.e., a movement of a class striving to enforce its interests in a general form, i.e., in a form possessing coercive force for the whole society"[99]. Therefore, in political and legal views, class interests are expressed in the most direct, sharp, and explicit form. In the history of political doctrines, one can always see the "struggle of various classes among themselves, a struggle that is reflected or finds its expression in the struggle of views on state, in the assessment of the role and significance of state"[100]. Therefore, the role of

---

98 *Ibid.*, p. 7.

99 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 271.

100 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 435.

political ideology in the class struggle is extraordinarily great. Political ideas, theories, and slogans mobilize whole classes to struggle and lie at the foundation of the organization and activity of corresponding legal and political institutions.

The active role of legal and political ideas consists primarily in the fact that on their basis, corresponding political and legal institutions are created and function, which realize class requirements expressed in political and legal views. Political and legal institutions cannot be equated with political and legal views. Political and legal ideology is one form of social consciousness, whereas state, legal institutions cannot be reduced to ideology; they represent specific forms and methods of organizing social relations and class rule. Political institutions—these are state bodies and state management, the entire vast state mechanism, including punitive organs, court and procuracy, as well as political parties carrying out the policy of various social classes. Clear it is that one must not, without falling into idealism, "dissolve" these institutions in political consciousness.

The same applies to legal norms and legal institutions. In legal norms, the legal consciousness of the ruling class is reflected and expressed, but nevertheless, law and legal consciousness cannot be identified: legal consciousness fully belongs to the realm of ideology; it encompasses people's concepts of the just, required, lawful, their views and convictions, whereas legal norms, expressing the legal views of the ruling class as a whole, are created by the state and their application is ensured by the coercive force of state power. Lenin emphasized that "law is nothing without an apparatus capable of compelling

compliance with legal norms"[101]; "will, if it is state will, must be expressed as law established by authority; otherwise the word 'will' is empty shaking of the air by empty sound"[102]. Legal institutions—these are above all state institutions and legal institutes regulating certain social and political relations. At the foundation of legal institutes lie specific economic relations that the ruling class strives to regulate and develop (or, on the contrary, restrict) in a manner advantageous to itself (for example, the institute of inheritance in bourgeois law is created on the basis of capitalist private property and is aimed at its strengthening).

Some jurists incorrectly understand the relationship between political and legal institutions. It is necessary, therefore, to emphasize that legal institutions by their very nature are inextricably linked with state institutions, and no counterposition or detachment of one from the other is permissible. First, law is created by the state and itself is one of the expressions of state policy. Lenin pointed out that "law is a political measure, it is politics"[103]. Second, the implementation of legal norms and the existence of legal institutions are impossible without state apparatus; the state, in turn, is not in a position to fulfill its functions without the help of law. Therefore, one should speak of a single state-legal part of the superstructure, encompassing both state and legal institutions, and the disputes that occurred among jurists as to what belongs to political and what to legal institutions must be recognized as

---

101 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 442.

102 *Ibid.*, p. 72.

103 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 36.

largely scholastic.

Political and legal institutions do not grow out of the economy automatically, by themselves. They are consciously created by social classes in accordance with their political and legal views. A change in political and legal ideas, caused by a change in the economy, historically precedes a change in political and legal institutions. Changes in the basis are first reflected in social ideology, and only then are corresponding institutions created. Thus, for example, the political ideas of progressive bourgeois thinkers of France in the middle of the 18th century formed the basis of the political transformations carried out by the bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century. Political and legal views of antagonistic classes are directly opposite, but the ruling ideas are always the ideas of the ruling class. It is these ideas, together with corresponding institutions belonging to the ruling class, that constitute the superstructure of a given basis, which actively contributes to its strengthening. The political ideas of slave-owning society, as well as its state and law, strengthened the slave-owning form of exploitation; the ideas and institutions of feudal society contributed to the strengthening of serfdom; the political and legal ideas and corresponding institutions of capitalist society are directed at securing the capitalist form of exploitation. In the hands of the ruling class here are state institutions, the entire state apparatus, which is used to suppress the resistance of the exploited, and law, which elevates the interests of this class to the status of law. Political ideas of the ruling class guide all its politicians, officials, judges. Finally, using its political power, the exploiting class imposes its political and legal ideas on the

masses of the exploited, keeping them, in this manner, not only in political but also in spiritual slavery.

Political and legal ideas of reactionary, obsolete classes are thoroughly permeated with a spirit of falsehood and hypocrisy, because they strive to hide, to disguise the essence of class rule. The question of the state, Lenin wrote, "touches upon the interests of the ruling classes more than any other question. The doctrine of the state serves as a justification for social privileges, a justification for the existence of exploitation, a justification for the existence of capitalism—that is why to expect impartiality on this question, to approach this question in such a way, as if people claiming to be scientific could give you here the viewpoint of pure science—is the greatest mistake"[1]. A striking example of an accumulation of lies, hypocrisy, and cynicism can serve as the political and legal ideology of the contemporary American imperialist bourgeoisie, as well as the bourgeoisie of other countries. Capitalist production relations have long been in irreconcilable contradiction with the character of productive forces, and capitalism still exists primarily thanks to the fact that political power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie strives with all its might to preserve its economic and political rule, and to this end serve all its political, legal, and other theories, which are now touted by corrupt bourgeois scribblers. Shouting for the deception of the working class about the defense of "democracy," the bourgeoisie in reality seeks to finish off the remnants of bourgeois democracy. In fact, it leans more and more toward fascism, applies all efforts to finally deal with any semblance of "legality," and transitions to open

fascist terror. Striving to facilitate the preparation and unleashing by Anglo-American imperialism of a new world war, bourgeois politicians and jurists speak out against national sovereignty, preach the idea of a "world state" under the aegis of the USA. Adopted into the service of American imperialism are rampant misanthropic racism, vile cosmopolitanism, the darkest religious obscurantism. Dragged out of the garbage heap of history is Malthusianism and advertised in every way.

Openly—in the press, on the radio, from university chairs—a pack of corrupt and despicable reactionary ideologists and politicians of the bourgeoisie justifies atomic, bacteriological, and chemical warfare. Accepted by the vast majority of civilized countries, the Geneva Convention of 1925 banning the use of bacteriological and chemical weapons is rejected only by the aggressive imperialist government of the USA. Insolently trampling international law, US imperialists conduct bacteriological warfare against the Korean and Chinese peoples. The atrocities of US imperialism evoke the angry protest of peoples all over the world.

In the field of legal ideology, bourgeois jurists, preaching idealistic nonsense, have reached the rejection of the very concept of justice, declaring it an empty word. Fascism and war—that is what American imperialism strives for, which it "substantiates" through its political ideology. And all this is covered up with demagogic, hypocritical phrases about love of peace, humanity, democracy, and vile slander against socialism, against the Soviet Union!

But in opposition to the reactionary ideas of the obsolete class, the oppressed class, in the person of its ideologists, gradually

develops its own political and legal ideas, which become the banner of its class struggle. These new, advanced political ideas, expressing the interests of the advanced, progressive class, do not, of course, belong to the superstructure of the obsolete basis and wage an irreconcilable struggle against it. These ideas arise on the basis of the matured needs of the material life of society, on the basis of the discrepancy between developed productive forces and lagging production relations. They correspond (to a greater or lesser degree) to objective economic laws of society's development and therefore play a progressive role, mobilizing and organizing revolutionary forces for the struggle against reactionary orders. On the basis of these revolutionary ideas, revolutionary political parties are created, revolutionary programs and slogans are developed, without which political struggle is impossible, and the replacement of the old system by a new one is impossible.

Precisely such a revolutionary character is possessed by the socialist political and legal ideas of the working class, developed by its ideologists in the depths of capitalist society. The hypocritical ideology of the bourgeoisie, fetishizing bourgeois state and law and directed at perpetuating capitalist exploitation, is hostile to the interests of the working class. The working class cannot relate to bourgeois "legality" as the bourgeoisie relates to it. "For the bourgeois," writes Engels, "law is sacred: for it is the product of his own power and issued with his consent for the protection of himself and his interests... He knows very well that even if a single law proves harmful to him, on the whole, legislation is directed toward the defense of his interests. On the contrary, the worker knows too well and

has too often experienced in practice that law for him is a whip woven by the bourgeoisie, and therefore he deals with it only when forced to... Thus, workers do not honor the law, but merely submit to it when they lack the power to change it"[104].

The working class, headed by its Communist Party, puts forward its own political and legal demands, reflecting its class interests and directed against the bourgeoisie. The sharper the class struggle becomes, the clearer the political consciousness of workers becomes. From their eyes, the veil of bourgeois ideology gradually falls.

It should be emphasized that genuinely socialist political and legal views could be developed and were developed only on the basis of advanced science, on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory. Marxist theory raised the political and legal views of the working class to the level of science. The Marxist-Leninist party brings socialist consciousness into the spontaneous labor movement, uniting the labor movement with socialism.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism established the dependence of all political, legal, and other ideas and institutions on the economic basis, showed that the struggle of classes is a law of history, and brought the class struggle idea to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They scientifically proved the inevitability of the victory of the working class and formulated its political slogans. "Thereby, a worldview was given corresponding to the conditions of life and struggle of the proletariat: the absence of property among workers could only correspond to the absence of illusions in their heads. And this

---

104 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 435.

proletarian worldview is now making its victorious march across the whole world"[105]. Marxism-Leninism is the worldview of the working class, the basis of its political and legal views.

Political class consciousness of the working class in capitalist society is a factor of tremendous revolutionary significance. Its content was clearly formulated by V. I. Lenin: "Class consciousness of workers is the understanding by workers that the only means to improve their position and achieve their liberation lies in the struggle against the class of capitalists and factory owners... Further, class consciousness of workers means the understanding that the interests of all workers of a given country are identical, solidary, that they all constitute one class, separate from all other classes of society. Finally, class consciousness of workers means the understanding by workers that for the achievement of their goals, workers must strive for influence on state affairs, just as factory owners and capitalists have achieved and continue to strive to achieve"[106]. Political consciousness of the working class rallies the ranks of the working class in the struggle against the bourgeoisie; it helps conduct the struggle against bourgeois ideology in the labor movement. Political consciousness of the working class arms it in its struggle against its class enemy. Therefore, the development of political consciousness of the working class is a primary task of the Marxist-Leninist party. Under the conditions of capitalist society, the stultification of workers' consciousness by bourgeois ideologists continues. Relying on

---

105 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. III, pp. 508–509.

106 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XVI, Part 1, p. 298.

the labor aristocracy, corrupting the leadership of the working class, the imperialist bourgeoisie exerts every effort to spiritually enslave the working class, to hinder its political growth. The main agents of bourgeois ideology in the working class are right-wing socialists. British Labourites, American union bureaucrats, French and Italian right-wing socialists, German right-wing social democrats—they all strive to tear the working class away from the invincible ideas of Leninism, to poison the working class with the poison of corrupt bourgeois ideology. They promote the notorious "democratic socialism"—the vile idea of class collaboration, reformism, trying to justify the police violence of the bourgeois state, portraying the bourgeois state as an instrument of peace and justice. Right-socialist lackeys of capital support the aggressive policy of American imperialism, calculated to unleash a new world war, and persecute the movement of peace supporters.

But at the head of the proletariat of capitalist countries stand courageous communist parties, which, despite any repression, consistently defend the interests of the working class and all progressive humanity. They tirelessly expose all and any reformist illusions sown by social-traitors, educate workers in the spirit of harsh class struggle, teach them to fight against the arbitrariness of the bourgeois state, against the policy of fascism carried out by imperialist governments, against the preparation and propaganda of a new world war. [107]

* * *

Political and legal views of the Soviet people, which grew on

[107] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 96.

the basis of the socialist basis and represent a further development of the revolutionary ideas of the proletariat, play a major role in the life of Soviet society. Political and legal views of Soviet people bear a socialist character and are one of the elements of the socialist superstructure. Under the conditions of Soviet society, in which there are no antagonistic classes and an indestructible moral-political unity of the Soviet people has been created, political and legal ideas express the interests of all the Soviet people. Unlike capitalist society, in the USSR there is only *one* socialist political ideology and socialist legal consciousness, embodied in Marxism-Leninism. As for remnants of old bourgeois political and legal views, they preserved themselves still in the form of individual remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of a few backward members of our society, and against these remnants, the entire socialist superstructure wages a persistent struggle.

At the foundation of all political and legal ideas of Soviet society lies the economic structure of our society—the **socialist basis**, the basis of which is public, socialist ownership of the instruments and means of production. Socialist political and legal ideas are directed primarily at the development and strengthening of the socialist basis, at the protection of public property, at the building of communism in our country. In its entire content, Soviet political and legal ideology is resolutely opposed to the ideology of the bourgeoisie. Giving a rebuff to social-traitors who raised a cry after the Great October Socialist Revolution about the "unjustness" of Soviet power waging a decisive struggle against counter-revolution, V. I. Lenin wrote: "I know where you derive your concepts of

justice. They are from the yesterday of the capitalist era. The slave-owner, his equality, his freedom—these are your concepts of justice. These are petty-bourgeois remnants of petty-bourgeois prejudices...—this is what your justice is, your equality, your labor democracy. But for us, justice is subordinated to the interests of overthrowing capital"[108]. Giving directives to the People's Commissar of Justice D. I. Kursky regarding the drafting of the Soviet Civil Code, Lenin emphasized that it was necessary to resolutely discard old bourgeois legal principles, that Soviet law must proceed from the interests of the new socialist basis and the Soviet state, that it must rely on socialist legal consciousness of working people: *"We do not indulge 'Europe', but move further in strengthening state interference in 'private relations', in civil matters"*[109]— demanded Lenin. If at the foundation of bourgeois ideology, legal and political, lies the idea of defending and strengthening capitalist private property, then socialist legal consciousness, on the contrary, demands the protection and strengthening of public, socialist property as the basis of the socialist system.

"We recognize nothing 'private'; for us, everything in the sphere of economics is public-legal, not private..." And Lenin demanded *"to apply not corpus juris romani (Roman law)—the classic law of private-property relations.—I. K.) to 'civil relations', but our revolutionary legal consciousness"*[1].

In the political views of Soviet people, in their socialist legal consciousness, the firm will of the Soviet people to destroy the remnants of capitalism in the economy, daily life, and

---

108 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 339–340.

109 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 177.

consciousness of people and to build a communist society is expressed. At the basis of the political and legal consciousness of the Soviet people, as well as at the basis of other forms of socialist consciousness, lie the great ideas of socialism and communism, the ideas of Soviet socialist democratism, socialist humanism, Soviet patriotism, the ideas of friendship and brotherhood of peoples, socialist internationalism.

Political and legal consciousness of the Soviet people occupies an extremely important place in the socialist superstructure. Lenin pointed out that politics is the concentrated expression of economics, that it cannot fail to take precedence over economics. In the political views of Soviet people, the interests of the Soviet people are reflected most clearly and definitely, and its most important requirements are formulated. Political views of the Soviet people express its attitude toward the Soviet state as the most important instrument for strengthening socialism and building communism in our country. Concern for the strengthening and development of the Soviet state—that is what constitutes the content of the political views of Soviet society. As for socialist legal consciousness, which represents one of the elements of socialist political ideology, it reflects scientifically understood interests of the Soviet people, realized or requiring realization in Soviet law.

A decisive influence on the formation of socialist political ideas and legal consciousness is exerted by the policy of the Communist Party, which is the vital foundation of the Soviet system. Political and legal consciousness of Soviet people does not develop spontaneously, by itself; it is purposefully educated by the entire policy of the Party, the entire system and

activity of the Soviet state. Comrade Stalin points out that in the second phase of development, the "main task of our state inside the country consists in peaceful economic-organizational and cultural-educational work"[2]. The tasks of the gradual transition to communism require especially great attention to the work of communist education of working people, education in the spirit of Soviet policy.

In the report speech to the 19th Party Congress on the work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.), G. M. Malenkov said: "In our Soviet society, there is not and cannot be a class basis for the rule of bourgeois ideology. In our country, socialist ideology reigns, the indestructible foundation of which is Marxism-Leninism. But we still have remnants of bourgeois ideology, remnants of private-property psychology and morality. These remnants do not die away by themselves; they are very persistent, can grow, and a decisive struggle must be waged against them. We are not guaranteed against the penetration to us of alien views, ideas, and moods from outside, from the direction of capitalist states, and from within, from the direction of remnants of hostile Soviet authority groups not finished off by the Party. It must not be forgotten that enemies of the Soviet state try to spread, heat up, and inflate all kinds of unhealthy moods, ideologically corrupt unstable elements of our society".

"Now the main tasks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," it is indicated in the new Party Statute, "consist in building a communist society through a gradual transition from socialism to communism, continuously raising the material and cultural level of society, educating members of society in the

spirit of internationalism and establishing fraternal bonds with working people of all countries, all-round strengthening the active defense of the Soviet Motherland from aggressive actions of its enemies".

The Directives of the 19th Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) on the Fifth Five-Year Plan for the development of the USSR mark a new serious step in the movement toward communism. The transition to communism presupposes not only further significant development of the economy and culture, but also a new rise in the communist consciousness of the masses.

Communist education is carried out by the Party of Lenin–Stalin and the Soviet state. Cultural-educational work of the Soviet state proceeds in various forms.

An important factor in introducing socialist political and legal ideas into the consciousness of Soviet citizens is Soviet law. Norms of Soviet law, in which the state will of the Soviet people is embodied, exert a serious influence on the formation of political and legal views of Soviet citizens. Soviet laws served the goals of political education of the masses even at the time when Soviet power was not yet completely consolidated and its decrees could not be immediately implemented. V. I. Lenin spoke about this at the 8th Party Congress: "We had a period when decrees served as a form of propaganda. They laughed at us, said that Bolsheviks did not understand that their decrees were not being carried out; the entire White Guard press was full of mockery on this account, but this period was legitimate, when Bolsheviks seized power and said to the ordinary worker, ordinary peasant: here is how we would like the state to be governed, here is a decree, try it. To the simple

worker and peasant, we gave our concepts of politics right away in the form of decrees"[110]. All the greater educational significance Soviet law has in the second phase of development of the Soviet state, when norms of Soviet law are an indestructible law, binding for all without exception—citizens, state bodies, and officials.

Norms of Soviet law are a most important factor in educating and developing socialist legal consciousness. Especially great in this respect is the role of the great Stalinist Constitution, which is, as M. I. Kalinin points out, not only the fundamental law of the USSR, but also a powerful factor in educating people. The Constitution of the USSR is "the only fully democratic constitution in the world"[111]. Articles of the Stalinist Constitution obligate Soviet citizens to work selflessly for the good of their Motherland, respect Soviet laws and unfailingly fulfill them, strictly observe labor and state discipline, honestly relate to public duty, cherish public socialist property as sacred and inviolable, be prepared to defend the freedom and independence of the USSR. Not only the Constitution, but the entire system of Soviet law, all its branches educate citizens in the spirit of socialist democratism, instill in consciousness principles of socialist policy. Soviet criminal law has, as Article 1 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR states, "the task of protecting the socialist state of workers and peasants and the legal order established in it against socially dangerous acts (crimes)". Punishing plunderers of public property and personal property of citizens, punishing speculators, swindlers,

---

110 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXIX, p. 419. 3rd ed.

111 J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 606. 11th ed.

bribe-takers, malicious violators of labor discipline, Soviet criminal law creates around them an atmosphere of general indignation and condemnation. Soviet labor law, regulating labor relations of Soviet people in accordance with the fundamental principle of socialism: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his labor," skillfully combines measures of coercion with respect to negligent, backward elements, slacker, defect-producers, violators of labor discipline with measures of encouraging best workers, vanguard workers of socialist enterprises, by establishing increased pay for overfulfilling production quotas, awarding orders and medals for outstanding production achievements, awarding Stalin Prizes, and conferring honorary titles up to the title of Hero of Socialist Labor.

In this way, Soviet law, in which the policy of the Soviet state is expressed, educates the most important moral-political quality—a socialist attitude toward labor. Tremendous educational power is possessed by our national economic plans directed at building the material-technical base of communism, the great Stalinist plan for the transformation of nature, decisions of the Party and government on the great construction projects of communism.

Directives of the 19th Party Congress on the Fifth Five-Year Plan for the development of the USSR, in which the general line of the Party on questions of economic and cultural construction is expressed, mobilize the working masses even more strongly for the struggle to build communism, calling Soviet people to new labor achievements. They instill in the hearts of Soviet people a sense of legitimate pride in their

socialist Fatherland, strengthen their faith in the strength and power of the Soviet State, in the correctness of the policy of the Communist Party.

Besides the norms of Soviet law themselves, an exceptionally important place in educating socialist political and legal consciousness of Soviet citizens is occupied by the realization of these norms in the activity of organs of state power, Soviet political institutions. Unlike the exploiting bourgeois state apparatus, anti-people by its very essence, the Soviet state apparatus is anti-people neither in spirit, nor in composition, nor in tasks, and by its organization is inextricably linked with broad popular masses, whom it serves. "...The bourgeois state apparatus," says J. V. Stalin, "stands above the masses, as a result of which it is separated from the population by an impassable barrier and, by its very spirit, is alien to the popular masses. Meanwhile, the Soviet state apparatus merges with the masses, for it cannot and must not stand above the masses if it wants to preserve itself precisely as a Soviet state apparatus, for it cannot be alien to these masses if it really wants to encompass millions of working masses"[1]. Acting on the basis of Soviet, socialist legality, broadly involving popular masses in the work of administration, the Soviet state apparatus thereby raises the political consciousness and activity of working people, teaches them in practice to use their democratic rights enshrined in the Stalinist Constitution.

An important role in the matter of political and legal education of citizens is played by judicial bodies. The Soviet court is a genuinely popular court, and its main task is the communist education of citizens.

"The Soviet court," it is stated in the Law on the Judiciary of the USSR, Union and Autonomous Republics, "applying measures of criminal punishment, not only punishes criminals, but also has as its goal the correction and re-education of criminals. By all its activity, the court educates citizens of the USSR in the spirit of devotion to the Fatherland and the cause of socialism, in the spirit of exact and unswerving execution of Soviet laws, care for socialist property, discipline of labor, an honest attitude toward state and public duty, respect for the rules of socialist human coexistence".

As expressed by M. I. Kalinin, the court in a concrete, understandable form propagates our laws and mobilizes for their execution, instilling into the consciousness of citizens the most important moral-political traits of Soviet ideology.

Besides educational work conducted by state bodies, the Party educates the political consciousness of the masses directly—through party organizations, party press, lecture propaganda, as well as through mass organizations of working people under the leadership of the Communist Party (Komsomol, trade unions). Soviet public organizations educate their members in the spirit of Soviet patriotism, in the spirit of devotion to the Party and the Soviet State.

Of great importance is the propaganda of Soviet law conducted by Soviet legal science, in particular the teaching of the Constitution of the USSR in secondary school. A decisive condition for developing socialist political consciousness is mastering Marxist-Leninist theory, which gives the key to understanding major political questions and helps develop scientific political convictions.

J. V. Stalin's brilliant work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* arms the Soviet people, all communist and workers' parties of the world with the knowledge of the laws of building socialism and communism.

Socialist political and legal ideas are consistently and unswervingly introduced into the consciousness of the masses by the Communist Party with the help of the Soviet State and public organizations of working people. Political ideas of Soviet society and its socialist legal consciousness do not passively reflect their basis, but actively act upon it, contributing to the destruction of remnants of capitalism and the building of communism in our country.

The creative role of political and legal ideas in Soviet society consists primarily in the fact that on the basis of these ideas, changes in the socialist basis are refracted, Soviet political and legal institutions develop and improve, without which the development of society is impossible. Soviet society, like any other, develops on the basis of objective economic laws existing independently of the will of people. The continuous growth of productive forces inevitably entails certain changes in production relations, and this, in turn, requires certain changes in the superstructure: changes in particular institutions, abolition of obsolete ones, and issuance of new laws, etc. But unlike objective economic laws, legal laws are created by the will of people themselves, are created consciously, on the basis of a specific legal consciousness, in which the needs of the development of economic relations are reflected. In capitalist society, legislation is carried out in the process of fierce class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, as well as

between different groups of the bourgeoisie. There law is a "formula, registration of power relations"[112], and in it is embodied only the legal consciousness of the ruling clique, with bourgeois legislation, protecting the interests of the obsolete class, retarding social progress and holding back the development of productive forces.

On the contrary, in Soviet society, where there are no exploiting, reactionary classes retarding the development of society, socialist law-making is carried out not through class struggle, but through conscious creativity of the popular masses, led by the Communist Party and armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism. Under socialalism, as J. V. Stalin points out in his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, as in all other formations, the general law operates that production relations lag behind the growth of productive forces. But the absence in our country of obsolete classes capable of organizing resistance gives Soviet society the opportunity to bring lagging production relations into conformity with the character of productive forces in a timely manner on the basis of scientific knowledge of objective laws, as well as the state-legal superstructure, without bringing matters to a conflict between them.

Objective processes are recognized first by the leadership of the Communist Party, which draws political conclusions from these economic processes and outlines measures necessary to ensure the victory of the new over the old. Then these new processes are recognized by the main mass of Party members,

---

[112] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 272.

i.e., the vanguard of the working people of the USSR. "...First there are facts," says Comrade Stalin, "then their reflection in the consciousness of the most advanced elements of the party, and only after this comes the moment of realization of new processes in the heads of the masses of party members"[1]. The next stage is the *persuasion* by the Party of broad strata of working people of the necessity of particular changes, shifts in policy or legislation. The Party acts upon political and legal consciousness of the masses; it does not decree its line from above, does not impose it on the masses, but *persuades* them of the correctness of its line. Only after broad strata of working people are already politically prepared for this, a necessary legal act is issued by the corresponding organ of power, authorized by the sovereign people. After this follows its *explanation* to the broad masses of working people and its *implementation*, which again is carried out mainly through persuasion; coercion is applied only to a tiny part of the population, which, due to particular reasons (the presence in their consciousness of remnants of capitalism, the influence of hostile capitalist encirclement), is inert and resists the birth of the new. Thus, the entire process of development of the Soviet state-legal superstructure is most closely linked with the level and growth of political and legal consciousness of citizens: on the one hand, the Party itself educates it, and on the other hand, relies upon it and proceeds from it. *"Expressing correctly what the people realize—this is precisely the necessary condition ensuring for the Party the honorable role of the main guiding force in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat"*[113]—

[113] J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 524.

teaches Comrade Stalin.

Under the conditions of Soviet democracy, working people themselves are creators of Soviet laws, many of which contain direct references to the legal consciousness of the masses or their initiative. For example, the resolution of the CEC and SNK of the USSR of August 7, 1932 "On the protection of property of state enterprises, collective farms, and cooperatives, and strengthening public (socialist) property" contains a reference to "frequent complaints of workers and collective farmers" about thefts of socialist property, complaints testifying to the growth of political and legal consciousness of working people, to their increased intolerance toward plunderers of public wealth. Upon the direct initiative of the working masses, the resolution of the SNK of the USSR, CC of the C.P.S.U.(B.), and AUCCTU of December 28, 1938 "On measures to streamline labor discipline, improve the practice of state social insurance, and combat abuses in this matter," the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of June 26, 1940 "On the transition to an 8-hour workday, to a 7-day workweek, and on prohibiting the unauthorized departure of workers and employees from enterprises and institutions," and many other legislative acts were issued. The Law on the Defense of Peace adopted on March 12, 1951 by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, being an important factor in the struggle of the Soviet people for peace and evidence of genuine humanism of Soviet policy, also contains a reference to the "conscience and legal consciousness of peoples who endured the disasters of two world wars over the lifetime of one generation".

The essence of the matter is that all Soviet laws and political institutions have as their source the will of the Soviet people. The system of Soviet democratism fully corresponds to the political ideals of Soviet people, and not only Soviet people, but millions of working people still languishing under the yoke of capital. Both higher and local organs of power in the USSR are elective. Deputies of the Soviets are faithful representatives of the Soviet people, invested with its full trust and under its vigilant control. Their political and legal convictions, by which they are guided in resolving major state affairs, are the political convictions of our people, of our Party. Besides deputies, the Soviet state involves other representatives of working people in legislative activity in various ways. For example, provisions On Commissions of Legislative Proposals of the Council of the Union and Council of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR provide for involving in the discussion of prepared draft laws not only deputies, but also representatives of state institutions, scientific and public organizations. This vividly testifies to the fact that, as Deputy P. K. Ponomarenko pointed out, "unlike the practice of bourgeois society, where the drafting of laws takes place covertly from the working masses, essentially behind the scenes of parliamentary screens, the drafting and preparation of Soviet laws bears a public, open character and is conducted with active participation of working people themselves"[114]. Soviet law is the fullest and most complete embodiment of legal views of Soviet people, their socialist legal consciousness. Understandably, this is one of the sources of strength and authority of the Soviet state and law,

[114] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 12, p. 232.

one of the sources of nationwide support given to their state by the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Political and legal ideas of Soviet society play a major role not only in Soviet legislation, but also in the process of daily work of state bodies. All organs of state management in the USSR act on the basis of Soviet laws, and strict observance of socialist legality is their primary duty. But practical-political activity of Soviet state bodies is exceptionally diverse; it encounters countless various facts and phenomena that cannot be foreseen in advance in legislation. Besides, the law formulates only a general rule of conduct, and application of this general rule to living reality can vary in different conditions. And here, political and legal consciousness of Soviet officials, party, soviet, komsomol, trade union, judicial workers has primary importance, helping them correctly, on the basis of all-round consideration of the interests of the Soviet State, to resolve concrete cases they encounter. A correct understanding of the essence, goals, and tasks of the Soviet State, an understanding of the character, spirit, and direction of Soviet legislation is an absolutely necessary condition for normal functioning of all Soviet state institutions. Comrade Stalin teaches[115] that every fact or phenomenon of daily life must be evaluated from principled, political positions. Soviet leaders are alien to a spirit of narrow practicalism, people who do not know how to rise to political generalization of facts. In order to notice and support the new, advanced in a timely manner and facilitate its victory over the old, dying, it is necessary to possess a broad political horizon, ability to look

[115] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 60.

far ahead, ability to evaluate facts from a state point of view. Perspective in work is the most important quality of a Soviet worker, and it is developed only as a result of persistent political study, both theoretical and practical. Conceit, localism, bureaucracy, which still take place in the work of individual leaders and against which the Party wages an irreconcilable struggle—all these are consequences of low political level of workers. Therefore, raising political level of our cadres is a most important task of the Soviet state. In the new Party Statute, every Party member is required "to work on raising one's consciousness, on mastering fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism".

The significance of socialist political and legal consciousness in the activity of state bodies can be shown with special clarity on the example of the activity of the Soviet court. The role of legal consciousness in the activity of judicial bodies is extraordinarily great. In a bourgeois court, which "portrayed itself as a defense of order, but in reality was a blind, subtle instrument of ruthless suppression of the exploited, defending the interests of the money bag"[116], complete rule of bourgeois law reigns, interpreting all laws in the interests of the bourgeoisie. Widely advertised by bourgeois jurisprudence, "democratic" trial by jury is in reality "a class court of privileged classes, established to fill gaps in law with the breadth of bourgeois conscience"[117]. Jurors originating from property classes are guided by interests of their own class, to the detriment of working people's interests. "Conscience," says

---

116 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 421.

117 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 558.

Engels, "depends on consciousness and on the whole way of human life. A republican has a different conscience than a royalist, a property owner—different than a non-property owner, a thinking person—different than one who never thinks. A person called upon to perform jury duties with property qualification alone, has a property qualification conscience"[118]. Striking examples of arbitrariness of a bourgeois court, its anti-democratic character, can serve as trials against leaders of the Communist Party of the USA, the shameful conviction of Henri Martin in France, systematic judicial persecutions against Indian communists.

On the contrary, the Soviet court is a genuinely popular court; organic formalistic and bureaucratic spirit inherent in bourgeois justice is alien to it. Soviet judges and lay assessors are elected representatives of the Soviet people, entrusted with responsible business of administering justice. Legal consciousness of Soviet judges is socialist legal consciousness inherent in all Soviet people. And its role in court proceedings is very great. In the first days and months after the Great October Socialist Revolution, when old bourgeois law was abolished, and new Soviet law was just beginning to be created, socialist legal consciousness served as main criterion of proletarian court. In draft program of the R.C.P.(B.), V. I. Lenin wrote: "Abolishing laws of overthrown governments, the party gives to elected Soviet voters-judges slogan—realize will of proletariat, applying its decrees, and in case of absence of corresponding decree or its incompleteness, be guided by socialist legal consciousness, noting laws of overthrown

---

[118] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. VII, p. 496.

governments"[1]. About revolutionary or socialist legal consciousness speak many decrees of Soviet authority, including Decree No. 1 on Court written by Lenin.

At present, courts find themselves in an incomparably more favorable position than in 1917–1918, since now there exists a developed system of Soviet law, by which judges are guided. Nevertheless, socialist legal consciousness even now remains a most important condition for administering socialist justice. Soviet courts act on the basis of law. But application by court of Soviet laws is not a formal, mechanical act. The court is obliged to carefully evaluate presented evidence; it must take into account in its decision not only character of crime, but also personality of accused. Interpretation of law itself, analysis of evidence presented to court, and determination of degree of guilt, and sentencing—all this requires a deep, thoughtful approach. Article 319 of Code of Criminal Procedure of the RSFSR states that "evaluation of evidence present in case is produced by judges according to their inner conviction, based on consideration of all circumstances of case in their aggregate". Judicial inner conviction plays an important role at all stages of judicial trial. But what is this inner conviction? As a rule, points out A. Y. Vyshinsky, inner conviction of a socialist court is a form of expressing socialist legal consciousness. One is inseparable from the other. On formation of this inner conviction, a decisive influence is exerted by entire system of political and legal views of judge. "Socialist legal consciousness provides Soviet judge opportunity to more flexibly, freely, wisely orient himself in complex circumstances of nature of civil dispute or criminal offense,

and in case of necessity, resolve in each concrete case in accordance with existing laws"[2]. Soviet legislation in every way protects freedom of inner conviction of judge, his socialist legal consciousness. According to Article 112 of Stalinist Constitution, judges are independent and subject only to law. This ensures genuine democratism and fairness of Soviet court and compliance of its decisions with legal consciousness and political views of broad popular masses.

Socialist political and legal consciousness of Soviet citizens is an important element of their communist consciousness. It ensures conscious and voluntary execution of Soviet laws by overwhelming majority of working people of USSR and is a serious stimulus for further development of our state. Bourgeois state is an exploiting one; it is hostile to popular masses. Therefore, as V. I. Lenin points out, capitalism left as a heritage to socialism hatred and distrust of masses toward everything state-related[3]. Persistent educational work was required on the part of Communist Party to eliminate this old view. This work was crowned with success. Popular masses, broadly drawn by Soviet authority into business of state management, realized that Soviet State is a genuinely popular state. That is why Soviet people place state, nationwide business above personal, look upon business of Soviet State as their own, personal business. Unprecedented growth of labor enthusiasm, nationwide help to great construction projects of communism, unanimous subscription of working people to state loans, growth of political activity of masses—all this irrefutably testifies to increased political consciousness of Soviet people. Decisions of Party and government are carried

out into life with active help and support of working people themselves. Power of Soviet state and law roots not in coercion (though character of socialist coercion, carried out in interests of majority against tiny minority of population, radically differs from coercion of bourgeois state), but in that majority of citizens voluntarily, out of conviction, supports it.

Character of crime in USSR fundamentally differs from character of crime in countries of capital. Under capitalism, society itself, placing individual in hostile relations to all others, creates crime in this way[1]. "With developed capitalist mode of production, no person will figure out where honest gain ends and where swindling begins"[2].

In epoch of imperialism, crime in capitalist countries acquired an organized character, and in modern USA gangsters serve monopolistic capital just like police. As for bourgeois "legality", it brings down all its penalties upon working class, patronizing crimes of ruling clique. In Soviet conditions, economic causes of crime (hunger, unemployment, social inequality) are eliminated, therefore offenses, number of which decreases with every year, stem not from objective causes, but are a consequence of presence of remnants of capitalism in consciousness of individual people and influence of hostile capitalist encirclement. Soviet public actively helps organs of state fight against criminal elements. Lenin pointed out that "...preventive significance of punishment is conditioned not by its severity, but by its inevitability. Important is not that severe punishment be assigned for crime, but that no single case of

crime pass undetected"[119]. Clear it is that investigative bodies alone, without support of public, are unable to cope with this task. Speaking of necessity to intensify struggle against plunderers of socialist property, Comrade Stalin emphasized: "You won't catch everyone with help of GPU. Here another measure is needed, more effective and more serious. This measure consists in creating around such petty thieves an atmosphere of general moral boycott and hatred of surrounding public. This measure consists in raising such a campaign and creating such a moral atmosphere among workers and peasants that would exclude possibility of stealing, that would make impossible life and existence of thieves and plunderers of national wealth..."[120]. Political and legal consciousness of Soviet people creates such an atmosphere of intolerance toward thieves, swindlers, slackers, and this leads to reduction of crime, facilitates execution in life of Soviet laws, accelerates building of communism.

Advanced political views of Soviet people are most closely intertwined with other forms of socialist consciousness and are a major factor in communist education of Soviet people, for ideological institutions, as indicated in decree of CC of C.P.S.U.(B.) on journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, "must be guided by what constitutes living basis of Soviet system—its policy. Soviet system cannot tolerate education of youth in spirit of indifference to Soviet policy, in spirit of lack of concern and despair"[121].

---

119 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 373.

120 J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 8, pp. 136–137.

121 Decree of CC of C.P.S.U.(B.) of August 14, 1946 "On journals 'Zvezda' and 'Leningrad'", p. 6.

Connection of political and legal ideas of Soviet society with its communist morality consists in that interests of Soviet state, interests of policy of Party are basis and most important criterion of communist morality. Execution of norms of Soviet law constitutes not only legal, but also moral duty of Soviet citizens, and Soviet law itself is filled with high moral content. Finally, major traits of communist morality—Soviet patriotism, socialist attitude toward labor, toward public and state duty, socialist humanism, etc.—are by their very nature traits of moral-political character, and moral profile of a person is determined primarily by his political convictions.

Political consciousness of Soviet people finds its reflection in art and literature, for aesthetic views of Soviet people are inextricably linked with their political convictions. "Power of Soviet literature, most advanced literature in world, consists in that it is literature that has no and cannot have other interests besides interests of people, interests of state. Task of Soviet literature consists in helping state correctly educate youth, answer its inquiries, educate new generation courageous, believing in its cause, not fearing obstacles, ready to overcome any obstacles"[122].

Soviet political ideology manifests itself in sphere of science as well. Political consciousness of Soviet scientists contributes to rise in theoretical level of scientific research, arms scientists in struggle for communist ideolocality, against all kinds of remnants and manifestations of bourgeois ideology.

Noble political ideas of Soviet society cement moral-political

---

[122] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XVI, Part 2, p. 456.

unity of Soviet society and friendship of peoples of USSR. They teach to cherish and strengthen one's socialist Fatherland. They teach to give all forces to building communism. Thus, socialist political and legal ideology actively contributes to development and strengthening of Soviet State, Soviet socialist basis.

Political ideology of Soviet society has not only internal, but also international significance. Ideas of socialist democratism raise to struggle for their liberation millions of masses of working people languishing under yoke of capital. Justice of these ideas is proved not only by experience of Soviet state, but also by experience of countries of popular democracy. Principles of proletarian internationalism contribute to strengthening friendship between peoples of all countries of world.

Greatest international significance is possessed by democratic and peace-loving principles of Soviet foreign policy, consistently defending cause of peace in whole world. Now, when Anglo-American imperialism feverishly prepares a new world war, when it already wages a predatory war in Korea, under Soviet slogans of peace rally hundreds of millions of honest people of all countries and nations in struggle to preserve peace.

Political and legal ideology of Soviet society is a most important element of socialist superstructure. Socialist political and legal views of Soviet people, reflecting economic relations of socialism, are result of long educational work of Communist Party and Soviet state. They actively contribute and help development and strengthening of Soviet state, cause of

building communism in our country.

Primary task of Communist Party and Soviet State, of all workers of our ideological front in period of gradual transition from socialism to communism is struggle for further raising level of political consciousness of working people.

Among main duties of communist, new Party Statute includes duty "daily to strengthen bond with masses, in timely manner respond to inquiries and needs of working people, explain to non-party masses meaning of policy and decisions of Party, remembering that strength and invincibility of our party—is in its vital and indestructible bond with people". Honorary duty of workers of ideological front, including philosophers, jurists, economists, historians, consists in explaining even deeper, brighter, more comprehensively to millions of Soviet people policy of our party, our state, decisions of historic 19th Congress of C.P.S.U.(B.), working on further development of political consciousness of great Soviet people—creator of communism.

7. Marxism-Leninism—The Scientific Basis of Soviet Foreign Policy
N. L. RUBINSHTEIN

The foreign policy of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet government is inextricably, organically merged with domestic policy. Both are aimed at building communism in our country; both express the fundamental interests of the Soviet people and represent a scientific policy based on a deep knowledge of the laws governing the development of society.

The main task of the Stalinist foreign policy of the Soviet Union is to ensure the external conditions necessary for building and achieving the final victory of communism in our country. This policy contributes to the victory of communism and inflicts defeat upon the enemies of the Soviet Union for more than a third of a century precisely because it carries out the requirements that Marxism-Leninism presents to the policy of the proletariat.

***

From the very first day of its existence, the Soviet state has been waging a tireless and continuous struggle against unjust, predatory wars, and against imperialist aggression. "If we keep in mind the main thing in our foreign policy, then, briefly speaking, this main thing is expressed in the fact that the Soviet Union stands for peace and defends the cause of peace,"[123]

[123] **G. M. Malenkov.** *32nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, p. 15. 1949.

The struggle of the Soviet Union for peace proceeds from the concrete conditions of the material life of society and from the real needs of its development. A scientific analysis of these conditions by Lenin and Stalin showed that wars are a property inherent to imperialism. "...The development of world capitalism in our time takes place not in the form of a smooth and even advance forward, but through crises and war catastrophes,"[124] — teaches Comrade Stalin. Predatory wars bring the greatest suffering to the working people, intensifying capitalist oppression even further. Hunger, poverty, lack of political rights—all this merges together and is multiplied tenfold by war, which means the mass destruction of workers, peasants, and the working intelligentsia in the interests of capitalist monopolies. Thus, the struggle against predatory wars is a vital necessity for the working people, their vital interest. However, this is not all. The scientific analysis carried out by Lenin and Stalin led them to the conclusion that in this struggle against imperialist wars, the popular masses have every chance of success. Facts have shown that the reliance of imperialists on conducting war purely through technology, aircraft, and tanks, without mass armies, turned out to be a fantasy of a reactionary clique. The possibility of breaking the plans of warmongers and achieving a long-lasting peace depends on the degree of political consciousness of the popular masses and on their activity.

Thirty-four years ago, V. I. Lenin, in his report on peace at a meeting of the Second Congress of Soviets establishing Soviet

---

[124] **J. V. Stalin.** *Speech at an Election Meeting of Voters of the Stalin Electoral District of Moscow, February 9, 1946*, p. 6.

power, pointed out the paramount role of peoples in resolving the question of peace: "Everywhere governments and peoples diverge from one another, and therefore we must help the peoples to intervene in questions of war and peace."[125] From this report by Lenin to Comrade Stalin's answers to the *Pravda* correspondent on foreign policy questions in February 1951, from the first decree of Soviet power on peace of November 8 (October 26), 1917 to the Peace Defense Law adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in March 1951, runs a straight line. At individual historical stages, specific tasks of the Soviet state in the struggle for peace changed depending on the situation, but the main goal of Soviet foreign policy—the struggle against predatory wars and against their instigators—remained unchanged at all historical stages.

The fact that the Stalinist policy of peace is based on an understanding of the laws of historical development gives it clarity of purpose, confidence, and persistence in achieving the set tasks necessary to carry out a consistent political line.

While the diplomacy of capitalist states renounces its false statements made yesterday in order to untie its hands for expanding aggression today and tomorrow, Soviet foreign policy does not have to renounce its statements, as it always reflects the fundamental interests of peoples.

In 1933, the Soviet government submitted to the League of Nations a draft definition of aggression, excluding any loopholes and subterfuges that an aggressor would want to use to justify an attack on other countries. Imperialist states—the

---

[125] **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 220.

USA, Britain, France, and others—refused to accept the Soviet draft. They were interested in leaving loopholes to justify aggression rather than closing them, precisely so that as many loopholes as possible would remain. But the sabotage of the imperialists could not shake the effectiveness of the Soviet declaration as a powerful tool for exposing aggressors. And it was not for nothing that 17 years after its creation, this declaration resounded across the world when the representative of the USSR in the Security Council, Y. A. Malik, on August 3, 1950, based on the Soviet definition of aggression given in 1933, irrefutably proved that the USA engaged in direct armed aggression against the Korean people.

At the Fifth and Sixth sessions of the UN General Assembly in 1950 and 1952, the Soviet Union resubmitted proposals defining aggression. But capitalist states, obeying American dictation, once again, as in 1933, evaded a precise definition of aggression under various pretexts that would preclude any excuse for it.

On April 11, 1951, the head of the Soviet delegation at the preliminary conference of deputy foreign ministers of the four powers, A. A. Gromyko, subjected the position of Western powers to sharp criticism, characterizing the Soviet Union's proposals for achieving lasting peace as "propaganda." Comrade Gromyko recalled that similar absurd statements were made back in the late 1920s in the League of Nations Preparatory Commission for Disarmament, when the Soviet representative pointed out that if the disarmament commission was an unsuitable place for peace propaganda, then the Soviet Union was in that commission by mistake. "We have reason to

say something similar now," said Comrade Gromyko. "If our conference... is an unsuitable place for peace propaganda, then, apparently, we are here by mistake."[126]

In the very first years of its existence, the Soviet government proclaimed the requirement for general arms reduction and, despite the refusal of imperialist powers to support this requirement at the Genoa Conference of 1922, reduced the size of its army by 25 percent that same year. In 1927 and 1928, the Soviet Union submitted a draft convention on general, complete, and immediate disarmament to the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, and when imperialist powers rejected it, proposed a draft for partial arms reduction. Shortly after the defeat of Hitlerite Germany and imperialist Japan, at the UN General Assembly in October 1946, the Soviet Union introduced a historic proposal for a general reduction of armaments, which included as a primary task the prohibition of the production and use of atomic energy for military purposes. A powerful response to the Soviet proposal from the popular masses across the world did not allow Anglo-American imperialists to evade it, and the General Assembly adopted a resolution on "Principles Governing the General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments." The Soviet Union steadfastly exposes the sabotage of the adopted proposal on arms reduction by the governments of the USA and Britain, demanding its prompt implementation.

The malicious and furious campaign of Anglo-American warmongers did not stop the noble efforts of the Soviet

---

126 Newspaper *Pravda*, April 12, 1951.

government. At UN General Assemblies, it repeatedly proposes to ban atomic weapons and reduce the armaments and armed forces of the five great powers by one-third. When it became known to the world that the US "monopoly" on the production and possession of atomic bombs was a fiction, the Soviet government declared that despite having atomic bombs, it stands not only against the use of atomic weapons, but also for its ban and cessation of production. By placing their signatures under the Stockholm Appeal and the Appeal of the World Peace Council, the Soviet people demonstrated their complete and unanimous approval of the peaceful Stalinist foreign policy of the Soviet government.

American imperialists and their henchmen cry about the "insincerity" of Soviet peace policy. In vain is the waste of effort! V. I. Lenin said in his time that "sincerity in politics, that is, in the sphere of human relations where we are dealing not with individuals, but with millions,—sincerity in politics is a fully testable correspondence between *word* and *deed*."[127] The sincerity of Stalin's peace policy has been tested by peoples and tested by history over more than a third of a century of the socialist state's existence. Nothing can shake the remarkable results of this test: neither malicious lies, vile slander, nor the deceitful and despicable maneuvers of imperialists.

***

The policy of the Soviet government aimed at defending state sovereignty, oppressed peoples, and those enslaved by imperialist powers is deeply scientific. Lenin and Stalin

[127] **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 24, p. 533.

showed that in the era of imperialism, national oppression intensifies to the extreme and that the national liberation movement of oppressed peoples has a historically progressive character. Lenin wrote: "Just as humanity can achieve the abolition of classes only through a transition period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, so can humanity achieve the inevitable fusion of nations only through a transition period of full liberation of all oppressed nations, i.e., their freedom of separation."[128] Lenin and Stalin always emphasized the necessity of equal relations between large and small nations.

Comrade Stalin clearly defined the theoretical basis of such relations: "Soviet people hold," said Comrade Stalin, "that every nation—whether big or small—has its own qualitative features, its own specific character, which belongs to it alone and which other nations do not have. These features constitute the contribution that each nation makes to the common treasury of world culture, enriching and supplementing it. In this sense, all nations—both small and big—are in the same position, and every nation is equal to any other nation."[129]

In its foreign policy, the Soviet state firmly follows this theoretical position developed by Comrade Stalin. In this sense, the Soviet government makes no distinction between large states with hundreds of millions of people and, for example, Albania, which has only 1 million inhabitants.

The Soviet state, steadfastly guarding its sovereignty against the encroachments of foreign imperialists, has always valiantly

---

[128] **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 135–136. See also **J. V. Stalin**, *Works*, Vol. 12, pp. 362–373.

[129] *"Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union"*, 1948, Part One, p. 24. 1950.

fought for the sovereignty of other countries against the threat of imperialist enslavement. It decisively stood for the sovereignty of China, Abyssinia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain, the Mongolian People's Republic, against Japanese imperialists and Hitlerite invaders.

During World War II, reactionary forces in France, Czechoslovakia, Norway, and several other European countries made shameful deals with Hitlerites at the expense of national independence.

When the Soviet Union, having crushed German fascism, liberated these countries from Hitler's yoke and restored their state independence, the popular masses showed their determination to take their fate into their own hands. The bourgeoisie feared this most of all. That is why it hurried to sell national sovereignty again—this time to American imperialism.

In 1918, Lenin said that when it comes to profits, the bourgeoisie sells its homeland and enters into commercial deals against its own people with any foreigners. More than a third of a century has passed since those words were spoken. Now, the question before the bourgeoisie is not only about profits, but about the very existence of the capitalist exploitation system. Naturally, the anti-popular trade of national sovereignty by the bourgeoisie has become immeasurably wider in scope, and more disastrous for the working masses.

Today, the leaders of the Conservatives and Labour in England, the Schumans, Plevens, and Mochs in France, De Gasperi in Italy, the Tsaldarises in Greece—in short, all

modern Quislings and Lavalists, relying on American aid as a means to preserve the power and profits of capitalists—commit even more shameful deals with Truman and Acheson than Pétain, Laval, and their likenesses concluded with Hitler in their time.

In the postwar period, the Soviet Union has stood and stands in defense of the sovereignty of European countries of popular democracy, Vietnam, Indonesia, China, and Korea against American aggressors and interveners, these suppressors of national independence. Exposing the cosmopolitan disguise of American policy aimed at liquidating the statehood of European and Asian countries, the Soviet Union tirelessly fights for the national sovereignty of large and small states, for equal rights of nations. This struggle has won the socialist state the warm gratitude of all peoples threatened by the iron heel of American imperialism.

Stalin's policy of defending national sovereignty acquires particularly important significance at the present time, when American imperialists have moved to the actual occupation of Western Europe, when American armed forces are deployed in the territory of England, France, and Italy, and American air and naval bases are created, and when the reactionary governments of these countries serve as mouthpieces for the ruling circles of the United States.

What enabled Soviet foreign policy to solve the problems of the struggle for state independence and sovereignty of large and small countries so correctly and consistently, making the Soviet Union the banner-bearer of the national independence of peoples? To this, only one answer can be given: the steadfast

implementation by the Bolshevik Party of the demands presented to Soviet foreign policy by Marxist-Leninist theory, primarily on the national question.

***

The brilliant theoretical propositions of Lenin and Stalin are the foundation of Soviet foreign policy for international cooperation, persistently pursued by the government of the USSR. Like other principles of Soviet foreign policy, the principle of international cooperation is based not on wishes and dreams, but on the Leninist-Stalinist analysis of the new historical era opened by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Comrade Stalin points out that at the beginning of the 20th century, especially during World War I, "Lenin, proceeding from Marxist theory, came to the conclusion that under the new conditions of capitalist development, the socialist revolution could fully win in one individual country, and that the simultaneous victory of the socialist revolution in all countries or in the majority of civilized countries was impossible due to the uneven maturation of revolution in these countries, and that the old formula of Marx and Engels no longer corresponded to the new historical conditions."^{1} As a result of a scientific analysis of concrete conditions, Lenin and Stalin established that the peaceful coexistence of the two systems—socialism and capitalism—is possible, and firmly adhere to the course of loyal, peace-loving relations with all states that express a desire for friendly cooperation on the condition of observing reciprocity and fulfilling obligations.

After World War II, Comrade Stalin repeatedly gave a clear answer regarding the absolute possibility of peaceful and long-

term cooperation between the USSR and capitalist countries. "Comrade Stalin—the leader of progressive humanity," writes G. M. Malenkov. Further, Malenkov recalls the content of Comrade Stalin's answers to Alexander Werth, Elliott Roosevelt, Stassen, Wallace, and Kingsbury Smith.

Despite these statements by the leader of the Soviet people and head of the Soviet government, American imperialists headed by Truman repeat the absurd lie that the opponent of international cooperation is... the Soviet Union. Articles and books are fabricated on this topic. About this, the "Voice of America" shouts in unison with the "BBC." Through this lie, American imperialists attempt to justify their military intervention in Korea, aggression against the People's Republic of China, the monstrous arms race, and the remilitarization of Western Germany, as well as the separate "treaty" with Japan pushed through by the USA in San Francisco.

The meaning of these subterfuges is clear. Exposed in their adventurous designs, warmongers want to deceive simple people with the false assertion that communists allegedly consider peaceful coexistence impossible. They want to cover up their criminal actions in preparing a new war with slander against the honest peace policy pursued by communists.

Harry Truman follows the "testament" of Adolf Hitler in this regard, who cynically stated that the task of war propaganda is to constantly prove one's own rightness, and not to seek objective truth. But Truman and his henchmen forget that such propaganda ended in shameful failure for the plans of the "Führer" and the defeat of Hitlerite Germany. Despite all the tricks and efforts of liars and slanderers—the leaders of the

Anglo-American aggressive bloc—peoples reject malicious, anti-Soviet slander and know that the truth is on the side of the Soviet Union. Simple people in all countries are accustomed to comparing words with deeds. They see that on all vital issues of world politics, the Soviet Union strives to find solutions based on international cooperation. It is the Soviet Union that, in contrast to the Anglo-American aggressive bloc, insists on concluding a Peace Pact between the five great powers. It demands that issues like the German problem or the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan, the elimination of American intervention in Korea, and aggression against the People's Republic of China be resolved in the spirit of international cooperation, not American dictation. The Soviet Union, at the Sixth Session of the UN General Assembly, as in previous ones, fought against the aggressive core of the UN, for the United Nations to fulfill the goals of preserving peace and strengthening international cooperation for which it was created in 1945.

All these are facts, life, reality; no sophisticated lie can convince millions of simple people around the world that the Soviet Union is not a true supporter of international cooperation, and that its sworn enemies are the reactionary governments of the North Atlantic aggressive bloc, primarily the United States of America.

The policy of international cooperation pursued by the Soviet Union enabled it to expose American imperialists as enemies of such cooperation, as provocateurs and warmongers to the whole world. Stalin's policy of international cooperation served as the foundation for the rapidly growing movement of peace

advocates in all countries, and for the formation of an organized world peace front. The prerequisites for the success of this policy lie in its solid theoretical foundation, developed by Comrade Stalin from scientific Marxist-Leninist propositions on the possibility of the coexistence of two opposing social systems.

***

Of paramount importance for the foreign policy of the socialist state are the Leninist-Stalinist propositions on the necessity of utilizing the internal contradictions of the capitalist system in the interests of peace and the struggle against imperialist war adventures.

Just as Marx and Engels studied the anatomy of capitalist society in its pre-monopoly stage, Lenin and Stalin studied the structure and internal processes inherent to imperialism. This study showed that imperialism is characterized by deep, ever-sharpening contradictions that are irremovable within the framework of the capitalist system. The presence of these contradictions is by no means merely of theoretical interest for the world's first socialist state and other countries breaking away from capitalism. The merit of Lenin and Stalin lies in the fact that, having established the fundamental contradictions in the development of capitalism, they demonstrated the necessity for a socialist state to utilize them in its foreign policy in the interests of peace and strengthening socialism.

History has brilliantly confirmed the correctness of the Leninist-Stalinist analysis of the concrete conditions of the material life of society and its importance for the foreign policy of the Soviet state. Thus, the contradictions between the victor

states in World War I—Britain, the USA, France—and defeated Germany were used by the Soviet state during the Brest period to gain a vital breathing space for young Soviet Russia. During the period of foreign military intervention, the Soviet state used the contradictions between the Entente and the USA, on the one hand, and small states, on the other, as well as Japanese-American and other contradictions, to weaken the pressure of interveners and split their camp.

In the subsequent twenty years, the Stalinist foreign policy of the Soviet Union utilized the contradictions inherent to the imperialist system to delay a new war, to prevent an attack by imperialists on the Country of Soviets as a united front. "The wise Stalinist foreign policy of the Soviet state both before the war and during the war," says Comrade Malenkov, "allowed us to correctly utilize the contradictions within the camp of imperialism, and this was one of the important conditions for our victory in the war."^{1}

In the postwar period, American imperialism, this new contender for world domination, trampling on the national independence of large and small bourgeois countries, moved to direct aggression against Korea and China, preparing a new world war. The presence of an aggressive bloc of imperialists, headed by the USA, by no means means that these contradictions have weakened or diminished. On the contrary, they are deepening, becoming ever sharper and tenser. The Soviet Union—the leading force of the anti-imperialist camp, the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism—uses the unprecedentedly sharpened contradictions of the imperialist system in the interests of peace.

Soviet foreign policy reinforces the trend toward continuing peaceful relations with the USSR, toward developing economic ties between capitalist countries and the Soviet state, in contrast to trends toward adventurous attacks on the USSR and a new war. The fact that the first trend exists in capitalist countries and has a solid basis for development is proven by facts. Despite all efforts by American imperialists to force their satellites to follow a policy of economic isolation against the Soviet Union without exception, they have failed. Even Britain and France have signed new trade agreements with the Soviet Union in the past six months. An even clearer example is the wide response found in business and public circles of capitalist countries to the initiative to convene an international economic conference in Moscow in April of this year to study practical means of expanding economic ties between peoples.

***

Marxist-Leninist theory requires historicism in assessing the attitude of the party toward social phenomena.

In the classic works of Comrade Stalin, *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* and *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, the deep significance of a concrete-historical approach to social phenomena for the policy of the Bolshevik Party is revealed. A phenomenon that is fully acceptable and lawful under certain conditions, representing a step forward compared to what existed before, must be evaluated completely differently when conditions change and it becomes a relic of the past, a brake on historical development. "Everything depends on conditions, place, and time,"^{1} points out Comrade Stalin.

Based on the granite foundation of Marxist-Leninist theory, the foreign policy of the Soviet state, like its domestic policy, is devoid of any dogmatism.

Stalinist foreign policy implements a historical approach to events in full measure. It is known, for example, that from the moment the League of Nations was created over thirteen years, the Soviet Union treated it extremely negatively. Created as a "sacred alliance" against the Soviet Republic and against the revolutionary proletariat in capitalist countries, the League of Nations was from its very first day an instrument of imperialists, their weapon in the darkest deeds, especially those directed against the USSR. In 1934, shortly after Hitler came to power in Germany, when a hotbed of a new world war emerged in Europe, the international situation changed. A comprehensive accounting of this new situation, taken in all its conditionality as required by dialectical materialism, determined a different attitude of the Soviet Union toward the League of Nations than before.

Answering a question from the correspondent of the American newspaper *The New York Times*, Duranty, at the end of 1933: "Is your position toward the League of Nations always exclusively negative?", Comrade Stalin said: "No, not always and not under all conditions... if the League can turn out to be a minor impediment on the path to war and facilitate the cause of peace to some extent, then we are not against the League. Yes, if such will be the course of historical events, it is not excluded that we will support the League of Nations despite its colossal defects."^{2}

It is known that the Soviet Union, guided by Stalin's instructions, entered the League of Nations in 1934 upon the invitation of thirty states and did everything depending on it so that the League of Nations would at least somewhat hamper the cause of fascist aggressors and facilitate the cause of peace. Six years passed. At the end of 1939, the bankrupt Finnish rulers from the Mannerheim-Tanner clique, supported by American, British, and French imperialists, as well as Hitler, provoked a war with the Soviet Union. Obedient to Britain, the USA, and France, the Council of the League of Nations supported the Finnish aggressors and set out on the path of further unleashing war. Since the Soviet Union was the only force in the League of Nations capable of opposing the vile plans of warmongers and exposing their aggressive policy, the imperialists of Britain, the USA, and France decided to get rid of the USSR as a member of the League of Nations. Through dirty manipulations of the composition of the League of Nations Council, they pushed through a decision to "exclude" the USSR from the League of Nations. A TASS report authorized by authoritative Soviet circles to evaluate this resolution noted the changed role of the League of Nations, pointing to its inglorious evolution, which turned the League of Nations into a actual instrument of the Anglo-French military bloc. The TASS report also noted that the authority of the League of Nations was undermined and an atmosphere of political reaction and moral decay reigned in its "spheres."[130]

[130] See newspaper *Izvestia*, December 16, 1939.

It is known that the Soviet assessment of the League of Nations Council's resolution was fully confirmed by subsequent events. The scandalous decision of the League of Nations proved to be evidence of its inglorious end.

The historical approach of Stalin's foreign policy to international events and institutions was also manifested in relation to the Soviet Union's stance on the United Nations Organization.

Even during the war, J. V. Stalin set the task of creating a special organization to protect peace and ensure the security of peoples. Recalling the lessons of the past, Comrade Stalin said: "This should not be a repetition of the sad memory of the League of Nations, which had neither rights nor means to prevent aggression."[131]

J. V. Stalin clearly defined under what conditions the United Nations Organization could be effective. "Can we count on the actions of this international organization being sufficiently effective? They will be effective if the great powers that bore the main burden of the war against Hitlerite Germany continue to act in a spirit of unanimity and harmony. They will not be effective if this necessary condition is violated."[132]

All activities of the Soviet government in the United Nations, the Security Council, and its other organs steadfastly pursue the goal of creating an effective international organization for the protection of world peace. All positive achievements in the

---

[131] **J. V. Stalin.** *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 168. 1951.

[132] *Ibid.*

UN's work are explained precisely by this persistent line of the Soviet government.

The Soviet government exposed the undermining carried out against the UN by the ruling circles of the USA and Britain, who turned to an openly aggressive political course. The reason for this undermining, as explained in the statement of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the North Atlantic Pact, lies in the fact that the United Nations "to some extent hinders and restrains aggressive circles in their policy of aggression and unleashing a new war." The Soviet government sees its task in fighting even more firmly against the destruction of the United Nations.

Since those words were written, three years have passed. During this time, American-British aggressors have gone further in their criminal designs. Using the UN banner in the most despicable way, they launched a bloody intervention in Korea and declared the People's Republic of China an aggressor. Naturally, due to the aggressive policy of the USA and its satellites, the United Nations itself ceased to be the organization it was in 1945–1946 and even in 1949. These qualitative changes were subjected to a deep analysis by Comrade Stalin in his conversation with a *Pravda* correspondent published on February 17, 1951. "The United Nations Organization, created as a bulwark for maintaining peace, is turning into an instrument of war, a means for unleashing a new world war," pointed out Comrade Stalin. "...Transforming into an instrument of aggressive war, the UN simultaneously ceases to be a world organization of equal nations. In fact, the UN is now not so much a world

organization as an organization for Americans, acting to serve the needs of American aggressors... The United Nations Organization is thus stepping onto the inglorious path of the League of Nations. It buries its moral authority and condemns itself to decay."

Thus, Stalin's analysis enables us to comprehend complex social phenomena in action, movement, and development.

***

Marx and Engels pointed out over a hundred years ago that as the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in capitalist society sharpens, the bourgeoisie increasingly resorts to "empty idealizing phrases, conscious illusions, and deliberate hypocrisy." But the more their falsehood is exposed by life... the more hypocritical, moralistic, and "sacred" becomes the language of this society...^{2}

The requirement presented by Marxist-Leninist theory to the policy of the Bolshevik Party—to expose the true predatory nature of imperialist policy—is especially important when it comes to international relations. Lenin emphasized in his time that "the ignorance of the mass of the population regarding foreign policy is incomparably broader than ignorance in domestic policy... The deception of the masses of the people is artistically developed regarding foreign policy 'affairs'."^{3} In foreign policy matters, the bourgeoisie finds it easier to pose as the representative of supposedly "national" interests, easier to cover up imperialist deeds with talk of "national unity," "state tasks," etc. It is clear that for a capitalist state it is easier to

mask the true nature of its foreign function than the nature of its domestic function—keeping the exploited majority in check.

The great historical merit of Soviet foreign policy consists in mercilessly exposing false declarations, hypocritical speeches, false pathos, and oily babble of imperialists, with which they mask their predatory plans and actions. Soviet foreign policy does not leave them unpunished, expressing in the words of Saltykov-Shchedrin, "to correct villainies with loud phrases."

Capitalist diplomacy, as stated in a Soviet document, "has sufficient reason to fear the light of day."

With bright rays of light, Soviet foreign policy illuminates everything that imperialists try so hard to hide. When Woodrow Wilson deafened the world with propaganda chatter about "democracy," "pacifism," and "unselfish aid," which supposedly constituted the subject of all dreams and thoughts of the USA at the end of World War I, Lenin and Stalin mercilessly exposed this Pharisee and hypocrite as the head of American billionaires, a servant of capitalist sharks. Lenin demonstrated with ultimate clarity that the USA was an "idealized democratic republic... which turned out in reality to be a form of the most furious imperialism, the most shameless oppression and throttling of small and weak peoples."[133] Back in 1919, when Wilson and his associates, primarily Hoover, spoke at length about aid, which they allegedly intended to provide to small nations out of "pious motives," Comrade Stalin stated: "Socialism will use all possibilities to open the

[133] Newspaper *Pravda*, January 29, 1949.

eyes of workers and peasants of these nations regarding the predatory nature of 'paternal cares' of imperialism."[134]

Under the banner of "paternal care" for Germany, American monopolies glorified the "Dawes Plan" in its time. The Locarno agreement of imperialists was advertised as the beginning of an "era of eternal peace." Comrade Stalin showed that behind this verbiage, intended only to deceive the popular masses, lay predatory designs of imperialists—warmongers of World War II. At the London Conference, where the "Dawes Plan" was adopted, Comrade Stalin said that it "is the fullest expression of deceitful, false bourgeois-democratic pacifism."[135]

Comrade Stalin exposed the anti-Soviet edge of the "Dawes Plan" just as he exposed the Locarno collusion of imperialists. "Locarno is a plan for regrouping forces for a new war, not for peace"—such was the conclusion drawn by Comrade Stalin. "Whether it is the League of Nations or Locarno—it makes no difference, you won't fool us with a banner, you won't scare us with noise!"[136]

When thirteen years after Locarno imperialists tried to cover up a new deal against the Soviet Union with pacifist talk, concluded in September 1938 in Munich, Comrade Stalin exposed the true meaning of the Munich deal, pointing out that a policy of "non-intervention" in reality means "connivance with aggression, unleashing war—consequently, transforming

---

134 **K. Marx and F. Engels.** *The German Ideology*, p. 273. 1933.

135 **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 67.

136 **J. V. Stalin.** *Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 276, 296.

it into a world war."[137] Speaking directly about the conditions of the Munich deal, Comrade Stalin noted that "the Germans were given districts of Czechoslovakia as the price for an obligation to start a war with the Soviet Union."[138]

Peoples of the whole world will forever preserve gratitude to Comrade Stalin in their hearts for tearing the mask off the Munich colluders.

Stalinist foreign policy in the postwar period continues the noble cause of exposing warmongers, American and British aggressors. No matter how Churchill covered up his program of aggression set forth in his Fulton speech, Comrade Stalin then exposed this inveterate warmonger by calling for a wide counter-propaganda effort against warmongers.

This position guides the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Appearing in 1947, the "Marshall Plan" was portrayed by American imperialists and their satellites as evidence of the "generosity" of the USA. The Soviet Union immediately exposed the true meaning of the "Marshall Plan" as a plan for enslaving European countries by American imperialism.

Taking into account the mood of the popular masses, American imperialists tried to disguise their preparation for war with "peaceful" maneuvers. They issued notes and messages stating that they supposedly did not object to resolving all disputed issues with the Soviet Union on a peaceful basis. They even agreed to the "coordination" of certain decisions, as was the case during the discussion of the "Berlin question" in Moscow

---

137 **J. V. Stalin.** *Problems of Leninism*, p. 570, 11th ed.

138 *Ibid.*, p. 572.

in August and in unofficial talks in Paris in October 1948. But then these agreed decisions were declared non-existent by the USA and Britain. Comrade Stalin tore the mask off these maneuvering politicians. In his answer to questions from a *Pravda* correspondent, Comrade Stalin said: "The point is that the inspirers of aggressive policy in the USA and Britain do not consider themselves interested in agreement and cooperation with the USSR... Warmongers fear agreements with the USSR most of all."[139]

By this position, Soviet foreign policy exposes warmongers in a timely manner, preventing them from abusing freedom of speech against the interests of peace.

The false peace banner usually hides the aggressive designs and actions of imperialists. The lengthy statement of the US State Department on the North Atlantic Pact of January 14, 1949 bore the loud title: "Building Peace in the North Atlantic Area." But the Soviet Union tore off this mask, convincingly proving that the North Atlantic Pact is an aggressive pact aiming to unleash a new war and establish American-British world domination.

At the Sixth Session of the UN General Assembly, representatives of the Soviet Union headed by A. Y. Vyshinsky showed that proposals of the American-British bloc on "regulation" and "balanced" armaments are in fact merely a cover for a further arms race.

---

[139] *Answers of Comrade J. V. Stalin to Questions of the "Associated Press" Correspondent*, 1946, p. 2.

It is known that American and British warmongers use the Tito clique of traitors and spies for their dark deeds. This gang, carrying out tasks for US and British intelligence, masked its true policy with false babble about an "authentically democratic, socialist character of popular power" in Yugoslavia. The historical merit of Comrade Stalin and the Soviet government lies in exposing the present Yugoslav rulers as rampant fascist warmongers.

In a conversation with a *Pravda* correspondent published on February 17, 1951, Comrade Stalin exposed the slander of former Prime Minister Attlee. Comrade Stalin showed that slander against the Soviet Union was necessary for Attlee to justify the arms race carried out by the Labour government in England.[140]

Historic speeches by Comrade Stalin on international issues, as well as diplomatic documents of the Soviet government, speeches by its representatives at UN Assemblies, in the Security Council, at international conferences, and speeches by representatives of the Soviet public at peace congresses, clearly demonstrate how the Soviet Union carries out its noble mission of exposing imperialists. No matter what colorful labels cover aggressive plans, the Soviet Union tears off all covers, illuminating the dark back alleys of imperialist diplomacy. It does not allow imperialists to go unpunished in deceiving and fooling the working masses.

Capitalist diplomacy, as indicated in one Soviet document, "has sufficient reason to fear the light of day."

---

[140] Newspaper *Pravda*, October 29, 1948.

Soviet foreign policy illuminates everything that imperialists try so hard to hide. When Woodrow Wilson deafened the world with propaganda chatter about "democracy," "pacifism," and "unselfish aid," Lenin and Stalin mercilessly exposed this Pharisee and hypocrite as a servant of capitalist sharks. Lenin showed that the USA was an "idealized democratic republic... which turned out in reality to be a form of the most furious imperialism, the most shameless oppression and throttling of small and weak peoples."

Comrade Stalin exposed the anti-Soviet edge of the "Dawes Plan" just as he exposed the Locarno collusion. "Locarno is a plan for regrouping forces for a new war, not for peace"—such was the conclusion drawn by Comrade Stalin.

Postwar Soviet foreign policy continues the noble cause of exposing warmongers, American and British aggressors. No matter how Churchill covered up his program of aggression set forth in his Fulton speech, Comrade Stalin then exposed this inveterate warmonger, calling for a wide counter-propaganda effort against warmongers.

The Soviet Union tore off the mask from the "Marshall Plan" as a plan for enslaving European countries.

American imperialists tried to disguise their preparation for war with "peaceful" maneuvers. In his answer to questions from a *Pravda* correspondent, Comrade Stalin said: "The point is that the inspirers of aggressive policy in the USA and Britain do not consider themselves interested in agreement and

cooperation with the USSR... Warmongers fear agreements with the USSR most of all."[141]

At the Sixth Session of the UN General Assembly, representatives of the Soviet Union showed that the proposals of the American-British bloc on "regulation" and "balanced" armaments are in fact merely a cover for a further arms race.

The historical merit of Comrade Stalin and the Soviet government lies in exposing the present Yugoslav rulers as rampant fascists, who, serving as an instrument of the aggressive policy of the USA and Britain, liquidated the independence of Yugoslavia.

In a conversation with a *Pravda* correspondent published on February 17, 1951, Comrade Stalin exposed the slander of former Prime Minister Attlee. Comrade Stalin showed that slander against the Soviet Union was necessary for Attlee to justify the arms race.

Historic speeches by Comrade Stalin on international issues, diplomatic documents of the Soviet government, and speeches by its representatives at UN Assemblies clearly demonstrate how the Soviet Union carries out its noble mission of exposing imperialists. The Soviet Union tears off all covers, illuminating the dark back alleys of imperialist diplomacy. It does not allow imperialists to go unpunished in deceiving the popular masses. The intentions, plans, and actions of imperialists aimed at unleashing a new war appear before peoples in their unvarnished, hideous form. It is not for nothing that bourgeois

---

141 **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 28, p. 169.

historians are forced to state that Soviet diplomacy is characterized by a tendency to call things by their real names. Not without reason, when the Soviet Union expressed its attitude toward the "Marshall Plan," the London *Times* regretted that Soviet diplomacy was accustomed to having "everything indicated in black and white."

The Soviet Union, to the greatest indignation of imperialists, steadfastly achieves that in international policy everything is indicated in black and white.

How imperialists fear the influence of Soviet diplomacy on the working people of capitalist countries is vividly evidenced by the speech of the reactionary English journal *The Economist* regarding the publication in England of a diplomatic collection of Soviet documents. Despite the biased selection of documents, *The Economist* frankly stated that "all readers should use this book, of course, together with books by non-Soviet... authors. Otherwise, they may fall victim to... revolutionary propaganda contained in almost every document."[142]

To Comrade Stalin, to Stalinist foreign policy, the Soviet people and the peoples of the whole world owe the fact that they recognize the beastly grin of imperialist predators under the pious mask.

***

[142] *The Economist*, p. 212, 28.VII. 1951.

"In order not to make mistakes in policy, one must look forward, not backward,"—teaches Comrade Stalin... "One must orient oneself not on those strata of society that are no longer developing... but on those strata that are developing, have a future, even if they do not represent the prevailing force at the present moment."[143]

For Soviet foreign policy, this instruction is of paramount importance. When the Soviet government came forward on October 26, 1917, with a proposal for an immediate democratic peace, the popular masses in all countries supported it. The rulers of the East and West, who do not see these forces and do not reckon with them, will suffer from this... Truth and justice are entirely on the side of the Chinese revolution. That is why we sympathize with and will sympathize with the struggle of the Chinese people for their liberation. Whoever does not reckon with this force will surely lose...[144]

As is known, the Chinese people, who always enjoyed the support of the Soviet Union, routed the armies of Chiang Kai-shek. The reactionary dictatorship of the Kuomintang was not helped by billions of American dollars, American weapons, and equipment. As Comrade Stalin predicted, American monopolists and their government headed by Truman lost. The popular revolution in China won, and the result of this victory was the formation of the People's Republic of China.

During the war years, the German people found themselves under the heel of Hitler. This dictatorship became the

---

143 *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Short Course*, p. 106.

144 **J. V. Stalin.** *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 46.

prevailing force in the country and was able to start an aggressive war. American and British imperialists, as in old times, oriented themselves toward the German bourgeoisie. They did not want to reckon with the German people and calculated that after the defeat of Hitler's regime in Germany, the power of German monopolists would be established.

Comrade Stalin during the war years pointed out that one cannot identify the German people with Hitler's rulers. "The experience of history says," Comrade Stalin pointed out, "that Hitlers come and go, but the German people, the German state remains."

After the defeat of fascism, the Soviet Union provided all-round assistance to the democratic forces of Germany, fighting for democratic unity, demilitarization, and denazification. Relying on this unselfish, sincere help and support, Germans in Eastern Germany created the German Democratic Republic. Its formation, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, was a turning point in the history of Europe. The German Democratic Republic raised high the banner of struggle for democratic unity and peace. All events of recent times speak to the fact that the future belongs not to the Adenauers, but to the German people building a new life on the territory of Eastern Germany.

On June 25, 1950, American imperialists began a bloody intervention in Korea, counting on a quick and easy victory. They looked backward and found in the past, in former colonial wars, the experience of such victories. American troops were able to advance north. But already in the initial period of intervention, Comrade Stalin saw that the people of Korea would be able to rebuff the invaders. This confidence in

the strength of the Korean people was expressed by Comrade Stalin in a reply telegram to Comrade Kim Il Sung. American interveners as a result of 20 months of military operations found themselves at a dead end.

American imperialists occupied Japan and are turning it into their military base for new adventures against the USSR, China, and other neighboring states. In doing so, American occupiers shamelessly trample on the elementary rights of the Japanese people. Ridgway, together with his agents, looks backward, into the past, when the Japanese people were voiceless.

Comrade Stalin in his New Year message to the Japanese people wished them freedom and happiness, and full success in their courageous struggle for independence. Peoples of the Soviet Union deeply sympathize with the Japanese people, who fell into misfortune due to foreign occupation.

This firm confidence stems from the fact that Comrade Stalin looks forward, sees the potential forces of the Japanese people in their development. Comrade Stalin sees that the future of Japan belongs to the Japanese people, and not to Ridgways and puppets.

Recognition of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and a number of other examples also testify to the fact that the Soviet Union does not make mistakes in foreign policy because it looks forward, not backward.

***

More than a quarter of a century ago, Comrade Stalin emphasized that our party conducts a scientific policy, that its

slogans have a scientific foundation. The scientific nature of Stalin's foreign policy determines its activity, creative character, unprecedented consistency, and firmness.

The scientific foundation of this policy means that the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet government firmly know the route of the historical development of society. In Stalin's foreign policy, clarity of purpose and persistence in its implementation are inherently present.

All these qualities are vividly manifested in the diplomatic actions of the Soviet government. In each of them—whether a note or statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, or a speech by a Soviet representative at international conferences—the true truth always sounds, breaking all false and deceitful inventions of imperialists. Stalin's foreign policy confirms with its every step the words of the great Lenin that "honesty in politics is the result of strength, hypocrisy is the result of weakness."[145]

The foreign policy of American imperialists—the leaders of the aggressive bloc—fiercely opposes the laws of social development. American imperialists and their satellites hate the successes of building communism in the USSR, which leads to the emergence and strengthening of states of popular democracy in Europe and Asia, the successes of the German Democratic Republic, the historic victories of the People's Republic of China, and the growth of the influence of communist parties. Back in 1946, Comrade Stalin pointed out that imperialists, primarily American and British, do not like

---

145 **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 17, p. 138.

such a development of events, and appeal to force. But such an appeal to force in relation to the Soviet Union always turned out to be a boomerang that hit the attacker. History has shown many examples that the independence and honor of the Soviet state are always sacred for the government of the USSR.

Thus, in the summer of 1918, after the provocative assassination of the German ambassador in Moscow, Mirbach, organized by Left SRs and Trotskyites, the German government of Kaiser Wilhelm proposed to the Soviet government to pass a battalion of German soldiers to Moscow. Soviet Russia was much weaker in a military sense than Germany, but in the Soviet government's reply, iron firmness resounded. Lenin declared that if German imperialists insist on their demand, the Soviet government will be forced to respond as it already responded to the actions of foreign interveners—with intensified mobilization, calling all adult workers and peasants to armed resistance. "War would become fatal for us then, but an unconditional necessity, and this revolutionary war workers and peasants of Russia will conduct hand in hand with Soviet power to the last breath."[146]

The defeat of foreign interveners in 1918–1920 showed that for the party of Lenin-Stalin, the words of the Soviet government do not diverge from deeds.

In 1922, on the eve of and during the Genoa Conference, the Soviet government gave a decisive rebuff to attempts by foreign imperialists to force Russia to surrender. "We have seen enough threats... We saw threats by cannons from the side

146 **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 498–499.

of allied powers in whose hands almost the whole world is located. We were not frightened by these threats," said Lenin then.

A year later, the British Conservative government presented the Soviet Union with an ultimatum. Despite the direct threat of war, the Soviet government did not yield to intimidation. It declared that imperialists vainly think to establish proper relations with Soviet republics through ultimatums and threats.

At the most critical moments, the party of Lenin-Stalin and the Soviet government steadfastly defended the sovereignty of the socialist state. So it was before the Great Patriotic War, during the war, and after the war. All encroachments on independence and sovereign rights from the American-British aggressive bloc meet a constant rebuff from Stalin's foreign policy.

Anti-Soviet attacks and assaults by representatives of the US government, masked by loud phrases, characterize the foreign policy of the United States of America. Comrade Stalin noted in his time that the unwillingness to reckon with facts and the objective course of events leads to adventures in policy.

The foreign policy course of Truman-Acheson is characterized by wild tossing, a heap of various "plans" intended to hide the true essence of the intentions of American imperialists—warmongers of World War III. Is not the attempt of US rulers to dictate their will to the Soviet Union an adventure? Is not the American intervention in Korea an adventure? Is not the American aggressive law of October 10, 1951 on funding bands of terrorists sent into the USSR an adventure by its very nature?

Behind this adventurous policy lies a desire to turn back the wheel of world history, to subject all peoples to the rule of American monopolies. The lessons of history are forgotten by new contenders for world domination.

They ended their career by suicide in the cellar of the Reich Chancellery in Berlin or on the gallows in Nuremberg.

The Soviet people clearly realize—and millions of simple people around the world have come to this realization—that if the harm that an ordinary adventurer can cause is limited in scope, the danger of the policy of people standing at the head of states and ignoring the laws of history is extraordinarily great for the popular masses of the entire world.

That is why the Soviet Union, along with calls to the peoples of the world to vigorously unfold the struggle for peace, does not forget the need to strengthen the defense capability of the country. Scientific analysis lies at the heart of the practical instruction given by Comrade Stalin before World War II: "We must keep our entire people in a state of mobilization readiness in the face of the danger of a military attack, so that no 'accident' can catch us by surprise..."[147]

***

Marxist-Leninist theory teaches that the key to the invincibility of Bolshevik leadership is its inseparable connection with the working masses, with the people. "The bourgeoisie considers a state strong only when it can, with the full power of the government apparatus, throw the masses where bourgeois

---

[147] *Letter to Comrade Ivanov and Answer by Comrade Stalin*, p. 14. 1938.

rulers want," said Lenin. "Our idea of strength is different. In our view, a state is strong through the consciousness of the masses. It is strong when the masses know everything, can judge everything, and go into everything consciously."[148]

From the very first day of the Soviet state's emergence, the party and government constantly keep the people informed about all foreign policy events. Reports by Lenin and Stalin at party congresses and Congresses of Soviets reveal the meaning of events taking place in the world arena, defining the foreign policy line of the Soviet government. A deep analysis of the international situation is given in the speeches of Comrade Stalin in the postwar period.

In the Soviet press, important diplomatic documents are published, including correspondence between the Soviet government and foreign states. The very style of Soviet diplomacy reflects the truth of Stalin's foreign policy. Foreign policy problems occupy a large place in all mass-political work of the party. Over thirty-some years, the Bolshevik Party has raised the people so that the political level of Soviet people and their understanding of world policy is incomparably higher than among people living under capitalist conditions.

Back in 1925, André Marty noted that "one of the most striking phenomena in Soviet Russia is the amazing interest shown by working people in primary sources regarding the international situation..."

---

148 **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 224.

In our time, objective observers speak of this. The English progressive journalist Ralph Parker notes that in the Soviet Union, broad masses are interested in international affairs like in no other country. The French progressive publicist Jean Cathala writes that he always admired the deep political culture of the Soviet people.

Educating Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism in the masses, the party keeps the working people in a state of mobilization readiness in the face of the threat of a new world war.

The realization by Soviet people of the fact that the party and government are doing everything possible to protect the vital interests of the country ensures all-national support for Stalin's foreign policy. Behind every diplomatic note of the Soviet government stands the unyielding will of the 200-million-strong Soviet people.

The genuine popular character of Stalin's foreign policy shows that the party in its activity in the international arena relies on the most important principle of Marxist-Leninist theory—on the inseparable connection of Bolshevik leadership with the masses.

***

Being creative by its nature and alien to dogmatism, Soviet foreign policy always demonstrates the greatest activity. It never occupies a position of passive defense; Soviet diplomacy always actively advances against the enemies of the country of socialism, against the enemies of peace and warmongers. It tirelessly exposes their machinations. Being extremely flexible,

Soviet diplomacy remains loyal to the principles of communism, the general line of the party, always having its main goals and key tasks before it. Finding weak spots and cracks in the enemy camp, it skillfully strikes blows, always retaining the initiative. This is forced to be admitted even by enemies. Thus, one of the advocates of American aggressive policy, the warmonger Burnham, writes: "In the UN and at all international conferences, Soviet representatives hold ideological initiative in their hands..."

The activity of Stalin's foreign policy reflects its scientific basis and the forward movement of socialism.

"The power of Marxist-Leninist theory," points out Comrade Stalin, "consists in the fact that it gives the party the opportunity to orient itself in a situation, to understand the internal connection of surrounding events, to foresee the course of events, and to recognize not only how and where events are developing in the present, but also how and where they must develop in the future."[149]

Marxist-Leninist theory determined the enormous advantage of Soviet foreign policy, which consists in the fact that it does not indulge in blind policy. Back in early 1918, the ruling circles of the Entente considered that German imperialism still possessed huge power. It is known that the Allied command planned a campaign for 1919. But Lenin and Stalin saw that behind the imposing appearance of the German war machine lay its growing weakness. This foresight enabled the party to correctly

---

149 *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Short Course*, p. 339.

orient its foreign policy. The empire of Wilhelm soon collapsed.

Later, during World War II, Anglo-Franco-American imperialists calculated that they would manage to organize a campaign against the USSR. For this campaign, broad preparations were undertaken: provocation of the Soviet-Finnish war, military support provided to White Finns, active operations against the USSR near its southern borders, the "phoney war" on the Western Front, and the flight of Hess to England aimed at reaching an agreement directed against the USSR.

However, Comrade Stalin foresaw and wisely evaluated the forces of the popular masses, who felt sympathy for the country of socialism. Based on brilliant Stalinist analysis, Soviet foreign policy achieved success in organizing the anti-Hitler coalition led by the Soviet Union.

After World War II, American imperialists calculated that they would manage to intimidate the Soviet Union and popular democracy countries. But Comrade Stalin saw that American imperialists overestimated their forces and that the main danger for the camp of democracy and socialism lay in underestimating one's own forces and overestimating the enemy. Back in early 1946, Comrade Stalin declared that millions of simple people stand guard over peace. "They, the 'simple people,' " said Comrade Stalin, "have their own views, their own policy, and they know how to stand up for themselves." This position of Comrade Stalin became one of the foundations of postwar Soviet foreign policy.

***

The criterion of the correctness of a theory is practice. Comrade Stalin repeatedly reminded us that parties, governments, and their policies are judged not by programs and declarations, but by their deeds and the results of their activities. What are the results of the historical test of the foreign policy of the Bolshevik Party and Soviet government over a third of a century?

Stalin's foreign policy actively contributed to creating conditions for building a socialist society and the gradual transition to communism in our country. It helped delay the war of imperialist aggressors against the USSR until socialism was built and strengthened in the Soviet Union. Under the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the power of the working class grew in the USSR, and the national liberation movement grew in colonial and dependent countries.

During the war, Soviet foreign policy played a great role in strengthening the anti-Hitler coalition, in exposing and liquidating the attempts of Hitlerites and Anglo-American imperialist reaction to break this coalition, and in the defeat of Hitlerite fascism and Japanese imperialism.

After the victory achieved under the decisive role of the Soviet Union, Stalin's foreign policy for nearly seven years has been successfully conducting a struggle against new contenders for world domination—American-British warmongers—for a lasting, democratic, and just peace.

The international position of the great socialist power during these years has strengthened. "Never in the course of its history

has our Homeland had such justly... established borders...—says G. M. Malenkov.—Never in the course of its history has our Homeland been surrounded by countries so friendly to our state."[150]

The policy of peace, equality, and independence of nationalities, true democracy—the socialist foreign policy pursued by the Soviet Union—corresponds by its very nature to the interests of the popular masses across the entire globe.

Before all honest people of the globe, the world-historical significance of Stalin's foreign policy of the Soviet Union stands out clearly. The tasks of this policy fully coincide with the interests of working humanity. Peoples of the world are grateful to the Soviet Union for steadfastly defending their state sovereignty and independence. The historical experience and present day of Soviet foreign policy inspire confidence, courage, and bravery in the hearts of simple people in all countries, warning them against underestimating their own forces.

Peoples of all countries are grateful to the great banner-bearer of peace, Comrade Stalin. Life itself and reality convince them that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, guided by Comrade Stalin and relying on the open classics of Marxism-Leninism, is the only correct policy expressing the interests of simple people across the world. "The guiding thought that determines both the development and concrete steps of foreign policy of the USSR... is the thought not only of the Chairman of the

---

[150] **G. M. Malenkov.** *32nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, pp. 5–6.

Council of Ministers—Stalin, but of Stalin—the Marxist philosopher,"—writes the French progressive writer Cathala. "Lenin and Stalin,—continues Cathala,—belong not only to the history of governments, but also to the history of philosophy. The Soviet Union finds the realization of the long-standing dream of thinking humanity... about the unity of the statesman and philosopher."[151]

All speeches by Comrade Stalin on international relations and foreign policy of the Soviet Union, all practical activities of Soviet diplomacy guided by him, are classic examples of the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory. In pre-war years, Stalin's wise instructions on the tasks of our foreign policy, and Stalin's skill as leader, ensured major victories for the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Guiding himself by the instructions of Comrade Stalin, the government of the Soviet Union frustrated the vile plans of warmongers.

"Comrade Stalin gave examples of a scientific solution to problems of international relations and foreign policy of the USSR under conditions of wartime and the postwar period."[152]

In the postwar years, Comrade Stalin repeatedly spoke on questions of international relations and foreign policy of the Soviet Union. In these speeches, a deep Marxist-Leninist analysis of the international situation and events in the world arena is given. Each of the leader's speeches mercilessly exposes American aggressors as enemies of peace and security

---

151 **Jean Cathala.** *L'URSS contre la guerre*, p. 251. Paris. 1948.

152 *Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin. Short Biography*, pp. 175–176, 232.

of peoples, enemies of the Soviet Union and countries of popular democracy.

Comrade Stalin is a great genius of science. That is why in the sphere of foreign policy, the mobilizing, organizing, and transforming power of Stalinist ideas is so great.

Stalin's speeches are historical documents of the struggle for peace. In every interview, in every conversation with a foreign politician or correspondent, in answers to questions from representatives of the Soviet press, in statements during meetings with representatives of other states, Stalin's requirement for peace sounds loudly as a requirement of the Soviet Union, which steadfastly conducts a policy of preventing war and preserving peace as a requirement of all humanity, of all peoples of the world.

Stalin's foreign policy carries out the requirement of Marxist-Leninist theory—to explain the world in order to change it. Even in the first years of the Soviet state's existence, Comrade Stalin said that "Soviet power thinks... about turning into a serious international force capable of influencing the international situation, capable of changing it in the interests of working people."[153] Under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, led by J. V. Stalin, Soviet power became such a great force. Every step of Soviet policy influences the international situation in the interests of peoples.

Based on a deep analysis of international relations, Comrade Stalin established that under present conditions, a new world

---

153 **J. V. Stalin.** *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 156.

war prepared by American-British imperialists can be prevented. Objective conditions for preventing war are present. They are created by the current stage of the general crisis of capitalism. They are multiplied tenfold by the weakened capitalist system, which was the result of the victory of the socialist state over Hitlerism and Japanese imperialism and the subsequent breakaway from the capitalist system of a number of countries in South-Eastern Europe, Korea, and China. The successes of building communism in the Soviet Union strengthen the forces of the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism throughout the world.

American imperialists and their satellites on an ever-increasing scale put the development of productive forces at the service of producing means for destroying humanity, means for destroying its materialized labor, the result of efforts of many generations. They "ensure" the growing poverty and lack of rights of working people.

Aggressive groups and their puppets—reactionary governments—are held together by lies and deception, through which they hide their true, criminal intentions, plans, and actions.

The fates of humanity, the outcome of the struggle between aggressive and peace-loving forces, the cause of peace depend on the main force in history—on the popular masses, on their determination, activity, courage, political consciousness, and will to win. That is why every speech by Comrade Stalin is a call to action in the struggle for peace, a call to peoples, to simple people to curb reactionary governments that find themselves in the hands of aggressive forces.

"World will be preserved and consolidated,"—points out Comrade Stalin,—"if peoples take the cause of preserving peace into their hands and defend it to the end. War can become inevitable if warmongers manage to entangle the popular masses with lies, deceive them, and draw them into a new world war."[154]

Despite the furious campaign of imperialist reaction against advanced fighters for progress, against the mass movement of peace advocates, Stalin's ideas conquer the minds and hearts of simple people in all countries. Not without reason, sworn enemies of peace sound the alarm, signaling to imperialist rulers that they discredit themselves in the eyes of the popular masses, that the aggressive policy of the USA causes universal hatred. On the absence in American imperialism of "moral ideals" suitable for distribution among broad masses, John Foster Dulles, Burnham, and other henchmen of imperialist aggression lament. With malice they speak of how the successes of peaceful construction of communism in the Soviet Union and Stalin's foreign policy attract warmer sympathies of peoples. "Something went wrong with our people, otherwise we would not be in our current state and mood,—writes Dulles. —Difficulties are by no means of a material order... What we lack is a just and dynamic faith. Without this, everything else is of little use to us... This lack cannot be compensated for by politicians, no matter how capable they are... In our country, institutions do not attract the spiritual loyalty necessary for their protection... Abroad, our foreign policy can be

[154] Newspaper *Pravda*, February 17, 1951.

implemented only through money and goods... They are limited, and so is our policy."[155]

As for the Soviet Union, Dulles is forced to admit that its influence is constantly growing. "Soviet communism,—Dulles admits with a gnashing of teeth,—has a conviction, a conviction of world-wide significance."[156]

One of the former editors of the reactionary English journal *The Economist*, Barbara Ward, accuses other apologists of imperialism that they "conduct their verbal war through calculations and statistics, while their opponents praise blooming deserts and spring, returning to resurrected humanity..." "Why is the creative initiative lost?"—Barbara Ward asks sorrowfully, calling on the West to "restore its creative spirit."[157]

To the lamentations of Barbara Ward join the efforts of American reactionaries urgently seeking a new name for the capitalist system hated by peoples.

How helpless are these tricks of Anglo-American counterfeiters! They expose the pathetic efforts of ruling circles of capitalist countries to hide the anti-popular essence of their policy from the working masses. The bankruptcy of this policy reflects the breakdown of attempts by imperialists to slow down and turn back the process of historical development. They can undertake bloody adventures, trying to save the existing decayed system, but they are unable to give the

---

155 **John Foster Dulles.** *War or Peace*, pp. 253, 256. New York. 1950.

156 **John Foster Dulles.** *War or Peace*, pp. 253, 256. New York. 1950.

157 *Atlantic Monthly*, December 1950, p. 28.

popular masses any perspective other than the perspective of a new world war. Hardly anyone, except the imperialists themselves, can be satisfied with the "soothing" assurance of Walter Lippmann, who claims that "rivalry, discords, and conflicts between states, societies, and groups are a normal condition of human life." Other "explanations" are not to be expected from ideologists of imperialism.

"One cannot calculate correctly when standing on the path to ruin,"[158]—said Lenin in his time about the exercises of bourgeois "theoreticians." But history confirms the correctness of foreign policy calculations of the party that leads the great socialist power building communism. "We measure more correctly than ever before, than other powers..."[159]—stated Lenin thirty years ago, evaluating the party's line in international matters.

With every day and every hour, this truth is realized by ever larger masses of people. The Stalinist foreign policy of the Soviet Union has won immense authority throughout the world because it answers the vital interests of working humanity, because it is based on the known laws of social development, on the most advanced theory—the science of Marxism-Leninism.

---

158 **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 128.

159 **V. I. Lenin.** *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 122.

8. The Place and Role of Philosophy in Social Life
M. A. LEONOV

1. Philosophy — a Component Part of the Superstructure

The tenets of Marxism-Leninism on basis and superstructure, enriched in J. V. Stalin's work on linguistics, make it possible to understand more deeply the source origin, development, and succession of philosophical ideas in society, the place and role of philosophy in social life, and the interrelation of philosophy with other phenomena of social life.

Marx in the preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* pointed out that certain forms of social consciousness correspond to the basis, constituting the ideological superstructure[160]. Ideology, therefore, is the sum total of concepts and notions expressed in various superstructural forms of social consciousness. Concretizing this thesis of Marxism, Comrade Stalin in his work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* develops it further. Comrade Stalin's work helps to understand more deeply the specifics of the forms of social consciousness. Qualitatively heterogeneous forms of social consciousness are characterized by qualitatively distinct laws of development.

One of the superstructural forms of social consciousness is philosophy. Unlike other forms of ideology, **philosophy is a worldview**.

---

[160] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 353, 1949.

If political, legal, and aesthetic parts of the superstructure are called upon to serve society with political, legal, and aesthetic ideas, philosophy, as a worldview, is called upon to give a integral representation of the world and its laws. Worldview is a system of views about the world as a whole. By this, philosophy as a worldview differs from other sciences.

Thinking, as a worldview, enters into the ideological superstructure, and by this it differs qualitatively from thinking as a logical process inherent in all human beings. The question developed by Comrade Stalin regarding the connection and distinction between superstructural and non-superstructural phenomena has great theoretical and methodological significance.

Only on this methodological basis can one correctly understand the interrelation between worldview and logic, worldview and language, worldview and science.

Comrade Stalin's work provides full opportunity to correctly resolve the question of the correlation between thinking and worldview. N. Y. Marr and his followers introduced harmful confusion into the question of the correlation of worldview, ideology, and thinking. According to Marr, all these concepts are identical. Thinking as a whole, like worldview, he classified among superstructural phenomena. Thinking, Marr asserted, is a superstructure over the basis, it is the "product of ideological production"[161]. Classifying thinking as a superstructural phenomenon, Marr began to assert that thinking moves according to the laws of social revolution and that

[161] N. Y. Marr, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 434.

following revolutionary upheavals in society, upheavals supposedly occur in systems of thinking. The change of systems of thinking, Marr asserted, stems "from various systems of economy and their corresponding social structures"[162]. On this invented premise, primitive society was characterized by synthetic thinking, and bourgeois society by analytical, or formal-logical, thinking.

Following the absurd "theory" of the explosion of language, Marr cooked up a "theory" of the explosion of humanity's thinking experience. He persistently asserted that "in science an explosion is necessary"[163]. Confusing thinking with ideology and worldview, Marr came to the false conclusion that thinking can only be class-based. On this false premise, Marrists constructed their ignorant arguments about proletarian and bourgeois grammar as an expression of the class nature of thinking, about the class nature of formal logic, etc. This confusion penetrated the heads of not only linguists; it found a place among philosophers, psychologists, logicians, and educators. It is difficult to overestimate the damage done by Marrists to this confusion in Soviet science.

The greatest merit of Stalin's work on problems of linguistics consists in pointing out the path to a correct solution of the question of the correlation between thinking and worldview, the interrelation of philosophy and logic, philosophy and psychology, etc.

---

[162] N. Y. Marr, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 71.

[163] "Print and Revolution," Book 7, 1927, p. 292.

Classics of Marxism-Leninism never and nowhere equated thinking as a whole with worldview. They always noted the multifaceted, complex nature of such phenomena as thinking and worldview.

Thinking has its material, physiological bases. Nature endowed man with thinking. Thinking is a function of the brain, its property, its product. It is inseparable from the activity of the brain. "...Our consciousness and thinking, however supra-sensuous they may seem, are the product of a material, bodily organ, the brain," says Lenin, "is a function of that particularly complex piece of matter called the human brain"[164]. In this sense, thinking is an inalienable property of man[165]. The capacity to think and reflect surrounding phenomena is inherent in all people, all classes of society. In a letter to Kugelmann dated July 11, 1868, Marx states that thinking "is a natural process"[166].

But human thinking is not merely the result of the physiological activity of the brain; it has a social character. As J. V. Stalin showed, thinking is possible only on the basis of language material. It arises historically in the course of the material-productive activity of people as a reflection of the objective world and its laws. Without this capacity, communication between people with the surrounding world and with each other would be impossible. All humanity, regardless of the class position of people, possesses definite logical laws and forms of thinking, produced by the entire

---

164 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 215.

165 See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 437.

166 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 209, 1947.

course of society's development. Generalizing the experience of the thinking activity of people, logic formulates universal rules, laws of thinking, binding for all classes of society. Logic, like language, is the result of the abstracting activity of human thinking and serves as an indicator of the achievements of thinking. The people, being the producer of material goods, is consequently also the creator of language and the rules of logical thinking, for both are directly connected with the productive activity of people.

Logic performs in social life a single-order function with language, with which it is connected directly and immediately. Language is the material shell of human thoughts. If language is an instrument of communication between people, without which society cannot exist, the auxiliary role of logic consists in providing forms and laws of correct thinking. If people were to think according to different logical laws, they would not be able to understand each other, and no exchange of thoughts could occur. "The exchange of thoughts is a constant and vital necessity, since without it, it is impossible to organize the joint actions of people in the struggle against the forces of nature, for the production of necessary material goods, and it is impossible to achieve success in the productive activity of society — meaning, it is impossible to ensure the very existence of social production"[167].

Engels notes: "If our premises are correct and if we apply to them correctly the laws of thinking, the result must correspond

[167] J. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, pp. 22–23, 1950.

to reality, just as a calculation in analytical geometry must correspond to a geometric construction..."[168].

Of course, logic, like any other phenomenon, has its stages of development. But these stages of logic's development are not determined by changes in the basis and superstructure. The thinking process is unified in social history, although it differs in the degree of maturity. In the same letter to Kugelmann, Marx notes that "thinking can only be one and the same, differing only in the degree of development, and, in particular, the development of the organ of thinking"[169].

J. V. Stalin's work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* dealt a crushing blow to troglodytes who tried to blow up formal logic and eliminate its laws.

As for the interpretation of thinking, it is class-based and enters as a constituent part into the worldview of classes, of parties. Materialism and idealism testify to this — two opposite theories of thinking that have always been connected with class relations, served and serve as an expression of definite worldviews, being their constituent part.

The history of philosophy shows that various classes created various doctrines on thinking, or various gnoseologies, theories of knowledge. Dialectical materialism, for instance, by its origin and character, is organically bound up with the historical tasks of the proletariat and constitutes its worldview. The creation of this highest scientific theory of thinking marks a genuine revolution in philosophy. Idealist gnoseology has

---

[168] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 377.
[169] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 209.

always represented an anti-scientific theory of thinking. Now, when the age of capitalism is coming to an end, idealism produces monstrous freaks of distorted bourgeois thinking. Consequently, the interpretation of thinking given by definite classes enters into the superstructure.

Worldview differs qualitatively from thinking as a logical process in that it is created not by all classes of society, but by one or another class. Worldviews are formed by the ideologists of classes. If under the slave-owning system we encounter one set of worldviews, under feudalism — another, under capitalism — a third, this is explained by the different conditions of life of classes in different periods of social development. The economic and political position of classes determines the character of their worldview. Pointing out the class character of worldviews, Marx writes: "Upon the different forms of property, upon the social conditions of existence, rises an entire superstructure of distinct and peculiar sentiments, illusions, modes of thought, and views of life. The entire class creates and forms all these on the basis of its material conditions and corresponding social relations"[170].

Thus, worldview is a product of a definite epoch; although all people think according to the same laws of logic, not all people have the same worldview. This is precisely what Engels had in mind in *Dialectics of Nature*, where he notes that theoretical thinking (meaning by this the worldview of each epoch) is a historical product that assumes very different forms at different times and receives very different content.

---

[170] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 347.

Of course, between worldview, as a superstructural phenomenon, and thinking, as a non-superstructural phenomenon, there is a close connection. However, this circumstance cannot serve as a basis for equating thinking and worldview, just as, for example, the use of language by classes does not mean its class nature.

Thus, philosophical ideas, views, and theories, unlike non-superstructural phenomena, represent the product of one epoch, and not of an entire series of epochs. Unlike language, which was created to satisfy the needs of all classes of society, philosophical theories, entering into the superstructure, express the interests of ruling classes in a society of classes and live as long as these classes live. It is known that the purpose of the ruling philosophy, as well as of the entire superstructure, consists in serving the given basis. By virtue of the fact that philosophy serves the needs of classes, and not of the whole society, it cannot serve both the old and the new basis, the exploiters and the exploited.

In Stalin's work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, we find not only a direct indication that philosophy is among those social phenomena that enter into the superstructure, but also the guiding thread for a comprehensive characterization of philosophy as a constituent part of this superstructure.

Philosophical theories live and act according to the laws of the superstructure. These are the objective laws that determine the development of philosophy, the succession of philosophical theories by others. From Stalin's characterization of superstructural phenomena, it follows that the laws of development and succession of philosophical theories are of

the same order as the laws of development and succession of the ideological superstructure. In a class society, a fierce struggle takes place between materialism and idealism, which is a reflection of the struggle of interests of opposing classes.

The Marxist understanding of the laws of the development of philosophy deals a crushing blow to all kinds of idealist representations of the development of philosophical ideas as an immanent process, allegedly independent of the economic life of society and class struggle; it overthrows the assertions of idealists that philosophy itself creates its own history thanks to a certain spontaneous spirit. The "theory" of the immanent development of philosophical systems, i.e., isolating philosophy from concrete historical circumstances and social-class roots, inevitably leads, as is seen especially clearly in the shameful activity of Menshevik-leaning idealists, to isolating philosophy from politics, to a direct rejection of historical materialism, and to a transition to positions of bourgeois objectivism, to a crude violation of the principle of Bolshevik partisanship of philosophy.

Marxism-Leninism requires that in the analysis and evaluation of philosophical theories, one proceed from the basis, from the material interests of classes. Only with such an approach can one scientifically uncover the causal connection between the most abstract philosophical questions and class interests. It is no accident, for example, that philosophers-lackeys of Anglo-American imperialism are addicted to semantics. The class meaning of these "addictions" is completely obvious: to shift the blame onto language for all the miseries inflicted on the working class and all working people by the capitalist system.

The conclusion that the Marxist doctrine of the basis and superstructure is the only scientific criterion for clarifying the connection between the most abstract questions of philosophy and class interests, may seem a simple truth. In reality, this truth is far from simple, as Marx noted in *Capital*, touching upon the origins of representations and ideas. "Of course, it is much easier through analysis to find the earthly nucleus of misty religious representations than, conversely, from the given relations of real life to derive the corresponding religious forms. The latter method is the only materialist, and therefore, the only scientific method"[171].

A concrete approach to philosophical theories reveals in their content the characteristic traits of the ideology of various classes at various stages of historical development. Ignoring the requirement of a concrete historical approach to theories inevitably leads to objectivism.

Revealing the dialectic of the interaction of basis and superstructure, Comrade Stalin says: "If the basis changes and is eliminated, then following it the superstructure changes and is eliminated; if a new basis is born, then following it a corresponding superstructure is born"[172]. This formula is a direct continuation and development of the propositions on basis and superstructure developed in the work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*. In considering the third feature of production in this work, Comrade Stalin showed that the emergence of new productive forces and their corresponding productive relations occurs within the old system. In

---

[171] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XVII, pp. 409–410.

[172] J. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, p. 6.

accordance with this regularity, within the bosom of the old structure, new social ideas are born, including philosophical ones, which are called upon to facilitate the elimination of old productive relations and facilitate the resolution of new tasks set by the development of the material life of society. Thus up to a certain period, emerging new philosophical theories develop in the depths of the old society, but into a ruling worldview they transform only after the revolutionary overthrow of the old basis.

In accordance with how one or another class by way of revolution transforms into the ruling class and by force abolishes the old basis, the philosophical views of this class in the course of revolution transform into the ruling philosophy. Confirmation of this Marxist conclusion is the history of philosophy. Bourgeois philosophy originated back in the XIV–XVI centuries in the depths of feudal society. However, into the ruling philosophy it turned in the XVII–XVIII centuries, after a series of bourgeois revolutions in Western Europe (the Netherlands revolution of the XVI century, the English revolution in the middle of the XVII century, the French revolution at the end of the XVIII century).

The maturation in the depths of the old society of a new philosophical superstructure does not proceed peacefully and smoothly, but in a sharp struggle reaching philosophical upheavals. Regarding French Enlightenment thinkers of the XVIII century, Engels wrote: "The French fought an open war against all official science, against the church, often also against the state; their writings were printed across the border,

in Holland or England, while they themselves were not infrequently sent to the Bastille"[173].

Consequently, philosophical revolutions precede political revolutions and serve as their ideological preparation. English materialism of the XVII century arose in the period that Marx called the prologue to the English revolution. So it was in other countries as well. On this occasion Engels wrote: "Just as in France in the XVIII century, in Germany in the XIX century the philosophical revolution served as an introduction to a political upheaval"[174].

Thus, the law of social revolution governs the development of philosophical ideas as well. In the course of maturation of new social relations, they undergo genuine revolutionary upheavals, deep shocks, and qualitative changes.

Meanwhile, the historical development of philosophy in our literature was portrayed extremely distortedly, as purely evolutionary, without leaps, without interruption of continuity. A. A. Zhdanov in his speech at the philosophical discussion in 1947 said that one cannot view the history of philosophy as a smooth succession of one philosophical school by another, that it is incorrect to portray the history of philosophy as a smooth evolutionary path of development of philosophical ideas and systems by way of accumulating quantitative changes[175]. The view on the history of the development of philosophy as a

---

[173] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 635.

[174] *Ibid*.

[175] See journal *Problems of Philosophy*, No. 1 for 1947, pp. 270, 257.

purely evolutionary process inevitably leads to the idealist theory of filiation of ideas.

The work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* gives the opportunity to understand more deeply the genuine regularity by which philosophical theories develop. The history of philosophy knows not a few revolutionary upheavals. If there is no necessity for language upheavals, then in relation to philosophy such a necessity exists. Bourgeois philosophy in the XVI–XVII centuries undermined the ideological logical foundations of the feudal-absolutist system, dealt medieval scholasticism crushing blows, and placed the empirical study of nature and inductive logic, deductive logic, and the doctrine of nature in the place of dead scholasticism. Undoubtedly, these were philosophical revolutions. On the philosophical revolution accomplished by French materialists, Engels wrote: "French materialists did not limit their criticism to the field of religion alone: they criticized every scientific tradition, every political institution of their time. To prove the universal applicability of their theory, they chose the shortest path: they boldly applied it to all objects of knowledge in that gigantic work from which they received their name, in the *Encyclopédie*. Thus, in one form or another — as open materialism or as deism — materialism became the worldview of all educated youth in France"[176].

In light of Stalin's work on linguistics, the character and content of the philosophical revolution accomplished by Marxism, its fundamental differences from all other

[176] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 97, 1949.

philosophical revolutions, emerge more deeply. The key to the solution of this question is the doctrine of Comrade Stalin on the regularities of development and changes of basis and superstructure. The Marxist revolution in philosophy differs from previous revolutionary upheavals in philosophy by the same thing that distinguishes the socialist basis and socialist superstructure from all preceding bases and superstructures, or by the same thing that distinguishes the proletarian, socialist revolution from all preceding revolutions in history. With all the difference of one superstructure from another, common features of antagonistic formations were inherent in all superstructures of the past. This circumstance left an imprint on the character of philosophical revolutions in the pre-Marxist period. Not a single philosophical system, even the ruling one, brought to completion the overcoming of old philosophical theories that served the old basis. On the contrary, the new superstructure attempted to adapt to itself quite a few reactionary ideas from old theories. Marxist philosophy brings to completion the destruction of reactionary ideologies that served the old basis. The revolution accomplished by Marxism in philosophy is the ideological harbinger of the socialist revolution accomplished 70 years later, of which Comrade Stalin said: "The history of peoples knows not a few revolutions. They differ from the October Revolution in that they were one-sided revolutions. One form of exploitation of working people was replaced by another form of exploitation, but exploitation itself remained. Some exploiters and oppressors were replaced by other exploiters and oppressors, but the exploiters and oppressors themselves remained. Only

the October Revolution set for itself the goal of destroying all exploitation and liquidating all exploiters and oppressors"[177].

The worldview created by Marxism is an ideological banner of struggle against all exploitation and oppression; it is the "theoretical summation of the conditions for the liberation of the proletariat"[178]. Only Marxist philosophy is a genuine weapon for changing the world, the only instrument suitable for its practical transformation. The history of philosophy preceding Marxism, explaining the world one way or another, but not suitable to serve as an instrument for changing the world, represents, in essence, only the prehistory of scientific philosophy.

The essence of the revolutionary upheaval in philosophy accomplished by Marxism with exceptional depth is revealed in Stalin's definition of Marxism as a science. In this definition it is noted that "Marxism is the science of the laws of development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, the science of building a communist society"[179]. Here the unusually deep revolutionary-transformative nature of the Marxist-Leninist worldview is revealed with extraordinary depth. From this definition it follows that Marxism created a philosophy of a new type, a qualitatively new worldview, transforming philosophy into a genuine science.

---

[177] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 412, 11th ed.

[178] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. V, p. 194.

[179] J. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, pp. 54–55.

The methodological significance of Stalin's work consists in pointing out the only correct path to solving the question of historical continuity in the development of social phenomena, and in this connection, of continuity in the development of philosophical theories. In this work, for the first time in Marxist literature, the question of qualitative differences in continuity in the development of superstructural and non-superstructural phenomena is developed most fully and comprehensively. Exposing vulgarizers like "Proletkultists" and "RAPPists" who mistakenly imagined the liquidation of the superstructure as its absolute destruction and rejected on this basis everything positive in the development of the past, subjecting the Marrists to sharp criticism for their "blank and light-minded rejection of everything that was in linguistics prior to N. Y. Marr," Comrade Stalin gave an exhaustive answer as to how a Marxist should relate to the ideological heritage of the past.

From the fact that philosophical theories develop according to the laws of the superstructure, it does not follow at all that with the liquidation of the old superstructure previous philosophical ideas perish completely. In philosophy, not everything is transient; here a certain continuity takes place. F. Engels pointed out that "the philosophy of each epoch possesses as a prerequisite a definite thinking material transmitted to it by its predecessors, from which it departs"[180]. If nihilists reject anything positive in development, vulgarizers of another type do not see the dying away of the old in this process.

[180] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 430.

What is the character of using the ideological heritage of philosophical theories? In resolving this question, the guiding principle is Stalin's doctrine on basis and superstructure. On the class nature of a given superstructure depends its relationship to the past. Quite obvious is the difference between continuity in the development of reactionary ideologies and continuity in the development of progressive ideologies.

Classes, depending on their progressive or reactionary role use the living or dead from the ideological heritage of the past. Progressive classes use everything valuable created by previous development. Reactionary forces of society feed on the waste products of history, with which they poison human consciousness. Thus, frantic philosophical reaction of the imperialist bourgeoisie uses in the struggle against Marxism all the most reactionary and dark from the history of philosophy. The rotting capitalist basis brings with it the decomposition of the bourgeois superstructure, the decay of bourgeois culture, and the complete collapse of bourgeois philosophy. Cries and pleas for a return to doctrines of the past have taken on monstrous proportions in the USA, England, France, Italy, Spain, and other countries. The medieval obscurantist, theologian, and scholastic who fanatically fought to perpetuate the feudal system and the Catholic Church, Thomas Aquinas, is depicted as the creator of modern civilization. In the USA, even the journal *Thomist* is published, advertising itself as the heir to the teachings of this obscurantist. In Europe and America over 20 years, about 6,000 books and articles

dedicated to Thomas Aquinas were published[181]. And the more hopeless the position of capitalism becomes, the more frantically philosophical lackeys of imperialism rage, grasping as a lifebuoy at the most wild and insane ideas of the past. This is a vivid example of the tenacity of remnants of the old superstructure in an antagonistic society.

Continuity in the development of progressive philosophical theories rests on directly opposite foundations. The point is that in philosophy, as well as in other parts of the ideological superstructure, elements of absolute truth are contained, despite the transient nature of their categories and concepts. If such elements of absolute truth were not contained in philosophical theories, then no continuity in the development of progressive worldviews could be out of the question. Having this side of the regularity in the development of philosophy in mind, Comrade Stalin in his work on linguistics notes: Marx and Engels "considered that their dialectical materialism is a product of the development of sciences, including philosophy, for the preceding period"[182].

Consequently, the class character of progressive philosophical theories does not mean at all that they do not contain elements of objective truth. However, Marxist philosophy differs qualitatively from all preceding philosophy in that it contains within itself not elements of truth, but as a whole represents objective truth. Lenin wrote: "...Marx's theory is objective truth... following along the path of Marx's theory, we shall

---

[181] See collection *Against Philosophical Lackeys of Anglo-American Imperialism*, p. 85, 1951.

[182] J. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, p. 34.

draw nearer and nearer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but following along any other path, we can arrive at nothing except confusion and falsehood"[183].

The attitude of Marxism-Leninism toward the ideological heritage of the past is fundamentally different from the attitude toward it of other, even progressive theories, for only the proletariat and its party from the point of view of dialectical and historical materialism are able to evaluate most deeply and correctly all the greatness that was created by humanity in history.

Only the philosophy of Marxism, whose bearer is the proletariat, represents a system of views in which party orientation coincides with objective truth. Comrade Stalin points out that if one stands on the path of objective truth, it will lead to Marxism. On the other hand, the more firmly a scientist links his fate with Marxism and its worldview, the more fruitful his creative activity, the more successfully proceeds the cognition of objective truth.

2. Specific Features of Philosophy as a Constituent Part of the Superstructure

The active role of philosophy in the life of society is not exhausted by the fact that it ideologically prepares conditions for overthrowing old productive relations. After it has become the ruling philosophy, its auxiliary role is expressed in serving the given basis.

---

[183] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 130.

What place does worldview occupy in the system of other ideological superstructures and what function does it perform? This question is important, firstly, because it gives the opportunity to correctly evaluate the social role of philosophy, and secondly, to overcome primitive views on the principle of partisanship of philosophy. In light of Stalin's work, the paramount importance of these questions becomes completely obvious.

Although the superstructure (legal, moral, artistic, and other views and their corresponding institutions) represents a single connected whole, each of its constituent parts has peculiar, specific laws of development. The question of the interaction of philosophy with other constituent parts of the ideological superstructure, on the mechanism of action of philosophy as a worldview part of the superstructure, on forms of correlation and interaction of philosophy with other social phenomena is very important and urgently requires consideration. The character of interaction of philosophy with other parts of the superstructure (legal, artistic, and other views) is completely different from the character of correlation of philosophy with non-superstructural phenomena. Paths to resolving the question on specific features of the philosophical part of the superstructure are indicated in Stalin's work on linguistics.

First of all, it is necessary to determine the place of worldview in the system of superstructure. Considering this question, Engels notes that philosophy stands higher than other ideological forms hovering in the air[184]. "Ideologies even

[184] See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 429.

higher-soaring, i.e., those even further removed from the economic basis, take the form of philosophy and religion"[185]. Being the part of the social superstructure most remote from the basis, philosophy is distinguished by its specificity, occupies a special place in the superstructural system, and by its functions differs from other ideological superstructures.

The **first** specific feature of philosophy as a constituent part of the superstructure consists in studying the relation of thinking to being. In this lies the subject of philosophy, its specificity as a science. The fundamental question of philosophy lies at the basis of every worldview, permeates all sciences, constituting their methodological and gnoseological basis. Philosophy is called upon to give all other sciences a method and theory of knowledge. The different character of resolving the main question of philosophy expresses in the final analysis the different relation of classes to the surrounding world. The starting point of any field of knowledge is the materialist resolution of the question of the relation of thinking to being. In interpreting any phenomenon, the application of the main question of philosophy takes place.

The influence of philosophy on other forms of social consciousness is accomplished in the most diverse forms, for the main question of philosophy lying at the basis of every worldview is unusually broad in its content.

Being a worldview, philosophy permeates all forms of ideology. Philosophy teaches people to approach the explanation and resolution of questions so that they correspond

[185] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 673.

to the principles of a definite worldview. All ideological forms of the superstructure have a direct relation to worldview.

Philosophy acts not only on all fields of ideological superstructure, but also on all spiritual life of society. The sphere of its action, consequently, is much broader and more diverse than the sphere of action of any other constituent part of the ideological superstructure.

The **second** specific feature of the philosophical superstructure consists in the fact that it is in the most complex relations with the economic basis of society compared to other parts of the superstructure. Whoever does not understand the dialectic of interaction of the philosophical superstructure with the basis inevitably slips into vulgarization of Marxism. Shulyatikov in his book *Justification of Capitalism in Western European Philosophy*, which Lenin branded as unexampled vulgarization of Marxism, derived philosophy directly from the economic basis and productive forces. This vulgarizer asserted that "having to do with a philosophical system of one or another bourgeois thinker, we are dealing with a picture of class structure of society"[186]. Speaking, for example, about the philosophy of Descartes, he asserted that this system depicts the world according to the type of manufacturing enterprise, and the Cartesian concept of man reproduces the organization of a manufacturing workshop. All without exception philosophical terms and formulas, Shulyatikov assured, serve

[186] Notes of V. I. Lenin on Shulyatikov's book. Journal *Bolshevik* No. 15 for 1937, p. 54.

the bourgeoisie "to designate class groups, cells, and their interrelations"[187].

N. Y. Marr was such a simplifier and vulgarizer of Marxism. The lethally accurate characterization given by Lenin to Shulyatikov is fully applicable to Marr. Lenin pointed out that human practice, repeating billions of times, is fixed in human consciousness in the form of abstract concepts, figures of logic. Marr managed to connect the formation of abstract concepts with the emergence... of the mill. "Only with the establishment of cosmic, in the first place astral worldview with the supremacy of one of a pair of great luminaries, formerly 'moon', then 'sun', is the opportunity obtained to construct abstract concepts... In the material basis, the prerequisite is the 'mill' (watermill, first of all), which, however, is preceded by artificial continuous use of water power by pumping flowing liquid, without a wheel, trough, etc..."[188]

Vulgarizers do not notice all the complexity of interaction between the economic basis and philosophical superstructure, and as a consequence do not understand that philosophy only in the final analysis follows the development of the economy. Stalin's work on linguistics aims at struggle on two fronts: against idealist understanding of the history of philosophy and against vulgar materialism of the Shulyatikov–Marr type.

The **third** specific feature of the philosophical part of the superstructure is expressed in its close connection with science

---

[187] *Ibid*.

[188] N. Y. Marr, *In the Dead End of the History of Material Culture?*, p. 74, 1933.

in general and natural science in particular. Without broad philosophical generalizations, not a single natural scientist can do. A method of expressing a definite worldview among natural scientists is the character of applying the fundamental question of philosophy and other philosophical principles to concrete questions of science. The greatness of I. P. Pavlov consists not only in his experimental activity, as L. Orbeli usually asserted, but in the materialist explanation of the vital activity of the animal organism, in the materialist application of the main question of philosophy to the study of physiological bases of higher nervous activity.

Sometimes to natural scientists it seems that philosophy is not directly connected with their scientific activity. In reality, such a connection exists, and without philosophy they cannot take a step. Every scientist consciously or spontaneously, but necessarily joins one of the philosophical camps — materialism or idealism — and pursues in his activity a definite worldview line. Engels pointed out that no matter how natural scientists resist, philosophy governs them. "Natural scientists imagine that they free themselves from philosophy when they ignore or abuse it. But as they cannot move a single step without thinking... in the end they prove to be in thrall to philosophy..."[189]

Incorrect methodology leads science to a dead end. In the work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, Comrade Stalin with great force showed that science cannot be developed

[189] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 415.

proceeding from incorrect formulas that contradict objective reality, the entire course of history.

Analysis of specific features of the philosophical superstructure in light of Stalin's work on linguistics clarifies the understanding of the Marxist principle of partisanship of philosophy. Prior to the publication of *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, primitive views on the class nature and partisanship of sciences were current. The partisanship of social sciences, directly connected with the basis, is completely obvious. Matters are more complex with natural sciences, which are connected not directly with the basis, but with production. Comrade Stalin brings complete clarity to the question of the correlation between class and non-class, the correlation between superstructural and non-superstructural phenomena.

In *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, two sides of a single question are clearly outlined: 1) indifferent attitude of non-superstructural phenomena to classes, and 2) non-indifferent attitude of classes to non-superstructural phenomena. Language, logic, etc., as social phenomena not entering into the superstructure, are indifferent to classes. However, classes are not indifferent to language, logic, instruments of production. The same is the case with sciences about nature. Natural sciences are indifferent to classes themselves, but classes are not indifferent to natural sciences.

Class character of worldview directs and guides people in a definite manner toward performing class tasks. Science was never neutral to class struggle. On the contrary, it was always an arena of fierce ideological struggle. Lenin in the article

"Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism" wrote that class struggle in science is a general fact. Finely noted J. V. Michurin how philosophy directly brings to class nature and partisanship: "Science — and in particular its concrete field, natural science — is inseparably bound up with philosophy, but as in philosophy human worldview manifests, consequently, it is one of the instruments of class struggle"[190]. Consequently, not science about nature is party-aligned, not physics is party-aligned, but scientists are party-aligned.

In his rebuke to Mikhailovsky, who asserted the incompatibility of scientific objectivity and partisanship, Lenin in *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* noted that all questions people inevitably consider through the prism of a definite worldview: "...not a single living person," wrote Lenin, "can fail to take the side of one or another class (once he has understood their interrelations), cannot fail to rejoice at the success of a given class, cannot fail to be grieved by its failures, cannot fail to be outraged at those who are hostile to this class..."[191]. The thought that natural science is not party-aligned, but scientists-naturalists are party-aligned, is expressed in the well-known Leninist words that bourgeois specialists in chemistry, physics, and other fields of knowledge cannot be trusted for a single word when it comes to philosophy, i.e., interpreting this knowledge in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Class point of view permeates all fields of knowledge. Every worker of science expounds the material of his science in

---

[190] I. V. Michurin, *Selected Works*, p. 508, 1948.
[191] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 498–499.

connection with his established worldview and has a definite practical purposeful direction in work.

Thus, the worldview of a scientist determines all his scientific activity. One should therefore recognize as incorrect the assertion sometimes encountered in our philosophical literature that facts represent objective truth, and only their theoretical interpretation is class-based. Bourgeois ideologists through and through distort facts as well.

Class approach to sciences about nature is clearly expressed in how they are used, to whom they are put to service. In this sense, one speaks of Soviet science and its fundamental opposition to bourgeois science.

In capitalist countries, natural science performs a shameful role of serving capital; it is entirely subordinated to the predatory policy of imperialism. Biology, bacteriology, medicine — by nature non-class sciences created to serve human society, called upon to protect life, health, longevity of man. However, in modern conditions of capitalism, American-English imperialist predators use biology, bacteriology, and other fields of knowledge for their vile purposes and turn science into a means of mass destruction of people. A vivid example of expressing class point of view of bourgeois physicists, their idealist worldview, are assertions about conditional, symbolic character of cognition of the microworld, extra-spatiality and extra-temporality of the electron, etc.

If interests of classes and their theoretical views receive most profound expression in worldviews, it follows that philosophy

in social life occupies a significant place. Misunderstanding of this often led to underestimating the social role of philosophy.

The work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* deepens and expands our understanding of the social function of philosophy as a constituent part of the ideological superstructure. Philosophy is the theoretical basis of class policy. On the other hand, all philosophy is permeated with class policy and guided by it. In view of this, philosophy is a deeply party-aligned theory and exerts enormous influence on all spheres of social life. Completely obvious that the social function of philosophy as a worldview is significantly broader than all other parts of the ideological superstructure.

The circumstance that philosophy, and not natural science, is a party science does not narrow the field of activity of a scientist at all. On the contrary, the range of his duties expands. This is precisely what Lenin had in mind when he wrote that materialism (meaning Marxism) includes partisanship and obliges one in evaluating any events and phenomena directly and openly to take the proletarian point of view, persistently raising the offensive spirit of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

To apply Marxism in every field of knowledge, to fight against idealism and metaphysics, to display care for Bolshevik partisanship are obliged not only philosophers, but also other scientists, writers, etc. Comrade Stalin said at the XVIII Party Congress that "there is no need for a specialist physician to be at the same time a specialist in physics or botany, and vice versa. But there is one branch of science, knowledge of which must be obligatory for Bolsheviks of all branches of science —

this is the Marxist-Leninist science of society"[192]. This means that the duty of every scientist is to study Marxist-Leninist science and apply the Bolshevik principle of partisanship in his scientific activity.

From the circumstance that Bolshevik partisanship coincides with objective truth, it follows that the principle of partisanship is the highest and guiding principle of Soviet science. It is not difficult to understand that those figureheads of science suffer from objectivism who shut themselves in the shell of their field of knowledge and forget worldview questions. Let us recall Leninist sarcasm addressed to those scientists who limit themselves to facts and factoids, or those engaged in "playing with figures".

J. V. Stalin's work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, in which the dialectic of complex interrelations between superstructural and non-superstructural phenomena is thoroughly and deeply revealed, puts an end to primitive views on partisanship, illuminates from a new angle the guiding role of the principle of partisanship of philosophy in approaching all questions of theory and practice, and raises the Marxist principle of class nature and partisanship to a new, higher level.

3. Features of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy as a Constituent Part of the Socialist Superstructure

Marxist-Leninist philosophy plays a special role in social life. J. V. Stalin's brilliant work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* is of vital importance for understanding the specifics of the regularities of development inherent in

[192] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 598.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy, its new features born of the Soviet system. In light of this work, the role of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, tasks, and ways of its development in the period of transition from socialism to communism became more visible.

In its origin, formation, and development, Marxist philosophy fundamentally differs from other philosophical theories.

Like any other philosophy, Marxist philosophy possesses in common that it develops according to the laws of the superstructure. In the pre-October period, Marxist-Leninist philosophy did not enter into the superstructure of bourgeois society. In view of this, there are significant differences in the regularities of development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the pre-Soviet period and in the period of socialism.

Marxist philosophy arose under the supremacy of capitalism, but not as a constituent part of the bourgeois superstructure, but as a reflection of the material conditions of existence of the proletariat, as a scientific expression of its historical mission, representing the seed, the nucleus of the new superstructure.

What is the role of Marxist-Leninist philosophy under capitalism? In the pre-October period, the destructive side of revolutionary-critical activity of the party and working class directed at overthrowing capitalism was brought to the forefront. The attitude of the proletariat toward the bourgeois basis is clearly expressed in the words of the *Communist*

Manifesto: "destroy everything that hitherto guarded and assured private property"[193].

Just as the proletariat is the destructive side of bourgeois society, Marxist philosophy expressing under capitalism the indignation of the proletariat against the bourgeois basis and its superstructure performs a destructive function in relation to bourgeois society. In the words of Engels, Marxist philosophy "represented the interests of the future of the oppressed"[194]. From the proletariat and its ideology stems action directed at destroying the capitalist system. Prior to the revolution, as M. I. Kalinin aptly expressed, the party and its theory, proceeding from knowledge of objective laws, help, like a midwife, the development of the historical process, the development of class struggle, mobilize and drive into battle against capital the masses of the proletariat and working people.

The constructive function of the Marxist-Leninist worldview under capitalism consists in bringing socialist consciousness into the labor movement, organizing and mobilizing the working class for the struggle against capitalism, ideologically arming advanced figures of science in the struggle against idealism. Ideologically arming the rising class, Marxist philosophy thereby contributes to the progressive development of society. Thus, the main, fundamental task of the Marxist-Leninist worldview under capitalism consists in ideological preparation for the overthrow of the bourgeois basis and the liquidation of the bourgeois superstructure.

---

193 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Communist Manifesto*, p. 63, 1948.

194 F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 89, 1950.

Fundamentally new tasks arise before Marxist philosophy in the period of socialism. Under capitalism, Marxist philosophy expresses the interests of the working class as an oppressed class; under socialism, it is the expression of socialist relations of production. The auxiliary role of Marxist philosophy as a constituent part of the ideological superstructure changes radically during this period. Its influence on historical development assumes new forms and new scales.

Accordingly, as the superstructure under socialism is created to satisfy the needs not of a single class, but of the whole society bound by moral-political unity, the auxiliary role of philosophy changes as well. It is called upon to serve not a single class, but the whole society, all its friendly classes. For the first time in the history of social development, philosophy in the USSR became the worldview of the whole society, of all the people. Bolshevik policy is the vital basis of Soviet society, and Marxist-Leninist philosophy is its worldview and ideological foundation. Not a single philosophical theory has had or has such widespread dissemination among the people as Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

In the Soviet epoch, the words of Comrade Stalin, spoken about 50 years ago, sound in a new way: that the Marxist worldview is not the property of philosophical schools consisting of a small number of philosophers, but is the symbol of faith of the working class and millions of working people. No other philosophical theory has ever had such a colossal influence on the actions and minds of people, on all spheres of social life, as the Marxist-Leninist worldview. **Philosophy in the USSR became the property of millions.**

Never in history has the propaganda of a philosophical worldview reached such scales as in the USSR. On the scope of the propaganda of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the USSR, the following figures testify: dialectical and historical materialism are studied by 1 million 356 thousand students in 887 higher educational institutions (the number of students in the USSR is significantly higher than in the capitalist countries of Europe and Asia combined), over 24 thousand graduate students; broad circles of the Soviet intelligentsia study Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the network of evening universities of Marxism-Leninism, in the network of party education. Widespread propaganda of ideas of dialectical and historical materialism is carried out by party study rooms and the Society for the Dissemination of Political and Scientific Knowledge.

In the USSR, philosophical literature is published in print runs unknown to other countries. F. Engels's work *Anti-Dühring* was published in the USSR in 12 languages with a print run of over 2 million copies, his work *Ludwig Feuerbach* — in 24 languages with a print run of over 2.5 million, *Materialism and Empirio-criticism* by V. I. Lenin was published in 17 languages with a print run of 4 million, works by J. V. Stalin: *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.): Short Course* — in 66 languages with a print run of over 40 million copies, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* — in 26 languages, *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* — in 41 languages with multi-million print runs.

The total print run of philosophical literature published from 1947–1950 alone is about 20 million copies. During the same period, philosophical literature in the Ukrainian language was

published at about 1.5 million copies, Uzbek — 391 thousand copies, Azerbaijani — 134 thousand copies, Yakut — 30 thousand copies. Prior to 1917, literature in the languages of the native population was not published at all in Belorussia, Turkmenia, Tajikistan, and Kirghizia. For 1947–1950 alone, philosophical literature was published in the Belorussian language — 41 thousand copies, Kirghiz — 58 thousand, Tajik — 80 thousand, Turkmen — 32 thousand copies. The total print run of published philosophical literature for the indicated years in the languages of the peoples of the USSR is about 3.5 million copies.

Unprecedented in history, the joining of a philosophical worldview with the broadest masses, the all-national character of the Marxist-Leninist worldview, constitutes its new foundation. On this foundation, "to which there is no equal in the world" (A. Zhdanov), Marxist-Leninist philosophy develops in the socialist epoch. In this lies its invincible power.

Accordingly, as the superstructure under socialism exists and develops according to laws qualitatively different from the laws of development of antagonistic superstructures, Soviet philosophy, as a constituent part of the socialist superstructure, reveals its own specific regularities. If in an antagonistic society there is no single philosophy and the ruling superstructure is opposed by the ideas and institutions of oppressed classes, under socialism, where there are no antagonistic classes, there exists a single philosophy, and only those ideas, theories, and institutions exist that fully correspond to the interests of the people, of socialist society. This regularity generates a whole series of new features in the

development of the socialist superstructure, including the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, which has become the **ruling worldview of socialist society**.

In Soviet socialist society, philosophy and other forms of social consciousness are in fundamentally different relations than under capitalism. In the system of the ideological superstructure of Soviet society, Marxist-Leninist philosophy holds a leading role. Under socialism, the worldview of the Communist Party is called upon to play such a leading role in social life as no other worldview could have; it illuminates our country's path toward communism.

The growth of socialist consciousness of the masses and the necessity of struggle against remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of people place increasingly high demands on all our ideological work. To raising the worldview level in the activity of writers, art workers, etc., historical decisions of the CC of the Party on ideological questions are directed. These decisions call upon all workers on the ideological front to study life deeper, and the laws of society's development. Failures in literature have their roots in the field of worldview. This is evidenced, for example, by V. Sosiura's ideologically flawed work *Love Ukraine*. Art and literature cannot develop successfully without relying firmly on real reality, on the Marxist-Leninist worldview. "The writer's wings," Academician V. Vinogradov aptly says, "are his worldview, and the height of flight depends on artistic skill, on highly artistic forms of reflecting the truth of life".

Infinitely diverse is the connection of Marxist philosophy with other forms of social consciousness. In a generalized form, the

place and role of philosophy in the life of Soviet society are expressed in the words of Comrade Stalin: "dialectical and historical materialism is the theoretical foundation of communism". This means that Marxist-Leninist philosophy is the worldview foundation of our social and state system, constituting the granite foundation of all cultural life of Soviet society; it is of vital importance for the development of social and natural sciences, represents a decisive ideological force of socialism, and serves as a powerful means of struggle for the ultimate victory of communism.

The leading role of the Marxist worldview is determined by the very nature of socialism. For the first time in human history, instead of a spontaneous process of development, conscious, planned management and direction of all spheres of material and spiritual production are carried out in our country. Under communism, people for the first time really become masters of nature. Only under communism, which is based on a scientific organization of society, people master the laws of nature and society, and their impact on the world takes on a planned character, achieving pre-set goals. The further Soviet society advances toward communism, the more its conscious, planned, purposeful influence on this development increases, and the deeper the laws of nature and society are comprehended.

Under socialism, where conscious management of the development of nature and society has become a law, the power of reverse impact of the superstructure on the basis increases significantly. The deeper and more accurately philosophy reflects the needs of development of Soviet society, the more the power of its reverse impact increases. The

Marxist-Leninist worldview expresses the need of the material and spiritual life of Soviet society. In these conditions, it becomes a paramount factor **accelerating the development of society forward, its unceasing movement toward communism**. New historical conditions in which Marxist-Leninist philosophy develops favor the deployment of its revolutionary-transformative power to the greatest extent.

Dialectical materialism was always a guide to action. The first thing that distinguishes this philosophical theory from any other is its transformative role. Marxist philosophy is the only theory for transforming the world. By its very nature, Marxist philosophy is calculated for active participation in the struggle of the broad masses of working people. Its tasks are realized on the condition of bringing into active movement the will and energy of the working class and all working people. And the broader the scope of their activity, Lenin said, the greater the masses involved in historical action, the greater the power the Marxist-Leninist worldview receives.

The transformation of Marxist-Leninist philosophy into an undivided, dominant state worldview means that it has become a guide to practical action for all people of Soviet society. Arming Soviet people with knowledge of universal laws of development of nature and society, philosophy expands their scientific outlook, develops the ability to approach all questions from the point of view of dialectical and historical materialism, and raises them to a comprehensive understanding of the great goals facing our Motherland.

In light of Comrade Stalin's work on linguistics, the growing need for philosophy and its growing importance in the advance

of Soviet society toward communism becomes obvious to all. This stems from the features of communism based on scientific foundations, and the features of Marxist philosophy as a paramount component part of the ideological superstructure of Soviet society. In accordance with the growth of the guiding role of the Party, its influence on the course of historical development, the organizing role of its worldview — dialectical and historical materialism — grows. In this light, the harmful, counter-revolutionary nature of the slogan "philosophy overboard", put forward by renegades after the October Revolution who preached the "theory" of the dying away of philosophy in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat, becomes even more obvious.

Stalin's principles on the significance of the superstructure for the development and consolidation of the basis are guiding principles for defining the tasks of Soviet philosophy in the period of transition from socialism to communism. The main task of the Marxist-Leninist worldview is the creation of spiritual prerequisites for this transition. The cause of communist education is served by the entire ideological superstructure of Soviet society, including philosophy. Marxist philosophy is called upon to arm the workers of socialist society with knowledge of the regularities of its movement toward communism, to theoretically substantiate the great advantages of the Soviet system over the capitalist system, and to summarize the vast experience of socialist construction. Marxist philosophy serves as a powerful means of forming a scientific, materialist worldview among Soviet people, as an

instrument for introducing them to the deepest knowledge, to the greatest achievements of human culture.

Educating the working people of our country in the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism is a paramount factor in developing high principledness, Bolshevik devotion, and unwavering faith in the victory of communism, along with selfless devotion to the cause of Lenin and Stalin; it inspires self-sacrificing labor to strengthen the power of our state. The Marxist-Leninist worldview educates Soviet people in the spirit of living Soviet patriotism, in the spirit of hatred for world imperialism. It instills in our cadres a sense of the new, teaches them to work with an understanding of perspective, and to combine their work with our common movement toward communism. Knowledge of the policy of the Bolshevik Party and its theoretical foundation — dialectical and historical materialism — and the ability to be guided by the theory and policy of the Party in practical activity are among the decisive conditions of our movement toward communism.

In the Soviet epoch, when dialectical materialism turned into the dominant worldview, the question of the interrelation between philosophy and natural science, of the guiding role of the Marxist worldview in scientific research, arose in a new way. Only under socialism did it become possible to fully realize the guiding role of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the development of natural science. A grandiose restructuring of natural science on the principles of dialectical materialism is taking place in our country.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy is becoming an increasingly firm foundation of Soviet science and is capturing within its orbit

ever newer fields of knowledge, arming them with the dialectical method and materialist theory of knowledge. In the epoch of socialism, when transformative processes take on an unprecedented scale, the role of Marxist theory of knowledge increases significantly. It opens wide scope for innovative research in various fields of science, reveals boundless prospects for cognition of nature and society, and arms scientists with infinite creative capabilities.

The revolutionary-transformative, guiding role of dialectical materialism receives its brightest expression in the successes of Soviet science. Not a single materialist theory has exerted such a powerful influence on natural science as dialectical materialism exerts on Soviet science. Under capitalism, the bourgeois superstructure imposes idealism and metaphysics on natural science in the most diverse forms. It creates an entire network of obstacles fencing off natural scientists from dialectical materialism. Only isolated individuals manage to break through this network, as was the case in tsarist Russia with Timiryazev, Michurin, Pavlov, etc., and in the West with Langevin, Joliot-Curie, etc. Only under socialism did dialectical materialism receive the opportunity to penetrate deeply into the consciousness of scientists, fully deploy its power as a method of scientific research, and serve as a guide to practical action.

Having dialectical materialism as its theoretical foundation, Soviet science possesses a great advantage compared to any other science. As early as in *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx noted that bourgeois science develops zigzaggingly due to the fact that it does not possess a genuinely

scientific methodology. "...Historical development of all sciences," wrote Marx, "...only through a multitude of intersecting and roundabout paths leads to their real starting point"[195]. Soviet science, in analyzing and resolving the most complex questions of knowledge, is freed from such zigzags and roundabout paths. Armed with such a perfect instrument of scientific research as dialectical materialism, Soviet science overcomes difficulties and contradictions on the path of its development and reflects objective reality more deeply and fully, discovering new regularities within it.

In the immortal work *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, Lenin wrote: "Human mind has discovered many amazing things in nature and will discover even more, thereby increasing its power over it"[196]. This brilliant foresight comes true with amazing accuracy in the USSR, where the inexhaustible capabilities of comprehending the objective world allow opening new laws of nature and making new major steps in its cognition.

Armed with dialectical materialism, Soviet biology has opened new perspectives in cognition and mastery of the main laws of the organic world. Core questions of Michurinist biology — questions of directed change of organisms and management of their vital activity, questions of speciation — have as their theoretical basis materialist dialectics. Materialist understanding of the interrelation between organism and environment became a firm basis for all branches of biological science. The guiding principle in the scientific discovery of O.

---

[195] K. Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, p. 46, 1949.
[196] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 268.

B. Lepeshinskaya is the idea of dialectical development. It is this idea that lies at the base of her theory of cell formation from non-cellular forms of life. It is no coincidence that the new theory of the origin of life on Earth was created in the USSR. The direct influence of the Marxist-Leninist worldview in creating the new cosmogonic science is completely obvious. Thus, with the growing need for theoretical generalization of data from modern natural science, the need for Marxist-Leninist methodology increases.

The new characteristic feature of Soviet science consists in the fact that all fields of science bring their theoretical principles to practical conclusions. Comrade Stalin teaches that genuine recognition of Marxism is its implementation into life[197]. Soviet science becomes increasingly genuine in the Marxist sense, expanding its practical participation in the construction of communism and transforming into a science of managing the regularities of development of phenomena of nature and society, revealing its transformative power ever deeper. In the USSR, deep penetration of the ideas of I. P. Pavlov's materialist doctrine into all areas of practical medicine takes place. Pavlov's ideas on the leading role of the central nervous system begin to permeate the entire complex of therapeutic measures. On the basis of Pavlov's doctrine, restructuring of rational nutrition, physical culture, resort management, etc., directed at strengthening the health of working people of socialist society, is occurring. On the scientific basis of Michurinist biology, socialist agriculture is developing. Michurinist biology plays a huge role in carrying out the great

[197] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 305.

plan for transforming nature in the USSR. The outstanding discovery of O. B. Lepeshinskaya is brought to practical implementation in medicine. By its steady forward movement and fruitful results, Soviet science is indebted primarily to mastering the Marxist-Leninist worldview, applying materialist dialectics — the only scientific method of research. In turn, the development of Soviet science on nature expands and enriches the natural-scientific foundations of dialectical materialism.

The importance of Soviet philosophy increases also in light of modern ideological struggle. The Marxist-Leninist worldview was always distinguished by its fundamental opposition to the bourgeois worldview and was always developed in a sharp struggle against it. In the period of transition to communism, the struggle against corrupt bourgeois ideology reaches an extreme degree of sharpness. If the Marxist-Leninist philosophy is an ideological banner of the Soviet people and peoples of the countries of people's democracy in the struggle for communism, corrupt bourgeois philosophy is the ideology of warmongers. The struggle of the Marxist-Leninist worldview against the bourgeois worldview assumes the most diverse forms. Sharp ideological struggle permeates all fields of science. Socialism by nature is incompatible with any remnants of old ideology. Even 50 years ago, V. I. Lenin called to "tirelessly fight against any bourgeois ideology, in whatever fashionable and glittering dresses it may be clothed"[198]. The edge of ideological work in modern conditions is directed at the steadfast overcoming of influences of reactionary bourgeois ideology, at strengthening Bolshevik uncompromisingness

[198] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 315 (*Emphasis mine — M. L.*).

toward all kinds of ideological distortions. In these conditions, the importance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy increases steadily. Marxist methodology played a decisive role in the struggle against pseudo-scientific trends in biology, physiology, physics, etc., in exposing the reactionary idealist teachings of Weismann, Mendel, Morgan, Virchow, the erroneous views of L. Orbeli, Beritov, and others. It serves as a sharpest weapon in exposing various forms of idealism and metaphysics in all other fields of science.

The greatest advantage of Marxist-Leninist philosophy over all other worldviews consists in the fact that it relies on a special political organization — the party of Lenin and Stalin. The transformation of the Marxist-Leninist worldview into the dominant power of socialist society means that conditions have been created for dialectical and historical materialism that no other philosophical theories had. Philosophy as part of the superstructure in the USSR relies on a vast network of philosophical institutions. In the country, there are over 10 philosophical institutions under the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and academies of sciences of union republics (in 1916 there was not a single one), about 100 philosophical departments at higher educational institutions and universities, and 880 departments of Marxism-Leninism that organize the study of Comrade Stalin's work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* and other works of classics of Marxism-Leninism.

In accordance with philosophy being an all-national worldview in the USSR, the party of Lenin and Stalin and the Soviet state use all the advantages of the Soviet socialist system to create all conditions so that philosophy could successfully perform its

functions. Never in history has any state or any party paid such attention to philosophy as the party of Lenin and Stalin and the Soviet state. The party displays special care for the ideological purity of the Marxist-Leninist worldview — the greatest ideological wealth of the party. In recent years alone, the CC of the C.P.S.U.(B.) issued a decision on Volume III of *History of Philosophy*, historic resolutions on ideological questions, and under the leadership of the CC of the C.P.S.U.(B.) in 1947, a philosophical discussion was held.

At the philosophical discussion, the Central Committee of the party uncovered serious defects in the field of developing Marxist-Leninist philosophy and gave instructions that set programmatic goals for the further development of all social sciences in the USSR.

The powerful development of Soviet philosophical science is carried out in the immortal works of Lenin and Stalin.

Comrade Stalin formulated a law of development of Soviet science of special importance for Marxist-Leninist philosophy under conditions of victorious socialism. Struggle of opinions and scientific discussions are a form of development of Soviet philosophy in the epoch of communism.

If in the pre-Soviet period the superstructure represented a product of that epoch when a given economic basis operated and lived briefly, perishing along with the liquidation of the basis that produced it, under communism the superstructure lives as long as society itself exists.

Previously, with the transition from one stage of society to another, materialism assumed a new form. Being the highest

form of materialism, Marxist philosophical materialism in its continuous development is enriched all the time, but does not change its form. Marxist philosophy is the philosophy not only of the present, but also of the future. Therefore, it can develop and change, enriched by new conclusions and formulas, but cannot be replaced by any other philosophy.

If in an antagonistic society the development and succession of philosophical theories are determined by class struggle, in conditions of victorious socialism, when there are no hostile classes and class struggle is absent, one of the main driving forces of development of Soviet philosophy is the struggle of opinions, which serves as a powerful stimulus for creative development of dialectical and historical materialism, enriching it with new experience and new conclusions.

Comrade Stalin's work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* outlines the greatest perspectives for the development of dialectical and historical materialism, raising Soviet philosophy to a level corresponding to the highest phase of communism.

Saturated with great ideological content, a vast amount of theoretical generalizations, Stalin's work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, like Engels's *Anti-Dühring*, Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, and other immortal creations of Marxist-Leninist thought, will serve as an inexhaustible spring feeding science with leading ideas, inspiring and guiding it toward new discoveries, to the boundless cognition of nature and society for the benefit of communist society.

9. Development of the Law of the Struggle of Opposites in K. Marx's *Capital*

M. M. ROSENTHAL

I

Capital is the greatest work of scientific socialism. If socialism was transformed from a utopia into a science, it was primarily thanks to *Capital*. *Capital* is devoted to analyzing the laws of capitalist society. In this work, for the first time, it is comprehensively shown how the development of capitalism, based on glaring antagonistic contradictions, inevitably, law-governedly, by virtue of natural-historical necessity, prepares the conditions for the transition to socialism.

If utopian socialists built socialist theories without being able to clarify the objective mechanism of the action of capitalism, the development of which leads to its demise, Marx's credit lies in showing socialism not as a good wish of people, but as a necessary, law-governed result of social development. Therefore, without *Capital*, there is no scientific socialism.

At the same time, *Capital* represents a great philosophical work of Marxism. *Capital* would be unthinkable without dialectical and historical materialism. The philosophical basis, the soul of *Capital*, is dialectical materialism, the materialist understanding of history. Lenin wrote that if Marx did not leave a *Logic* with a capital letter, i.e., did not give us dialectics in a systematically expounded form, he left us the logic of *Capital*, and this should be used to the maximum. Lenin pointed out that in *Capital*, dialectics, dialectical logic, and dialectical theory of knowledge are applied to a single science,

applied not abstractly, but concretely to the analysis of an entire socio-economic formation—the capitalist system.

In a review of Marx's book *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, which is of extraordinary value to us and serves in many respects as a guiding thread in considering the question of the method of *Capital*, Engels wrote:

> "The elaboration of the method which forms the basis of Marx's critique of political economy we consider a result which in its significance is hardly inferior to the basic materialist conception."[199]

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of *Capital* for the development of the Marxist dialectical method. *Capital* is a true encyclopedia of materialist dialectics. In his work, Marx subjected Hegel's idealist dialectics to a comprehensive critique and contrasted it with his own method—the only scientific method of materialist dialectics. In the Afterword to the second edition of Volume 1 of *Capital*, Marx points out: "My dialectical method is not only fundamentally different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite."

Not Hegel's idealist mystified dialectics, but Marx's materialist dialectics found its most complete and deep expression in *Capital*, arming revolutionary Marxists with a powerful method of theoretical cognition and revolutionary action.

The materialist dialectics of Marx and Engels received its further development in the works of the great leaders of the

---

[199] K. Marx. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, p. 235. Gospolitizdat. 1949.

Russian and international proletariat, Lenin and Stalin, who sharpened this most powerful theoretical weapon on the experience of a new historical era—the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the era of building socialism and communism.

Marx's method, deeply developed in *Capital*, has primarily the characteristic feature that it is revolutionary, partisan from start to finish. With tremendous force, the revolutionary-critical character of Marxism manifested itself in *Capital*. With the help of his method, Marx fearlessly exposes the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production, lays bare the incurable ulcers of capitalism, and demonstrates its doom. Every step of Marx's analysis is substantiated by a whole Mont Blanc of objective facts, and at the same time, this analysis is imbued with revolutionary passion, hatred for the bourgeoisie, and great love for the proletariat, in which Marx sees the fighter for the happy future of all working humanity.

Marx's method is not only a method for researching capitalism, but also a method for criticizing the defenders of capitalism, a method of sharp revolutionary struggle against the apologetic conclusions of all bourgeois political economy. It is no coincidence that *Capital* has the subtitle *Critique of Political Economy*. Shortly before his death, Marx, in one of his letters, joyfully reported the completion of the first volume of *Capital*, writing that it was "the most terrible missile that has ever been launched at the head of the bourgeoisie."

It is easy to understand, therefore, that studying the dialectics of *Capital* is of immense theoretical interest. Using the example of Marx applying dialectics to the analysis of

capitalism, we learn how to master this sharpest theoretical weapon. The study of this work and its method also has urgent political significance. For what is dialectics in *Capital*, if we state the essence of this question briefly? It is, above all, a deep analysis of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production—contradictions whose movement and development inevitably lead capitalism to its demise. That is precisely why all enemies of Marxism, including modern ones, launch their arrows against *Capital*, against the revolutionary method of *Capital*, against the brilliant works of Lenin and Stalin, which give a dialectical analysis of the contradictions of the last stage of capitalism—imperialism—and which represent a creative development of the ideas of *Capital* as applied to new historical conditions.

Modern Right Socialists fiercely attack the basic propositions of *Capital*. Like their predecessors Bernstein, Kautsky, etc., they conduct a struggle against the revolutionary dialectics of *Capital*. This is explained very simply: one only has to remove dialectics from *Capital* to deprive it of its living soul. Without the dialectics of *Capital*, there is no revolutionary-critical spirit inherent in *Capital*. The analysis given in *Capital* is a dialectical analysis of capitalism. Therefore, the struggle waged by modern traitors to the working class against Marx's dialectics is a struggle against revolutionary Marxism, against the revolutionary conclusions that flow from *Capital*, a struggle against scientific socialism.

The speeches of modern Right Socialists against dialectics are nothing other than a technique, a means of struggling against

the revolutionary edge of the analysis of capitalism given by Marx.

Any conscious worker can expose the falsifiers of Marxism and, in the words of Marx himself, reveal the true reasons for the hatred of right-socialist advocates of the bourgeoisie toward dialectics. "...Dialectics," wrote Marx, inspires the bourgeoisie and its doctrinaire ideologists only with anger and horror, because in its positive understanding of existing things it includes at the same time an understanding of their negation, their inevitable demise; it views every historical form in motion, and therefore from its transient side as well; it bows before nothing and is in its very essence critical and revolutionary."[200]

For this same reason, Right Socialists harbor malice toward revolutionary dialectics. They undertake the hopeless task of refuting dialectical materialism for a reason. Marxist dialectics, when applied to the tactics of the party of the proletariat, teaches that not reformist smoothing over and blurring of the glaring contradictions of capitalism, but the fearless revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and all oppressed slaves of capital against imperialism moves society forward, is the decisive force of development. Marxist dialectics teaches that not quantitative, reformist improvements introduced into the existing capitalist system can eliminate the misery, poverty, and ruin of the working masses, but a radical, qualitative change in the system of exploitation, the destruction of the capitalist system, and the building of socialism. But because

---

[200] K. Marx. *Capital*. Vol. 1, p. 20. Gospolitizdat. 1949.

Right Socialists are terrified of such a struggle, such a revolutionary leap, they act as lackeys of the capitalists. Hence all their zeal against dialectics, against dialectical materialism; hence their attempts to declare dialectical materialism a "phantom," a "figment," and to cross out its existence.

Within the limits of an article, it is, of course, impossible not only to exhaust, but even in outline form to present the main questions of dialectics, dialectical logic, and theory of knowledge developed by Marx in *Capital*. In Marx's great work, all sides of materialist dialectics found their deep elaboration. But special attention, for completely understandable reasons, Marx devoted to the most important question of dialectics—the question of contradictions, of the unfolding of contradictions as the source and internal content of development. For the analysis of the capitalist mode of production, which is characterized by deep contradictions, this side of dialectics was of paramount importance.

From the whole sum of questions related to the problem of the elaboration of dialectics in *Capital*, we shall take precisely this question.

II

A distinctive feature of the method of *Capital*, in contrast to the method of bourgeois economists, is the application of the dialectical theory of development to the analysis of the capitalist mode of production. In the history of political economy, this was a great revolutionary turnover. Smith and Ricardo approached the capitalist mode of production as an eternal, natural expression of social life. Being bourgeois

ideologists, they taught that the capitalist mode of production is established once and for all as an unchangeable mode of production. The greatness of Marx lies in the fact that he, as an ideologist of the proletariat, approached the analysis of capitalism from the standpoint of the dialectical theory of development.

Marx himself, in the preface to the first edition of Volume I of *Capital*, speaks of this fundamental difference between him and his predecessors. He points out that "the present society is not a solid crystal, but an organism capable of transformation and constantly in the process of transformation."[201]

Marx contrasts the anti-historicism of the old bourgeois economists with his dialectical historicism. The most important feature of the method of the old economists was the ignoring of the historical specificity of capitalist production, those specific forms that labor and all social relations take under capitalism. For them, an analysis of quantity was characteristic—for example, an analysis of the magnitude of value, profit, rent, etc. But they paid no attention to why social relations between people assume precisely this, and not another, character, i.e., they ignored the qualitative side of capitalism, and consequently, its historically transient nature.

Marx, in contrast to the old bourgeois economists, focuses all attention on the analysis of the historical form that labor assumes under certain conditions, on the qualitative specificity of the capitalist mode of production.

---

201 Ibid., pp. 8–9.

He investigates why, under the dominance of commodity production, the products of human labor acquire the form of value and surplus value, etc. Precisely such an approach helped Marx make a revolution in the science of the capitalist mode of production and view it in the process of emergence, development, and demise as a phenomenon caused by specific historical conditions.

Marx himself stated that the ultimate aim of his work was to "disclose the economic law of motion of modern society."[202]

Applying the dialectical principle of development to the analysis of capitalism, Marx gives a comprehensive development to the question of contradictions based on concrete material. Lenin called the question of contradictions the essence, the core of dialectics. In his notes on dialectics in *Philosophical Notebooks*, he paid special attention to this side of *Capital*.

And indeed, the richness of *Capital* in this sense is inexhaustible. Development occurs in contradictions. The struggle of opposites is the driving force of development. Capitalism is particularly characterized by the antagonism of the social relations dominating in it. To show the scientific origin, development, and inevitable demise of the capitalist mode of production means to show how the contradictions of capitalism arise, how they develop and intensify, turning into irreconcilable extremes, as at a certain stage of their development these contradictions explode the capitalist system

202 K. Marx. *Capital*. Vol. 1, p. 8.

from within, lead to a revolutionary leap, to a necessary, law-governed transition from capitalism to socialism.

That is why Marx devotes such great attention to the question of the contradictions of capitalism and thereby develops the dialectical doctrine of contradictions in general.

Marx points out that the source of any dialectical development is contradiction, its development, and its resolution:

> "...The development of the contradictions of a given historical form of production is the only historical way of its dissolution and the formation of a new one."[203]

This is the real key to all of *Capital*! This proposition of Marx is directed against idealists, against petty-bourgeois socialists, romantics, and other diverse enemies of the proletariat who fear the development of contradictions and who, even if they see contradictions, try to neutralize them, synthesize them, reconcile them, transferring contradictions into the realm of thought, consciousness, logical categories. Marx had to fight along this line against Smith and Ricardo, against Hegel, Proudhon, and other philosophers and economists.

In Marx, logical concepts and their movement are a reflection of the real objective movement, the development of the contradictions of commodity production itself. In other words, behind the logical analysis, behind the economic categories examined by Marx, lies a colossal historical material summarized in *Capital*.

---

[203] Ibid., p. 493.

Even in *The Poverty of Philosophy*, criticizing Hegel's idealist method, as well as Proudhon, who, in Marx's phrase, reduced this method "to more wretched dimensions," Marx pointed out: "Economic categories are only the theoretical expressions, the abstractions of the social relations of production."

In a letter to Annenkov, Marx wrote: "Wishing to reconcile contradictions, Mr. Proudhon completely bypasses the question: shouldn't the very foundation of these contradictions be overthrown? He completely resembles a political doctrinaire who wants to preserve the king, the chamber of deputies, and the upper house as constituent parts of social life, as eternal categories. He merely seeks a new formula to balance these forces, whose equilibrium consists precisely in their modern movement, where one of these forces is now the victor, now the slave of another. Thus, in the XVIII century, many mediocre minds tried to find the true formula to balance the social estates, the nobility, the king, parliaments, etc., and the next day there was no king, no parliament, no nobility. The true equilibrium of this antagonism was the overthrow of all social relations that served as the basis for these feudal institutions and the basis of the antagonism of these feudal institutions."[204]

This remarkable statement of Marx deeply exposes the main flaw in the method of bourgeois philosophers and economists. Bourgeois philosophers and economists seek to reconcile contradictions, to find a formula that, without destroying the constituent parts of contradictions, would re-balance them. According to Marx, true development consists in destroying

[204] K. Marx and F. Engels. *Letters on Capital*, p. 19. Gospolitizdat. 1948.

the real basis of these contradictions, and therefore the contradictions themselves.

Consequently, the task is not to reconcile contradictions, but to examine how they develop in life, are resolved, and overcome. Precisely in this lies one of the fundamental differences between Marx's method and Hegel's idealist dialectics.

Showing that, in contrast to Hegelian, idealist dialectics, his dialectical method is materialist, Marx writes that for Hegel's dialectics, the glorification of the existing is characteristic, and therefore, the reconciliation of contradictions, whereas materialist dialectics approaches everything existing from the point of view of cell. And, just as from the reproduction of individual cells an organism grows, from the reproduction of the commodity cell grows commodity production—first simple, and then capitalist production.

Marx begins with an analysis of the commodity because, under certain historical conditions, the products produced by people assume the commodity form. When ties between people due to the social division of labor and the presence of private property are realized not directly, but through exchange, the product takes the form of a commodity. Commodity production and circulation took place long before the emergence of capitalism, but only in capitalist society do they become dominant. In capitalist society, says J. V. Stalin, "everything takes the form of a commodity; everywhere the principle of buying and selling reigns. Here you can buy not only consumer goods, not only food products, but also human labor power, their blood,

their conscience."[205] Therefore, in the commodity form, in the commodity cell, in the simple act of exchange, all the secrets of capitalist production, the germ of all contradictions of capitalism, are hidden.

It is clear that without a preliminary analysis of the commodity, it is impossible to understand everything else: the emergence of money, surplus value, the whole mechanism of the capitalist mode of production; it is impossible to understand the historically transient nature of capitalism.

Beginning his analysis of capital with the commodity, Marx immediately reveals the historical specificity of the capitalist mode of production, showing that capital is not an eternal category, but only a stage in the development of humanity. Already in the form of the commodity, as Marx himself states, *the specific nature, and by no means the absolute character of modern bourgeois production*, is analyzed.[206]

Investigating the commodity, Marx immediately reveals the contradictory nature of this initial cell. The commodity is both a use value and an exchangeable value; it is a unity of these opposites. Labor creating commodities also contains an internal contradiction: it is a unity of concrete and abstract labor, of private and social labor. These contradictions contained in labor express the anarchic nature of commodity production based on private property.

Marx attached immense importance to the analysis of the contradictions of the dual nature of the commodity and labor

---

205 J. V. Stalin. *Works*. Vol. 1, p. 332.

206 K. Marx and F. Engels. *Letters on Capital*, pp. 77–78.

producing the commodity. Bourgeois economists, even when they spoke of the difference between use value and exchange value, glossed over the contradictions between them and did not understand or want to understand the social character of this contradiction. The dual, contradictory nature of labor they did not see at all. Marx was the first to establish this fact. Marxism is rightly proud of this discovery of abstract labor, for without distinguishing between concrete and abstract labor, the whole mechanism of commodity production and exchange, the production of surplus value, is incomprehensible.

In the contradictions of the commodity and labor, the basic contradiction of the capitalist mode of production—the contradiction between the social character of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation—is already present in potentiality. Therefore, only the analysis of these contradictions, the analysis of the growth, unfolding, and transformation of the contradictions of simple commodity production into the contradictions of capitalist production can reveal the true laws of bourgeois society, its emergence, development, and inevitable demise.

Lenin, in his fragment *On the Question of Dialectics*, emphasizes the importance of Marx's analysis of the contradictions of the simplest, most ordinary relationship of bourgeois society—the exchange of commodities.

"The analysis," writes Lenin, "reveals in this simplest phenomenon (in this 'cell' of bourgeois society) *all* the contradictions (or the germs of *all* the contradictions) of modern society. The subsequent exposition shows us the development (and growth and movement) of these

contradictions and of this society, in the Σ (in the sum—*M. R.*) of its individual parts, from its beginning to its end."[207]

It is easy to understand, therefore, why bourgeois economists, apologists for the capitalist system, could not and did not want to expose these contradictions in the commodity and labor. Marx fought against bourgeois economists who blurred the deepest contradictions of labor in conditions of commodity production. Proceeding from a metaphysical conception of the commodity as an identity of use value and exchange value, they painted an idyllic picture of bourgeois society, in which commodities were allegedly produced for the sake of consumption. From this, the conclusion was drawn that crises of overproduction were impossible. Citing a relevant passage from Ricardo, Marx ironically notes:

> "What a sweet picture of bourgeois relations!"[208]

Regarding a proposition of J. Mill, the meaning of which consists in erasing the opposition between use value and exchange value, Marx writes: "...From what he (*i.e., the commodity producer—M. R.*) wants to free himself is a definite quantity of use value; what he wants to have is the value of this use value. Both things represent *anything but identity*."[209]

But bourgeois economists deliberately present use value and exchange value as an identity, cleansing the commodity and labor of contradictions in order to prove the coincidence of

---

207 V. I. Lenin. *Philosophical Notebooks*, p. 328. 1947.

208 K. Marx. *Theories of Surplus Value*. Vol. II, part 2, p. 183. 1936.

209 K. Marx. *Theories of Surplus Value*. Vol. III, p. 73. 1936. (Emphasis mine—*M.R.*)

supply and demand, the impossibility of crises of overproduction, etc.

Only the brilliant Marxist analysis of the contradictions of the initial "cell" of commodity production, the analysis of the contradictions of labor, allows one to understand all further development of commodity production, the transition of this production into capitalist production, the growth of the contradictions of capitalism, etc. Marx reveals how these contradictions find the form of their movement, their development in reality itself. He gives an analysis of the form of value, the development of the form of value in the process of exchange—a development concluding with the splitting of the single commodity into commodity and money.

The contradiction between the use value and exchange value of a commodity, like any contradiction, requires its overcoming, its resolution. The actual movement in the historical process of exchange creates the real form of overcoming this contradiction.

In Marx, logical analysis of contradictions is an expression of real objective movement, the development of contradictions of commodity production itself. In other words, behind this logical analysis, behind the economic categories examined by Marx, lies a colossal historical material summarized in *Capital*.

Even in *The Poverty of Philosophy*, criticizing Hegel's idealist method, as well as Proudhon, who, according to Marx, brought this method "to more wretched dimensions," Marx pointed out:

“Economic categories are only theoretical expressions, abstractions of the social relations of production.”[210]

Because the economic categories formulated by Marx are so deep, vital, and flexible, they are abstractions, i.e., generalizations of real “social relations of production”—relations studied not in statics, but in dynamics, not as fixed, but as developing and changing ones. The transition from one set of economic categories to others, for example, from the simple form of value to the complex, from the complex to universal, from commodity to money, from money to capital, etc., reflects Marx’s real objective development and is based on a thorough study of vast factual material. Marx sharply ridicules Proudhon, who, due to his idealist method, views economic categories in such a light "as if they were born in the head, full of pure reason: to such an extent these categories seem to generate each other..."[211]

In Marx, economic categories do not generate movement. In categories, the real movement of production and the entire sum of social relations of capitalism are summarized. Marx shows that deep contradictions between use value and exchange value do not arise immediately; he reveals the nature of different forms of value: simple or individual, total or expanded, general, and money. These forms of value are milestones on the path of deepening development of the contradictions of commodity and commodity exchange.

---

210 K. Marx and F. Engels. *Works*. Vol. V, p. 364.

211 K. Marx and F. Engels. *Works*. Vol. V, p. 363.

The simple form of value corresponds to that period of economic development when commodity exchange did not yet exist, when primitive communities accidentally encountered each other (hence the accidental form of value) and exchanged surpluses of their products. But even in this accidental exchange, an essential difference, the beginning of the contradiction between use value and exchange value, was already present, for products enter into exchange that have no use value for their producers, but have exchange value.

Growth of production and growth of exchange lead to more and more products being produced specifically for exchange. Production increasingly assumes a commodity character. Under new conditions, a single commodity can be exchanged for a number of other commodities. And this means a further deepening of contradictions, a break between use value and exchange value. A new—total or expanded—form of value arises.

But the process of development does not stop here. The development of commodity exchange leads to a specific commodity being singled out as a measure of value, expressing the value of all other commodities. Gradually, gold becomes such a universal form of value. Money arises as a specific commodity, with the characteristic capacity to be exchanged for any other commodity. In this special commodity, value materializes, separating from use values; social wealth is expressed in it, regardless of concrete forms of this wealth.

The development of the contradictions of the commodity concludes with the splitting of the single commodity into

commodity and money. What was originally a relative unity has split into external opposites, standing face to face.

We see, therefore, how in reality itself contradictions arise and forms of their resolution develop. Marx had no need, after the manner of Hegel, to invent an artificial "synthesis," analyzing such a contradiction as the contradiction between the use value and exchange value of a commodity. The objective development of this contradiction itself gives rise to a specific objective form of its resolution. But this overcoming does not mean disappearance, non-reconciliation, but a further deepening of contradictions. The contradictions of the commodity are only the beginning of the movement of contradictions of commodity production, and in the splitting of the commodity into commodity and money they find their expression not in the destruction of these contradictions, but in their deepening and sharpening. "The development of the commodity," says Marx, "does not abolish these contradictions, but creates a form in which they can move. Such is generally the method by which real contradictions are resolved."[212]

The form of further movement of the contradictions of the commodity is the newly emerged opposition between commodity and money. "The process of exchange," writes Marx, "gives rise to a splitting of the commodity into commodity and money—an external opposition in which commodities express their inherent opposition between use value and value. In this opposition, commodities as use value stand opposed to money as exchange value."[213]

---

212 K. Marx. *Capital*. Vol. 1, p. 110.

213 K. Marx. *Capital*. Vol. 1, p. 111.

Money splits the single act of sale and purchase into two independent acts. The exchange of a commodity for money does not entail the immediate conversion of money into a commodity. The realization of exchange value existing in the form of commodities with a definite use value depends on external conditions and may not take place. The single process of exchange splits into opposite parts: **C - M** and **M - C**.

And in this, as Marx shows, the possibility of crises is already embedded. But this is still only a possibility. This possibility is embedded already in simple commodity production and circulation. The conditions for converting this possibility of crises into reality are created only with the development of the capitalist mode of production. Marx writes on this subject: "The immanent contradiction of the commodity—the opposition of use value and value, the opposition of private labor, which at the same time must express itself as labor directly social, the opposition of specific concrete labor, which at the same time has value only as abstract universal labor, the opposition of the personification of things and the reification of persons—this immanent contradiction receives in the oppositions of commodity metamorphosis developed forms of its movement. Consequently, these forms already contain in themselves the possibility—however, only the possibility—of crises. The conversion of this possibility into reality requires a whole sum of conditions that within the framework of simple commodity circulation do not exist at all."[214]

[214] Ibid., pp. 120–121.

Marx points out that during a crisis, the opposition between the commodity and its form of value—money—"grows into an absolute contradiction."[215]

Having examined the contradictions of simple commodity production, Marx proceeds to analyze the contradictions of capital, the self-expansion of capital. Here we come to the central point of Marx's work, to the analysis of surplus value, i.e., to the analysis of new contradictions—the contradictions of capitalist commodity production.

Marx points out that the ultimate product of simple commodity circulation is money. Money constitutes together with this the first form of appearance of capital. The motto of simple commodity production is the production of use values, the exchange of commodity for commodity through the medium of money. The motto of capitalist commodity production is the production of expanding value for the sake of enriching the capitalist.

"Simple commodity circulation," says Marx, "—sale for the sake of buying—serves as a means for achieving an ultimate result lying outside circulation—the appropriation of use values, for the satisfaction of needs."[216]

For the capitalist, the main goal is the production of surplus value, a "passionate chase after value."[217] "Therefore, use value

---

215 Ibid., p. 145.
216 Ibid., pp. 158–159.
217 Ibid., p. 160.

must never be regarded as the immediate goal of the capitalist."[218]

But what is the magical capacity of value, of money, for self-expansion? This cornerstone question was a stumbling block for all pre-Marxist bourgeois political economy. It felt its way toward understanding the secret of surplus value, but could not uncover it. Marx did this, and herein lies his deathless achievement.

As is known, Marx discovered the source of surplus value in the exploitation of workers by capitalists.

From this moment on, the center of Marx's analysis of contradictions is the analysis of contradictions between the working class and the capitalist class.

The contradiction derived earlier between concrete labor creating use value and abstract labor creating value is transformed at a new stage of development of commodity production into a contradiction of the process of capitalist production. Here is what Marx writes on this subject:

> "Thus, the distinctions previously derived from the analysis of the commodity between labor that creates use value and labor that creates value, since it creates value, now appear as distinctions between different sides of the production process."

As the unity of the process of labor and the process of formation of value, the productive process is a process of

---

[218] Ibid., pp. 159–160.

production of commodities; as the unity of the process of labor and the process of increase of value, it is a capitalist process of production, the capitalist form of commodity production.[219]

This contradiction is expressed in a specific way in the contradictory nature of labor power: the value of labor power and the value created by labor in the process of its consumption are two different magnitudes. Standing before a single goal—the production of surplus value—the capitalist is interested in the maximum reduction of necessary labor time for the reproduction of the value of labor power and the maximum increase of surplus time. The worker, on the contrary, is interested in working less for the capitalist. This irreconcilable contradiction of the fundamental interests of workers and capitalists is the basis of the fierce struggle between them.

"Thus," writes Marx, "in the history of capitalist production, the regulation of the working day appears as a struggle for the limits of the working day—a struggle between the collective capitalist, i.e., the class of capitalists, and the collective worker, i.e., the working class."[220]

Marx further reveals the paths and methods of production of absolute and relative surplus value. He paints a striking picture of the exploitation of workers by the bourgeoisie—adults and children, the heartless attitude of the new formation of slaveowners toward workers and their families. In remarkable chapters on the production of absolute and relative surplus

---

219 K. Marx. *Capital*. Vol. 1, pp. 203–204.

220 Ibid., p. 240.

value, Marx shows how the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie deepens.

With the introduction of machines arises a contradiction between the natural limits of labor power and the capacity of the machine to work like a *perpetuum mobile*. A machine can work continuously day and night; it can be exploited day and night, but human labor power cannot be exploited 24 hours a day, and the capitalist strives to overcome this contradiction by forcing the worker to work more intensively, squeezing out of him, like a press, all his vital juices.

The working class, Marx points out, "represents the absence of development in order that other classes might serve as representatives of human development."[221]

Old bourgeois political economy represented by Smith and Ricardo, although it did not blur, like vulgar political economy, the contradictions between the working class and capitalists, still tried to prove the harmony of class interests. Marx, with his brilliant analysis of the contradictions of capitalism, destroyed ideas about non-existent harmony between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and raised the consciousness of the working class to the level of understanding the fundamental opposition of its interests to those of the bourgeoisie.

Further analysis of contradictions, given by Marx in the chapter on the general law of capitalist accumulation and others, shows the growth and deepening of contradictions between the working class and the bourgeoisie.

---

221 K. Marx. *Theories of Surplus Value*. Vol. III, p. 74.

The process of capitalist reproduction is a process of reproduction of capitalist relations on an expanded scale, with all their contradictions. Expanded reproduction means further expansion and deepening of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production and, above all, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

"As simple reproduction," writes Marx, "continually reproduces the capitalist relation itself—capitalists on one side, wage laborers on the other—so reproduction on an expanded scale, or accumulation, reproduces the capitalist relation on an expanded scale: more capitalists or larger capitalists at one pole, more wage laborers at the other."[222]

The process of accumulation of capital is accompanied by the growth of its organic composition, which leads to a relative decrease in the variable part of capital. As a result of the growth of concentration of capital and concentration of production at one pole—the pole of the bourgeoisie—colossal wealth is concentrated; at the other pole—the pole of the proletariat—grows colossal poverty, absolute impoverishment of the working class, and the industrial reserve army grows.

As a result of a deep analysis of the process of accumulation of capital, Marx formulated the famous general law of capitalist accumulation, in which in concentrated form the sharpness and antagonistic nature of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production are expressed.

---

222 K. Marx. *Capital*. Vol. 1, p. 619.

"The greater the social wealth," writes Marx, "—the functioning capital, the extent and energy of its growth, and, therefore, also the absolute mass of the proletariat and the productiveness of its labor, the greater is the industrial reserve army. Free labor power develops for the same reason as the expansion force of capital. Therefore, the relative magnitude of the industrial reserve army increases with the growth of wealth. But the greater this reserve army in comparison with the active labor army, the more massive the consolidated surplus population, whose poverty is inversely proportional to the torment of its labor. Finally, the greater the lowest strata of the working class and the industrial reserve army, the greater is official pauperism. *This is the absolute, general law of capitalist accumulation*."[223]

And further: "Consequently, accumulation of wealth at one pole is at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of labor, slavery, ignorance, brutalization, and moral degradation at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that produces its own product as capital."[224]

The process of capitalist accumulation brings to the extreme limit of sharpening the main contradiction of developed capitalism—the contradiction between the social character of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation.

In preparatory works for *Capital* and in *Capital* itself, Marx deeply reveals and vividly demonstrates the movement of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production and

---

223 Ibid., p. 650.

224 Ibid., p. 651.

exchange. He shows how in its movement capital creates on its path limits that it must break through in order to encounter new limits again, etc., until the very existence of capitalism becomes an absolute obstacle to the further development of society.

Capital is forced to endlessly expand the production of commodities in order to increase profit, and together with this, by its exploitation of the main consumers—workers and all working people—it undermines the very foundation on which it rests. The contradictions of the commodity, the contradictions between use value and exchange value, between private and social labor, etc., sharpen to the highest degree. The capitalist does not know and does not want to know limits in the production of value. But there is no value without use value. The more values a capitalist produces, the more use values he produces. But the latter must be available in a definite quantity, and if there are more of them, they cannot be converted into the general form of value, into money. Produced commodities, in Marx's expression, cannot be "gilded."

"In order to be able to convert it into the general form of value," writes Marx, "...use value must be present only in a definite quantity, in a quantity whose measure is not contained in the labor objectified in it, but flows from its nature as use value, with use value existing for others."

In connection with this, Marx reveals a characteristic feature of the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism: their insolubility on the basis of the capitalist mode of production.

"Capitalist production constantly strives to overcome these immanent limits, but it overcomes them only by means that place these limits before it again, and moreover on a larger scale.

The true limit of capitalist production is capital itself, that is: capital and its self-expansion of value is the starting and finishing point, the motive and goal of production; production is only production for capital, and not vice versa: the means of production are not mere means for a constantly expanding process of life for the society of producers."[225]

The contradiction between the drive toward unlimited development of production and the narrow limits of this development erected by capitalism ruins the mass of producers and plunges working people into an abyss of poverty and misery. This could be resolved only on the condition that production were subordinated to the vital interests of the masses. But then capitalism would cease to be capitalism. Its goal is the production of profit and self-expansion of value. That is why the resolution of the contradictions of capitalism on the ground of capitalism itself is impossible. Such a resolution can be achieved only by destroying the capitalist mode of production and creating a socialist mode of production, for behind all the contradictions of capitalism lies the main and underlying contradiction—the contradiction between private capitalist appropriation and the social character of productive forces, which have outgrown the

[225] K. Marx, Capital Vol. III, Part III, Chapter 15.

framework of bourgeois relations of production and require a new, socialist form of production relations.

Capitalism in its heyday could drive production because its relations of production were at that time progressive. These relations of production were in full accord with productive forces. But over time, capitalist relations of production transformed from forms of development of productive forces into their fetters. And then only the destruction of these production relations can open the road to further societal development.

"The contradiction between general social power into which capital is transformed," writes Marx, "and the private power of individual capitalists over these social conditions of production develops more and more into a glaring contradiction and carries within itself the resolution of this relationship, since it at the same time implies the transformation of the conditions of production into general, collective, social conditions of production."[226]

In other words, the action of the inherent laws of capitalism, the mechanism of competition, the boundless thirst of capitalists for gain result in an immense growth of the productive forces of society, the development of comprehensive interdependence and interconnection between individual parts of the production process, and the growth of the social, cooperative character of production. The social character of production urgently requires planned organization of production in accordance with its objective content. But on

[226] K. Marx, Capital, Vol. III, I. c.

the path to such organization stands the class of capitalists, subordinating social production to the private interests of their own enrichment. Hence inevitable crises of overproduction, economic catastrophes, recurring periodically and each time with ever more destructive force, shaking the social organism. What at the beginning of the development of commodity production was only a germ, a possibility of glaring contradictions, became reality under capitalism. From initial, undeveloped forms of contradiction grew and unfolded catastrophic contradictions that pose humanity with a dilemma: either perish, or free productive forces from capitalist fetters and move forward to a new, socialist organization of society.

It is very interesting to note how modern bourgeois political economy tries to “remove” these contradictions of capitalism. In this respect, the theory of the English economist Keynes, who became almost a prophet for modern capitalists and their servants from the camp of Right Socialists, is characteristic. Silencing the contradictions of capitalism, in particular the contradiction between supply and demand, between the impoverished level of consumption of the masses and production, is no longer possible. Keynes is forced to declare that the opinion of old economists about harmony between supply and demand, as if existing under capitalism, turned out to be an illusion. One cannot fail to see real "difficulties," says Keynes.

But Keynes’s whole theory is aimed at blurring the real causes of the "difficulties" of capitalism, at whitewashing the bourgeoisie and relieving it of responsibility for all the evils it rains down upon the heads of millions and tens of millions of

working people. It turns out that a certain “fundamental psychological law” is to blame for everything, according to which people tend to increase their consumption with an increase in income, but to a lesser extent than income grows! Hence unemployment (about which modern bourgeois economists can no longer remain silent!), economic crises, etc. The hired ideologist of imperialism Keynes does not want to admit that the catastrophic fall in mass consumption under capitalism is not the result of a “psychological law,” but of the very nature of the capitalist mode of production, which condemns working people to poverty and hunger. He fears admitting the fact irrefutably established by Marx that the lag of the purchasing power of the masses from the growth of production is in fact the expression of the main contradiction—between the social character of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation.

Keynes tries to prove that contradictions and "difficulties" of capitalism can be overcome on the basis of the capitalist system. But the “proofs” and recipes for saving capitalism composed by him can only serve as evidence of how far modern bourgeois “political economy” has degraded.

In *Capital*, Marx irrefutably proved that the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production can be overcome only by eliminating capitalism. Emphasizing the impossibility of resolving the antagonistic contradictions of capital on the basis of capital itself, Marx shows how in bourgeois society the very force is created that resolves these contradictions. This force is the proletariat.

In the remarkable twenty-fourth chapter of Volume 1 of *Capital*, "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation," Marx summarizes his study of the contradictions of the development of capitalism. He shows that if earlier the capitalist expropriated the worker, now the capitalist himself undergoes expropriation:

> "The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production which has flourished alongside and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."[227]

In one of his letters to Engels, setting out the plan for *Capital*, Marx wrote:

> "...What follows from all this (i.e. the whole movement of the contradictions of capitalism—*M.R.*) is class struggle, in which the movement finds its resolution and which eliminates all this trash..."[228]

III

The brilliant analysis of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production given by Marx in *Capital* allows us to

---

227 K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, Ch. 32.

228 K. Marx to F. Engels, April 30, 1868

draw extremely important conclusions for the Marxist dialectical doctrine of contradictions. First of all, this is the conclusion regarding the significance of the moment of struggle of opposites in the process of development as the main and decisive moment. Lenin subsequently developed this Marxist proposition, formulating the famous statement about the absolute character of the struggle of opposites. Marx waged a fierce war against the host of vulgar bourgeois economists who smoothed over the contradictions of capitalism and brought to the fore the moment of unity, not of struggle. Characterizing the method of one representative of this political economy—Mill—Marx wrote:

> "Where an economic relationship—and consequently also the categories expressing it—contains opposites, represents a contradiction and precisely the unity of opposites, he emphasizes the moment of unity of opposites and denies the opposition. The unity of opposites he converts into the immediate identity of these opposites."[229]

And further: "If a relationship contains opposites, then it contains not only opposition, but unity of opposites. Therefore, there is no unity without opposition. Such is the logic of Mill, with the help of which he eliminates 'contradictions'."[230]

Marx's method of analyzing economic relations, as we have seen, consists in revealing their internal contradictoriness. In any economic phenomenon of commodity production—in

---

229 K. Marx. *Capital*. Vol. III, p. 260. 1949.

230 Ibid., p. 76.

commodity, labor, exchange, capital, etc.—Marx reveals contradictory, opposing sides and analyzes them in the most thorough manner.

He shows that the combination of contradictory sides in an economic phenomenon means struggle between them, leading to the resolution of the given contradiction and the emergence of a new, deeper contradiction. Marx's brilliant analysis of the contradictions of the bourgeois mode of production in *Capital* is irrefutable proof that struggle, not reconciliation of contradictions, serves as the driving force of development.

Marx studies contradictions in their development, movement, and investigates the real objective forms of their resolution, which are created by the very development and deepening of contradictions. Therefore, economic categories and concepts in Marx are deprived of that rigidity, static quality, and anti-historicism that are characteristic of the economic categories of Smith and Ricardo, not to mention vulgar economists. They are mobile, flexible, fluid, transforming into one another in accordance with the development and transformation of reality itself.

Noting the circumstance that Marx in *Capital* reveals contradictions in every economic category of bourgeois society and traces their growth and development "from beginning to end," Lenin shows what importance this has for dialectics in general.

"Such must be," writes Lenin in the fragment *On the Question of Dialectics*, "the method of exposition (or study) of dialectics

in general (for the dialectics of bourgeois society in Marx is only a particular case of dialectics)."[231]

Emphasizing the struggle of contradictions as the decisive moment of development, Marx does not ignore the moment of their unity. *Capital* contains very important indications regarding the relative significance of this moment in the process of development. At the same time, of course, what is meant is not the "unity" of bourgeois economists, who cleanse this concept of internal contradictions, but dialectical unity containing internal contradictions. On the basis of concrete analysis of real economic phenomena of bourgeois society, Marx shows that once opposites tending toward greater separation from each other split, they nevertheless constitute a relative unity, i.e., presuppose each other, are linked until a certain time, and this leads not to softening, but to sharpening, to the unfolding of the struggle between them. If opposites had no relation to each other and existed independently, there would be no contradiction between them, and consequently no struggle. Therefore, the moment of unity, the interconnection of opposites, is, according to Marx, also an important moment that conditions not softening, not reconciliation, as metaphysicians believe, but the sharpening and unfolding of the struggle of contradictions.

This can be seen in the example of the unity of such opposites as the sphere of production and the sphere of circulation in bourgeois society. The sphere of production and the sphere of circulation in capitalist society acquire to a significant degree

---

[231] K. Marx. *Capital*. Vol. 1, p. 766.

an independent character. But in fact, both of these opposite spheres are internally bound together, and precisely because they are internally bound, because they are a unity of opposites, at a certain stage of their separation from each other a crisis breaks out, forcibly and temporarily restoring the unity of these two spheres.

"If they (the phases of production and circulation—*M.R.*)," writes Marx, "were *only separate*, without representing at the same time a *unity*, it would be impossible forcibly to restore their unity, a crisis would be impossible. If they represented only something *single, undivided* (i.e. without contradictions—*M.R.*), it would be impossible forcibly to separate them, which again represents a crisis. It represents the forced creation of unity between separated moments and the forced separation of moments that in essence represent a single whole."[232]

Finally, Marx's analysis of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production is of major importance for dialectics because it brilliantly revealed the type of development characteristic under the rule of antagonistic contradictions. Marx showed that on the basis of antagonistic contradictions, development occurs through progressive splitting of the single whole, deepening and sharpening of contradictions, concluding in a law-governed manner with the destruction of one of the opposites, i.e., the liquidation of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletariat.

---

[232] K. Marx and F. Engels. *Letters on Capital*, p. 149.

In this connection, it must be borne in mind that the dialectics of development of capitalist society as expressed in *Capital* is only a particular case of dialectics in general.

It is clear that it would be dogmatism of the worst kind to simply transfer Marx's propositions on the development of antagonistic contradictions to socialist society, where contradictions of an entirely different order operate—contradictions of a non-antagonistic nature. Marx himself in *Capital* makes a number of valuable remarks showing completely different laws of development under socialism. He repeatedly points out that under socialism production will exist not for squeezing out surplus value from the labor of workers, but for "expanding the life process" of the working people themselves, and that this fact alone fundamentally changes the picture of social development.

In order to understand the completely new character of development after the destruction of capitalism, it is sufficient to refer to the experience of Soviet society, where production exists not for the sake of producing surplus value, but for the sake of raising the material and cultural well-being of the working people. Overcoming the main contradiction of capitalism—the contradiction between the social character of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation—the socialist system in the USSR removed and destroyed all limits to the development of society.

Comrade Stalin teaches that the basic economic law of socialism consists in securing maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the whole of society through continuous growth and perfection of socialist

production on the basis of higher techniques. From this flows a completely different relationship between production and consumption of the masses under socialism compared to capitalism. Characteristic of capitalism is the contradiction between the growth of production and the lag behind this growth of mass consumption (purchasing power), which is an expression of the contradiction between productive forces and production relations. Under socialism, as J. V. Stalin showed, a completely different relationship between them was established: the growth of consumption (purchasing power) of the masses here constantly outpaces the growth of production, creating thereby incentives for endless development of production. “Metabolism” between production and consumption under capitalism is constantly disrupted due to the exploitative nature of that society. On the contrary, the socialist system, thanks to the liquidation of class antagonistic contradictions, creates all conditions for normal “metabolism” between them: the growth of production raises the living standard of the masses, and the growth of the living standard of the masses pushes production forward.

All this conditions a completely different type of development in socialist society compared to capitalist society, a different character of contradictions and forms of overcoming them under socialism. Lenin and Stalin on the experience of the USSR revealed the full specificity of dialectics of development in conditions of struggle for socialism and the victory of the socialist system.

***

Marx's analysis of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production—an analysis brought up to the moment of the inevitable "expropriation of the expropriators" by means of proletarian revolution—retains its full force for the current stage of development of capitalism as well. Lenin and Stalin, relying on the ideas of *Capital*, creatively developing them, gave a theoretical analysis of imperialism as the highest and last stage of capitalism, discovered the laws of economic and political development of capitalism at this stage. They showed that all the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production revealed by Marx in *Capital* are not only preserved, but manifest themselves with even greater sharpness at this stage. Lenin proved that imperialism is precisely the stage in the development of capitalism when conditions are created for the "expropriation of the expropriators." Lenin called imperialism the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat.

Lenin and Stalin exposed the sophistries of revisionists and reformists who tried to blunt the sharpness of Marx's analysis of the contradictions of capitalism, depicting the new stage of capitalism—imperialism—as a stage of class harmony between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, as a stage of "organized capitalism."

Modern Right Socialists continue the social-treasonous line of the old reformists in even more hideous forms. In a period of especially sharpened class struggle, when the world has split into two camps—the camp of imperialism and war and the camp of socialism, peace, and democracy—right-socialist servants of the imperialists shamelessly declare that Marx's analysis of the contradictions of capitalism is "outdated," that a

new era of development has arrived, when a "peaceful," uncontradictory stage has replaced the "polemical" stage, in the expression of Blum.

Right Socialists, striving to befuddle the consciousness of workers, preach that, unlike the era when Marx wrote *Capital*, now in capitalist countries there exists a class "community," a commonality of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

There is no need to prove that this "community" exists only in the fantasy of Right Socialists. What kind of "class community" can we speak of if, for example, in the USA capitalists receive fabulous profits, while workers do not have the means to satisfy their minimum needs! In this country, which Right Socialists hold up as a model of supra-class "democracy," the deficit in the minimum budget of a working-class family is about 30%. There are 60% of such families in the USA receiving an income 25–30% below the subsistence minimum!

The chatter of the leaders of Right Socialists about the "outdatedness" of *Capital* is needed in order to cover up the glaring contradictions of decaying imperialism. If there is a difference in the situation, it is only that the contradictions of modern capitalism, by virtue of the characteristics it acquired at the stage of imperialism, have reached their zenith.

Lenin and Stalin, developing Marx's economic doctrine, proved that the transformation of old, pre-monopoly capital into financial monopoly capital, the growth of cartels and trusts, uneven capitalist development requiring periodic redistributions of the world through imperialist wars, etc.,

sharpen the contradictions of capitalism to an unprecedented degree. “To what extent monopoly capitalism has sharpened all the contradictions of capitalism, is universally known,” wrote Lenin. “Suffice it to point to high prices and the oppression of cartels. This sharpening of contradictions is the most powerful driving force of the transitional historical period that began from the time of the final victory of world finance capital.”[233]

The same is taught by Comrade Stalin. “Imperialism,” writes J. V. Stalin in his work *On the Foundations of Leninism*, “brings the contradictions of capitalism to the last limit, beyond which revolution begins.”[234] Comrade Stalin shows what the main contradictions of imperialism are that make proletarian revolution a “question of immediate practice.”[235] This is the contradiction between labor and capital, the contradiction between different financial groups and imperialist powers in their struggle for seizure of foreign territories and sources of raw materials, the contradiction between imperialist and colonial and dependent peoples of the world.

At the modern imperialist stage of the breakdown of bourgeois society, capitalists are no longer satisfied with the profits they received before. Comrade Stalin teaches that the basic economic law of modern capitalism is the chase after maximum profit, which is achieved through brutal exploitation by imperialists of the working people of their own countries and the enslavement and plundering of peoples of other countries. Hence the policy of unleashing predatory wars,

---

233 V. I. Lenin. *Works*. Vol. 22, p. 286.

234 J. V. Stalin. *Works*. Vol. 6, p. 72.

235 Ibid.

which for capitalists are a goldmine. Thus, thanks to the action of this basic economic law of modern capitalism, those contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between labor and capital, which Marx investigated in *Capital*, have not only not softened, but on the contrary, have sharpened as never before.

On the basis of an analysis of the sharpened contradictions of monopoly capitalism, Lenin and Stalin developed further the propositions of the Marxist dialectical method on development as a struggle of opposites. Comrade Stalin shows that the struggle of opposites is a struggle between the new and the old, the emerging and the dying out. Once capitalism was new, progressive compared to feudalism. But it has long since turned into a brake, without the destruction of which further development of society is impossible.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in the USSR, which resolved the contradictions of capitalism on one-sixth of the earth's globe by the path indicated by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, was the greatest triumph of the Marxist analysis of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production. The breaking away from the chain of imperialism as a result of World War II of the countries of people's democracy, the victory of the great Chinese revolution, the powerful national liberation movement in other countries of Asia serve as new bright confirmations of the correctness of Marxism.

The dialectical analysis of the contradictions of capitalism given by Marx in his immortal work is so valuable because it teaches a revolutionary approach to reality, demanding, in the

words of Comrade Stalin, not to gloss over class contradictions, not to extinguish the class struggle against the bourgeoisie, but to carry it to the end, to the complete victory of the proletariat.

10. MAIN FEATURES OF SOCIALIST IDEOLOGY
F. V. KONSTANTINOV

Socialist ideology is a complete, harmonious system of ideas expressing the position, interests, and historical tasks of the working class as the gravedigger of capitalism and the creator of communism. The creators of socialist ideology are Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It arose as a scientific expression of the needs of the development of the material life of society, as an expression of the needs and historical tasks of the transition from capitalism to the highest social system — to communism.

The deepest economic basis for the emergence of Marxist socialist ideology is the historically mature need to overcome the conflict between the productive forces and the production relations of capitalist society, the conflict between the social character of production and the private, i.e., capitalist, form of appropriation.

Marxist socialist ideology, growing on the soil of the economic and social contradictions of capitalist society, at the same time emerged as a natural development of preceding philosophical, economic, and historical thought.

The emergence of Marxist socialist ideology marked the greatest revolution in the field of scientific thought.

The invincibility of socialist ideology, of scientific socialism, lies in its truthfulness, in the fact that it expresses the deepest needs of historical development, that it has discovered in the

working class the great revolutionary force of our time; the strength of socialist ideology lies in the fact that it is the weapon of the communist party. The Communist Party, having arisen on the ideological basis of Marxism-Leninism and relying on this great ideological weapon, raised the working class to the struggle against capitalism, for communism. Socialist ideology was brought into the spontaneous working-class movement by the Marxist party. As a result, it became the militant ideological banner of the revolutionary struggle of tens and hundreds of millions of proletarians of all countries.

Armed with socialist ideology — Marxism-Leninism — the working movement acquired the power of organization, consciousness, purposefulness, and invincibility. It was socialist ideology that gave and continues to give the international working movement clarity of purpose, correct orientation, confidence in its own strength, and unshakable faith in the victory of socialism. Marxist-Leninist ideology, having mastered the minds of millions of people, has become the greatest material force.

Socialist ideology has withstood all the tests of time, the test in the fire of revolutionary practice. Under the banner of socialist ideology, the working class and all the working people of Russia accomplished the Great October Socialist Revolution. Under the banner of socialist ideology, the Soviet people built the majestic edifice of socialism, transforming our Fatherland into the most advanced country in the world, into a country of unprecedented progress in all spheres of life. This historically unprecedented revolutionary leap from backwardness to socialist progress was accomplished by the Soviet people

thanks to the leadership of the communist party, which illuminates the path of the Soviet country with the light of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

In the modern period of the development of our society — in the period of transition from socialism to communism, in the period of the great Stalinist construction projects — socialist ideology is a powerful organizing, mobilizing, creatively transformative force, raising tens of millions of people to build communism, its material and technical base, to a gigantic transformation of nature unprecedented in history, and to the conscious and planned subordination of its forces to the power of the free people of socialist society.

The transition from socialism to communism presupposes the solution by the Soviet people of the main economic task: to catch up and surpass the most developed capitalist countries in the production of industrial output per capita. The implementation of this historical task is inextricably linked with the great Stalinist construction projects on the Volga, Dnieper, Amu Darya, Don, and other places.

The most grandiose tasks of the transition from socialism to communism demand from the entire Soviet people the greatest efforts, organization, endurance, discipline, an even higher level of consciousness, selflessness, labor heroism, and unity of will, which has always been provided by the leadership of the communist party, relying on the organizing and mobilizing force of socialist ideology.

The great Lenin said that consciousness not only reflects but also creates the world. Having arisen on the basis of certain

conditions of the material life of society, it is capable of exerting and does exert a reciprocal active influence on the course of social life, on the historical movement of humanity. Advanced consciousness, the great ideas of socialism and communism, having taken hold of the minds of millions of people, truly create the world, a world of new social relations. This is evidenced by the experience of the victorious construction of socialism in the USSR; this is also confirmed by the experience of building socialism in the countries of people's democracy, where, just as in the USSR, the mighty energy of the masses has awakened and great socialist transformations in the economy, social life, and culture are being accomplished.

Socialist ideology reigns supreme in the Soviet country, serving as a guiding star for all builders of communist society.

Socialist ideology has now become the militant banner of the proletarians of all countries and the oppressed peoples of the world.

Comrade Stalin writes: "Marxism is the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, the science of building communist society" [236].

Non-Marxist "socialist" theories suffered and continue to suffer collapse because they contradict the interests and historical tasks of the working class. False "socialist" phraseology covers

[236] J. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, pp. 54–55. Gospolitizdat (State Publishing House of Political Literature). 1951.

up the reactionary bourgeois content of the pseudo-socialist teachings of right-wing "socialists."

The fact that socialist ideology won a complete victory in the USSR, one of the greatest countries in the world, that the ideas of scientific socialism received material embodiment here in the created socialist society, and the fact that socialist ideology acts as the weapon of the communist party — all this has given the ideology of socialism an irresistible attractive and offensive force.

What are the qualities and features of socialist ideology that make it a powerful, organizing, mobilizing, and transformative force of our time, the greatest engine of development of socialist society, and an indispensable weapon for building communism?

Socialist ideology is a genuinely scientific ideology. All ideologies that dominated in exploiting societies, including the bourgeois ideology that dominates in modern capitalist society, are antiscientific. Social life and social relations are reflected in bourgeois ideology in a false, distorted form, like in a *camera obscura*, where objects are reflected upside down. The true nature of the capitalist system, the true causes of the poverty of the masses, the anarchy of capitalist production, crises, economic catastrophes, wars, and other disasters engendered by capitalism, the causes of the class struggle and popular revolutions — all this is presented in bourgeois ideology in a distorted form.

Truth is fatal for the bourgeoisie and bourgeois ideology. To tell the truth about the nature and essence of capitalism means

to show its anti-people essence. To tell the truth about the causes of imperialist wars means to raise the masses against the perpetrator of these wars: the bourgeoisie and its social system. That is why the ideology of the bourgeoisie cannot be truthful, true, or scientific. The main ideological weapon of the modern bourgeoisie is lies, deception, distortion of facts, and slander.

One of the most cynical ideologists of the modern bourgeoisie, who groveled before Hitler and now serves American imperialism, the English General Fuller, wrote: "Just as the engines of war are set in motion by oil, so the will of man to fight is set in motion by lies. Once the great rule was: 'The truth shall make you free.' Now this rule must be turned upside down and say: 'Lies will make you fight'."

In lies — this is where the reactionary bourgeoisie seeks salvation. Its despicable idealistic philosophy and sociology are permeated with lies; from beginning to end, from foundations to conclusions, all modern bourgeois political and legal theories, and the doctrine of the state and law are permeated with lies; lies reign in bourgeois art, literature, and its hypocritical, two-faced morality. Lies are daily and hourly propagandized by the entire venal reactionary press, radio, and cinema. The thoroughly false and slanderous bourgeois ideology expresses the collapse of capitalism, the bankruptcy of the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie slanders the USSR and the countries of people's democracy especially much.

Lenin wrote about the bourgeoisie and its ideologists: "There is no lie and slander that they would not send against Soviet

power. We can say right now that the entire Anglo-French and American press is in the hands of the capitalists, — and it controls billions, — that it acts as a single syndicate to suppress the truth about Soviet Russia, to spread lies and slander against us" [237].

The banner of truth, of science — this is the banner of the working class, the banner of the country of socialism. This great truth is embodied in the ideology of Marxism-Leninism.

Unlike utopian socialism, scientific socialism does not dream of socialism, but scientifically substantiates its inevitable victory. Socialist ideology with scientific precision reflects the present and at the same time allows for foreseeing the future, what must happen tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, in the coming years and decades.

All outstanding events of the 20th century in Europe, Asia, and America testify that the bourgeoisie is suffering one collapse after another. Attempts by the international bourgeoisie to prevent or weaken the crisis of the capitalist system have suffered bankruptcy. The prophecies of the ideologists of the bourgeoisie and its right-socialist servants about the onset of better times for capitalism were not justified.

Followers of the theory of Marxism-Leninism can be proud that the great teachers of the working class — Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin — precisely determined with their socialist teaching the prospects of historical development, the

---

[237] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 28, p. 142.

inevitability of the collapse of capitalism, and the victory of socialism.

The victory of socialism in the USSR, the victory of the regime of people's democracy in a number of European countries, the great victories of the Chinese revolution, the powerful national liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries, the mighty worldwide growth of the influence of socialist ideology, the ideas of communism, and Marxist parties — all this is evidence of the truth of Marxism-Leninism, evidence of the mighty power of foresight provided by Marxism-Leninism.

Socialist ideology gives a huge advantage to communist parties over all parties of the bourgeoisie. Comrade Stalin wrote in 1934: "Look at the surrounding countries: will you find many ruling parties having a correct line and putting it into practice? Actually, there are no such parties in the world anymore, because they all live without prospects, get confused in the chaos of the crisis, and find no way to get out of the quagmire. Only our party knows where to lead the cause, and leads it forward successfully. To what does our party owe this advantage? To the fact that it is a Marxist party, a Leninist party. It owes it to the fact that it is guided in its work by the teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin. There can be no doubt that as long as we remain faithful to this teaching, as long as we possess this compass, we will have success in our work" [238].

Since this was said by Comrade Stalin, eighteen years have passed. How many times during this time have enemies of Marxism declared Marxism-Leninism definitively refuted, yet

[238] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 13, p. 377.

it again and again wins the greatest victories in Europe and Asia. The worst enemies of Marxism — the Hitlerites, the fascists in Italy, Japan, and Germany — were crushed in the Second World War. The victory over these reactionary, imperialist forces was won primarily by the Soviet Army and the people, brought up in the spirit of the great ideology of socialism, Leninism.

Some ideologists of the American bourgeoisie complain that in the struggle against the forces of progress, against the forces of communism and its ideology, they have to fight with an old, rusty, antediluvian ideological weapon. We have, they write, atomic bombs, tanks, shells, bacteriological and chemical weapons against the USSR, but we do not have a modern, effective ideological weapon, ideals acceptable to the masses. The "spiritual values" of the American bourgeoisie have lost their universal significance, as the American sociologist Angell admits. Hence the newer and newer inventions in the field of philosophy, sociology, in the field of political and economic theories, and clowning with contests for a better name for capitalism, since the word "capitalism," hostile to the masses, has acquired an abusive meaning.

But whatever names the ideologists of the bourgeoisie invent for capitalism and its ideology, it will remain decaying capitalism, and its ideology — a reflection of the self-serving interests of the bourgeoisie, an ideology of lies, deception, violence, and enslavement of the popular masses.

The well-known reactionary and warmonger, Truman's advisor J. F. Dulles, writes: "In the last 5 years we have spent millions of dollars preparing for a possible war using bombs, airplanes,

and guns. But we have spent very little on the war of ideas, in which we are currently actively involved and in which we are suffering defeats that cannot be compensated for by any possible forces."

In another of his speeches, to an "association of persons who graduated from Princeton University," Dulles was forced to admit that "a revolutionary spirit has gripped more than half of humanity."

Of course, the defeat in the struggle of ideas of American imperialism, the entire camp of imperialist reaction and war, was not suffered because fewer billions of dollars were spent on the ideological war than on atomic bombs, tanks, airplanes, and on the bacteriological and chemical preparation for war. The American bourgeoisie spends a lot on reactionary spiritual poison for the masses. But its ideas are false and hostile to the peoples. That is the reason for their defeat.

It is impossible to seriously assert that capitalism is a paradise when it represents a hell for the working people. It is impossible to seriously assert that capitalism is the only possible economic and social system when the country of socialism proves its superiority over capitalism in practice. It is no longer possible for the ideologists of the bourgeoisie to "scientifically" prove that the people cannot govern society and the state without the bourgeoisie, when the Soviet people have been the masters of their own country for more than three decades already. The working people of the countries of people's democracy followed this example.

It is impossible in our age to deceive with impunity with the false theory of "higher" races, of the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race over all others. This theory and the policy corresponding to it are capable of causing and do cause burning hatred among the working people towards US imperialism and the "American way of life." The American newspaper *Chicago Tribune* reported that a member of the House of Representatives from Illinois, Republican Busbey, in a report on a three-month trip to European countries stated: "We are becoming the most despised and hated nation in the world. The praises of the people from the Eisenhower organization of the North Atlantic Pact... do not correspond to what I was told." In the countries of Western Europe, Busbey admits, they "despise our foreign policy." Similar conclusions were reached by other American congressmen.

The hatred of peoples for the ideology and policy of American imperialism forces the latter to seek new ways of masking its reactionary essence. Apparently, this is why Truman and Acheson — conductors of the policy of imperialist aggression — when they attempt to appear before the peoples of the world, put on the mask of active peacemakers.

At a session of the UN General Assembly, A. Ya. Vyshinsky tore off this new mask from the warmongers and showed the peoples the bestial face of American and English imperialism.

Socialist ideology is the deepest, most accurate and complete scientific expression of the needs of the development of modern society, the needs of society's movement towards socialism, and here in the USSR — towards communism. This

is the source of the invincibility of socialist ideology. In this is its great attractive force for millions.

In opposition to the reactionary ideology of the bourgeoisie, socialist ideology by its origin, essence, and social role is a revolutionary ideology.

The revolutionary nature of socialist ideology stems from the fact that it scientifically not only uncovered the conflict, the disparity between modern productive forces and capitalist production relations, but also indicated the only correct revolutionary path to resolving this disparity, the path to socialism. Socialist ideology is revolutionary because it expresses and scientifically substantiates the tasks of all the revolutionary forces of our time, headed by the working class and its party. Marxist ideology is the ideology of the socialist revolution, the ideology of the oppressed and exploited masses. It inspired the working class and the poorest peasantry of Russia to the greatest revolutionary feats in the days of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It inspired the Soviet people to victorious socialist industrialization, to the collectivization of agriculture, to a revolution in the field of culture.

Relying on this ideology, the communist party directed the creative, transforming forces of the Soviet people to destroy the antitheses between town and country, between mental and physical labor, between science and production.

The revolutionary spirit of socialist ideology finds its embodiment in the bold, daring deeds and feats of the Soviet people building communism.

The Stakhanovite movement — this great, invincible movement of our time, revolutionizing industry and agriculture, technology, methods of work, the psychology of people, their attitude towards labor, — is an expression of socialist production relations, relations of comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance, a product of the historical victories of socialism. At the same time, it is the result of the action of socialist ideology, its life-giving ideas, calling forward to the struggle for the new, against the old.

Stakhanovites are innovators, people who do not rest on their laurels. It is precisely socialist ideology that fosters in people this sense of the new. The Party of Lenin - Stalin, relying on socialist ideology, has fostered in the Soviet people the best features of its character: revolutionary spirit, hatred of everything stagnant, immobile, of routine, of inertia. The Russian revolutionary sweep inherent in the Soviet people was fostered in it by the Party of Lenin - Stalin.

Michurin's Bolshevik motto "We cannot wait for favors from Nature, to take them from her — that is our task," which has become the banner of millions of collective farmers, expresses the revolutionary essence of the socialist ideology of Bolshevism. The revolutionary spirit of socialist ideology found its highest expression in the grandiose Stalinist plans for the transformation of nature, in the great construction projects of communism.

Soviet scientists, engineers in laboratories, in plants and factories, developing and solving new problems of science and technology, laying new paths for their development; workers and collective farmers — Stakhanovite innovators, giving new,

higher indicators of socialist labor productivity, new, higher models of product quality, — all of them are inspired by the life-giving revolutionary spirit of socialist ideology, its bearer and conductor — the Party of Lenin - Stalin.

Never to rest on one's laurels, to move from success to success, not to become conceited in the days of victories, not to lose heart in moments of difficulties — this is what the Party of Lenin - Stalin teaches the Soviet people, relying on socialist, revolutionary ideology.

Reactionary bourgeois ideology drags humanity backward, back to barbarism. It is no accident that the ideologists of the bourgeoisie invented a special "sociological" theory about the so-called crab-like, i.e., backward, movement of humanity as a "law" of world history. But Churchill himself — the "ruler of thoughts" of imperialist reaction — preaches the return of humanity to the Stone Age, the age of darkness. He stated in his speech at Westminster College in Fulton that this Stone Age could return "on the gleaming wings of science." Science, from being a source of the greatest progress, is thus turned by reactionaries of the Churchill-Truman type into an instrument of destruction and regression.

One of the favorite themes of modern bourgeois "sociology" and journalism is the debunking of the doctrine of progress. Progress — this is not at all a law of history and not a blessing, but a disaster, preach the current ideologists of the bourgeoisie, vainly trying to turn the historical movement backward.

Washington University professor A. Keller, in the article "The Meaning of Progress," writes: "Now the concept of inevitable

progress has practically been abandoned in the USA and other countries (capitalism. — *F. K.*). Whether this renunciation is caused by a change in intellectual assumptions or by changes that have taken away from our economic system its capacity for expansion, history will decide. One thing is clear, that the former belief in progress has vanished."

The fact that it is impossible to move forward without moving towards socialism, towards communism, that the future for capitalism is prospectless, — the bourgeoisie intuitively senses this and therefore draws the conclusion: "Down with progress!"

The bourgeoisie of our days seeks to discredit the ideas that in the era of its youth were held high by its advanced ideologists like Condorcet, Voltaire, and some others. Marx wrote that the bourgeoisie is like a sorcerer who called up spirits with his spells and cannot cope with them. Having called to life modern powerful productive forces, the bourgeoisie is not able to cope with them, it calls for their destruction, to retard their development. It screams that progressive forward development is not a law. But this means only an admission that the bourgeoisie has long since ceased to be the bearer of progress, that capitalist production relations have become a brake on the development of productive forces. Historical progress in our era is possible only on the basis of socialism. This the ideologists of the modern bourgeoisie are also indirectly forced to admit.

The aforementioned A. Keller, speaking about the ideological and moral crisis in the US, to which technological progress has led, writes about the USSR: "The merging of material and moral has given the Soviet Union prestige since 1920 and

during the Second World War; abroad there was a general feeling that the Russians were developing their material resources to achieve the broadest goals in the interests of humanity. On the other hand, it is said of the Americans that their inventiveness has given them extensive material resources, but their inability to develop positive ideals deprives them of the possibility to use these resources for any purpose beyond directly mechanical use... The arms race increases the gulf between our material dominance and our moral bankruptcy."

As we can see, gentlemen ideologists of the bourgeoisie are sometimes forced to tell the truth. Not the whole truth, and a part of it, and not clearly, but in an indirect way. Yet, the admission of the absence of a positive ideal among the American bourgeoisie, as among the bourgeoisie in general, the admission of its moral bankruptcy, its reliance on the omnipotence of the atomic bomb — this is a valuable admission!

The bourgeoisie and its ideologists hate everything new, advanced, progressive. On the contrary, socialist ideology calls all progressive forces of the world to support that which develops and has a great future.

Only the advanced, the developing is invincible, teaches Comrade Stalin. Thus, "in order not to err in politics, one must look forward, and not backward" [239].

[239] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 540, 11th ed.

The sense of the new is the precious quality of a Bolshevik. This feeling is fostered by the communist party in Soviet cadres, in the entire Soviet people, relying on the revolutionary soul of socialist ideology, on Leninism.

The most important feature of socialist ideology is consistent, socialist democratism. This feature, this aspect of socialist ideology internally stems from its class essence. The bourgeoisie came to power under the banner of bourgeois democratism, under the slogan of freedom, equality, and fraternity. But in reality it was freedom to exploit workers by capitalists, freedom for the worker to sell himself into slavery; it was the "equality" of the well-fed and the hungry, the rich and the poor, the slave and the slave owner.

Bourgeois democracy is formal, hypocritical, false. What bourgeois democratism represents in reality we see on the example of the USA, England, France, Italy, Japan, West Germany. This is the democracy of the police baton, of police tyranny, violence, and abuse of the people. The shootings of unarmed workers, armed suppression of strikes, bestial violence against Black people, lynch mobs in the USA. The word "peace" has become a crime in capitalist countries, especially in the citadel of imperialist reaction — in the USA. The most advanced, honest, and noble people are persecuted there only because they dare to speak their convictions, calling capitalism capitalism, the bourgeoisie the bourgeoisie, and its bloody deeds execution. The democracy of the USA is the domination of plutocracy, of the financial oligarchy; it is the Inquisition of the 20th century. The peoples of the world see

now better than ever the repulsive bestial face of bourgeois "democratism."

In the face of growing contradictions, the bourgeoisie casts off the mask of democratism and openly passes to fascism, i.e., to the undisguised terrorist dictatorship of financial capital, trampling on its own bourgeois constitutions, laws, bills of rights, etc.

Leninism teaches that the transition from pre-monopoly capitalism to imperialism means the onset of reaction along all lines: economic, social, political, cultural, and ideological.

"The political superstructure over the new economy, over monopoly capitalism (imperialism is monopoly capitalism) is a turn from democracy to political reaction. Free competition corresponds to democracy. Monopoly corresponds to political reaction... And in foreign policy, and in domestic policy equally, imperialism strives towards violations of democracy, towards reaction. In this sense it is indisputable that imperialism is the 'negation' of democracy in general, of all democracy..." [240]

Before the Second World War, the center of imperialist reaction in domestic and foreign policy in Europe was Hitlerite Germany, and in Asia — imperialist Japan. At present, the center of political and ideological reaction has shifted to America. The USA has become the homeland and hotbed of mysticism, decay in the field of philosophy, the most vile

[240] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 31.

racist, geopolitical, cosmopolitan "theories." American obscurantists and retrogrades rely in this area on the fanaticism of Hitlerism and on their own old slave-owning racist traditions, which have always occupied a significant place in the ideological arsenal of the American bourgeoisie.

The open terrorist dictatorship of the financial oligarchy in the USA still preserves an external democratic cover, but in reality, the current political regime of the USA differs little from the Hitlerite one. Instead of the Gestapo in the USA, the FBI and the committee to investigate so-called un-American activities run rampant. Alongside Jewish pogroms, the American Ku Klux Klaners are adding bestial reprisals against Black people, lynch courts. Many leaders of the communist party, noble fighters for the interests of the people, are sitting in prisons. Concentration camps are established for progressive people who dare to speak out against plutocracy, police tyranny, and the preparation of a new world war. The military has taken command posts in the state apparatus. The economy is militarized.

American imperialism implements political reaction not only within the USA but also externally, acting as the world gendarme, suppressing national liberation movements in colonial and dependent countries, trampling on national sovereignty and elementary democratic rights of peoples. Just as in fascist Germany, in the USA there acts an army of hired scribblers attempting to "justify," to "excuse" the rejection of national sovereignty, of bourgeois democracy, to justify the transition to reaction.

A certain Philip Selznick (USA) in 1951 wrote: "The mass poses a terrible threat because that which was previously a passive multitude, a neutral element in the state, has now become dynamic... Previously the mass accepted its position, now it claims the right to overthrow the ideals, achievements, and behavior established by the traditional chosen part of society."

The "theory" of the domination of the "chosen," i.e., the financial oligarchy (60 families of the USA, 200 families in France, a few dozen families in England, etc.), the terrorization of the masses, the abandonment even of the appearance of democracy — such is reality, such are the political ideals of modern imperialist reaction. The reactionary "theories" created in the USA, together with unsold goods and Hollywood films, are intended not only for domestic consumption in the USA but also for all capitalist countries of Europe, America, and Asia.

In the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, political and legal ideas and institutions expressing the interests of genuine, consistent, socialist democratism have won.

Characterizing socialist democratism, V. I. Lenin said: "The Soviet system is the maximum of democratism for workers and peasants, and at the same time it means a break with bourgeois democratism and the emergence of a new, world-historical type of democracy, namely: proletarian democratism or the dictatorship of the proletariat" [241].

[241] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 32.

Historical revolutionary practice led to the emergence of socialist democracy in the form of people's democracy. Created by the people's creation and discovered by Comrade Stalin, this form successfully develops and fulfills the function of the dictatorship of the working class.

Socialist democratism proceeds from the fact that the people are the main creators of history, its main driving force. The Communist Party and its leaders Lenin and Stalin teach that the people, the working people, are not only creators of material wealth, but also creators of the greatest cultural values.

"The times have passed," says Comrade Stalin, "when leaders were considered the only creators of history, and workers and peasants were not taken into account. The fates of nations and states are decided now not only by leaders, but primarily and mainly by the multi-million masses of the working people. The workers and peasants, without noise and crackle building plants and factories, mines and railways, collective farms and state farms, creating all the blessings of life, feeding and clothing the whole world — they are the real heroes and creators of new life... Their 'modest' and 'unnoticeable' labor is actually great and creative labor, deciding the fate of history" [242].

The Soviet people — the undivided masters of their country — manage their state themselves. Their party — the party of Bolsheviks, flesh of the flesh, bone of the bone of the people — leads the socialist people's state. Socialist democratism

[242] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 422.

found its brightest embodiment in the Stalin Constitution, the constitution of victorious socialism.

Capitalist society and the state are based on the intimidation and lack of consciousness of the popular masses. The bourgeoisie, like fire, fears the consciousness of the masses. In contrast to capitalism, the Soviet society and state, as Lenin teaches and Comrade Stalin teaches, are strong by the consciousness of the masses. The higher the communist consciousness of the masses, the more fully and deeply the broadest popular masses understand their true interests, the interests of socialist society, the Soviet state, the stronger our society and state, the faster our movement forward.

The task of the bourgeois state and the entire huge ideological apparatus of the bourgeoisie is the political and ideological suppression of the masses. The main task of the socialist state and the communist party in the field of educational work is to ensure the complete overcoming of survivals of capitalism in people's consciousness and the comprehensive growth of the communist consciousness of millions of people.

The development of socialist democratism in the conditions of the gradual transition to communism goes through the further growth of the communist consciousness of the masses and their even greater political activity, through the deployment of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism in all areas of social life.

Socialist democratism is internally connected with internationalism, with the principle of equality and fraternity of peoples. Socialist ideology is therefore the ideology of proletarian internationalism, the ideology of equality,

friendship, and fraternity of peoples. The most important, reliable condition for the victory of the socialist revolution and the victory of socialism in the USSR was the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, relying on the ideological principles of the equality of nations, races, and peoples.

The triumph of socialism was at the same time the triumph of the ideology of socialist internationalism over the ideology of bourgeois nationalism — the ideology of enmity and distrust among peoples, disuniting and weakening them.

The slogan of socialist internationalism: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" — is sacred to Soviet people. No one in the world has made so many sacrifices in the name of implementing this call as the Russian working class, the party of Bolsheviks, the entire Soviet people.

The great teaching of Lenin - Stalin on the equality and friendship of peoples was for the first time in history embodied in life in socialist society, in the multinational Soviet state. Marxism-Leninism teaches that a nation that oppresses other nations cannot be free. "The October Revolution," writes J. V. Stalin, "broke the chains of national-colonial oppression and liberated all without exception oppressed peoples of an expansive state from it. The proletariat cannot liberate itself without liberating the oppressed peoples. A characteristic feature of the October Revolution is the fact that it carried out an national-colonial revolution in the USSR not under the flag of national enmity and inter-ethnic clashes, but under the flag of mutual trust and fraternal rapprochement of workers and

peasants of the nationalities of the USSR, not in the name of nationalism, but in the name of internationalism" [243].

The victory of socialism in the USSR shattered into pieces reactionary, racist, nationalist "theories" about so-called higher and lower races. The numerous peoples of the USSR, belonging to different races, were freed from the yoke of capital. Under the leadership of the Party of Lenin - Stalin they showed the greatest capacity for historical creation of socialist forms of life, socialist statehood, socialist culture. Here the socialist ideology of equality and friendship of peoples revealed its power.

"Soviet people believe," says Comrade Stalin, "that every nation — whether large or small, has its own qualitative features, its own specificity, which belongs only to it and which other nations do not have. These features constitute the contribution that each nation makes to the common treasury of world culture and augments it, enriches it. In this sense all nations — both small and large — are in the same position, and every nation is equal to any other nation" [244].

In the capitalist world, misanthropic racist ideology dominates, the ideology of zoological nationalism, cosmopolitanism, chauvinism. Imperialists of the USA and England preach the superiority of one nation, American or English, over all other nations, seek the domination of American imperialism over the whole world. American imperialism, the most predatory and thievish, tramples on the national sovereignty and national

---

[243] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 205.

[244] Speech by Comrade J. V. Stalin at a dinner in honor of the Finnish government delegation, April 7, 1948. Journal *Bolshevik*, No. 7 for 1948.

independence of peoples. Inside the USA, anti-Semitism, abuse of Negroes, over immigrants from Slavic countries has taken on dimensions and forms eclipsing the barbarity of Hitlerism.

In this atmosphere of rampant racism, nationalism, the USSR, heading the mighty camp of democracy and socialism, has raised high over the world the banner of the ideology of socialist internationalism, the banner of friendship, equality, and fraternity of all nations, races, and peoples.

The friendship of peoples is one of the mighty driving forces of the development of socialist society. It helped us build a socialist society, defeat the forces of the enemy in the years of the Patriotic War. In the friendship of peoples is one of the sources of the inexhaustible strength of the socialist state. Crushing and exposing Hitler's fanatic ideology of racial and national inequality, Comrade Stalin said: "In the course of the war the Hitlerites suffered not only a military, but also a moral-political defeat. The ideology of equality of all races and nations established in our country, the ideology of the friendship of peoples has won a complete victory over the ideology of bestial nationalism and racial hatred of the Hitlerites" [245].

The ideology of the friendship of peoples, which established itself and won in the USSR, is the source of the invincibility of socialist society. The task of communist education consists in further strengthening and developing the friendship of peoples, educating the people in the spirit of socialist internationalism,

---

[245] J. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 162. 5th ed. Gospolitizdat. 1950.

overcoming the remnants and recurrences of bourgeois, nationalist ideology.

In 1934 at the XVII Congress of the CPSU(b) Comrade Stalin said: "It should be noted that the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people are much more tenacious in the area of the national question than in any other area. They are more tenacious, since they have the ability to camouflage themselves well in national costumes" [246]. Nationalism, nationalistic prejudices — this is a retreat, a betrayal of the Leninist ideology of internationalism. Therefore, the communist party has always waged an uncompromising struggle against the ideology of nationalism, for the complete overcoming of nationalistic survivals in the minds of Soviet people.

Nationalistic survivals weaken the moral-political unity and friendship of peoples. Therefore, imperialist encirclement tries to revive bourgeois, nationalistic survivals in the area of consciousness.

Nationalism has always played into the hands of imperialists, the worst enemies of socialism, the enemies of the Republic of Soviets.

Nationalistic, hostile elements have not yet been uprooted everywhere. On the ideological front, they impact one way or another manifestations of nationalistic ideology in historical science, in literature, poetry, and art. Some historians of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, contrary to historical truth, idealize and embellish reactionary figures of the past;

---

[246] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 474. 11th ed.

they, these nationalistically minded historians, emphasize and bring forward in the historical past of the peoples of the USSR that which disunited them, and not that which brought them together in the common struggle against tsarism, against exploiters, for socialism.

In the history of philosophy of the peoples of the USSR, we observe tendencies to embellish certain philosophers of the past, the desire to pass off idealists for materialists, reactionary figures for progressive ones. This took and takes place, in particular, in the defense of dissertations by some comrades from Central Asia.

Survivals of nationalism weaken our strength, our unity, hinder the movement forward. Therefore, the most important task of communist education is the complete overcoming of nationalistic survivals, which the enemies of socialism cling to.

Internationalism is inextricably linked with Soviet patriotism, the most important trait of socialist ideology. Socialist ideology fosters in our people the feeling of Soviet patriotism, love, and devotion to the socialist Fatherland, to their people, national pride in the fact that our great people were the first in the world to destroy capitalism and proved the possibility of governing society and the state without exploiters, without landlords and capitalists.

We are proud of the consciousness that we saved the world from fascist barbarism, saved European and world civilization from destruction by the Huns of the 20th century.

We rightfully take pride in the fact that the Soviet people stand at the head of world progress, that the country of socialism is

the hope of all progressive humanity, the citadel of the struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism, for the bright future of all peoples.

The eyes of the peoples of the world are turned to the USSR. It is the source of inspiration in the struggle of peoples against capitalist slavery, imperialist plunder, and barbarism.

Socialist, Soviet patriotism is a mighty driving force in the development of Soviet society. It inspires Soviet people to labor exploits. In the name of the good of our Fatherland, in the name of love for the people, for the communist party, for the socialist state, workers, peasants, and intellectuals provide new and newer models of high labor productivity, doing everything to accelerate our movement toward communism. "The strength of Soviet patriotism consists in the fact that it has as its basis not racist or nationalistic prejudices, but profound devotion and loyalty of the people to their Soviet Homeland, the fraternal commonwealth of the working people of all nations of our country. In Soviet patriotism, national traditions of the peoples and the common vital interests of all the working people of the Soviet Union harmoniously combine. Soviet patriotism does not disunite, but, on the contrary, unites all the nations and nationalities of our country into one fraternal family. In this we should see the foundations of the indestructible and ever-growing friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union" [247].

The moral-political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of peoples, and Soviet patriotism — these driving forces of the development of socialist society, which grew on its economic

[247] J. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, pp. 160–161.

and social soil — are closely connected with one another, mutually conditioning and feeding each other. They exert influence on the entire course of economic, political, and cultural development of the USSR.

These driving forces of development have Marxism-Leninism as their ideological basis. The Communist Party, relying on the ideology of Leninism, crushed political and ideological currents hostile to Bolshevism and thereby forged the moral-political unity, the friendship of peoples, educating the people in the spirit of love and devotion to the socialist Homeland.

The Communist Party wages an uncompromising struggle against imperialist ideology of cosmopolitanism hostile to socialism, aimed at ideologically disarming the peoples before the onslaught of American imperialism. Homeless cosmopolitans, as well as nationalist elements, are anti-patriots, hidden or open agents of the enemy, conductors of the reactionary ideology of American-English imperialism.

Fostering a sacred hatred for imperialist reaction, for the stranglers and executioners of the freedom of peoples, ideological workers of our country show the whole world the greatness of our system, the greatness of the people creating the socialist structure, the majestic culture of socialism. The education of the peoples of the USSR in the spirit of Soviet patriotism is the axis of all our educational work.

Soviet patriotism and true, i.e., socialist, internationalism completely coincide with each other.

"An internationalist is one," says Comrade Stalin, "who unconditionally, without hesitation, without conditions, is ready to defend the USSR..." [248]

To educate the Soviet people in the spirit of internationalism means to educate Soviet people in the spirit of love and devotion to the Soviet Homeland, to the cause of Lenin - Stalin.

The socialist ideology of the friendship of peoples, Leninist internationalism, and Soviet patriotism mean genuine, socialist humanism, humanism in action.

Bourgeois ideology, attempting to slander socialism, the Soviet Union, tried to prove that socialism, destroying private property, thereby allegedly destroys the personality, the human being in the name of the general, the whole.

But in reality, it is exactly capitalism, depriving nine-tenths of the population of property, concentrating the wealth of society in the hands of a small handful of parasites, that thereby kills the personality, bringing the situation of the working people down to a slavish condition, subjecting them to merciless exploitation, dooming them to starvation, deprivation, and lack of culture.

The value of a person and their position in society under capitalism are measured not by personal abilities, but by the size of capital and origin.

"...Under the capitalist system all methods for raising the social productive power of labor are carried out at the cost of the

[248] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 10, p. 51

individual worker; all means for the development of production transform into means of subordination and exploitation of the producer, deform the worker into an incomplete man, degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, by increasing the burden of labor they deprive it of its meaningfulness, alienate from the worker the spiritual potencies of the labor process to the same extent to which science enters the labor process as an independent force; they distort the conditions under which the worker works, subordinate him during the labor process to the most petty, detestable despotism, transform all his life time into working time, throw his wife and children under the Juggernaut wheel of capital" [249].

Only socialism, destroying economic, social, and political oppression, for the first time in history created conditions for the flourishing of the personality, for the manifestation and development of popular talents. In Soviet society, one of the principles of socialist ideology is affirmed: "Property status, not national origin, not gender, not official position, but personal abilities and personal labor of each citizen determine their position in society" [250].

In the USSR, the most valuable capital is people, cadres. Comrade Stalin, our party, teaches to carefully foster and nurture cadres.

Historical development to the present time — to the era of socialism — took place at the cost of the exploitation, poverty, and brutalization of the working people. Characterizing the

---

249 K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 651. 1949.

250 J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 517.

antagonistic character of the capitalist production process, Marx wrote: "On the one hand, such industrial and scientific forces have awakened to life that no one in any preceding epoch of history could even suspect. On the other hand, there are symptoms of decay far surpassing all the horrors recorded in the chronicles of the late Roman Empire.

In our time, every thing seems fraught with its opposite. We see that machines, possessing the miraculous power to shorten and make more fruitful human labor, bring starvation and exhaustion. Newly invented sources of wealth, thanks to some fatal spell, become sources of deprivation. The victories of art seem bought at the cost of moral qualities. To the same extent as humanity subordinates nature, man falls into slavery to another man or becomes a slave to his own baseness. Even the pure light of science cannot, apparently, shine otherwise than against a dark background of ignorance. The result of all our discoveries and all our progress, evidently, is that material forces are endowed with spiritual life, while human life degrades to the level of material force. This antagonism between modern industry and science, on one side, and poverty and decay, on the other — this antagonism between productive forces and social relations of our era is an undeniable, palpable, and indisputable fact" [251].

Only under socialism do all the achievements of technology and science for the first time in history come to the service of man. Simultaneously with the development of science and technology there takes place a steady cultural and technical

[251] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XI, Part 1, pp. 5–6.

upsurge of the working class and collective farm peasantry, a development toward communism is underway, when all workers and peasants will become educated, comprehensively developed people, when the difference between people of mental and physical labor will forever disappear into the past. In all this manifests the strength of socialist society, its superiority over capitalism, the new historical regularity, and the triumph of the ideology of socialist humanism.

The ideology and practice of socialist humanism oppose the bestial ideology and barbaric practice of the imperialist bourgeoisie. In his time, Marx exposed the villainy of the sermon of the English priest Malthus. Today, the apostles of the imperialist bourgeoisie have outdone the man-hating priest Malthus a hundredfold.

In our press, the fanatic, misanthropic preaching of the American cannibal W. Vogt, author of the book "Road to Survival," was already exposed.

Vogt and Baruch, the author of the foreword to this book, might seem to some to be madmen like Forrestal. But there are too many such Vogts bred in the USA and other capitalist countries. A member of the Canadian Royal Society B. K. Sandwell in his "learned" report proposes neither more nor less than destroying 9/10 of the population of India, in order to raise the living standard of the remaining tenth of the population.

Another member of that society, a certain H. F. Angus, in a report on the topic "Malthus Today" says: "In a political attitude our world is Hobbes' world: 'War of all against all'. In an economic attitude it is Malthus' world: if a person cannot

obtain the means for existence from his nation, he has no right to claim the smallest share of food".

The bacteriological war of US imperialists against the Korean people, the barbaric bombings of populated areas, the extermination of the peaceful population — all this speaks of the fact that the cannibalistic Malthusian and racist theories have become the foundation of the policy of the ruling class of the USA, their state doctrine, guided by them in practice. The peoples of the world must know this and unite in a sacred struggle against the bearers of modern barbarism, against the imperialism of the USA.

Ruining, plundering the working people of their own countries and the population of colonies, imperialism and its ideologists responsible for poverty, starvation, and disasters of hundreds of millions of people attempt to shift the blame onto nature, onto the allegedly excessive reproduction of the population, onto the diminishing fertility of soils, etc. But Marxism long ago refuted this nonsense of the ideologists of the bourgeoisie.

Socialist society has practically proven and proves the immense possibilities of increasing soil fertility, expanding sowing areas through the cultivation of new lands, transforming once barren lands and deserts into flourishing agricultural regions.

The annual population increase in the USSR exceeds 3 million people. We stand for maximum population growth. In the country of socialism, there is a place for everyone. Soviet power, Soviet science fights to prolong the life of people, for

maximum longevity, while imperialists scream about excessive population growth.

Two worlds, two worldviews, two ideologies.

Socialist ideology is fundamentally hostile to bourgeois and petty-bourgeois individualism, growing on the basis of private ownership of the means of production. In the world of capitalism bestial principles dominate: "Man is a wolf to man," "Every man for himself — one god for all."

The Great Lenin, the founder of our state, taught that Soviet people are obliged to destroy these wild rules of life and affirm the principle of socialism "All for one, one for all." This principle rules in our great country.

The working class goes through the school of joint labor under the conditions of capitalism, the school of class struggle, which fosters in it a sense of solidarity, class consciousness. But even workers under capitalism are placed in relations of competition. It is no accident therefore that bourgeois ideology tries in every way to infect the workers with the poison of individualistic ideology. Only the introduction of socialist ideology into the working movement frees it from the influence of bourgeois, individualistic ideology.

However, for a long time still under socialism, remnants of it are preserved as survivals. "To snatch from the state as much as possible and give it less" — this is reflected and continues to reflect here and there the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois individualism.

The socialist ideology of collectivism has become completely dominant in our country. This is explained by the fact that the socialist mode of production won, that pre-socialist economic structures, feeding individualism, were liquidated.

Individualistic ideology completely dominated among peasant owners, whose labor was based on private ownership of the means of production. Enemies claimed that the individualistic ideology of peasants, established over centuries, grown on the basis of private property and transformed into prejudice, is an invincible force which the efforts of Bolsheviks would shatter against.

The collectivization of agriculture and the flowering of the collective farm system were a tremendous victory for socialist ideology, the ideology of collectivism. This showed the great organizational and educational work of our party. However, in the village and in the city there still live remnants of individualistic, private-property ideology. These remnants of capitalism manifest in a negligent attitude towards socialist property, towards public good, in violations of labor discipline, in private-property tendencies. These survivals appear in hack-work relations to labor, not worthy of people of socialist society. Cases of defective, low-quality production are often explained by a non-communist attitude towards labor, an insufficient sense of responsibility before the people, before society. The task of communist education consists in completely overcoming these survivals — birthmarks of the old structure. This is one of the important conditions for the transition from socialism to communism.

Socialism is a society that has only just emerged from the womb of the capitalist system. Socialist society is still not free from remnants of the old society both in economics and in the consciousness of people. Birthmarks of capitalism are preserved for a long time on the body of the new social structure even after capitalism is destroyed. Consciousness, being a reflection of the conditions of the material life of society, always lags behind changes in the conditions of life, if this consciousness is not armed with the knowledge of the laws of social development, the ability to foresee scientifically. And if we take into account that socialist society exists in capitalist encirclement, which tries to revive remnants of the old, bourgeois ideology, subject to the pernicious influence of bourgeois, reactionary ideas some unstable strata of the population, it becomes understandable why we still have remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of people, why today the task of communist education of the working people has decisive significance for the development of socialist society, for the transition from socialism to communism.

We have not completely outlived such a heavy survival of the old system as bureaucracy. Bureaucrats fetter the creative initiative of the masses. They forget that our cadres are servants and representatives of the people, that in the country of socialism there is no higher calling than the calling of a servant and representative of the people. The Communist Party, its Central Committee wages an uncompromising struggle against bureaucracy as the most harmful survival of capitalism. The greatest significance of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism in the life of socialist society consists, among other

things, in the fact that it is a powerful weapon in the struggle against bureaucracy, fostering in the people the feeling of the master of the country, political and any other activity, and the creative initiative of tens of millions of people.

Survivals of the past still sometimes affect our national planning. Socialist planning requires a strict accounting of all material and human resources of the country, planned distribution of them taking into account the needs of the entire national economy. Unfortunately, to this hinder sometimes uneradicated localistic tendencies, alien to socialism, the tendencies of supplementing by neglecting nationwide interests.

Survivals of bourgeois ideology find their reflection on the ideological front in the form of harmful, anti-scientific, reactionary theories, having had and still having currency in some fields of science.

Theoretical discussions conducted under the leadership of the CC CPSU(b) in a number of fields of science, and the decisions of the CC CPSU(b) on ideological issues opened and exposed anti-scientific, reactionary theories in philosophy, biology, linguistics, chemistry, anti-patriotic elements in the field of literature and art. The broad ideological offensive of the party against the penetration of bourgeois ideology, against survivals of this ideology is a composite part of the Bolshevik party's activity in the communist education of the working people, in the ideological, theoretical tempering of Soviet cadres.

Socialist ideology, being the ideology of the working class, of the working people, is the ideology of peace between peoples,

the ideology of creation, of creative labor. It opposes the imperialist ideology of destruction, of aggressive wars — this spawn of imperialism. The bourgeoisie of the USA and England strives to resolve internal and external contradictions through military adventures against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy. The American and English press daily churns out articles calling for wars. By their predatory ideology, the American and English bourgeoisie day in and day out poisons the minds of the American, English, and other peoples.

One of the bourgeois journalists of the USA in an editorial of the *Washington Times-Herald* writes: "A new war must not be the military defeat of a hostile nation, as it was in past wars, but literally the extermination of the hostile people. To exterminate an entire people, it is necessary to drop bombs in order to destroy without any pity men, women, and children, burn their homes, ruin factories, poison water, burn the harvest, and turn the very earth into a lifeless desert."

Here are the plans and dreams of the modern imperialist bourgeoisie of the USA! Here are its "modern ideals"!

Another American journalist, U. Wallace, broadcasts: "Murder — this is our method of improving life. Let other peoples have other systems, our system is murder. It is an American system, and therefore the best." There it is, the "American way of life" and action!

Theodore Rosebury, author of the sensational cynical book *Peace or Pestilence*, proves the advantages of bacteriological warfare over atomic.

American imperialist ideology is the ideology of predatory aggressive wars, the ideology of the enraged, maddened bourgeoisie. "War for capitalist countries," says Comrade Stalin, "is as natural and legitimate a state as the exploitation of the working class" [252]. For the USA and England, war is currently one of the ways to resolve profound contradictions of capitalism. War is needed by them to maintain high industrial conjunctures, as a means to avoid a crisis, as a source of maximum profits for capitalist monopolies.

The American bourgeoisie is experiencing genuine fear of peace. The start of negotiations on an armistice in Korea caused a severe fall in shares on the American stock exchange. The organ of American financiers *United States News* wrote: "If peace is indeed secured, everything will collapse."

Henri Claude, the French communist, author of the book *Who Needs War*, is deeply right when he writes: "Capitalism is no longer able to break out of the vicious circle of world conflicts. Consequently, it ceased to be simply a regime of the exploitation of man by man, it turned also into a regime of extermination of man by man. Its abolition appeared not just a measure of social order, it was for humanity an act of salvation" [253].

Exposing the organizers, instigators of a new world war, a holy tireless struggle against aggressive imperialist ideology is the most urgent task of our days. This struggle is led by people of various political and ideological directions, but consistent

---

252 *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.): Short Course*, p. 154.

253 A. Claude, *Who Needs War*, p. 110. IL (Foreign Literature Publishing House). 1949.

fighters against imperialist ideology, preachers of the naturalness and expediency of wars are only supporters of Marxism-Leninism. Only they express the interests of all peoples.

Being the most consistent defender of the cause of peace, socialist ideology thereby acts as a protector of all toiling humanity, the greatest treasures created by them. It points advanced humanity the path to a lasting peace, to people's democracy, and socialism. The country of victorious socialist ideology is a firm and unshakable bulwark of peace.

The great fighter for the cause of peace between nations is always the leader of the Soviet people, the ideologist of the working class, the expresser of the thoughts, aspirations, and hopes of all progressive humanity — Comrade Stalin.

"Peace will be preserved and consolidated," said Comrade Stalin, "if the peoples take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and will defend it to the end" [254]. These inspired Stalinist words, filled with profound wisdom and boundless love for the working people, have become the program of action for the fighters for peace across all continents of the earth.

The bourgeoisie and its ideologists declared Bolshevism a force of destruction. In fact, such a force is the reactionary bourgeoisie. Bolshevism and its ideology are the force of creation, of creativity, which is clearly evidenced by the flowering of socialist society, its economy, production,

---

[254] J. V. Stalin, *Interview with a Pravda Correspondent*, p. 14. Gospolitizdat. 1951.

technology, culture, and art. These successes of socialism are what the bourgeoisie fears most of all, which with all its strength seeks to hinder the peaceful construction of communism in our country, of socialism in the countries of people's democracy.

The peoples of the world, relying on the USSR, can rein in the instigators of war, disrupt their bloody plans. But if the camp of reaction manages to unleash a new world war, the whole capitalist world will find its grave in it. "Can there be any doubt," said Comrade Malenkov, "that if the imperialists unleash a third world war, then this war will become the grave no longer for individual capitalist states, but for all world capitalism" [255]. The new, advanced always wins over the old, reactionary. Such is the law of history. And this law is stronger than all the laws of the American Congress put together.

Socialist ideology has a materialistic, atheistic character. It is an ideology of cheerfulness and optimism. Being a scientific ideology, socialist ideology cannot not be hostile to mysticism, idealism, and religion. The theoretical, philosophical foundation of socialist ideology is dialectical materialism — the worldview of the Marxist party.

Socialist ideology teaches that nature and society are a unified real world, that religious representations are generated by the powerlessness of people before the spontaneous forces of nature, and in class society, under capitalism, additionally — before the force of capital.

---

[255] G. M. Malenkov, *The 32nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, pp. 21–22. Gospolitizdat. 1949.

Using religious ideology, the reactionary bourgeoisie implants a psychology of decline, pessimism, hopelessness, maintains faith in miracles, in supernatural, otherworldly forces.

Socialist ideology, the ideology of progressive development, of boundless progress, is the all-conquering ideology of scientifically based optimism. "We live in an age when all roads lead to communism" (Molotov). The forces of socialism, peace, and people's democracy are inexhaustible and invincible.

"The philosophy of 'world sorrow' is not our philosophy" [256], says Comrade Stalin. This is the philosophy of departing, dying classes. And indeed, the ideologists of the bourgeoisie say a lot about the decline of civilization. Moreover, this demise of capitalism the bourgeoisie perceives and interprets as the demise of the world, as the end of civilization in general. The bourgeoisie is possessed by fear before the growing working-class movement, before the national liberation movement of colonial peoples.

This mentality of the modern bourgeoisie received its expression in its ideology, in philosophical works of existentialists like Sartre, the instrumentalist Dewey. Here, for example, is the confession of one of the fashionable bourgeois American writers, a certain Henry Miller: "We are doomed to ruin, we have no more hope, neither for anyone among us. But since this is so, let us burst out with a terrible final howl, sneering bullying, a battle cry. Down with lamentations! Down with dirges and funeral chants! Down with biographies and

---

[256] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 273.

historical research, libraries and museums! Let the dead bury their dead. Those who are still alive, let's dance our last monstrous dance over the crater."

The bourgeoisie of a number of European countries hoped to save the situation by resorting to "aid" from the USA — the "Marshall Plan." But this only increased economic chaos, which the bourgeoisie itself is forced to admit. The French bourgeois newspaper *Combat* recently wrote: "The decomposition of the European economy continues at an awful pace, according to rules so consistent with the boldest dreams of Marxism that one might think one was present at a lecture on political economy at Moscow University. Capitalist contradictions, brought to a paroxysm as a result of the rearmament policy, place the West in such a position that it loses the war without having started it. Exhausted by the weight of manufacturing rearmament, Western Europe risks suffocating in its armor. The USA could make nothing better out of the 'free world' than a syndicate of paupers."

Regarding the results of the foreign policy of the countries of the Atlantic bloc, *Combat* reports the following: "Whatever the opinion expressed regarding Soviet diplomacy, for the West the hour to sum up the total of total tragedy has arrived, which it was offered two years ago as the main task."

Thus, total tragedy, decomposition of the European economy, economic chaos, rise of unemployment, growth of high prices, poverty, deepening of all contradictions, and in addition to this the national liberation movement of the peoples of Vietnam, Burma, Malaya, Morocco, Egypt, Iran, the hopeless adventure in Korea. There is reason to fall into despair!

The Soviet people, guided by the communist party, moves confidently toward communism. Socialist ideology fosters in our popular masses, in our youth the spirit of cheerfulness, confidence in their strength, in the inevitability of the victory of the cause of Lenin - Stalin, the cause of communism worldwide. This is taught by Marxism-Leninism. This is confirmed by the entire course of world history.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that, along with the most general sociological laws having force and significance for all stages of society's development, every socio-economic formation has its own specific laws of development, inherent only to it.

The law of the determining role of the mode of production as the main force in the development of society, of the determining role of the economic basis in relation to the superstructure applies also to socialist society. The structure of socialist society, the nature of its classes and nations, the relationships between them are determined by the character of the socialist mode of production.

Political, legal, artistic, philosophical views of our society and corresponding institutions, their prevailing role in social development are determined by the nature of the socialist economic system.

Along with laws common to all formations, in socialist society new, unprecedented in past history regularities and driving forces of development operate. To them belongs the special, specific role of consciousness, a radical change in the ratio of the spontaneous and the conscious in the development of society, the victory of socialist consciousness over the

spontaneous, the special role of the policy of the socialist state, guided by the Party of Lenin - Stalin, in all areas of social life.

And in the conditions of socialism economic, social laws exist objectively, outside the consciousness of people, but they cease to operate spontaneously. These laws are consciously used in the policy of the Bolshevik party and the Soviet state. The strength of this policy lies in the fact that it is built on scientific foundations, on the knowledge of laws of social development, on the strict taking into account of the needs of the development of the material life of socialist society. That is why this policy constitutes the vital basis of the Soviet system.

In the thesis: the policy of the communist party constitutes the vital basis of Soviet society — the decisive importance of the conscious, directing, organizing activity of the vanguard of the Soviet people is defined. This itself determines the special, greatest role of socialist consciousness, socialist ideology in the development of Soviet society.

Hence follows the huge responsibility of cadres in managing the economy, state, and party bodies, the high requirements for their theoretical level, ideological tempering, scientific horizon, the ability to orient themselves in the surrounding situation, and their understanding of the prospects of the development of socialist society, their ability to foresee.

To govern, teaches Comrade Stalin, means to foresee, and to foresee, one must know the laws of social development.

In the conditions of capitalist society, based on private property of the means of production, where every private owner runs the economy at their own risk and peril, the regulator of the

economy is spontaneously operating laws. In the conditions of socialism, which has public ownership of the means of production as its base, the economy cannot exist and develop without a single plan, without the organizing, directing role of the socialist state and its organs. But the economy, economics — is the basis of all social and cultural life of society.

That is why the policy of the communist party, the organizational activity of the state and the party have decisive importance in the development of socialist society. Here the role of the subjective factor, i.e., cadres, is immense, decisive. From the degree of communist consciousness of the masses, from the successes of the communist education of the masses, from the successes in fully overcoming the survivals of capitalism in people's consciousness depends the success of building communism.

The decisive importance of communist education of the masses for the transition to communism is determined, however, not only by the fact that the remnants of capitalism in people's consciousness have not yet been overcome. This task of the party, of workers of the broad ideological front stems from the internal tasks of the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

Just as socialist society, its economic, political foundations continuously develop, so the socialist consciousness of the masses must develop, rise to a new, higher step, corresponding to the level of new tasks facing socialist society in the period of gradual transition to communism.

Great construction projects of communism require tremendous energy, creative initiative, and labor heroism of tens of millions of people. The source of this energy, creativity, heroism is the socialist system and its Marxist-Leninist ideology, our noble goals, the guiding, inspiring, and directing power of the communist party.

Communism is a society of comprehensively developed people, where labor for all people will become the primary necessity of life. It has already become this necessity for many hundreds of thousands of Stakhanovites, but the task is that to this level of communist consciousness, when communist creative labor for society becomes the first vital necessity, the habit of all champions of the new society without exception should be raised.

Marx wrote in the *Critique of the Gotha Program*: "In a higher phase of communist society... when labor will cease to be only a means of life, but will become itself the first necessity of life; when along with the all-round development of individuals the productive forces will also grow and all springs of cooperative wealth will flow more abundantly, — only then... will society be able to write on its banner: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs'" [257]. Such a great goal, which was in the era of Marx only an ideal of the distant future, is today a practical task, realized by the Soviet people under the leadership of the communist party and the great leader Comrade Stalin.

---

[257] K. Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, p. 14. Gospolitizdat. 1945.

The success of solving this task essentially depends on the growth of the communist consciousness of the masses, on the ideological tempering, the creative mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory by all our cadres.

Marxism-Leninism became a powerful effective force because it holds the minds of millions of people, because the conductors of these ideas are the communist party, state, legal, and other institutions of socialist society.

Comrade Stalin — the great architect and teacher of communism — with his brilliant theoretical works ideologically arms our cadres, broadens their horizons, raises their Marxist-Leninist consciousness. In his immortal work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, he smashed anti-Marxist simplifications, vulgarizing theories in the field of linguistics, creating solid Marxist foundations for this science. Comrade Stalin's work was a new greatest contribution to Marxist-Leninist science, a new classic model of creative Marxism. Again and again Comrade Stalin emphasizes the irreconcilability of Marxism to dogmatism, superficial reading, and Talmudism. The strength of Marxism lies in the fact that it always demands consideration of the new that arises in life. Marxism is a weapon of action, a great, invincible weapon for building communism.

With new force Comrade Stalin emphasized the greatest active role of the superstructure, i.e., political, legal, artistic, philosophical views and corresponding institutions, in the development of society.

Marxism always taught that only people, advanced classes, consciously mastering new, advanced ideas, can destroy old, outlived social relations and create new social relations.

Lenin and Stalin in their works on the role of socialist consciousness, socialist ideology in the working-class movement always advanced and emphasized the special role of the Marxist party as the bearer of socialist consciousness, as the propagandist, conductor of socialist ideas.

Assessing the great importance of V. I. Lenin's work *What Is to Be Done?*, Comrade Stalin writes: Lenin "raised to the height the significance of theory, consciousness, the party, as the revolutionizing and leading force of the spontaneous working-class movement... Brilliantly grounded the fundamental Marxist proposition stating that a Marxist party is a combination of the working-class movement with socialism" [258].

In the work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* Comrade Stalin emphasizes that on the basis of new political views new political institutions arise, that as a consequence of this political and other social views, the whole superstructure acquires a profound active force.

In the conditions of socialist society, the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism (political, legal, artistic, philosophical) in inseparable unity with corresponding political, legal, and other institutions became the greatest active force, immensely

[258] *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.): Short Course*, pp. 37–38.

accelerating the development of the economic system and the entire life of socialist society.

The effective, active, mobilizing, and transformative force of socialist ideology reveals itself through the activity of the communist party.

The Great Stalinist ideas became, thanks to the activity of the communist party and the Soviet state, the property of tens of millions of people. These ideas mobilize the Soviet people to strengthen the power of the socialist state, the planned transformation of nature, the struggle for further growth of material well-being and cultural-technical level of the working class and collective farm peasantry.

Comrade Stalin teaches our cadres to use fully and comprehensively the active role of the socialist superstructure in the construction of communism, in the struggle for the vital cause of all peoples — for peace throughout the world. The Great Stalin raised high over the world the unfading torch of Marxist science and illuminates with it the path to all progressive humanity, the path to socialism, to communism.

The strength of Marxist-Leninist theory consists in the fact that it gives not only a deep scientific knowledge of what is happening today, but also foresight of what will happen tomorrow, where, in what direction historical development goes. But theory can successfully fulfill this role only in the event that theoretical workers, following the instructions and example of our great teacher and leader Comrade Stalin, will boldly, creatively develop Marxist-Leninist theory based on generalizing the new, richest experience of socialist life. Here

our workers, including philosophers, are still heavily indebted to the party, to Marxist science. Creative development of Marxist science is hindered by timidity, a certain dogmatism, quote-mongering, insufficient knowledge of life, practice, and finally, insufficient deployment of genuinely scientific, principled, deep criticism and self-criticism in all sectors of the theoretical front.

The Central Committee of the party, using the example of a number of discussions on philosophy, biology, linguistics, showed what a mighty creative force in the development of science criticism and self-criticism is. The power of the collective often remains under a bushel, unused, and this causes great damage to the cause of developing Marxist theory, our ideological work. Comrade Stalin's instruction that no science can develop without a struggle of opinions, without freedom of criticism, must become an immutable law of all scientific activity.

7. N. V. GOGOL ON ART
S. N. DURYLIN

The centennial anniversary of the death of N. V. Gogol, solemnly celebrated by all progressive humanity, was a powerful demonstration of the greatness and true immortality of the Russian people, who have enriched world culture with their contribution. N. V. Gogol, whose artistic images were widely used by V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin in the struggle against various enemies of the party and the people, is the pride and glory of Russian literature. His remarkable works, mercilessly exposing the autocratic-serf system, everything petty, corrupt, and base in man, have not lost their significance in our days, when honest people of the whole world, headed by the peoples of the Soviet country, are leading a heroic and self-sacrificing struggle against the dark forces of the American-English camp, preparing a new world war.

Gogol's formidable laughter, his powerful satire, his inspired and deeply patriotic artistic works help us successfully fight not only against the bitterest enemies of peace, but also against those who hinder our forward movement. "Pravda" on the day of Gogol's jubilee wrote: "The duty of Soviet literature consists in showing life in all its diversity, in movement, mercilessly exposing everything stagnant, backward, all that is hostile to the people, which is mortally afraid of the fresh air of criticism and self-criticism, uprooting from the consciousness of people the remnants of capitalism, directing against their carriers the sharp edge of satire. We need Gogols and Shchedrins!"

The brilliant creator of *The Government Inspector* and *Dead Souls* was, according to the statement of N. G. Chernyshevsky, the father of Russian prose and the founder of the critical trend in Russian literature of the XIX century [259], the trend that brought forward outstanding continuers of Gogol—Nekrasov, Saltykov-Shchedrin, Ostrovsky, and other luminaries of Russian literature.

Gogol's feature as a writer is that he not only created artistic works that took an honorable place in world literature, but also continuously reflected on literature and art, making these reflections the property of his numerous readers. Already in Gogol's second book, *Arabesques* (1835), alongside artistic works, we find the articles "Sculpture, Painting, and Music," "On the Architecture of the Present Time," and the brilliant article "A Few Words About Pushkin." In the same book, Gogol placed the article "The Last Day of Pompeii" (about Bryullov's painting) and the essay "On Little Russian Songs." One of the artistic works in *Arabesques*—the story "The Portrait"—is devoted to the most important problems: clarifying the essence of art, the aesthetic and social tasks of the artist. In 1837, in Pushkin's *Contemporary*, "Petersburg Notes of 1837" by N. V. Gogol (unsigned) appeared, in which the writer developed remarkable thoughts about theatrical art, opera, and ballet.

In response to critics of *The Government Inspector*, Gogol published "An Excerpt from a Letter Written by the Author Soon After the First Performance of *The Government Inspector*

[259] See N. G. Chernyshevsky. *Complete Works*, Vol. 3, pp. 16, 18. OGIZ, M. 1947.

to a Man of Letters," which gives a critical analysis of the performance of *The Government Inspector*. In 1842, publishing all his dramatic works, Gogol concluded them with a comedy-epilogue, "After the Play," and in this short play gave his own aesthetics of the comical in characters. "Four Letters to Various Persons Regarding *Dead Souls*" served as Gogol's answer to the criticism of *Dead Souls*. In 1843–1846, Gogol's articles about Russian writers—Lomonosov, Derzhavin, Fonvizin, Krylov, Griboyedov, Pushkin, etc., were written, and in 1846, the articles "On the Theater" and "The Historical Painter Ivanov" were printed. In all these works, Gogol expressed a number of most valuable judgments on fundamental issues of literature, theater, and painting.

Thus, during Gogol's lifetime, the Russian reader already possessed a whole corpus of his statements on issues of literature, dramatic and musical art, painting, sculpture, and architecture. After the writer's death, "An Author's Confession" and supplementary articles to *The Government Inspector* were published. Gogol's letters, which first appeared in 1857, provided rich new material illuminating Gogol's views on literature and art, his aesthetic views.

It is known what enormous creative labor Gogol expended on his artistic works. To his calling he gave all his strength, talent, life. The immense value of Gogol's aesthetic statements on issues of literature and art lies primarily in the fact that they are the result of the creative experience of the great Russian realistic artist who created immortal works—the comedy *The Government Inspector*, the poem *Dead Souls*, the stories "Taras Bulba," "The Overcoat," and others. These works, by the

recognition of Belinsky and Chernyshevsky, became models of new, realistic aesthetics, which found its embodiment in the remarkable creations of Ostrovsky, Turgenev, Nekrasov, Goncharov, Saltykov-Shchedrin, and other classics of great Russian literature.

N. V. Gogol's judgments on theatrical art, on the mastery of the actor and director, and on the visual arts are of exceptional interest.

In Gogol, a remarkable actor and no less remarkable director were combined. Even in his early youth, Gogol amazed everyone with his bright acting talent. During his studies at the Nezhin Lyceum, he participated in student performances of comedies by Fonvizin, Krylov, Sheridan, etc. Gogol himself, being very strict with himself, recognized an actor's talent in himself: "...I would play Bobchinsky excellently and am sure that Shchepkin would not expel me from the troupe if he had his own troupe and his own theater" [260].

Experiencing poverty in Italy during his work on *Dead Souls*, Gogol wrote to Zhukovsky: "If I were to join the actors, I would be provided for... and you yourself know that I would not be a bad actor" [261].

The great master of the Russian theater Shchepkin recognized Gogol not only as a remarkable actor, but also as a teacher of actors. He did not miss a single reading by Gogol of his works,

---

[260] V. I. Shenrok. *Materials for the Biography of N. V. Gogol*. Vol. 4, p. 267. M. 1897.

[261] N. V. Gogol. *Letters*. Ed. by V. I. Shenrok. Vol. 1, p. 442. SPb. 1901.

especially the comedies *The Government Inspector*, *Marriage*, and *The Lawsuit*, considering them an excellent school of life truth and genuine simplicity. Before staging *The Government Inspector*, Shchepkin persistently called Gogol to Moscow: "You know better than anyone that your play, above any other, requires that we read it to our superiors and actors... you must do this for the comedy... you must do this for Moscow" [262]. So highly valued was Shchepkin, the father of Russian stage realism, Gogol as a director-stager.

All of Gogol's judgments on the aesthetic and social requirements for the art of the actor and director are based on his own experience as a genius playwright, a remarkable actor and director, and on the richest experience of all Russian realistic art of that time. In this lies their value for the aesthetics and practice of theatrical art.

Gogol wrote not only about the theater, but also about the visual arts. Did Gogol have any personal experience here? Gogol himself printed a confession of his love for painting: "I always felt a small passion for painting. I was much occupied with a landscape painted by me, in the foreground of which a dry tree was spread out. I lived then in the country; connoisseurs and judges of mine were the surrounding neighbors. One of them, looking at the picture, shook his head and said: 'A good painter chooses a leafy tree, a good one, on which both the trunk and leaves are fresh, growing well, and not a dry one.' In childhood, this seemed annoying to me to

[262] M. S. Shchepkin. *Notes, Letters, Stories*, pp. 169–170, SPb. 1914.

hear such a judgment, but later I extracted wisdom from it: to know what people like and what they do not like" [263].

In the cited arguments of Gogol, a thought was contained that the task of the artist is to depict the truth of life, and not to select only what is beautiful in it.

These thoughts of the young Gogol were evoked by Pushkin's literary landscapes. Gogol highly valued the simplicity of these landscapes, their fidelity to Russian nature. "They can be fully understood only by one," wrote he, "whose soul carries in itself purely Russian elements, to whom Russia is dear" [264].

To Pushkin's landscapes, faithful to Russian nature, Gogol contrasted the cold-conventional academic landscapes with their polished scenery and romantic landscapes with their effective gorges and bottomless abysses, written "for beauty," etc.

From his observations of Pushkin's landscapes and from his own aesthetic experience, Gogol drew a remarkable conclusion directed against the aesthetics of romantic-unusual art and entirely in favor of the beautiful simplicity of the real: "...The more ordinary an object is, the higher one must be as a poet to extract the unusual from it, and so that this unusualness should be, by the way, the absolute truth" [265]. Gogol recognized A. S. Pushkin's *Boris Godunov* as a model of such realistic creation,

---

[263] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. VI, pp. 63–64. GIKhL 1937.
[264] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

[265] *Ibid.*, p. 131.

contrary to the judgment of the vast majority of critics and readers of the time:

"Did anyone define, did anyone understand *Boris Godunov*, this high, deep work, enclosed in internal, inaccessible poetry, rejecting every coarse, colorful embellishment, upon which the crowd usually gazes?" [266].

These lines were written in 1832, and it can be said with certainty that the severe truth of the realism of Pushkin's tragedy, the truthfulness of all its poetry was defined by no one at that time with such clarity as Gogol in his small article "A Few Words About Pushkin." Not for nothing did V. G. Belinsky quote this article by Gogol in full in one of his articles devoted to Pushkin.

In a whole series of his later statements on literature and art, Gogol returns to the realistic landscape with a dry tree in the foreground. All of Gogol's aesthetics of the real, and in particular the comical, is built on the principled rejection of the unusual as a subject of art, and on the decisive assertion of the ordinary in art. That is why Gogol fought so decisively and passionately against the romantic aesthetics of violent dramas, bloody melodramas, against the false pathos of official romantics of the Kukolnik type and the equally official tragedians of the Karatygin type.

N. V. Gogol loved painting and practiced it a lot. In the Nezhin Lyceum he studied under the "free artist" K. S. Pavlov. Unfortunately, we have no information about what this pupil of

[266] *Ibid.*, p. 365.

the Academy of Arts was like as an artist, but from Gogol's letters it is clear that he went through considerable painting practice under Pavlov. Under his guidance, Gogol wrote, as he himself informed his parents, pictures, "pastel drawings" and "dry colors," pictures painted with "oil paints" [267].

With his move to Petersburg, Gogol continued his studies in the highest art school of the country; on June 3, 1830, Gogol wrote to his mother: "...At 5 o'clock I go to class, to the Academy of Arts, where I practice painting, which I am in no condition to abandon,—the more so, since here there are all means to perfect oneself in it... In the class that I attend three times a week, I sit for two hours." There too, Gogol tells his mother about his acquaintance "with artists, and with many even famous ones" [268].

Thus, when Gogol turned to issues of painting in his collection *Arabesques*, he had considerable practice in painting, acquaintance with artists, and visits to exhibitions at the Academy of Arts. Later, Gogol's acquaintance with German Gothic, with museums and art galleries of Paris and Rome, highly enriched his knowledge in the field of art and, in particular, painting.

The writer's close acquaintance with the painter A. A. Ivanov in Rome revealed to him the creative laboratory of this genius artist and gave him precious material for judgments on art.

---

[267] See N. V. Gogol. *Letters*. Ed. by V. I. Shenrok. Vol. 1, pp. 18, 25, 35.

[268] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

N. V. Gogol also knew architecture remarkably well. His thoughts and observations touching upon this complex form of art have not lost their aesthetic value to this day.

Even in the Nezhin Lyceum, Gogol gathered materials for the study of ancient architecture, the architecture of St. Peter's Basilica in Rome. In the notebook published to this day, "A Book of All Sorts of Things, or a Handy Encyclopedia," Gogol collected engravings with architectural monuments, tracings with detailed drawings of columns, friezes, architraves, monuments of ancient Greek architecture, excerpts from Winckelmann, etc. All this testifies to young Gogol's deep interest in architecture.

Abroad, Gogol closely acquainted himself with Western European classicist art. Hardly any Russian writer of Gogol's time had such a rich experience of acquaintance with the art of Italy as the author of the story "Rome." Known to Gogol were the works on ancient art by Piranesi, Visconti, Nibby, Canina.

The remarkable statements of the great Russian writer on all forms of art represent an inestimable contribution to the development of Russian aesthetic thought.

* * *

Fighting against the autocratic-serf orders in Russia, Gogol at the same time sharply spoke out against the vices and ugliness in social life engendered by emerging bourgeois relations. Observing in Russia, and especially in a number of Western European countries, the hostility of the bourgeoisie to genuine art, the great writer thought deeply about the fates of art and the artist forced to sell his creativity, his talent for money.

Money, according to Gogol, destroys art, ruins the talent of the artist.

In his judgments on art, Gogol made certain mistakes, occasionally fell into the captivity of idealistic aesthetics, paid tribute to romantic views on creativity, but in one thing he was firm—in the consistent rejection of those requirements that bourgeois-serf society presented to the artist. The tragedy of the artist in a corrupt bourgeois-serf society was portrayed by Gogol in the story "The Portrait" (1832) and deepened in the second edition (1842) of the story. "The Portrait" is one of the brightest portrayals of this sad lot in world literature.

The artist Chartkov is not an invented, romantic "priest of art." This is a real image of a Russian artist of the 1830s of the past century. He is almost a youth. As fits a pupil of the Academy of Arts, he paints a picture on a mythological theme: the love of Psyche,—but he is drawn to living, realistic painting. And he decides to paint a portrait of his servant, the peasant Nikita, rightly convinced that this truthful portrait from life is "better than the portraits of any fashionable painter." However, the landlord, to whom the portrait is offered as payment for the apartment, is dissatisfied with it: "It would be fine if there were pictures with noble content, so that one could hang them on the wall, even some general with a star or Prince Kutuzov's portrait, but here he drew a peasant, a peasant in a shirt, a servant,—what rubbish." On top of that, the landlord, together with the house owner, with his contempt for the ordinary, taken from living reality, expresses "aesthetic" views deeply alien and hateful to the writer-realist. Gogol exposes in his work "The Portrait" the sterile and corrupt activity of the artist for

whom gold and fame in high society are the main "creative" spur.

The artist Chartkov is to paint a portrait of a certain Lise, the daughter of a society lady. What should an honest realistic artist see in this society girl? "If he were a connoisseur of human nature," writes Gogol, "he would have read in her in a single minute the beginning of childish passion for balls, the beginning of sadness and complaints about the length of time before dinner and after dinner, the desire to run about in a new dress at gatherings, heavy traces of unconcerned application to various arts, inspired by a mother for the elevation of the soul and feelings."

In other words, a true realistic artist should have reflected the sores and ailments of the social milieu that engendered her in the portrait of this girl. Gogol himself wrote his portraits precisely like this. In the features of Sobakevich, a crude man with the appearance of a bear is depicted, but in his portrait a landlord-kulak is expressed. And Gogol with reproach says of Chartkov that he did not even feel this social task of a portraitist-realist, setting himself an incomparably simpler task of superficial characteristic of the face, depiction of its external beauty: "...The artist saw in this delicate little face only one thing enticing for the brush, an almost porcelain transparency of the skin, captivating light languor, a slender white neck, and aristocratic lightness of stature."

But even a superficial characteristic, to be successful, required truthfulness from the artist in depicting the languid face of the lady. "He caught every shade, light yellowness, barely noticeable blueness under the eyes." And despite the timid

attempt to be truthful, he met with protest from the lady-client: "Look, in some places... it's as if it were a bit yellow, and here it's completely like dark spots." The artist attempted to give a formal-technical justification for this "yellowness" and "spots," hiding the realistic necessity of showing them for the liveliness of the entire portrait and proving that they constitute pleasant and light tones of the face. But he was answered that they do not constitute any tones and that it only seems so to him. The artist attempted to protect at least the smallest part of his rights to creative will: "...Allow here in one place only to touch up a little bit with yellow paint." But even this was not allowed to him.

Severely and simply Gogol depicts the ruin of the artist who betrayed the aesthetics of life truth: "He heartlessly began to smooth out everything... that general color which is given by memory and turns faces, taken from life, into some cold-ideal ones. The artist longed for those truthful tones which his brush mercilessly destroyed at the request of the client, and attempted to transfer these features to his Psyche. And this Psyche, slightly revived by real features of a society girl, was accepted by the lady-client as a portrait of her daughter and she exclaimed in delight: 'Lise, Lise! Ah, how similar! Superbe, superbe! How well you thought of putting her in a Greek costume... But what work! This is Correggio!'"

And the artist, for falsifying nature, for a crime against art and his talent, "was rewarded by all: with a smile, money, compliments, sincere handshakes, invitations to dinners; in a word, received a thousand flattering awards. The portrait made a noise around the town... The artist was suddenly besieged

with work. It seemed the whole town wanted to be painted by him."

And Chartkov turned from an honest artist into a craftsman, a panderer to bourgeois taste, a traitor to his talent: "Even of two, three words he caught beforehand what the person wanted to depict himself as. Who wanted Mars, he drew Mars; who aimed for Byron, he gave him a Byronian stance and turn. Whether Corinna, Undine, Aspasia were desired by the ladies, he agreed to everything with great willingness and added from himself a sufficiency of elegance."

In Russian classical literature, one could hardly point to a more vivid depiction of the disgraceful and sad fate of the artist forced to sell his talent for money and submissively execute the vulgar demands of the client.

In his story "The Portrait," Gogol touches upon the essence of that realism to which Chartkov turned traitor. In the first edition of the story, the ill-fated portrait that brought the artist Chartkov to ruin was painted by an artist who, "dared to depict a man," who "chose as his dwelling the antichrist." In the 1842 edition, Gogol decisively abandoned this romantic invention. The artist who created the eerie portrait points to a completely different cause for the fatal flaw of this portrait: "I wrote it with disgust, I felt no... love for my work. By force I wanted to conquer myself and, heartlessly, smothering everything, be faithful to nature." However, nothing came of this, for without love, without fidelity to the truth of life, true art cannot be created.

N. V. Gogol in his statements on literature and art not only consistently defends realistic art, but also reveals the true meaning of this art. Realism is not a formal description of facts of reality. A realistic artist is not a recorder who registers with pen or brush these or those phenomena of life. Mindless fidelity to nature leads only to a poor artistic work, worthless for art. That is why in "The Portrait" the old artist who painted the portrait of the usurer without "love for the work" repents of this as an aesthetic and moral crime. He gives a commandment of true realism: "Investigate, study everything you see, submit everything to the brush, but in everything know how to find the internal thought and above all strive to comprehend the high secret of creation. Blessed is the chosen one who possesses it. There is no low subject in nature. In the insignificant, the creator-artist is just as great as in the great; in the despicable there is no longer the despicable for him, for there shines through it invisibly the beautiful soul of the creator, and the despicable received a high expression, for it passed through the purgatory of his soul."

In these remarkable words is contained the essence of the aesthetics of critical realism, which never neglected the "low" in life and always knew how to fill every significant phenomenon of reality with enormous internal meaning.

Seeing a painting painted by a young painter faithful to the truth of life, Chartkov understood his entire fall as an artist. "It was seen how all, drawn from the external world, the artist first enclosed into his soul and from there, from the spiritual spring, sent it in a harmonious, solemn song. And it became clear even

to the uninitiated what an immeasurable abyss exists between creation and a simple copy from nature."

Thus Gogol himself "passed" the material of Russian reality through the "spiritual spring" of bitter reflection on the sad and joyless life of the people, through the bitterness of laughter and high "lyrical agitation" of deep faith in the beautiful future of the Russian people.

* * *

To Gogol belongs an article about K. Bryullov's painting "The Last Day of Pompeii" (1834). It is full of delight before the art of Bryullov: "Bryullov's painting is one of the bright phenomena of the 19th century. This is a bright resurrection of painting, which was for a long time in a sort of semi-paralyzed condition" [269].

All who wrote about this article by Gogol reproached him for his delights before Bryullov and reproached him completely incorrectly, approaching the matter anti-historically. Bryullov's painting had enormous success in Russia. Before the artist bowed Pushkin and Herzen.

Gogol's delight before Bryullov was not isolated, but a general phenomenon of the era.

In 19th-century painting, Gogol notes new features: "They noticed such secret phenomena as no one previously suspected. All that nature which man sees, which surrounds him and lives

[269] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. VI, p. 129. GIKhL 1937.

with him, all this visible nature, all this detail which great artists neglected, reached amazing truth and perfection... Coloration, used by the 19th century, shows a great step in the knowledge of nature" [270].

Gogol correctly reveals the essence of Bryullov's painting, asserting that in his work "sculpture turned into painting." Seeking elements of realism in Bryullov, N. V. Gogol writes: "...In the whole painting, the absence of ideality is revealed, i.e., ideally detached, and in this consists its first virtue" [271].

Gogol describes "The Destruction of Pompeii" as a powerfully tragic scene with direct lighting effects. "It can be said that the 19th century is a century of effects. Everyone, from the first to the last, hurries to produce an effect, starting from the poet to the confectioner, so that these effects, truly, are already sickening, and, maybe, the 19th century, by a strange whim of its own, will finally turn to everything effectless" [272]. This "effectless" quality Gogol found a few years later in the severe painting of Aleksandr Ivanov.

"There are people," wrote he, "who are convinced that everything is accessible to a great artist: earth, sea, man... and the prayer to God, in a word—everything can come to him easily, if only he is a talented artist, having studied at the academy. However, an artist can depict only that which he felt,

---

[270] *Ibid.*, pp. 129–130.

[271] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

[272] *Ibid.*, p. 131.

and of which a complete idea has formed in his head; otherwise the painting will be a dead, academic painting" [273].

This was written in 1846, when Gogol himself had already created such pictures of a formidable judgment over the life of serf Russia as *The Government Inspector* and *Dead Souls*— works in which he is infinitely far both from the false aesthetics of abstract romantic impulse and from the dry canons of dead academic routine.

For a fuller understanding of Gogol's aesthetic views, it is necessary to turn to his statements on issues of architecture.

In his reflections on architecture, Gogol touches upon many of the most important problems of the art contemporary to him. In his article "On the Architecture of the Present Time" (1831), he proceeded from the complete rejection of the architecture of bourgeois modernity, which, from Gogol's point of view, does not deserve the name of art at all:

"I am always saddened when I look at new buildings continuously being built, on which millions are spent and of which few stop the amazed eye with the majesty of design or willful boldness of imagination... Involuntarily the thought sneaks in: has the age of architecture really irreversibly passed? Has grandeur and genius really left us?" [274].

This reflection on the poverty of 19th-century architecture Gogol accompanies with righteous indignation against the typical official architecture of the Russian city of the era of

---

[273] *Ibid.*, p. 365.

[274] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. VI, p. 67.

Arakcheyev and Nicholas I: "To all buildings city-wide they began to give a completely flat, simple shape. Houses tried to make as similar to one another as possible; but they were more similar to barns or barracks than to cheerful dwellings of people. Their completely smooth shape did not assume any liveliness from small regular windows, which in relation to the whole building were similar to squinted eyes. And of this architecture we were recently vain, as the perfection of taste, and built whole cities in its spirit! Would anyone dare even now, among this smoothly uniform pile, to erect a building carrying on itself the stamp of a special, sharp architecture... he would be considered almost insane! That is why new cities have no appearance at all: they are so regular, so smooth, so monotonous that having walked one street, you already feel boredom and refuse the desire to look into another. This is a row of walls, and nothing more" [275].

In the story "The Portrait," Gogol with disgust wrote: "Our XIX century has long since acquired the dull appearance of a banker." This "appearance" was hateful to Gogol in literature, in theater, in art. Having acquainted himself with this "appearance" in Western Europe, he invariably noted its self-satisfaction, vulgarity, and soul-lessness.

In the story "Rome," Gogol describes the impression of a young Italian prince who arrived in Paris: "And here he is in Paris, senselessly embraced by its monstrous exterior, struck by the movement, the shine of the streets, the disorder of roofs, the density of chimneys, the architectural overcrowding of masses

[275] *Ibid.*, pp. 73–74.

of houses, covered with a tight patchwork of shops, ugly signs of unsightly side walls, an innumerable mixed crowd of golden letters that climbed onto walls, windows, roofs, and even chimneys, with the bright transparency of the lower floors, consisting only of plate glass alone."

Here Gogol expresses his aversion to the ugly appearance of the bourgeois city with its sharp contrasts of shine and poverty, with its tightness and overcrowding, where construction is subordinated primarily to the interests of bourgeois mercantilism, the interests of profit.

Gogol was ready to admire the Gothic city of old Germany or the picturesque quarters of old Rome. But no matter how Gogol admired Gothic and Renaissance architecture, he did not at all wish to subject modernity to the aesthetics of the past. A great realist, closely connected with modernity, Gogol asked the question: "Why, however, is it not possible to create... a completely peculiar and new architecture, bypassing former conditions? When a wild and uneducated man, who has only nature for guidance and inspiration, creates a creation in which there is both beauty and a secret instinct of taste,—why we, who have all abilities developed so extensively, who see more and understand nature in all its secret phenomena,—why do we produce nothing completely penetrated by such richness of our knowledge?" [276].

Gogol awaits the birth of a new architecture which, proceeding from the achievements of science and technology, will not limit itself to simple repetition of previously created architectural

[276] *Ibid.*, pp. 88–89.

forms, but will find new means and forms conditioned by the living needs of modernity.

Gogol asserts that "in our century there are such acquisitions and such new ones, belonging entirely to us, elements from which a abyss can be borrowed of never before erected buildings." Gogol puts forward in the future the triumph of new "elements" in architecture—the triumph of metal, iron. With this new material base Gogol connects the inevitability of the appearance of new forms and images of architecture.

Rejecting the bourgeois city with its ugly architecture, Gogol dreams of new construction, of an architecture belonging to the future.

In his article "Sculpture, Painting, and Music" (1831), this romantic poem in prose, Gogol single out music as an art primarily contemporary, especially suited to the 19th-century man: "She—is ours! she—is a property of the new world!" [277]. And it is highly characteristic of Gogol's perception of reality that in music he sees a protest against bourgeois mercantilism, against the greedy property-seeking and money-grubbing which later he stigmatized with such force and anger in the image of Chichikov. "O, be our savior, save us, music!" exclaims Gogol.—"Do not leave us! strike more sharply with your sounds upon our dormant feelings! Agitate, tear them and chase away, if only for a moment, this cold-terrible egoism striving to possess our world! Let, at the powerful stroke of the bow, the troubled soul of the plunderer feel, if only for an instant, remorse, the speculator lose his calculations,

[277] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. VI, p. 13.

shamelessness and impudence involuntarily drop a tear before the creation of talent" [278].

In his article "On Little Russian Songs" (1833), he speaks of music which has nothing in common with the aesthetics of vocal self-indulgence, "soul-pleasing." According to M. I. Glinka's definition, this is the music and poetry of folk song. In folk song Gogol sees great art emerging from the core of national life. Songs liberate human hearts and wills for the best movements: in them "the soul sounds, and all members, destroying indifference, ordinary position, become freer... Nothing can be stronger than national music, if only a people has a poetic disposition, diverse activity of life" [279].

This was written by Gogol in 1833, and three years later he expressed with full confidence the thought that a Russian opera should be born from national music in Russia. Of complete novelty sounded then Gogol's assertion: "...What an opera, what music could be composed from our national motives! Show me a people who would have more songs! Little Russia boils with songs. Along the whole Volga, song-lovers float, ring out storm-like songs. To songs, timber is chopped from log cabins across all Russia, bricks are thrown from hand to hand, and houses rise. To songs, all Russia works... Have we nothing to compose an opera from?" [280].

---

[278] *Ibid.*

[279] *Ibid.*, pp. 115, 117.

[280] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. 6, p. 321. 10th ed. under the editorship of N. S. Tikhonravov.

Scarcely half a year passed, and Gogol's prediction came true: Glinka's opera *Ivan Susanin* appeared, born from the composer's communion with the creativity of the people. "It is not we who create," asserted Glinka, "the people create, we only write down and arrange."

Acquainting himself with Glinka's brilliant creation, Gogol wrote: "Glinka's opera is only a beautiful beginning. He managed to harmoniously fuse two Slavic musics in his creation; you hear where the Russian speaks and where the Pole" [281].

Following Glinka's example, Dargomyzhsky, Mussorgsky, Borodin, Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov followed the Russian song, creating the Russian national opera.

Gogol's thoughts on the inexhaustible riches of Russian folk creativity had enormous significance for the struggle against serfdom, against the hostile attitude of czarism and landlords toward the people and their remarkable creativity. For it was precisely Gogol who was one of the first in Russian literature to widely and brightly use folk tales, songs, and legends in his work, boldly introducing the language of simple people from the people into literature.

Reflecting on another form of musical art—ballet—Gogol here too opposed abstract music and standard scenario court and bourgeois ballet with choreographic theater emerging from the life of the people. Gogol reproached the ballet of his time for forgetting that dance is a creation of the people. "Look,"

---

[281] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. 6, p. 515. 10th ed. under the editorship of N. S. Tikhonravov.

exclaims Gogol, "in what unnumbered variety dances appear in different corners of the world. They, like the people, differed each into their own form. Here is the Russian—flowing, tense and quiet dance... Here is the dance of Western Slavs—free, unbridled... In each people they are also a consequence of life... Can a creator of ballet not somehow present this difference for a certain definition of the character of the acting persons?"

Gogol dreamed of a realistic reform of ballet; he believed that ballet should be a choreographic tragedy or comedy and even "in a comical way can more express action" [282].

Thus, Gogol's aesthetics included requirements of realism in such a field of theater as ballet. And in this Gogol stood far ahead of his time.

* * *

For all statements of Gogol about theater, the condemnation of the aesthetics and practice of bourgeois dramaturgy is characteristic. In two genres—in vaudeville and melodrama, dominating in the theater of the 20s–30s of the past century,—Gogol saw an especially bright expression of the corruption of bourgeois art. Both these genres, beloved in bourgeois Europe and diligently cultivated by serf-owners in the Russian theater, were deeply hostile to Gogol with his new aesthetics of the real, with his striving for effectlessness, with his requirement of the "ordinary subject," as the central object of attention of artists of the word, sound, brush. Bourgeois melodrama, penetrated with the spirit of commercialism and mercantilism,

[282] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. 6, p. 326. 10th ed.

was far from national life. Instead of life truth, it always sought to depict the unusual and effective.

"A strange thing became the plot of present-day drama," wrote Gogol in Pushkin's journal *Contemporary*. "The whole point is to tell some event, necessarily new, necessarily strange, hitherto unheard of and unseen: murder, fires, the wildest passions, of which there is no trace in present societies! As if in our European tailcoats people dressed up as sons of scorching Africa! Executioners, poisons—effect, eternal effect, and not a single face arouses any participation!" [283].

"Effect"—the product of romantic aesthetics of the "horrible"—became, according to Gogol's assertion, the property of bourgeois art in the broadest sense of the word. Melodrama replaces tragedy: the aesthetics of the tragic, the aesthetics of Shakespeare and Schiller, is incomprehensible to the dull consciousness of the bourgeois; to his self-satisfied philistine life-enjoyment, the tragic is completely alien; instead he seeks the effective, the unusual, and finds it in melodrama.

In the bourgeois theater, vaudeville begins to oust comedy. The bourgeois spectator can no longer endure either the healthy realism of Molière or the satirical laughter of Beaumarchais, and satisfies himself with a surrogate of comedy—vaudeville, which catches a real image of reality with conventional lifelikeness of theatrical event, the sole purpose of which is to entertain the spectator. Both of the above-mentioned genres, beloved by the bourgeoisie, lead theater and actor away from

[283] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. 5, p. 563. 10th ed.

artistic truth and social task, without service to which theater loses the very meaning of its existence.

Gogol considered melodrama and vaudeville as a phenomenon of decay of the European theater. He deeply believed that the development of the Russian theater would go along a different path, along the path of nationality and realism. "Glory be to God," wrote Gogol, "we... are not at the decline of existence, but only still at the dawn of its stand. Our people are still young and serve as eternal material for the writer, striking him with a multitude of diverse degrees of education,—and all elements of our state are elements of strength and youth" [284].

In this remarkable statement Gogol points to the inexhaustibility of material for the writer connected with the life of his people. The material of national life and Russian reality is "eternal material," and, consequently, realism is eternal as a creative method nourished by the vital juices of reality.

Only realism can be the method of genuinely national art, since it is conditioned by life, by the reality created by the people. Melodrama and vaudeville, created in detachment from reality, to suit the tastes of ruling classes, are purely theatrical genres, and their transplantation onto Russian soil constitutes, from the point of view of Gogol, an artistic defect and a social crime. "Where is our life? Where are we with all modern passions and strangenesses? If only some reflection were seen in our melodrama! But our melodrama lies shamelessly" [285].

---

[284] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. 6, p. 320. 10th ed.
[285] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. 5, p. 563. 10th ed.

According to Gogol's thought, vaudeville lies and falsifies reality, replacing high social comedy with its critical attitude toward reality. "For God's sake, give us Russian characters, give us ourselves, our rogues, our eccentrics! onto the stage them, for everyone to laugh at! Laughter is a great thing: it does not take away life, nor property, but before it the guilty one—is like a bound hare" [286].

To this appeal to playwrights of the epoch of reaction, only Gogol himself could answer, and he answered with *The Government Inspector* and *Marriage*.

In all his work, Gogol denied bourgeois comedy, its ethics and aesthetics. Scribe and other authors of comedies of the 1830s–1850s (Labiche, Augier, Ponsard), turning away from life, fearing meetings with sad or disgraceful reality, refused the satirical direction in comedy, outstanding representatives of which were in their time in the West Molière and Beaumarchais.

The basis of comedies-vaudevilles is served not by phenomena of reality, but by theatrical events, thought up in a deliberately comical aspect. Gogol decisively refused any search for the comical in the plot and scenario of a play, in the driving of intrigue, in the selection of corresponding masks and roles (a simple, brisk servant, a smart maid, etc.).

In the aesthetics and poetics of comedy, Gogol drew a sharp dividing line between the comical and the funny. The comical is extracted from phenomena of life, from conflicts of reality;

[286] *Ibid.*, p. 517.

the funny is devised by a playwright who has gotten his hand in the mastery of scenario, intrigue, dialogue. Speaking of the character of comicality, Gogol asserted that "the comical lurks everywhere, living among us, we only do not see it; but if an artist transfers it to art, onto the stage, we ourselves will roll over with laughter and will wonder that we did not notice it before" [287].

The great writer banished the funny for the sake of creative work of the playwright and actor's play, achieving complete correspondence with life truth. "The less an actor thinks about how to amuse and be funny," said Gogol, "the more the comical aspect of the role he takes will be revealed. The comical will reveal itself by itself precisely in that seriousness with which each of the persons brought out in the comedy is occupied with his own business... But they themselves do not joke at all and do not even think that anyone would laugh at them" [288].

Refusing the search for the comical as theatrical-conventional, Gogol consciously banished from drama and comedy love intrigue as an indispensable axis of dramatic action. Neither Molière, nor Beaumarchais, nor Fonvizin, nor Griboyedov resolved to construct a comedy without a love intrigue, although the unnecessariness of it was completely obvious in such, for example, comedies on Russian reality as *The Minor* by Fonvizin or *The Misfortune of Having Wit* by Kapnist. A true refusal of the unusual, Gogol taught that a play will then only be effective if it is built on real, living conflicts, on

---

[287] S. T. Aksakov. *History of My Acquaintance with Gogol*, p. 7. M. 1890.
[288] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. IV, p. 471.

dramatic everyday and ordinary events. The lover of arts in "After the Play" says of love intrigue: "It is time to stop relying to this day on this eternal plot. It is worth looking intently around. Everything has changed long ago in the world. Now a stronger plot is caused by a desire to obtain a profitable position... Are not rank, capital, a profitable marriage more electric than love?" [289].

Gogol calls here a powerful "engine" of all kinds of conflicts in landlord-bourgeois society, such as gain and money. Conflicts existing in life must, according to the writer's thought, find a truthful reflection in a dramatic work. According to this principle, all Gogolian plays were created.

Gogol's proposition on a "plot" taken directly from life, without obligatory love intrigue, had enormous significance for a new, realistic aesthetics of the comical, which, on Gogol's initiative, was developed by Ostrovsky (*It's a Family Affair—We'll Settle It Ourselves*), Turgenev (*A Breakfast at the Leader's*), Sukhovo-Kobylin (*Tarelkin's Death*), Saltykov-Shchedrin (*Pazukhin's Death*).

Gogol asserted: "...Comedy must weave by itself, with its whole mass, into one big common knot. The plot must embrace all faces, and not one or two,—touch upon what agitates, more or less, all acting persons. Here every hero..." [290].

This is precisely how the comedies *The Government Inspector* (the plot of officials expecting a "governor" from Petersburg) and *Marriage* (the struggle of suitors for a rich bride) are tied.

---

[289] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. IV, p. 114.
[290] *Ibid.*

In all Gogol's plays, events and facts that deeply agitate readers and spectators are brought to the foreground.

Building the action of comedy on a real-life conflict, Gogol banished from comedy "ideal faces," with which old Russian comedy was so rich (Starodum, Pravdin, Milon in *The Minor*, etc.), and broadly introduced into comedy a most important, though invisible acting person—laughter.

Gogol spoke out against simple description of life. "What is comedy without truth and malice?" wrote he. Truthful in comedy and in story for him was only such depiction of reality in which realism, the truth of life, were combined with critical depiction of its dark sides—with "malice" of satire. Only such theater in which the fullness of living and artistic truth triumphs, Gogol recognized as genuinely necessary, aesthetically justified, and socially valuable. He mercilessly condemned official theater and dramaturgy of czarist Russia, as well as the theater of the bourgeois West, which distorted living truth in the interests of ruling classes.

"From theater they made a toy like those trinkets with which children are enticed, forgetting that it is such a tribune from which a whole crowd is suddenly told a living lesson, where, with the solemn shine of illumination, to the sound of music, with unanimous laughter, a familiar, accustomed vice is shown, or at a secret voice of universal participation a familiar, timidly hiding elevated feeling is brought out" [291].

[291] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. 5, p. 518. 10th ed.

Gogol was a harbinger of new theater, theater-tribune, from which the verdict of public judgment over life was announced and in which the call to struggle for a bright future of the people was heard.

* * *

In one of the letters regarding *Dead Souls*, Gogol wrote: "...There comes a time when it is impossible otherwise to direct society or even an entire generation to the beautiful, until you show the whole depth of its real baseness; there comes a time when it is not at all proper to speak of the high and beautiful, without showing here just as clearly as day the paths and roads to it for everyone" [292].

In this remarkable confession is enclosed the basis of the aesthetics of *The Government Inspector* and *Dead Souls* as works not only realistic, but also satirical. The beautiful in epigones of romanticism, turning in such reactionary apologists of the Nicholas regime as Kukolnik, Polevoy, and others, turned out to be the antithesis of the real, it coincided entirely in them with the notorious Uvarov triad: Orthodoxy, autocracy, nationality.

All artistic creation of Gogol was a sharp denial of this triad, contrasting the high and beautiful with the real and ordinary. Gogol perfectly understood the reactionary meaning of aesthetics that set art above life and banished from the sphere of creative attention of the artist all so-called "low" phenomena of reality. In one of his letters, Gogol sharply attacked those

[292] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. VI, p. 321.

who demand that the author "tickle them with something reconciling with life" (as people say). Rubbish! As if it were possible to devise this reconciliation with life. Believe that such a work will not be released, it will not gain influence now, if it does not contain precisely those questions around which present society revolves and if it does not depict those people who are needed by us now and in the present time" [293].

The great Russian writer noted that art "reconciling with life"—with Russian reality of the 1830s–1840s—could only be "devised," as its official romantics of the Kukolnik type devise it. The aesthetics of "reconciliation with life" in Gogol's eyes was a corrupt aesthetics. Properly Gogolian aesthetics, the aesthetics of "Petersburg Stories," *The Government Inspector*, and *Dead Souls*,—is an irreconcilable one, but, on the contrary, fighting against life, in which the ruling class are Sobakeviches and Nozdrevs, whose power over the Russian people is supported by town governors and derzhimordas.

"In *The Government Inspector* I decided to gather into one heap all the bad in Russia that I knew then... and at one time laugh at everything" [294]. Here is a creative-artistic task, strikingly opposite to the task of reconciliation with reality, calming in the pseudo-"high," in the abstractly "beautiful," the task that bourgeois and feudal-gentry aesthetics set before artists.

The Government Inspector, fully corresponding to the aesthetics of irreconcilability with disgraceful reality,

---

[293] N. V. Gogol. *Letters*. Ed. by V. I. Shenrok. Vol. 3, p. 447. SPb. 1901.
[294] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. 4, p. 249. 10th ed. under the editorship of N. S. Tikhonravov.

produced, by the recognition of Gogol himself, a shocking effect. In *Dead Souls* Gogol just as boldly gathered "all the bad in Russia." From creative notes of the writer made during his work on *Dead Souls*, his aesthetics of anger, directed against autocratic-serf arbitrariness that dominated in Russia, clearly emerges.

As early as 1838, Gogol wrote from Rome that he needed to return to Russia and live in Petersburg, as in the focus of the empire of Nicholas I:

"Here, perhaps, I would get angry again—and very strongly—at my beloved Russia, toward which a wrathful disposition is already beginning to weaken in me, and without anger—you know—little can be said: only having gotten angry, truth is spoken" [295]. And two years later Gogol wrote from there to Pogodin: "Well, good that I am going to Russia: I already begin to cool down a little anger, so necessary to an author, against this and that, all kinds of родных плевел" [296].

The powerful civic pathos of *Dead Souls*, their formidable satirical force fully flow from realistic aesthetics setting the creative task of fighting against "all the bad in Russia." "The first part (*of Dead Souls*.—*S. D.*)," wrote Gogol,—"despite all its imperfections, the main thing did: it planted in everyone disgust for my heroes and for their insignificance; it spread some needed sadness and our own dissatisfaction with ourselves" [297].

---

[295] N. V. Gogol. *Letters*. Vol. 1, p. 544.
[296] N. V. Gogol. *Letters*. Vol. 2, p. 83.
[297] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. VI, p. 317.

Gogol's deepest conviction that aesthetics of life truth and critical thought is the only aesthetics worthy of a writer who relates to his creativity as to serving his people, inspired Gogol with the famous beginning of the seventh chapter of *Dead Souls*—about two writers with different views on the tasks of art. One writer passes "by characters boring, disgusting, striking with their sad reality." He draws from a "great whirlpool of daily spinning outstanding images... the few exceptions." The aesthetics of this writer cannot be aesthetics of realism; it covers life with a light fog of alluring fiction: "he stupefied with enticing smoke human eyes." Gogol mercilessly exposes the aesthetics of "enticing smoke" as aesthetics of deception: "he wonderfully flattered them, concealing the sad in life." To the aesthetics of beautiful deception the great writer contrasts the severe and truthful aesthetics of a writer-citizen, a writer-fighter for humanity in man, who dares to "bring out to the surface everything that is every minute before eyes, and which indifferent eyes do not see, all the terrible, shocking slush of insignificance that entangled our life, all the depth of cold, fragmented, everyday characters," and "with a firm chisel fearlessly... to stand out these everyday characters, this slush and mud of reality convexly and brightly before all-world eyes" [298].

Such a writer was Gogol himself, the author of the immortal creations *The Government Inspector* and *Dead Souls*, a remarkable artist of critical realism.

---

[298] N. V. Gogol. *Works*. Vol. V, pp. 153–154. GIKhL 1937.

The immense social significance of Gogol's works, which asserted the principles of the method of critical realism, was emphasized with special force by N. G. Chernyshevsky. He pointed to Gogol's predecessors in this direction, in particular to Pushkin and Griboyedov. "And yet," wrote Chernyshevsky, "despite the high virtues and enormous success of Griboyedov's comedy and Pushkin's novel, one must attribute exclusively to Gogol the merit of firmly introducing into Russian polite literature satirical—or, as it would be more correct to call it, critical direction"[299].

This judgment on the character of Gogol's creativity, on the bases of his creative aesthetics acquires special value and significance because it proceeds from the author of the dissertation *Aesthetic Relations of Art to Reality*, who opened with his brilliant work new horizons for the development of realistic aesthetics, grown on the basis of summarizing the richest experience of great Russian literature and first of all the creativity of Gogol.

Gogol experienced quite a few changes in his views, he made quite a few serious mistakes. But as an artist—and where he remained an artist—he was, in essence, always faithful to the aesthetics of the real. That is why Chernyshevsky, who asserted that "the beautiful is life," wrote upon the first appearance in print of excerpts from the second volume of *Dead Souls*: "...The artist's program remains, as seen, the former program of *The Government Inspector* and the first volume of *Dead Souls*. Yes, Gogol the artist remained always

[299] N. G. Chernyshevsky. *Complete Works*, Vol. 3, p. 18.

true to his calling, however we might have to judge the changes that occurred with him in other respects. And indeed, whatever his mistakes were when he speaks of objects unfamiliar to him, —one cannot fail to admit, re-reading the surviving chapters of the second volume of *Dead Souls*, that he barely passes into spheres of relations closely familiar to him, which were depicted in the first volume of *Dead Souls*, as his talent appears in its former nobility, in its former strength and freshness. In the surviving excerpts there are very many such pages which must be numbered among the best that Gogol ever gave us, which lead to delight with their artistic dignity, and, what is even more important, with the truthfulness and power of noble indignation" [300].

The realistic bases of Gogol's aesthetics are so firm that they could not be shaken, as seen from Chernyshevsky's statement, by his errors and vacillations. The great revolutionary democrat considers it necessary to emphasize especially that Gogol the realist does not part with the aesthetics of anger, which made him a formidable judge of old, serf Russia. The truthfulness and power of noble indignation against the sores and vices of this reality are characteristic of all Gogol's creativity; they were an organic part of his creative genius and an inalienable part of his aesthetic views.

In Gogol's creativity and in his reflections on art are enclosed most valuable thoughts that enriched Russian aesthetic science and the creativity of many Russian writers and artists.

[300] N. G. Chernyshevsky. *Complete Works*, Vol. 3, p. 13.

8. ON THE ESSENCE OF THE REALISTIC ARTISTIC IMAGE
V. A. RAZUMNY

Marxist-Leninist aesthetics teaches that the most important specific feature of art is the reflection of reality in the form of artistic images. In light of Comrade Stalin's brilliant proposition regarding the necessity of studying the specific features of social phenomena, Soviet philosophers and art historians face the primary task of comprehensively investigating the problem of the artistic image.

In this article, the author sought to consider only certain aspects of this crucial problem—namely, the question of the essence of the realistic artistic image.

Before considering the basic laws governing the truthful reflection of life in the form of artistic images, it must be noted that the formulation of the question of realistic cognition of life through the means of art is characteristic only of materialistic aesthetics. For idealism, the problem of reflecting reality in the form of artistic images does not and cannot exist. Idealism, always acting as the theoretical basis of lack of ideology and apoliticism in art, denies the objective reality of the subject of art, asserting as the content of its images either a mystical absolute idea or the product of the "pure self-activity" of our "I".

One of the methods of idealistic aesthetics in denying the possibility of truthful artistic cognition of life is the

metaphysical opposition of art to science, as object-sensory thinking to logical thinking. This opposition is expressed in absolutizing the formal features of the artistic image and considering them in isolation from the complex process of reflecting reality in art.

Thus, for example, idealistic aesthetics absolutizes the most obvious feature of the artistic image—its concrete sensory nature, which distinguishes the image of art from concepts in science.

Indeed, unlike a concept, an artistic image—be it a poetic or stage image, a musical or architectural, choreographic or pictorial-artistic one—is always sensory and concrete. It is always designed for human sensory perception, for live contemplation, through which it indirectly acts on the process of abstract thinking. The sensory concreteness of artistic images as special cognitive forms is achieved by embodying them in the material of a given form of art through those formal methods and techniques that have been historically developed by a specific art form in the process of its development.

However, the recognition of the concrete sensory nature of images in art does not yet mean the disclosure of their essence. Idealistic aesthetics, which sees the essence of the artistic image in the objectification of the world of ideas or the world of man's subjective experiences, by no means denies the concrete sensory nature of artistic images.

Exposing the formalism of idealistic aesthetics, the great Russian revolutionary democrats Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, and Dobrolyubov, passionate fighters for progressive ideology

in art and for its high social purpose, asserted that there is not and cannot be any essential difference between science and art. They taught that art, by reproducing phenomena of reality that are interesting to humans, thereby gives them an explanation and, moreover, passes judgment on them. They expressed the brilliant insight that artistic and scientific cognition of life, despite their specific features, have a common gnoseological basis.

For the first time in the history of aesthetic doctrines, a scientific solution to the problem of the essence of the realistic artistic image was provided by Marxist-Leninist aesthetics, which revealed the laws of realistic artistic generalization from the standpoint of dialectical and historical materialism. It was the first to scientifically substantiate the objective truth of artistic cognition and its dialectical character. It proved that realism and ideological commitment in art are inseparable.

Marxist-Leninist aesthetics teaches that artistic generalization of reality by man is subject to the general laws of cognition first revealed by Marxism.

"Human consciousness, science ('concept')," points out V. I. Lenin, "reflects essence, the substance of nature[301], that is, it gives us objective truth. But it does not reflect the whole diversity of the concrete directly, as a whole, but indirectly, through departure, abstraction from non-essential features given in perception, and through generalization in cognitive forms of the most essential features, properties, and aspects of objects. The results of this generalization, to use Engels' words,

[301] "Philosophical Notebooks" by V. I. Lenin, p. 162.

are abbreviations in which human thought embraces, according to their common properties, a set of various sensory-perceived things.

In the process of generalization, abstracting (abstracted) properties and aspects of objects from reality, cognition, if correct, does not depart from the truth, but, on the contrary, approaches it. In abstractions, thought reflects objective reality deeper, truer, fuller than direct live contemplation, for in being they reveal the essence.

An artistic image, like a concept, represents the result of a certain abstraction from reality of its interconnected elements, common features of objects and phenomena, the result of their specific generalization. But unlike a scientist, an artist generalizes certain aspects of reality without abstracting from the living completeness and concrete individuality of the phenomena themselves, conveying them in the form of an image of an individual phenomenon.

The very fact of an artist's selection of only certain aspects of life is determined by the laws of creating an artistic image in concrete art forms. For example, in the so-called spatial arts, the artist, by virtue of their specific nature, is limited to a single moment in the development of the depicted phenomenon. A sculptor or a painter in portraits or complex compositions abstracts from the entire preceding and subsequent history of the development of an event or the biography of the depicted person, selecting only one moment in their life activity; and at this moment, they again abstract from a number of properties

and characteristics of the subject that cannot be conveyed in a visual image.

Cinema, literature, theater, and music are not limited to a single moment in the development of what is depicted: they give an image in motion, in action. However, disclosing an image through action over time does not exclude, but on the contrary, presupposes the artist's abstraction both from preceding and and from subsequent stages of the reflected life. Any dramatic situation, any plot representing the development path of an image, has a backstory of its development and certain consequences thereof, which remain outside the book, screen, stage, etc.

Marxist theory of knowledge teaches that abstraction from reality does not always correspond to its truthful cognition, and not every generalized abstraction is true.

Due to certain epistemological and social reasons, cognition in the process of abstraction can yield false generalization. In art, likewise, abstraction from a number of features, properties, and aspects of reality does not always and under all conditions mean truthful artistic cognition. This circumstance is extremely important for understanding the difference between a realistic artistic image and anti-realistic, false generalizations.

The anti-realistic character of formalistic abstractions from reality is expressed in the hypertrophy of individual, accidental elements to the detriment of the general, the essential, to the detriment of the organic interconnection of these elements in reality. The formalist artist, ignoring the fact that reality is multifaceted and versatile, that all its external manifestations

are organically interconnected with one another and express their essential content in this interconnection, snatches and abstracts these elements from reality and fixes them regardless of content. They are interested only in rhythm, only composition, only color, only volume, only a gesture in itself, detached from the essential content of life manifested in these formal features.

An impressionist artist, for example, creating an image, completely abstracts from the true essence of those phenomena that they select as the subject of depiction. Positioned with an easel in front of a majestic landscape, they are far from the thought of giving an artistically generalized image of their native land and are interested only in light spots, color effects, fleeting and random impressions. Depicting a person, they "abstract" from the main and essential aspect that characterizes them: from their struggle and ideological aspirations, from their true social essence. For an impressionist artist, a person is important only as a pretext for formalist pursuits. "...Dancers served me," wrote Edgar Degas, rejecting the epithet "painter of dancers" attributed to him, "as a pretext to paint beautiful fabrics and convey motion"[302].

For the formalist Cézanne, a person is merely a complex of volumes conveyed by color. "Treat nature by means of the cylinder, the sphere, the cone..."[303], he instructs. The form of objects, whether it be a human or a turnip lying on the table, is,

---

302 Masters of Art on Art. Vol. 3, p. 124. Pub. "Iskusstvo", 1939.

303 Ibid., p. 222.

in his opinion, the only worthy object of creativity available to the artist.

The theoretical basis of formalist "abstractions" from reality is idealism. Reinterpreting in every way the Kantian thesis on the insurmountable opposition of essence and existence, theorists of formalism assert the fantasy-like impossibility of an artist knowing the essence of phenomena located outside their "I"—that is, the impossibility of a realistic, truthful artistic representation of reality.

"In painting, every genuine object must be replaced by signs born of it... the sum total of which should in no way coincide with the object itself," proclaims the bourgeois French art journal *L'Art*. This journal and hundreds of similar conduits of bourgeois ideology seek in every way "theoretically" to justify formalism as the only possible creative method. They try to place a "scientific" foundation under formalist antics in art, in order to justify the artist's departure from reality, from social issues, and to replace the progressive art of great social generalizations and progressive ideas with an unprincipled phantasmagoria of colors, sounds, shots, and structures.

With formalism, in essence, naturalism converges, characterized by a superficial depiction of life and leading to the destruction of the image, for naturalistic depiction does not reveal the essence, connections, and laws of real-life phenomena. Naturalism, based on the subjective-idealistic philosophy of positivism, asserts the artist's impossibility of going beyond the boundary of sensory phenomena of reality perceived in the process of direct observation—that is, the

impossibility of generalization and typification of facts. A mirror-dead copying of any random facts of reality is presented by naturalism as the true objectivity of artistic images. Truly authentic cognition, according to naturalists, consists not in generalization, but in the simple summation of facts, in their dispassionate registration and systematization. Thereby, the artist is turned into a mindless clerk who does not allow themselves to judge or pass judgment on the phenomena of life.

"A fact is not yet the whole truth; it is only the raw material from which one must smelt and extract the real truth of art... one must be able to extract the meaning from a fact"[304], wrote M. Gorky. Stopping at the stage of direct perception and scrupulous, unthoughtful registration of facts, the artist will at best achieve a semblance of images, but by no means their truthfulness corresponding to their true truth of life.

It is no coincidence that naturalism became one of the dominant trends in modern bourgeois art. Today, the bourgeoisie requires its ideologists to actively stupefy the consciousness of the broad masses of working people at any cost to distort the truth of life, to convince working people of the uselessness of social progress, and to instill through art individualism and intellectual anarchy—this is the true political meaning of naturalism and formalism, which are inextricably linked to the bourgeois worldview. That is why our party, in its struggle for the flourishing of realistic art—the art of great social generalizations and life truth—has repeatedly warned

[304] M. Gorky. On Literature, p. 109. 1937.

Soviet artists about the political harmfulness of any relapses into naturalism and formalism.

Marxist theory of knowledge teaches that truthful generalization is only the generalization of essential properties and aspects in each phenomenon. As applied to art, this means that only abstraction from non-essential, untypical aspects of life and generalization in the image of essential, typical features and properties of a specific socio-historical phenomenon constitutes the specificity of the realistic artistic image.

A realistic artistic image, like any correct generalization, does not exhaust the reflected object. In the phenomena of multifaceted life that act as the object of artistic cognition, the realist artist extracts only essential connections and relationships subject to artistic processing. Therefore, the artistic image in realistic art represents not a mirror-dead reproduction of reality, but the result of a complex, dialectical process of its cognition. By selecting for generalization the most important and significant elements in the object of reflection, the realist artist does not depart from the truth of life, but approaches it. Precisely due to the conscious selection of material from reality, the realist artist achieves a truth of life that is inaccessible to the crawling empiricism of naturalism.

The naturalist artist, in striving for verisimilitude, usually focuses attention on the secondary. They can copy reality with absolute accuracy, but in the image created by them there will not be a grain of that life truth which breathes in the drawings of Rembrandt or Serov, who achieved in their generalization a

vastly greater resemblance with a few bold strokes, for they revealed the main thing—the spiritual appearance of the depicted person, ungraspable in a single perception.

A plaster mask is capable of accurately conveying the forms of a face—and nothing more! But the chisel of a realist sculptor, selecting essential features of the depicted person, reveals their spiritual appearance. Regarding Balzac, it was written: "The task of art is not to copy nature, but to express it..."[305] Otherwise, the sculptor would have completed his work by taking a plaster mold from a woman. Well! Try taking a plaster mold from the hand of your beloved and placing it before you —you will see a terrible corpse without the slightest resemblance, and you will have to seek a chisel and an artist who, without giving an exact copy, will convey the movement of life. Mind must capture the meaning, appearance of things and creatures.

Creating a human image in theater or cinema, authors, in order to achieve life truth, select for generalization only the most important, characteristic, and typical aspects of human activity. Let us recall, for instance, the work of the creative team on the film *Mussorgsky*. Studying Mussorgsky's biography, the creators of the film selected the main elements that revealed the true appearance of the brilliant Russian composer and discarded everything that could diminish the social significance of the image. For example, the authors omitted the period in the composer's life when he was tragically perishing, hounded by tsarist officials—and this was, without a doubt, a correct

---

305 "Balzac on Art", p. 164. Pub. "Iskusstvo", 1941.

creative decision. The death of Mussorgsky in the finale of the film would have sounded false and violated the truth of life. The image of the composer who created brilliant works of Russian musical art is truly immortal! A wonderful example of realistic generalization is the film *Composer Glinka*, in the center of which the authors placed not minor episodes of the composer's personal life, but his creative daring, his great feat —the creation of Russian national music and Russian national opera.

Bourgeois naturalist artists follow a fundamentally different path. In their films about great artists—Beethoven, Verdi, and others—secondary everyday details, family squabbles, and personal troubles obscure the images of brilliant creators and distort the progressive ideological orientation of their work.

An artist's generalization in images of the essential aspects of reality—that is, typification—is a key specific feature of realistic art. In this connection, the propositions in G. M. Malenkov's report at the XIX Party Congress dedicated to disclosing the problem of the typical are of fundamental importance for the development of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics. Exposing the primitive, simplified interpretation of the typical as merely the most common, frequently repeated occurrence, G. M. Malenkov noted that "the typical is not only what is most frequently encountered, but that which expresses with maximum fullness and sharpness the essence of a given social force. In the Marxist-Leninist understanding, typicality by no means means a kind of statistical average. Typicality corresponds to the essence of a given socio-historical phenomenon and is not simply the most common, widespread,

ordinary occurrence... The typical is the main sphere of manifestation of party-mindedness in realistic art. The problem of typicality is always a political problem".

In this most important proposition, expression was given to the directives of Comrade Stalin on questions of art. It represents a theoretical generalization of the experience of realistic art and, above all, the art of socialist realism—the art of great social generalizations reflecting the most essential, typical aspects of life. In this proposition, a deep analysis is given of the essence of the realistic artistic generalization of life, and the importance of typification in art is emphasized.

"An artist," said M. Gorky, "must possess the capacity for generalization—typification of recurring phenomena of reality"[306]. It was precisely this capacity that belonged to the remarkable representatives of 19th-century Russian realistic art, in whose works the most essential, typical aspects of Russian life of that time were generalized. For example, the main question around which social struggle flared up in Russia in the second half of the 19th century was the question of eliminating autocracy and serfdom through revolution. The hatred of the working masses toward exploiters was expressed in an unprecedented growth of peasant unrest. Progressive Russian artists, raised on the progressive ideas of the great Russian revolutionary democrats, as true realists, reflected in artistic images the essence of those social forces whose struggle constituted the main content of social life in pre-revolutionary Russia.

---

306 M. Gorky. On Literature, p. 299.

As passionate patriots, they primarily ruthlessly exposed in their works the typical features of that social environment which they rejected and against which all the pathos of their exposure was directed. They passed a ruthless judgment on the hideous post-reform reality, the kingdom of Derzhimorda and Tit Titych.

Turning to the people, they generalized with deep sympathy for their suffering the typical aspects of their life, revealing their unyielding will in the struggle for freedom.

The greatness of Leo Tolstoy, noted Lenin, lies in the fact that he, as a brilliant artist, was able to convey with remarkable force the mood of the broad masses of the people, outline their position, and express their spontaneous protest against the autocratic-serfowning system. Lenin's characterization of the great writer applies in full measure to other brilliant representatives of Russian critical realism who reflected in vivid artistic images the spontaneous indignation of the million-strong masses of peasantry rising to the revolutionary struggle.

Let us recall, for example, Repin's canvas *A Timid Peasant*. With matchless power, the artist creates a typical image of a Russian peasant robbed by the reform of 1861, in whose gaze lies an unquenchable hatred toward oppressors and the world of landlord tyranny. Sketching numerous studies of barge haulers, Repin, from the position of revolutionary democracy, revealed typical features of the mighty character of the Russian man and his spiritual appearance; as a result, the painting *Barge Haulers on the Volga* became a passionately generalized

image of typical features of an oppressed people, yet endowed with indestructible strength.

Progressive socio-political views and the realistic creative method helped Russian artists truthfully reveal the essence of particular social phenomena, rather than limiting themselves to registering the most mass-scale, widespread facts and events. Precisely because of this, they were able to create a series of images of positive heroes and show the positive ideal of their era.

Thus, 19th-century Russian writers and artists were able to discern in a relatively small number of professional revolutionaries the typical features of the progressive person of the era and generalize them as the ideal of the beautiful. Let us recall the image of Rakhmetov, whose noble example inspired many generations of revolutionaries to struggle; Rakhmetov is an exceptional phenomenon and at the same time expresses with maximum fullness and sharpness the essence of a revolutionary democrat. In this fiery image of an extraordinary man, Chernyshevsky conveyed the typical features of Russian revolutionary democracy with exceptional force of artistic truth.

Socialist realism is a qualitatively new stage in the development of realistic art, perceiving and developing on a new basis the imperishable achievements of the realistic art of the past. The method of socialist realism requires from the artist a truthful, historically concrete representation of reality in its revolutionary development. This means that Soviet artists must, on the basis of careful and deep study of the life of

Soviet society, reveal and select for generalization its most essential, typical aspects.

Typical for the development of our society is the mass combat and labor heroism of Soviet people, their new moral appearance as Soviet patriots. The Party teaches Soviet artists to reveal the best qualities of the ordinary Soviet person and to show that these qualities are mass-scale, inherent not to an isolated elite, but to millions of Soviet people. Creating positive artistic images of Soviet people, our artists generalize this mass phenomenon as typical, for in it the essence of our socialist reality is expressed with maximum fullness.

It is on this path that Soviet artists have created such classic images as Chapayev and Oleg Koshevoy, Batmanov and Voropayev, Pavel Korchagin and Meresyev, embodying the best typical features of millions of ordinary Soviet people.

However, the typical is not only what is most frequently encountered in life. Typical is that which expresses the essence of a given social force with maximum fullness. This scientific proposition is of fundamental importance for the further development of Soviet art. It shows Soviet artists the path in their struggle against relapses into the "theory" of conflictlessness.

It is known that artistic generalization presupposes the depiction of typical characters in typical circumstances that determine the formation, development, and action of these characters. The artist's task is to depict a person in an organic, inseparable unity with the environment, in truthful life conflicts and situations in which human characters manifest themselves,

and to show the struggle of the new against the old in society in its concrete forms and manifestations. This task can be successfully solved only with deep knowledge by the artist of reality and its real contradictions and conflicts.

In this connection, the editorial article of the newspaper *Pravda* of April 7, 1952, "Overcome the Lag in Playwriting," is of great importance for a new upsurge in Soviet art. It reveals the serious harm to the development of our playwriting, as well as Soviet art as a whole, caused by the "theory" of conflictlessness in art preached by certain literary critics and art scholars. Forgetting the most important proposition of the aesthetics of socialist realism—to depict life truthfully in its revolutionary development—they demanded that artists create only ideal types, which led to a distorted, one-sided depiction of life.

"An artist," noted *Pravda*, "who truly knows life and thoughtfully observes everything happening around, cannot fail to see that obstacles, difficulties, clashes, and serious life contradictions are encountered on the path of the builders of communism; overcoming them requires great effort and a high consciousness of patriotic duty. The struggle of the new with the old gives rise to the most diverse life conflicts, without which there is no life and, consequently, no art".

The Soviet artist is called upon to assert the positive ideal, and for this they must be strong not only in depicting the new, progressive, and advanced generated hourly by the development of our society, but also in exposing the old, which slows down the development of the new and emerging. They must be able to look truth boldly in the face, see the leading

trends of life's development, understand the essence of life's conflicts, and use the weapon of criticism as an effective means of education. "The power and significance of realistic art," says G. M. Malenkov, "consists in the fact that it can and must reveal and uncover the high spiritual qualities and typical positive character traits of the ordinary person, create a vivid artistic image worthy of being an example and subject of imitation for people". This responsible task, by its very nature, presupposes the civic pathos of the artist in exposing negative types and false people who hinder our movement forward toward communism.

Of course, with a statistical approach to typification, the artist will not be able to solve this important task. Indeed, rogues, bureaucrats, sycophants, hypocrites, etc., are phenomena that do not have mass prevalence in the conditions of our life. But does this mean that the artist should not create a typical image of such a false person for public ridicule and exposure? Absolutely not. In creating images of negative people, Soviet writers and artists are obliged to emphasize their typicality for a specific socio-political environment—the environment that breeds people and phenomena deeply hostile to the entire structure of our life.

Boldly revealing life's conflicts and contradictions, the Soviet artist is called upon not only to generalize the essence of the new, advanced, and progressive in our life, but also passionately and mercilessly to unmask in artistic images the essence of the old, dying, and interfering with the progressive development of our society. We need Gogols and Shchedrins; we need a militant satirical genre in art!

"Conscious exaggeration and sharpening of an image does not exclude typicality, but discloses and emphasizes it more fully," says G. M. Malenkov. Sharpening an artistic image means enhancing characterization, an exaggeration for ideologically artistic purposes of essential aspects of a phenomenon generalized in the image.

Satirical exposure of everything stagnant, reactionary, and obsolete in life inevitably presupposes a conscious sharpening of the image for maximum completeness in revealing the essence of the artistic social phenomenon being exposed. Let us recall the immortal satirical image of Iudushka Golovlyov, in which Saltykov-Shchedrin brilliantly generalized the phenomena of feudal-serf Russia that he passionately hated. A hypocrite and dissembler devoid of any moral foundations, around whom reigns a "thick atmosphere of ignorance, prejudice, and painstaking pouring from empty into vacant," a covetous person and predator who destroyed his children, murdered his own brother, and ruined his mother—a hollow void, a "festering sore" that unceasingly oozed from itself—such is how this classic image appears before the reader.

It would be naive to think that Iudushka Golovlyovs in "pure form" were encountered even in the environment contemporary to the great satirist. It is no coincidence that liberal criticism in its time reproached Saltykov-Shchedrin for unjustified "exaggeration" and thickening of colors. Yet it is precisely in this exaggerated, sharpened image that the writer achieves the pinnacle of life truth, tearing off the masks from "respectable," polished serf-owning Iudushkas, revealing typical, essential traits of their character.

The creation of heroic-romantic images generalizing the most beautiful and elevated typical traits of man, in essence, is also impossible without conscious sharpening thereof. Let us recall the image of the fiery Danko or the image of the Girl from Gorky's remarkable fairy tale *The Girl and Death*. These images are not a simple reproduction of the ordinary, frequently encountered person, but a sharpened, exaggerated depiction of typical spiritual traits of the Beautiful Person.

It should not be forgotten, however, that the manner of sharpening images—the manner of Gogol and Saltykov-Shchedrin—is by no means the only possible way of revealing and generalizing the typical. There is also the manner of Chekhov, Gorky, and Mayakovsky. They all generalized life's phenomena differently in all their complexity and versatility. Soviet artists are called upon to persistently perfect their mastery, mastering various methods of typification to create works of great social significance.

Artistic images are truer and more vital the broader the artist encompasses life in their generalization, and the deeper they penetrate into the essence of phenomena and events, clearly understanding the laws governing them. Penetrating into the essence of phenomena, selecting the typical in the depicted environment is aided by the artist's correct worldview. It is no coincidence that idealistic aesthetics, opposing the realistic method of artistic cognition of reality, always strives to discard thought and idea from the creative process. Whatever sophisms and tricks it uses to cover up its anti-intellectualism, at its core lies the desire to belittle the role of ideas and reason in art.

Marxist-Leninist aesthetics teaches that artistic cognition and logical thinking are unitarily connected. In the creative process, logical thinking helps the artist compare essential relationships of life that are not perceived in direct observation.

The conscious selection of facts from reality by an artist for artistic generalization and the comprehension of their conformity to an ideologically artistic goal is ultimately determined by the artist's entire worldview. In the images created by an artist, their view of reality is always expressed. The artist strives to express in them their thoughts and feelings, as well as the thoughts and feelings of a given social environment.

The artist is a representative of a specific class, a specific epoch, and specific social forces, which is why they inevitably express in artistic generalization what is considered beautiful and most important from the perspective of that class.

The practice of an artist is always social practice. It determines the artist's relation to reality. Therefore, the artist turns for artistic generalization only to those aspects of reality that contribute to raising ethical, political, aesthetic, and other questions troubling society. This manifests the party-mindedness of the artist. That is why G. M. Malenkov's remarkable proposition on the typical as the main sphere of manifestation of party-mindedness in realistic art is of exceptionally vital importance.

In the extraordinarily broad scope of life's coverage by realistic art—inaccessible to any anti-realistic art—lies the secret of its immense cognitive significance. The logic of real life finds a

corresponding reflection in the logic of realistic artistic images. Their relationships reflect essential relationships of the objective world. The cognition of essential relationships of reality, Marxism teaches, is the cognition of objective truth, the cognition of laws governing phenomena. To this cognition, a person is led by the realistic artistic image, revealing essential relationships of reality in a concrete-individualized image form.

Art enriches man with ideas and feelings, with knowledge of life in its various manifestations. It fosters in him a certain attitude toward reality. That is why art always serves the political interests of various social forces, and the problem of generalization and typification is always a political problem.

The Communist Party and the Soviet people highly value the socially transformative role of Soviet art as a powerful instrument of communist education. They view the artist as an engineer of human souls, as a propagandist using the means of art for the most advanced ideas of modern times—the ideas of communism.

The Soviet artist is obliged to understand that the problem of typicality is political, and therefore must always be guided in creative work by what constitutes the living basis of the Soviet system—the policy of the Communist Party. The scientific nature of this policy conditions the correct selection by the Soviet artist for generalizing the most typical, essential aspects of life.

Thus, the first essential feature of the realistic artistic image is its **typicality**. But the typical in reality, by virtue of the specific

nature of art, cannot be artistically reflected outside the individual, for both in reality and in its truthful artistic reflection, the typical does not exist outside the individual. Therefore, the next most important requirement of realistic art is the **individualization** of that typical and general element which constitutes the content of works.

There can be no truthful artistic reflection of reality with unconcrete generalization, which inevitably leads to transforming a living, integral artistic image into a scheme. Without individualization of images, art loses its specificity and turns into dry abstraction devoid of artistic value. **Individuality is an essential feature of the beautiful**, as Chernyshevsky asserted. In truly beautiful artistic images truthfully reflecting life, individual details in their integral, organic interconnection serve as a means of conveying and expressing typical features of reality. The individual must always lead to a comprehensive and deep disclosure of the typical.

The necessity of individualizing the typical as a most important feature of realistic art was pointed out by Engels, who held that in art, each depicted character must be a type, but at the same time a fully defined individual. However, individualization of features without that connection which leads to revealing and disclosing the typical does not yet characterize realism in itself. "...Realism," wrote Engels, "presupposes, besides truth of detail, the truthful reproduction of typical characters under typical circumstances"[307].

---

[307] K. Marx and F. Engels. Selected Letters, p. 405, 1947.

Whatever a realist artist reflects in their works—the actions and feelings of a concrete individual or the landscape of their homeland, the meaning of events of their epoch or the heroic past of their people—they primarily seek to find a truthful, organic synthesis of the typical and individual, revealing the internal, lawful interconnection of single features of reality that leads to the typical and through which the typical is most fully expressed.

Let us recall, for example, the unique models of portrait genre created by the great Russian realists of the 19th century. In portraits painted by Perov, Repin, Kramskoy, Serov, and other masters of Russian painting, a gallery of images of people of the past century opens before us, based on which we can not only imagine their actual features, but also know characteristic features of that social environment and epoch whose representatives and brightest articulators they were. Unsurpassed in the depth of psychological characterization, the portraits of L. Tolstoy, Sechenov, Mussorgsky, and others reveal to us through individual uniqueness these remarkable sons of the Russian nation typical traits of the spiritual appearance of the Russian person.

It often happens that a portrait, having completely lost its significance as a historical document, remains alive through the centuries as an artistic image synthesizing in itself typical features of a contemporary artist of that epoch. We are not interested in who the prototypes were of a particular portrait created by Velázquez or Rembrandt. The eternal vitality of their creations is predetermined by high artistic transmission in

the image of an individual face of general, typical features of a specific social group, epoch, or nation.

Indeed, who besides art historians might be interested in the fact that the famous *Girl with Peaches* by V. A. Serov is a portrait of V. S. Mamontova, or that one of the best examples of portraiture in world art—*The Archdeacon* by I. E. Repin—is none other than a portrait of the Chuguyev deacon Ivan Ulanov?

A true realist artist approaches nature not passively and mindlessly, but consciously and creatively, searching for and selecting in it above all the **typical**. Here is how Repin testifies about the choice of model for *The Archdeacon*: "What a terribly interesting type! This is the extract of our deacons, these lions of the clergy, who lack a single grain of anything spiritual—all flesh and blood, goggle-eyed, roaring and burping, senseless, yet majestic and strong, like the ritual itself in most cases... And this was always visible to me in my beloved deacon, as the very typical, most frightening of all deacons".

Revealing the typical, I. E. Repin strove in the process of work for maximum resemblance of the portrait to nature. "The whole town of Chuguyev," wrote he, "can testify to the complete resemblance to the original, which so amused well-meaning townsfolk. And the manner, and the gesture of the hand, and the eyes—in a word, the whole character was there, they said..."[308]

---

308 Repin's letter to Kramskoy dated January 13, 1878.

When creating an artistic image that is not a portrait of a specific individual, the realist artist also strives for a full synthesis of the typical and individual in the image. Russian classical writers left us a whole gallery of remarkable artistic images. In these images, typical aspects of Russian life during the period of serfdom were reflected. The grandeur and imperishable charm of artistic images created by the classics consist not only in the breadth of coverage of typical aspects of reality, but also in the vitality and high artistic individualization of each of them.

Very well was this law of realistic creativity expressed by M. Gorky: "Having described a merchant, an official, or a worker known to him, a writer will make a more or less successful photograph of only one person, but this will be only a photograph devoid of socio-educational significance, and it will give almost nothing to expand or deepen our knowledge of man and life. But if a writer manages to abstract from each of 20–50 or a hundred merchants, officials, workers the most characteristic class features, habits, tastes, gestures, beliefs, speech mannerisms, etc.—abstract and combine them in one merchant, official, or worker, with this technique the writer creates a 'type'—and this will be art"[309].

The dialectical unity of the typical and individual is equally inherent to more general artistic images expressing through music, architecture, and poetry the typical aspects of an epoch in the life of a nation, its greatness, and its feelings.

---

309 M. Gorky. On Literature, p. 201.

Undoubtedly, for example, remarkable architectural monuments reflect the most general aspects of reality. However, truly great architectural images are at the same time unique in their individuality. The stations of the Moscow metro and the high-rise buildings of the capital embody the greatness of the people who gave birth to them, their material and spiritual power, and the ideological content of the epoch of building communism. At the same time, each of these architectural structures individually is distinguished by its own unique individual appearance, which conditions its aesthetic charm.

The requirement for deep individualization of images is one of the main requirements of the aesthetics of socialist realism. Conveying in artistic images the typical aspects of socialist reality presupposes a vivid individualization of images, for our reality has formed a new type of person, extraordinarily multifaceted in character and versatile in the richness of their spiritual appearance. The "theory" of conflictlessness exposed by the Party—inevitably leading the artist away from knowing the typical aspects of our life—is harmful and destructive to genuine art. It is known that without artistic embodiment of life conflicts, one cannot deeply and comprehensively show human character. Evidence of this is found in schematic images of innovators in production in a number of plays by Soviet playwrights, who, contrary to life truth, are portrayed as one-sided people lacking breadth of thought, richness of outlook, and whose interests are limited solely to their industrial and technical activity.

Fully realized realistic individualization of images requires from the artist deep and comprehensive knowledge of life, a careful and loving attitude toward depicting the beautiful in its versatility in the Soviet person—the builder of the majestic edifice of communism. It presupposes a sensitive attitude of the artist to life truth and masterful command of all means of individualization characteristic of a given concrete art form, as well as the ability to embody the typical in the form of a highly artistic individualized image.

Thus, the essence of the realistic artistic image consists in **the generalization of typical, essential aspects of life in the form of an image of an individual phenomenon**.

An understanding of the realistic image would be incomplete without considering another essential law of realistic art—the reflection of reality in **the unity of content and form**.

It is known that the "theoretical" basis of formalist theories of "pure art" is the assertion of the self-sufficiency of artistic form regardless of its content. This assertion, in particular, is one of the cornerstones of Kantian aesthetics, which for more than a century and a half has supplied pseudo-scientific arguments to all kinds of varieties of formalism. According to Kant, only that which is necessary and, through its form alone, evokes disinterested pleasure is beautiful: "Only form, without knowledge of purpose, pleases in aesthetic judgment in and of itself"[310].

---

[310] Immanuel Kant. Critique of Judgment, p. 83, 1898.

Exposing the formalism of idealistic aesthetics, Russian revolutionary democrats put forward the remarkable proposition that aesthetic pleasure is distinct from material interest or a practical view of an object, but is not opposed to it. Precisely for this reason, in the unity of content and form in art, they considered the content of a work—its ideological meaning—to be primary and paramount. "Useless beauty," said Chernyshevsky, "has no right to respect".

Marxist-Leninist aesthetics, requiring from art great ideas and broad social generalizations, teaches that in art there is not and cannot be a beautiful form without socially significant content. In the content of images of Soviet realistic art, the most important aspects of life must be reflected, and the sharpest social questions of modern times must be posed communism, the historical meaning of events and activities of people of the Stalinist epoch.

The world-historical significance of Soviet art, marking a qualitatively new step in the artistic development of humanity, is determined by its content, which truthfully reflects the life of Soviet society.

While emphasizing the determining significance of content in artistic images, Marxist-Leninist aesthetics at the same time points to the crucial importance of their form. No matter how significant content is in itself, if an artist fails to give it appropriate concrete sensory embodiment, the image created will lack artistic quality and will have no aesthetic value. In this connection, historical significance attaches to Party directives on questions of artistic craftsmanship, particularly

the proposition that the success of an artistic work is determined by the depth of ideological intent and high quality of artistic form.

The Communist Party teaches that the correct choice of socially significant content by an artist does not in itself determine creative success. If the artist fails to transform the chosen content into living, truthful images and impart to them high artistic form, they will involuntarily discredit the content of their work.

"Some authors," wrote *Pravda*, "naively believe that a contemporary theme can redeem the artistic shortcomings of works. Is it not clear that the more significant and responsible the theme of a play, the higher its artistic merits must be?" This proposition applies in full measure to all forms of Soviet art. It suffices to recall the unsuccessful opera by composer Zhukovsky, *From the Bottom of the Heart*, in which a socially significant theme turned out to be distorted by an unartistic theatrical and musical resolution.

The authors of the opera, choosing as its theme the life of our collective farmers in the post-war years, should have truthfully shown through opera art the contemporary collective-farm village and its remarkable people. But, as *Pravda* noted, having taken on a large and important theme, they were unable to reveal it truthfully in vivid artistic images and bright realistic music.

The libretto's authors, depriving it of dramatic development and sequence, constructed the plot from disjointed, organically unconnected episodes. Such a violation of dramatic unity led to

an impoverishment of character images, for plot is the path of an image's development through which it is revealed in all its versatility and fullness.

The heroes of the opera turned out to be devoid of living human feelings, which was largely facilitated by the extremely poor, primitive language of the opera, drawn from the worst operatic and romance clichés. The language of the heroes and their vocabulary proved powerless to convey the thoughts and feelings of Soviet people or serve as a means for bright individual characterizations.

The weak, colorless music only exacerbated the flaws of the libretto. The heroes of the opera turned out to be musically featureless and deprived of individual coloring. Extreme poverty of scenery, operatic conventionality of collective-farm mass scenes, and a primitive, clumsy depiction of "labor processes" further emphasized the grayness, dullness, and anti-artistic nature of this unsuccessful opera's form. As a result, a great ideological intent turned out to be distorted by the artistic inadequacy of its form.

In realistic art, beautiful artistic form must always be not an end in itself for aesthetic contemplation, but a means of artistic transmission and revelation of content, the main idea, and intent of the author. In art, the viewer, reader, and listener are attracted primarily not by the formal means of creating an artistic image—not composition, rhythm, volume, color, etc. in themselves—but by the content revealed through form.

The unity of form and content of an image is achieved when the content does not exist outside its form, just as no element of

artistic form exists that does not reveal its content. In a beautiful artistic image, everything down to the smallest components of its form—shades, strokes—must serve to express artistic content, the main idea of a work of art.

In the external design of artistic images, an important role belongs to the components of the "language" of art—that is, to those formal techniques and methods of fixing images that have been historically developed by a specific art form in its development and perfection.

The artistic language of individual art forms was created by generations of artists contributing to the treasure house of world art. As society developed, it became increasingly flexible and perfected in the figurative transmission of human thoughts and feelings. The "language" of art contributes to the creation of a complete artistic image that most accurately expresses its ideological content.

That is why our Party, in its struggle for communist ideolodgy and folk character in art, turned and continues to turn the attention of Soviet artists to the impermissibility of a nihilistic, Proletkultist attitude toward the "language" of art. Of course, in the "language" of art there are subjective aspects determined by the creative individuality of a master, their manner, which cannot be subjected to leveling or decreeing. However, alongside these, there are very significant non-subjective aspects characterizing the creative face of a particular master, and objective general laws of "language" of art, the ignorance of which is impermissible.

The Party severely condemned the formalist trend in music as anti-popular and leading in practice to the destruction of music. Deliberate complication of musical language, preached by formalist composers as a new step in developing musical mastery, turned for them into an end in itself and meant, in fact, the impoverishment of musical language and destruction of its specificity. "Under the guise of purely external complication of compositional techniques," said A. A. Zhdanov at the conference of Soviet music workers, "there lies a tendency to impoverish music... Musical language becomes inexpressive... Music introduces so much crude, vulgar, and false elements that it ceases to fulfill its purpose—to afford pleasure".

The distortion of musical language, built up over centuries, and the destruction of the harmonic unity of all its elements inevitably lead to music ceasing to express great social content and inspiring people, for it ceases to be accessible to the broad masses, intelligible, and loved by them.

What a dead end formalism leads art into is best demonstrated by modern American music built on the "principles" of atonality, dissonance, and disharmony. The main task of such music is to stun the listener with a cacophony of unmusical sounds and dull their mind. Absolutizing rhythm to the detriment of all other elements of musical expressiveness turns the piano in the hands of an American pianist into a percussion instrument played with palms and elbows, while singing turns into a wild screech, and the orchestra into a semblance of a menagerie.

The Party's directives on the impermissibility of ignoring the specifics of the "language" of art have a direct bearing on the creative activity of artists in various art forms. Eliminating formalist distortions in their practice through effective criticism and self-criticism, Soviet artists decisively fight for the flourishing of Soviet art—socialist in content and national in form.

Thus, since the content of an image in art does not exist outside its form, masterful command of all its elements and their comprehensive utilization for the complete adequacy of the image's form to its idea is a necessary condition for the artistic quality of an image.

An artist's mastery, expressed in the creation of beautiful artistic images, is equally characterized by both the creation of socially significant content of an image/idea and the discovery of an artistic form corresponding to this content. Consequently, an artist's mastery manifests itself at all stages of creating an artistic image—from studying reality and formulating the initial concept to its final realization.

Thus, the essence of the realistic artistic image consists in **the specific generalization of typical, essential aspects of reality in the form of an image of an individual phenomenon possessing aesthetic value due to the organic unity of the socially significant content of the image and its corresponding artistic form**.

This proposition of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics theoretically equips Soviet artists in their struggle to create beautiful works of art worthy of the great deeds of the Soviet people.

10. GANGSSTERISM IN THE SERVICE OF US MONOPOLIES
B. S. NIKIFOROV

1

Recently in the US, many books and journal articles have been published whose authors lament the "corruption of morals" in the US and speak of the need to strengthen "ethical standards of American public life." The majority of these authors come to the conclusion that "standards of public ethics" in modern America have declined, that they must be raised, that "private profit" subordinates "public interest," that this is reflected in the activities of bourgeois political parties, in the work of the US Congress during elections, and so forth. The stream of demagogic literature devoted to questions of "public ethics" is constantly increasing in the US, especially as presidential elections approach. Not only professional philosophers and sociologists of the American bourgeoisie take up the pen, but also senators, lawyers, and others.

The Academy of Political Science devoted one of the issues of its "Proceedings" for 1952 to this topic, in which certified lackeys of imperialism grandiloquently expatiate on the need for "sanitation" of US political life, chatter about "ethics in American state and public life."

All of them excel in vain attempts to mask the gaping ulcers of the capitalist system in the US. The fact is that the use of bandits and gangsters by American monopolies has become one of the characteristic features of political life in the US. It is

no longer possible to hide the glaring facts of the connection between monopolies, the apparatus of the Democratic and Republican parties, prominent US political figures, and gangs of bandits and gangsters.

Indignation among various strata of the public is constantly growing. This gives rise to "philosophical" literature on questions of "public ethics," designed to calm public opinion with arguments about the possibility of "restoring ethical standards" without changing anything in the political and social system of the country.

All these theorists of imperialism would like to instill in their readers that the rampage of banditry in the political life of the US is a "temporary," "accidental" phenomenon, supposedly not inherent in the "American way of life," and that this phenomenon can easily be managed by spreading various types of moral sermons.

The falsity of such arguments by American philosophers, sociologists, and lawyers is completely obvious. In essence, their "theories" serve to justify and perpetuate banditry, against which they supposedly speak out, to distract public opinion from the actual causes of this disgraceful phenomenon, and to confuse and disorient working people. Facts expose attempts of this kind and lay bare the true motives impelling theorists of American imperialism to invent "theories" about the causes of the growth of organized crime in the US and the role of criminals in political and public life.

Lenin pointed out that the era of imperialism is characterized by "...desperate efforts of the bourgeoisie to get rid of the

legality created by it and which has become unbearable for it!"[311]

One of the vivid manifestations of the destruction of bourgeois legality in the period of imperialism is the constant violation of bourgeois law by the bourgeoisie itself, which has become a system and a necessary integral part of the way of life of the bourgeoisie, remaining, of course, a completely unpunished violation of its own laws enacted by the legislative bodies of the bourgeois state. It is this fact first and foremost that the "theorists" who write about organized crime in the US would like to conceal.

The deep crisis of bourgeois legality under modern conditions is also expressed in the fact that the ruling circles of imperialist states strive to get rid of — and every day ever more cynically and impudently get rid of — all kinds of legal "constraints" and transition to open terrorist methods of suppressing and robbing the people.

"Comrade Stalin teaches that the main features of the basic economic law of modern capitalism are the securing of maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of the majority of the population of a given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and finally through wars and the militarization of the national economy, used to secure maximum profits."[312]

---

311 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 16, p. 284.

312 Leading article of the newspaper *Pravda* of April 1, 1952.

In the pursuit of maximum profit, the imperialist bourgeoisie is not content with robbing working people within the framework of bourgeois legality. It casts aside even nominal barriers that its laws sometimes set, modest by old, pre-imperialist standards. "The interest of law," wrote K. Marx in one of his early works, "receives the opportunity to speak as long as it is the law of interest, but it must be silent as soon as it collides with this holy of holies." [313] With particular force these words sound now, when the insatiable appetites of the aggressive imperialist bourgeoisie do not fit within the framework of its established law, break it, destroy every appearance of law, and in its place establish the element of shameless, mocking, unrestrained robbery and oppression of peoples.

In post-war years, America has been literally flooded with a tide of state criminality, which cannot be viewed otherwise than as the establishment in the US of a regime of ruling criminal criminality modeled after familiar Hitlerite patterns.

This is precisely what American bourgeois lawyers and sociologists wish to conceal, who devote their works to questions of "public ethics" and "problems of the growth of organized crime" in the US.

Gangsters, racketeers, and provocateurs of every kind widely used by American imperialism — all that has received the name "organized crime" — represent the last resource to which monopolists resort to protect their oligarchic dictatorship. The transformation of criminals, gangsters, and bandits into authorized representatives of state power alongside senators

[313] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 243.

and policemen, customs inspectors, and tax inspectors has become an ordinary, everyday phenomenon in the US and represents one of the manifestations of the fascisation of the bourgeois state.

Certified lackeys of American imperialism for a long time bypassed in silence the existence of organized crime. But recently even they have been forced to come forward with some kind of "theories" explaining this evil of US social life.

Bourgeois sociologists invent any "theories" they like, if only to lead away from the question of the real causes of the emergence and flourishing of organized crime in the US. They see the causes of the emergence of organized crime in the striving of "energy" into those areas "where there is hope for large profits," [314] explain it by the "natural" application of "organizational methods adhered to by modern business," [315] and other, in essence, equally apologetic considerations that do not touch the foundations of the capitalist system.

Some theorists, alarmingly noting the growth of organized crime, see in this the decay of social principles and the decline of morality, describe in great detail the pathways of organized crime's penetration into all links of state and public life, and back away from an analysis of the real causes for the spread of this ominous phenomenon of US public life.

---

[314] W. Reckless, *The Crime Problem*, p. 144, 1950.

[315] *Third Interim Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce*, p. 145, 1951.

Organized crime serves the interests of capitalists; it is needed by monopolists, and therefore it is organized, directed, used, and protected by them. Organized crime in modern America represents an integral part of the political superstructure of the rotten capitalist society.

Organized crime — and especially its armed force, gangsters — is needed by monopolies as a means of struggle against organized workers, a means of violence against working people, used when demagogy and other means of influence are powerless. "An important (perhaps the most important) source in the most real sense of the word, and the breeding ground for the emergence of various kinds of gangs, racketeers, and criminal organizations of all sorts," writes a prominent representative of so-called American criminology, Prof. Tannenbaum, "was the sharp, unstoppable struggle between labor and capital in the United States... In conflicts between workers and entrepreneurs, violence became a constant means of resolving contradictions, and the invariable companion of this struggle were armed gangs of gangsters..." [316] This the bourgeois sociologist is forced to admit, although he does not draw any conclusions from his admission.

Having arisen as a tool in the hands of capitalists for breaking and suppressing strikes, gangsterism is widely used by American capitalists in the struggle against the labor movement. Some entrepreneurs resort for this purpose to the services of special agents, like the gangster strike-breaking firm "Bergoff and Waddell Brothers," which undertakes to

[316] F. Tannenbaum, *Crime and the Community*, pp. 36–37, 1951.

deliver within 72 hours to any specified location up to 10 thousand armed men ready for anything.[317] Larger capitalists prefer to maintain their own detachments of armed gangsters, to whom under various transparent pretexts they regularly pay "wages." The Ford Motor Company is served by special gangster gangs of Adonis and D'Anna. The New York "Phelps-Dodge Company" uses to suppress strikes gangsters from the gang of one of America's most dangerous criminals — Albert Anastasia. "Detroit Stove Works" uses the services of bandits, the Perrone brothers. Capitalists pay gangster ringleaders huge sums of money and take care in every way to ensure they lead a carefree existence. Thus, the older of the Perrone brothers receives from "Detroit Stove Works" from 40 to 65 thousand dollars a year.

The servicing of capitalists' "needs" by gangster gangs is no secret to the American public. Even the sensational Kefauver Committee, which was specially engaged in an "all-around investigation of organized crime on an all-American scale," wrote in its official report about the existing business agreements in Detroit between entrepreneurs and racketeers — agreements under which racketeers were supposed to take part in the struggle against the organized labor movement.

The nature of this participation can be judged from the description of one of the gangster reprisals against strikers given by Tannenbaum in the book *Crime and Society*: "...On the platform of the motor trucks, Gatling machine guns were placed, after which these motor trucks stretched out one after

[317] See ibid., p. 38.

another in the night darkness through the streets of mining villages where strikers lived with their families. When the procession drove into a village, usually stretched along two rows of houses near a railway line, the guards fired a couple of rifle shots from the motor trucks to provoke the miners into returning fire, and then machine guns came into play, and motor trucks drove through the village at the slowest speed, firing up to 250 bullets a minute, which shredded tents and shacks of miners, maiming and killing men, women, and defenseless children." [318]

Cooperation between major gangsters and major entrepreneurs was called even by the Kefauver Committee a dark page in the history of American industry. And one of the committee members, Senator O'Conor, involuntarily explained the reasons for the emergence of this "dark page." "Things must be bad with American businessmen," he noted, "if they cannot do business without coming into contact with bandits." [319]

Things with American capitalists are indeed bad, and there is a direct connection between the bad affairs of American monopolists and the fact that they ever more widely involve gangsters in participation in the struggle against the labor movement. Not content with judicial and extrajudicial repression widely applied by the capitalist state against working people, American capitalists rely ever more on gangsters as a political force, like the German stormtroopers or Mussolini's squadristi. Under conditions of dominance in the

---

[318] F. Tannenbaum, *Crime and the Community*, pp. 38–39.

[319] E. Kefauver, *Crime in America*, p. 113, 1951.

United States of capitalist monopolies, gangsterism flourishes primarily because gangsters are needed by monopolies, needed just like the police, the courts, and the state apparatus. Precisely this explains that cult of gangsterism which day in and day out is cultivated by American newspapers, so-called fiction, cinema, and radio. Crime news replaces fiction in the US. "There are no statistical methods," write American criminologists Teeters and Reinemann, "with the help of which one could calculate the number of persons who set out on the path of crime under the influence of newspapers." [320]

According to data by these same authors, 49% of surveyed offenders wanted to possess weapons under the influence of movies they saw, 28% learned from movies information about methods of theft, 21% learned in the cinema to fool the police, 12% stated that movies they saw "inspired" them to commit crimes, 45% acquired from movies they saw a notion of "easy money," 26% under the influence of cinema decided to become "crooks," and 20% began to dream of a career as a bandit or gangster. [321] "The gangster," notes Reckless, "is undoubtedly the most noticeable figure in America." [322] A thoroughly thought-out program of training gangsters from among the youth is carried out by American reaction in exactly the same way as it prepares soldiers for an aggressive war against the states of the camp of peace and democracy. American gangsters are a weapon that monopolies ever more widely use against the forces of democracy and progress, for a criminal

---

320 Teeters and Reinemann, *The Challenge of Delinquency*, p. 175, 1951.

321 See ibid., pp. 180–181.

322 W. Reckless, *The Crime Problem*, pp. 158–159.

war against their own people, and to carry out a policy of terror against the popular masses offering ever more active resistance to the criminal plans of American reaction to prepare an aggressive war for world domination.

The participation of the gangster element in the struggle of American capitalists against organized workers is the most important and therefore the most carefully concealed form of serving the interests of monopolies by organized crime. A far more noticeable form is the participation of organized crime in the competitive struggle of American monopolies among themselves, a struggle whose everyday expression is the squabbling between the two largest bourgeois parties in the United States — Republican and Democratic.

In the United States operates the so-called spoils system, in accordance with which all elective and appointive posts in civil service, all "cozy spots," are filled by supporters of the party that won the election. It is known that to the American bourgeoisie it is completely indifferent which of the two parties turns out to be the winner in federal or local elections, since both with equal zeal serve the interests of big capital. "It makes not the slightest difference," wrote the philosophizing banker Martin, "which political party is in power and which president holds the reins of government in his hands." However, for individual monopolists and their associations in the center and locally, for competing corporations and various political cliques, bosses, and all kinds of party leaders, it is by no means indifferent which particular figure occupies this or that post in federal or local administration. Between the two parties and their leaders there are not and cannot be any principled

disagreements; the squabbling between these parties is stimulated by the prospect of "division of spoils."

In proof that American elections represent nothing more than a wretched farce, that this is not even a game of democracy, but a mockery of it and of the people, it is sufficient to point to the role played in these elections by organized crime. The connections between the political machine of either of the two main parties and organized crime are complex and diverse. The political machine in the US controls voters' votes. Control over voters' votes is victory in elections, and victory in elections is the capture of "spoils," capture of posts in organs of state administration, and consequently, control over police, judges, prosecutors, city councils, sheriffs, city mayors, as well as state government and to a significant extent the federal government. Thus, appointment by the party machine of "Republicans" and "Democrats" is primarily the realization of control over voters' votes. "The machine can exist only under the condition," openly states criminologist Reckless, "that on election day by legal or illegal methods it secures voters' votes." [323] "Legal methods" are demagogy, false promises of every kind, speculation on racial and national prejudices of backward voters, etc. Illegal or, simply speaking, criminal methods are carried out with the help of organized criminals, in particular, gangsters.

The participation of organized crime in elections of responsible representatives of state power in the US has a diverse character. It is expressed in the transfer by a criminal syndicate

[323] Ibid., pp. 156–157.

or individual gangsters of large sums of money to the election fund of a corresponding candidate. Information about such operations, naturally, is carefully hidden. However, even the Kefauver Committee was forced to state that in 1948, during the gubernatorial election in the state of Missouri, "Capone's gang," striving to secure success for "its governor," spent in favor of candidate Smith about 100 thousand dollars. Victory in the election was won, of course, by Smith.

Usually, however, the participation of criminal elements in elections is not limited to paying money contributions. Gangsters widely use other methods of assisting their actual or potential patrons from the state apparatus. They falsify voter lists by entering names of non-existent persons; intimidate or kidnap officials designated to control the conduct of elections, as a result of which they manage to advance "loyal people" to corresponding posts; fill in the column left blank by the voter on the ballot or fill in the second column and thereby make the ballot invalid; distort total figures; replace election ballots; fill ballot boxes with fake ballots prior to opening polling places; steal ballot boxes; vote on behalf of persons no longer residing in a given election district; vote instead of those who for some reason did not register; vote for those who did not appear immediately after voting began, and thus deprive "latecomers" of the opportunity to vote on the ground that they allegedly already voted; shoot up polling places and force voters to scatter; kidnap or eliminate functionaries of the hostile party; kill the most energetic opponents of the party represented by them. Bandits force voters to vote not for whom they wish to cast their votes. To achieve goals set before them by the

"machine," gangsters use fraud, blackmail, kidnapping of people and documents, violence of all kinds. Under conditions of bitter electoral struggle, criminals apply simultaneously all these means and methods of falsifying the actual will of voters and election results.

Organized criminals are united with both Democrats and Republicans by hatred for progressive elements, figures, and organizations. "Since the bosses of the political machine and racketeers have a common enemy in the person of progressive elements," openly state Temple University professors in Philadelphia, Barnes and Teeters, "they are bound by a feeling of mutual sympathy and strong ties of ideological and social kinship." [324] Barnes and Teeters did not resolve to go further and point out that these kinship ties and mutual sympathy of American criminals and American politicians have a purely mercenary groundwork.

Organized criminals, participating in the tragicomedy of elections, quite reasonably count on the fact that the "machine" that wins the election with their help, as well as leaders of police, judges, and prosecutors appointed by the "machine," will provide them all-around assistance not so much out of gratitude for past services, but in anticipation of future services. "A characteristic feature of organized crime that has essential significance for securing immunity of its cadres and the viability of criminal organizations," writes as about an ordinary and universally known matter Prof. Reckless, "is its close connection with the political machine. We are speaking

---

[324] Barnes and Teeters, *New Horizons in Criminology*, pp. 64–65, 1947.

not of accidental relationships, but of a direct connection with political bosses heading the machine." [325]

Impunity of organized criminals in the US in exchange for services rendered by them to entrepreneurs in the struggle against workers and during elections is universally known. It should be noted that quite recently, in 1950–1951, the activity of the Senate Kefauver Committee, created for purposes of the most unbridled demagogy, showed that in the US no one intends to fight gangsters in the service of monopolies.

"In many circles there existed an incorrect representation," we read in the final section of the committee report, "that the committee had in mind to embark on a crusade against crime and put all criminals behind bars. In reality, the committee was — and remains — an investigative body not endowed with the right to carry out criminal prosecution or the right to examine cases of these or those crimes on their merits." [326]

The activity of this committee boiled down to demagogic statements which its chairman Kefauver intended to use further in advancing his candidacy for the post of US President.

The complete impunity of organized crime in the US is connected with the fact that it has become an indispensable element of all institutions of public life and the state apparatus. In recent years, the penetration of racketeering and gangster elements into the world of business has acquired such a systematic and stable character that in American literature to

---

[325] W. Reckless, *The Crime Problem*, p. 156.

[326] *Third Interim Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce*, p. 188.

designate this process there even appeared a special term — "infiltration," used often without any explanation as universally accepted. Money received from the exploitation of gambling dens and brothels criminals invest in various branches of legal activity. According to official estimates of the Kefauver Committee, criminal elements have thoroughly entrenched themselves in approximately fifty branches of legal business, ranging from dance halls and bowling alleys to steel production and broadcasting. [327] Kefauver himself considers that there are more than seventy such branches.

Suffer from this "infiltration," of course, not business operators who use criminal elements in their interests, but the working classes. As a result of "infiltration," American citizens are forced to pay higher prices for goods and services, forced to put up with wretched quality of products produced by those branches of industry in which gangsters dominate. The people suffer from racketeer-gangster "infiltration" because vast economic resources controlled by gangsters and racketeers give them the opportunity ever more to expand and strengthen their influence.

Before our eyes in the US is occurring a process of organizational merger of big business with organized crime, with racketeer and gangster syndicates, trusts, and combines. Already now in a number of cases it is impossible to establish whether in the United States a racket is a variety of capitalist entrepreneurship or American business is a variety of criminal activity. Even bourgeois criminologists are forced to admit that

---

[327] See ibid., p. 170.

methods with the help of which racketeers and gangsters enrich themselves "differ in no way from those that a businessman, political figure, and anyone else, with cunning and resourcefulness achieving success in our decaying society, disposes of his affairs." [328]

Analogous processes take place in the state and party apparatuses. It is universally known that for a number of years the organization of the Democratic Party in New York headed by Hynes acted under the leadership of the ringleader of New York racketeers, Schultz, while the apparatuses of the Republican and Democratic parties in Chicago were managed by the gang of Al Capone. Many years have passed since then, but the character of relations between organized crime and party organizations remained as before; only the names of active personages and methods of influence of organized criminals on politics changed. This could not fail to be noted in its reports by the Kefauver Committee, which wrote that in New York Schultz's place was taken by "king of the underworld of America Frank Costello," to a significant degree guiding and directing the New York organization of the Republican Party. Recordings of telephone conversations of Costello show that this businessman devotes morning hours to conversations with subordinate racketeers located in various parts of the country, and the rest of the time — to questions of politics, such as staffing legislative, executive, and judicial bodies of the state, filling posts in city management, etc. The committee chaired by Kefauver noted that "the sinister

---

328 W. Reckless, *The Crime Problem*, p. 117.

influence of Costello in the leadership bodies of the Democratic Party in New York is very great." [329]

A similar conclusion the committee had to make in relation to Brooklyn gangster Adonis, before whom, as the committee indicated in its report, figures of the Republican and Democratic parties "crawled on their bellies and tried to secure his help and get money from him for conducting elections." [330] Adonis himself did not in the least conceal that he spent tens of thousands of dollars and used dozens of his "guys" for "conducting" elections. Adonis behaved before the committee so impudently that even seasoned senators appealed to competent authorities with a request to hold this bandit criminally responsible for... "contempt of Senate," while Senator Kefauver wrote later that this "impudent Brooklyn gangster climbed very high in all three spheres that in the US merged into an unholy trinity — in crime, politics, and business." [331]

In recent years, the merger of the apparatus of organized crime with the party apparatus takes on new forms. It often bears no longer merely an organizational, but, so to speak, directly "personal" character: one and the same person is simultaneously a party leader, boss of a specific district or whole state, and leader of a criminal organization operating in the district or state territory. There is no need to prove that under these conditions the criminal activity of a gangster-

---

329 *Third Interim Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce*, p. 124.

330 Ibid., p. 155.

331 E. Kefauver, *Crime in America*, p. 155.

racketeer gang is maximally facilitated, while the activity of the party apparatus as a whole is subordinated to the interests of the gang and acquires a very peculiar direction, since the party organization becomes a branch of the association of criminals or a criminal syndicate.

What results from this can be judged by the example of the gubernatorial election in Missouri in 1948. In this election against a certain Smith, another local politician, McKittrick, decided to run. First of all, he went to pay homage to Binaggio — the Kansas City boss of the Democratic Party and simultaneously manager of a network of gambling dens. McKittrick knew that Binaggio intended to expand and legalize his gambling business and therefore was going to spend a significant part of the funds he had previously spent on the political game as a party boss, putting them into a more profitable game of dice and roulette. In view of this, he needed "his own governor."

At a political dinner in Springfield, Binaggio told McKittrick that he should get out of the game, because "the guys," i.e., gangsters, from East St. Louis did not support him. Knowing that Binaggio had many friends and supporters, that he could put into play big money borrowed from the gambling business, McKittrick, as he himself stated to the Kefauver Committee, told Binaggio: "If you made a decision, the game, I suppose, is over, because he whom you support will win." To get out of the game McKittrick, however, hesitated, and soon the East St. Louis gang offered him at first 35, and then 50 thousand dollars as severance pay. McKittrick continued to stall, and then Binaggio offered him instead of the gubernatorial post the post

of attorney general of the state, while informing him that the gang was "ready to pay all his expenses at the rate of a thousand dollars a month for the entire time of his tenure in the specified post and support the candidacy of McKittrick to the federal Senate from the Democratic Party, again with payment of 'expenses'." In response to McKittrick's question why Binaggio insisted that McKittrick run for attorney general, Binaggio cynically stated: "Frankly speaking, there is no confidence that Smith will develop sufficient power... We count that if you are attorney general, you will pull him up and force him to develop greater power..." [332]

Thus in the dollar kingdom governors and prosecutors are "elected," thus is realized in it the notorious separation of powers, expressed now in the fact that each of them plays its own special role in servicing a gang of organized criminals.

The system of bribery and direct line buying becomes ever more exposed during the election campaign taking place at the present time in the US. The American press reports, for example, facts exposing the corruptibility of the candidate from the Republican Party for the post of Vice President, Senator Nixon. The case received such wide publicity that in the American press demands appeared for Nixon to withdraw his candidacy for the post of Vice President, as it became known that Senator Nixon, besides his senatorial salary, receives money from wealthy California entrepreneurs. According to a report by the newspaper *Chicago Tribune* of July 8 of this year, buying votes of participants of conventions of both bourgeois

[332] E. Kefauver, *Crime in America*, pp. 86–87.

parties of the US is carried out not only by offering profitable government posts and other "tidbits," but also by paying cash.

Before us published in 1952 in the US is a book by Lee Mortimer and Jack Lait *U.S.A. — Confidential* and two articles by the first of these authors, printed in the journal *New American Mercury* in May and July 1951. The book and both articles contain data testifying to close connections of organized criminals with no less a person than the chairman of the Senate committee for investigation of organized crime Kefauver and employees of this committee. Mortimer and Lait report that as soon as Kefauver's committee was created, organized criminals brought to the attention of its chairman, members, and employees that the all-American criminal cartel created a special fund of 100 million dollars, which would be spent in the autumn of 1952 in the course of elections to municipal bodies, elections to state bodies, to federal Congress, and, finally, in the course of presidential elections. Thereby interested persons were made to understand that organized criminals intended to use the election period to punish their enemies and richly reward friends. To Senator Kefauver this was supposed to be especially interesting, as he, as is known, was going at that time to "try out" his candidacy for the post of President or Vice President from the Democratic Party in the November elections of 1952. Therefore he took all measures depending on him to ensure that, coming down on small fry, he would take under his protection big bosses of criminal business. This task was not very difficult, if one takes into account that one of the members of the committee, Republican Senator Tobey, who constantly spoke at committee meetings

with pathetic speeches about the need for an relentless struggle against organized crime, in the early 30s was elected governor of the state of New Hampshire with money collected by his supporters from bootleggers during prohibition, and in 1950 secured his re-election to the federal Senate, using for this purpose funds received from the largest New Jersey gangster Willie Moretti. Chief counsel of the Kefauver Committee Halley, who displayed particular vigor in questioning representatives of the criminal world, was brought to work in the committee by his closest "comrades-in-arms" Costello — New York boss of the Democratic Party Ed Flynn and Judge Pecora. Mortimer and Lait assert that Halley used the Kefauver Committee as a springboard for advancement to a major government post, and precisely for this reason he tried in every way to win the favor of kings of organized crime. Now he is president of the New York municipality. The Kefauver Committee in its "preliminary report" had to admit: "Racketeers and gangsters having the opportunity to influence appointments to posts in state institutions paralyze the action of the law. Until such time as such opportunity is eliminated, gangsterism and racketeering will flourish." [333] This statement quite vividly characterizes the position in the state apparatus of the US.

Mortimer and Lait come to the conclusion that the investigation conducted by the Kefauver Committee represented the greatest deception. To be convinced of this, there is no need to turn to the "behind-the-scenes" side of the

---

[333] *Third Interim Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce*, p. 142.

Senate committee's activity, as did the authors of the book *U.S.A. — Confidential*; it is sufficient to familiarize oneself with official reports of the committee and with the book *Crime in America*, written by Kefauver himself on the basis of collected committee materials.

Organized crime represents, besides everything of which speech was made above, a very effective way of pumping billions of dollars from thin wallets of simple people of America into deep pockets of kings of the criminal world.

The closest and most scandalous connection of monopolies and government of the United States with organized crime — a connection which American theorists for understandable reasons try "not to notice" — is expressed in the fact that American monopolies through the state apparatus subordinate to them systematically take away in their favor the greater part of that tribute which organized criminals levy on the American people.

The Kefauver Committee, on which simple people of America pinned no small hopes, naively believing that it intended to enter into a struggle with organized crime, in reality was established for establishing order in confused calculations between racketeers and the state treasury — the treasury of American monopolies. In recent years racketeers felt themselves to be such a force that they began systematically to evade transferring to the treasury in the form of income tax that part of their criminal incomes to which, as to its share in all-American racketeer robbery, monopolies lay claim. Mentioned in passing, as something self-evident, that "organized crime

cannot be fully liquidated," [334] the Kefauver Committee with striking cynicism and very indicative persistence emphasizes further that "the federal government must take care that through energetic enforcement of income tax laws it takes away from gangsters and racketeers as large a part of their criminal loot as possible." [335] Noting that "bandits participating in organized crime through fraud evade paying federal government many, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars of income tax," [336] the committee with extraordinary resolve concludes: "It is absolutely necessary that the federal government enact new laws and change and improve existing administrative procedure and effective rules to force gangsters, racketeers, owners of gambling dens and other persons engaged in illegal activity to give up to the federal government in the form of income tax as large a part of their criminal incomes as possible." [337]

Senators demanded that in relation to owners of gambling dens, gangsters, and racketeers rules obliging taxpayers to keep accounting books and keep records of income and expenditure be strictly observed. Not content with this, senators specially pointed out the need to change existing laws so that illegally functioning gambling establishments from sums subject to income tax could not deduct operating expenses, nor sums paid by them in the form of wages to service personnel, nor rental payments, nor "bribes" going in favor of police and figures of

---

334 Ibid., p. 6.

335 *Third Interim Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce*, p. 142.

336 Ibid., p. 9.

337 Ibid.

legislative and executive power in the center and locally. Kefauver does not in the least conceal his irritation over the fact that many big figures of gambling business, instead of honestly sharing their profits with the state treasury, conceal the actual size of their incomes.

It is not difficult to see that under the guise of "income tax" American monopolies take away in their favor the greater part of criminal incomes of racketeers; therefore monopolies are in the least degree interested in any infringement of racketeers or in restricting their activity.

The work of the Kefauver Committee excellently showed how much the capitalist state in the US merged with organized crime, and the activity of organized criminals acquired a directly state character.

Organized crime in the United States represents an integral part of the mechanism of the American state, one of the necessary sides of the notorious "American way of life." It performs the same, in essence, tasks that the capitalist state performs — tasks of robbing working people, tasks of their terrorist suppression. As also the capitalist state in the period of imperialism, organized crime is directed by capitalist monopolies and in the most direct way services their interests. The fiction of struggle against it is needed by the capitalist state as a way of masking the servant role of organized crime. To that same goal serve all kinds of recipes for "struggle" with organized crime offered by agents of American imperialism, who can no longer hush up the fact of existence and development of organized crime.

Explaining the impunity of organized crime by corruptibility of local or even federal administration and loudly indignant at this, American "theorists" and official figures try to "prove" that organized crime can be liquidated if the apparatus in the center and locally is staffed with "honest people." Declaring that organized criminals remain unpunished because the political machine of two major bourgeois parties is interested in their existence, American "theorists," having expressed hypocritical indignation on this account, begin to assure that the whole point here is in the system of filling government posts by election or, on the contrary, by appointment, or in the notorious "spoils system."

Organized crime in America is a product of the existing US economic and political system of capitalism at a given stage of its development, a result of the omnipotence of monopolies. Like a malignant tumor, it grows and develops together with the decaying, obsolete system of capitalist exploitation that gives rise to and feeds it.

11. IDEALISTIC COVERAGE OF QUANTUM MECHANICS IN HEISBERG'S NEW ARTICLE[338]

A. P. POLIKAROV (Sofia)

Quantum theory already has a fifty-year history. Undoubtedly, it has proved its right to existence — the most perfect form of it — quantum mechanics, as a physical theory, covering a very rich experimental material from the field of modern atomic physics.

This theory represents a new step forward in the cognition of the objective world. It penetrates into those areas of phenomena that were completely inexplicable from the standpoint of the old, "classical" physics, the inviolability of the basic concepts of which is the main dogma of metaphysical materialism.

It is natural, therefore, that the philosophical interpretation of quantum mechanics is of paramount importance in the struggle of materialism against idealism. The preachers of idealism in our day, just as at the turn of the 20th century, after the collapse of certain metaphysical concepts, are trying to prove that the collapse of metaphysics is the collapse of materialism. The sophistry of this trick was brilliantly exposed by V. I. Lenin in his work *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, where it was convincingly shown that the complete inability of metaphysical materialism to explain new phenomena in natural

[338] W. Heisenberg, 50 Jahre Quantentheorie. «Die Naturwissenschaften», 38, H. 3, 1951.

science is clear evidence of the victory of dialectical materialism. Currently, in connection with a sharp aggravation of the irreconcilable ideological struggle between the new world of socialism and democracy and the world of agonizing imperialism, idealistic philosophy shows an incomparably greater activity in using sophistry to interpret new data of natural science in a sense needed by the ruling classes. Heisenberg's recent article is indicative in this respect. In it, the author, now working in Göttingen, sums up the results of fifty years of development of quantum theory, relates his memories of the creation of quantum mechanics, in particular, the history of establishing the uncertainty relations and their interpretation in the spirit of the Copenhagen school.

The idealistic nature of Heisenberg's interpretation of questions related to the origin and development of quantum mechanics manifests itself primarily in exaggerating the role of so-called thought experiments. It is these "experiments," according to Heisenberg, that make it possible to clarify the realm of applicability of classical physics concepts. Thus, it turns out that the new physical theory is built primarily on the basis of facts of consciousness. However, it is clear that a thought experiment in itself cannot finally decide the question of the applicability of certain concepts to objective reality until it is verified in practice. The history of science abounds in examples showing that the results of thought experiments often turned out to be in sharp contradiction with reality. Thus, on the basis of its own kind of "thought experiment" in the Middle Ages, for example, the existence of antipodes was denied.

According to another thought experiment, in the correctness of which even the followers of Copernicus did not doubt for a long time, a stone thrown from the mast of a moving ship should fall at some distance from the base, since the ship during the time of the stone's fall must travel some distance. On the basis of this reasoning, the immobility of the Earth was proved. A thought experiment can play a major role in the process of generating a guess, a hypothesis, but it cannot serve as proof of truth; the criterion of truth can only be practice, only an actual experiment. For example, the uncertainty relation can be substantiated by such physical facts as the Compton effect. A thought experiment can be used only as an illustration, at best, as a guess.

Typically Machist, blatant idealistic attitudes of Heisenberg are also manifested in his assertion that "the new quantum theory dealt, to put it simply, not directly with nature, but with our knowledge of nature". This means that the results of this theory can be applied only to knowledge about nature, and not to objective reality itself, which is refuted by all the rich practice of applying the conclusions of quantum mechanics to the study of physical phenomena, i.e., directly to nature.

Heisenberg links the above assertion with the fact that, since knowledge of nature "revealed itself as necessarily incomplete, a statistical, accidental element could not be avoided in the new theory. And this knowledge did not allow objectification in a simple way".

Before us is an example of a metaphysical mode of thought leading to idealism. The question of the relationship between the accidental and the necessary, which was one of the

stumbling blocks of pre-Marxist philosophy, represents an unsolvable difficulty for Heisenberg. He is unable to rise to the understanding of the unity of the necessary and the accidental, to the understanding of the objective character of chance, to which, for example, the outstanding representative of statistical physics M. Smoluchowski arrives[339]. Instead, Heisenberg has a certain preconceived abstract scheme of physical theory, reminiscent of the construction of classical mechanics, in accordance with which, in his opinion, the phenomena of the microworld should be explained.

If these phenomena cannot be explained in accordance with such a mechanical scheme and the new theory, i.e., quantum mechanics, allows a "random element," then, since chance, according to Heisenberg, has a purely subjective character and does not exist in nature, quantum mechanics has no relation to reality, is a purely mental construction (probably, with the aim of exercise in solving differential equations). Thus, the metaphysical understanding of chance leads to a Machist assertion, according to which quantum mechanics is not a physical, but a psychological theory, which actually means its liquidation.

A curious detail is presented by Heisenberg's reservation, consisting in the words "in a simple way". This reservation is due to the notorious Machist principle of "economy of thought". From the standpoint of dialectical materialism, it is completely obvious that the simplicity or complexity of

---

[339] M. Smoluchowski, *On the concept of chance and on the origin of the laws of probabilities in physics*. Journal "Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk", Vol. VII, issue 5 for 1927, p. 329.

"objectification" has no fundamental significance in the question of whether quantum mechanics reflects objective reality.

Trying to use quantum mechanics to disprove materialism, Heisenberg resorts to a sophistical substitution of concepts, to identifying any materialism with the old, inconsistent and metaphysical form of it, i.e., to the trick that was long ago exposed by the classics of Marxism and especially by V. I. Lenin in *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*. Speaking about the opposition that met the idealistic interpretation of quantum mechanics at the Solvay Congress of Physicists in 1927, Heisenberg writes: "The talk was in reality not only about a physical experiment, but also about philosophical positions. Here the old fought, which had established itself since Descartes, the idea of dividing the world into an objective one, unfolding in space and time, and a soul separated from it, in which it is reflected, against new views, in the light of which it can no longer be subjected to division in the former primitive way".

The logic is indeed striking: if the dualistic idea of Descartes is primitive, then, it turns out, there is nothing left but to grasp at a "new understanding," which is essentially nothing other than the rather old-fashioned idealistic concept of Bishop Berkeley, revived at the turn of the 20th century under the mask of "the newest philosophy" — empirio-criticism — and smashed by V. I. Lenin.

Heisenberg, if he took it upon himself to write on philosophical issues, should have remembered that, besides idealistic philosophy and Cartesianism, there is dialectical materialism.

And if idealism treads in a vicious circle, trying to push off from solipsism, then merging with it, if new idealistic schools, especially in our time, simply resurrect the most reactionary and expired systems and ideas (Berkeleyanism, Thomism, Pythagoreanism, etc.), then materialism all the time developed — from the spontaneous materialism of the ancient Greeks to the materialism of Spinoza and the French materialists, and from the materialism of Feuerbach and the Russian materialists of the 18th–19th centuries to the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels, developed further in the works of Lenin and Stalin.

Dialectical materialism, representing a revolutionary turning point in the history of philosophy and human culture in general, consistently overcomes all the difficulties that were inevitable for the old, metaphysical materialism.

Another line along which Heisenberg directs the struggle against materialism is connected with the question of causality. Here, as in old works, he acts as an active proponent of the so-called concept of complementarity of Bohr, which formed the philosophical creed of the Copenhagen school of neo-Machism. According to this concept, the description of natural processes in space and time, on the one hand, and causality — on the other, are mutually exclusive, according to Bohr's terminology, complementary. In quantum theory, we can allegedly preserve causality only in a mathematical scheme, outside space and time (?!).

Not distinguishing the method of describing an object from the object of description, representatives of this school begin to talk about the abandonment of "unambiguous predictability"

due to the impossibility of separating phenomena from the means of observation and even... the objective world from consciousness. And this subjective-idealistic, pseudo-scientific attitude is presented almost as the last word of science. Bohr tried to extend this attitude to biology, physiology, psychology, and the science of society[340], while his follower Pascual Jordan used it to substantiate racial genetics[341].

Heisenberg adds new "arguments" against the principle of causality. He writes that since the current state in the theory of elementary particles leads to the idea of replacing (as applied to sufficiently small spatial and temporal intervals) former types of causal connections between particles with interactions of a more general nature, "we must reckon with deviations from the law of causality also in those cases where the former quantum theory still functions causally"[342].

Thus, the fact of deepening and expanding our knowledge of causality, going beyond the scope of outdated ideas about it, is used by Heisenberg as an argument in favor of indeterminism. Here again, total ignorance or deliberate ignoring by Heisenberg of dialectical materialism, which is the ideology of all progressive humanity, manifests itself. All this speaks of the class, party positions of this typical bourgeois scientist.

---

[340] N. Bohr, *Atomtheorie und Naturbeschreibung*, 1931; N. Bohr, *On the Notion of Causality and Complementarity*, "Dialectica", 7/VIII, V. 2, 3–4, 1948.

[341] P. Jordan, *Quantenmechanik und Grundprobleme der Biologie und Psychologie*, "Die Naturwissenschaften", 20, H. 45, 1932.

[342] W. Heisenberg, *Paradoxien des Zeitbegriffs in der Theorie der Elementarteilchen*. Festschrift zur Feier des 200-jährigen Bestehens der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1951.

Let us summarize some results.

The interpretation of quantum mechanics in the spirit of the Copenhagen school is propaganda of idealism and has nothing in common with the actual physical content of the theory.

The reason for the idealistic aspirations of modern bourgeois physicists, as well as their predecessors, as was disclosed by V. I. Lenin, consists in the fact that they do not know any other materialism except metaphysical, in the fact that they themselves have not freed themselves from the metaphysical mode of thought, leading directly into the mire of idealism, which is explained by the logic of class struggle, and not by scientific considerations.

Behind all this, to speak in the words of V. I. Lenin, one cannot fail to see the struggle of parties in philosophy. The shift of idealism in philosophy in the final analysis expresses the tendencies and ideology of the exploiting classes of modern society. That is why "not a single one of these professors, capable of giving the most valuable works in special fields of chemistry, history, physics, can be trusted for a single word once it comes to philosophy"[343].

Heisenberg's article testifies to the powerlessness of idealism, to the fact that the real development of physics, as well as science in general, is possible only on the basis of dialectical materialism, which is confirmed by the ever-increasing progress of advanced Soviet science.

---

[343] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 327–328.

12. RIGHT-WING SOCIALISTS OF AUSTRIA – AGENTS OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM
A. I. TER-ZAKHARYAN

American imperialism attaches special importance to uniting and coordinating the activities of its right-wing socialist agency. For these purposes, under the auspices of American imperialism, an international organization of socialist parties was created (the so-called "Socialist International").

From its very first steps, this organization of splitters directed its activities to defending and propagating the aggressive Atlantic alliance and the Anglo-American policy of remilitarizing Western Germany and Austria.

The Conference of Right-Wing Socialists held in London in July 1949 and the Frankfurt Conference of Right-Wing Socialists held in July 1951 showed that the predatory policy of American warmongers has become the official program for right-wing socialist leaders of Europe.

Despite the fact that the Conference of Right-Wing Socialists in Frankfurt am Main took place behind closed doors, the general public became aware that the right-wing socialists had gathered at the behest of their American masters to develop various methods of fighting against the working class, against communism. For this purpose, the Frankfurt International undertakes a series of organizational measures aimed at making the agents of US imperialism popular among the masses. It is no coincidence that the official representative of the US for the implementation of the "Marshall Plan" in Europe, Harriman,

noted with satisfaction that the right-wing socialists are the greatest potential allies of the United States in Europe.

The political functions of modern right-wing socialists are in principle no different from the political functions of those reformist traitors whom V. I. Lenin back in 1919 characterized as servants of international imperialism, as real agents of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement.

After the Second World War, the right-wing socialists, including the leaders of the right-wing socialists of Austria, entered the service of a stronger capitalist master—into the service of American imperialism.

The weakness of the Austrian bourgeoisie, the defeat in the war of the German bourgeoisie—in whose person the right-wing socialists saw the bastion of capitalism in Austria—is the main reason for the right-wing socialists entering the service of American imperialism. The establishment of people's democratic power in a number of countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe, which is one of the forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat, meant that socialism won new victories in Europe. This gave strength and courage to the Austrian working class, revolutionized the working masses, and at the same time exacerbated internal class contradictions. The Austrian bourgeoisie and its agency—the right-wing socialists—in search of support openly defected to the position of American imperialism in the person of which they found patrons in the struggle against the working class.

Faithfully serving American imperialism, Austrian right-wing socialists actively contribute to transforming Austria into a springboard for imperialist forces in Central and South-Eastern Europe for the struggle against the USSR, against the countries

of people's democracy, against the democratic movement in all European countries, including Austria itself.
Colluding with the most reactionary forces of the country, utilizing the backward sentiments of a certain section of Austria's working people, speculating on slogans of socialism, as did the monarchists and fascists, poisoning the consciousness of the masses with the ideology of cosmopolitanism, the right-wing socialists of Austria zealously serve American imperialism.
In the field of theory, they not only falsify Marxism-Leninism, in which they have long specialized, but openly oppose Marxism-Leninism from the standpoint of American misanthropic ideology.
Renner, Pollak, Leichter, Schärf, and other right-wing socialists attempt to confuse the working class with demagogic statements about the "outdated nature" of Marx's theory for the present stage of capitalist development. In his latest book, *The New World and Socialism*,[344] Renner assures that every era and every country has its own special Marxism, by virtue of which Marxism allegedly cannot serve as a guiding theory for the labor movement of all countries. With these false "theoretical" exercises, Renner attempted to pass off something eternally "new" in science. The wretched ideas put forward by Renner are no novelty. Back in 1928, Renner preached false theories that the working class of each country supposedly has its own special ideology distinct from the ideology of the working class of other countries. All these fabrications of Renner and his colleagues pursue the goal of complete ideological

[344] K. Renner. *Die neue Welt und der Sozialismus*, S. 15. Wien, 1946.

disarmament of the Austrian working class, the goal of detaching Austrian working people from the working people of other countries and primarily from the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, in which Marxism-Leninism is the nationwide ideology.

Austrian right-wing socialists openly substitute Marxism with pseudo-scientific bourgeois "theories." They falsely assert that Marxism was allegedly a specific phenomenon of the 19th century, and therefore social regularities discovered by it supposedly cannot be applied to the social life of the 20th century. In the opinion of right-wing socialist Deutsch-Renner, who is supported by all Austrian Social-Democrats, Marxism must be replaced by a so-called science of methods. As new "fresh ideas enriching" the science of society, Deutsch-Renner recommends the arguments of the Labourite Crossman about the "religious essence of socialism" or about "applying psychoanalysis to social relations." Deutsch-Renner believes that British and American imperialists currently hold the leading role in the capitalist world, which is why Labourite ideas should be "imported" into Austria from there.

Austrian right-wing socialists do not adhere to any single philosophical theory. Their philosophical views represent a concoction of unprincipled eclectic mix of Neo-Kantianism and Machism, directed towards Neo-Hegelianism. A prominent place in the "system" of views of right-wing socialists is occupied by various refined tricks aimed at embellishing subjective idealism. The goal of Austrian socialists is to prove that dialectical materialism does not constitute the philosophical foundation of Marxism. Like all traitors to the working class, leaders of the Socialist Party of Austria cover up

their abandonment of materialism with theories of reconciling materialism with idealism. These wretched theoretical tricks, mostly borrowed from Mach and other ingrained idealists of the era of imperialism are needed by right-wing socialists to justify their betrayal of science and materialism, their betrayal of the cause of the working class. V. I. Lenin, in his brilliant work *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, exposed the philosophical revisionists of all shades and laid bare the class essence of such attempts to substitute materialism with idealism. Right-wing socialists no longer limit themselves to revising Marxism, but strive to sever even external ties with it. Thus, in the May issue of the theoretical journal of the Austrian Socialist Party, *Die Zukunft*, for 1949, the right-wing socialist Meisl raises the question of abandoning all Marxist terminology, which right-wing socialists still occasionally flaunt to deceive the masses.

In the ideological luggage of right-wing socialists, an increasingly prominent place is occupied by pragmatism, which is one of the dominant trends in modern American reactionary philosophy. This reactionary philosophy of subjective idealism, designed to justify the policy of American imperialism, is widely preached by Austrian social-traitors as well. From the viewpoint of the right-wing socialist K. Czernetz, a devotee of the misanthropic philosophy of John Dewey, "true is what is useful." If it is useful to US imperialism, say, to transform Austria into its rights-deprived colony, then right-wing socialist "theoreticians" are ready to declare this policy to be "truth" and "good." This same imperialist-minded idea is preached by the editor of the central organ of the Austrian Socialist Party, the newspaper *Arbeiter-*

Zeitung, warmonger Oskar Pollak, who proclaimed that "truth is man himself."

Subjective-idealist positions of right-wing socialists only confirm that social-traitors openly grasp at the weapon of idealism when revolutionary forces enter into battle with reaction. This is especially characteristic of them in the current period of development of imperialism, when a sharp demarcation of political forces is taking place throughout the world. Austrian right-wing socialists reduce productive forces and production relations to purely external factors of social life. They assert that production relations "can be understood only as phenomena of spiritual life." Adopting such a position, they draw from it the conclusion about the "identity of being and thought," breaking completely with materialism by asserting that it is not human consciousness that is determined by their being, but social being that is determined by human consciousness. The right-wing socialist Hannak asserts that "man can never be changed either directly or through changing economic relations." The conclusion is clear: "economic relations" of capitalism must not be changed; the system of capitalist slavery must be preserved! "Man changes himself, caring for this himself, being driven to this only by life's experiences."[345] According to Hannak, individual consciousness is determined not by social conditions; a person's character and worldview in no way depend on social conditions or social environment. Hannak's reasoning is aimed at instilling in workers the idea that not capitalism with its inhumane exploitation, not the struggle of the working class play a

[345] Journal *Die Zukunft*, No. 6, 1947.

decisive role in shaping the consciousness of workers, but innate character traits, etc. Therefore, if workers wish to improve their lives, they should start not with a revolutionary change of their being, the conditions of their life, but with changing... their character.

There is no filthy slander against the working class that the leaders of Austrian right-wing socialists would not invent. Austrian Social-Democrats in their slavish subservience to Anglo-American imperialists reach the extreme limit of vileness and meanness. It is easy to notice that in their meanness they merely spit back at their American masters's calls. If, for example, Leichter, Hannak, and other Austrian right-wing socialists relatively timidly recommend "sanitizing" society by reducing the number of "inferior, neurotic" people, as these slandering hacks call working people, then the well-known warmonger and cannibal, American "learned" William Vogt in his book *Road to Survival* writes: "Everything we do to increase population numbers works against Europe and ourselves. Stabilization, then reduction of Europe's population would be the greatest blessing in the cause of universal peace and prosperity."[346]

The right-wing socialists of Austria lead a fierce struggle against the Marxist-Leninist teaching on classes and class struggle, on the state and democracy, on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

They spread lies, assuring that the class struggle leads to decay and ruin of society. Faithful servant of American reaction Oskar Pollak, in order to legalize the rule of US imperialists,

---

[346] W. Vogt. *Road to Survival*, p. 211. London, 1949.

rebels against "class thinking" and advocates for a "peaceful community" of antagonistic classes within the framework of the "United States of Europe."

Comrade Stalin in *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, exposing anarcho-syndicalist views on society and class struggle, points out: "Of course, it is untrue that owing to the existence of a fierce class struggle society has allegedly split into classes not linked with each other economically in one society. On the contrary. As long as capitalism exists, the bourgeoisie and proletarians will be bound to each other by all threads of the economy as parts of a single capitalist society... Therefore, the class struggle, no matter how acute it may be, cannot lead to the disintegration of society."[347]

Contrary to assertions of right-wing socialist liars, the exacerbation of class struggle leads not to the "disintegration of society," but leads only to the ruin of old, obsolete exploiting classes. The best proof of this Marxist truth is the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia and the victory of the popular masses over imperialist reaction in the countries of people's democracy.

It should be noted that right-wing socialists can say nothing except lies and slander on the question of dictatorship and democracy either. However, while previously Bauer, Adler, and other leaders of Austrian Social-Democrats covered themselves with leftist phraseology, modern right-wing socialists like Pollak, Schärf, and others speak completely openly and cynically against Marxism on all questions. They openly lie about the disappearance of antagonistic classes in

---

[347] J. Stalin. *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, p. 19. Gospolitizdat, 1951.

capitalist society, about the supra-class character of the capitalist state and democracy. While in the Linz program of 1926 the possibility of a dictatorship of the proletariat was formally recognized, in the new program of Austrian right-wing socialists any hint of a dictatorship of the proletariat is expelled. Right-wing socialists act as ardent defenders of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The American imperialist state, which is a dictatorship of the most predatory circles of US monopoly capital, is presented in the booklet of right-wing socialist Deutsch, *What Do Socialists Want?*, as an "advanced fighter for freedom and human rights." Deutsch, fulfilling the role of an imperialist agent in the Austrian labor movement, thoroughly obfuscates the processes of fascistization of the American state and denies what warmongers themselves do not deny—the fact that Austria is losing its independent existence.

The position of the working class of Austria forces right-wing socialists to cover themselves with the slogan of "democratic socialism." Renner in his book *The New World and Socialism* advertises by all means the Labourite "path to socialism." As is well known, once one of the theoreticians of the Austro-Marxist school, O. Bauer, also advocated the "theory" of democratic socialism and proved the possibility of building socialism within the framework of capitalism. Bauer was also the proponent of the program of "socialization," which spoke of nationalizing the capitalist economy of Austria, and this without any qualms of conscience was declared to be socialism. Being in power, Social-Democratic leaders Bauer, Renner, and others conducted demagogic talks about the "voluntary transfer by the bourgeoisie of their enterprises to the

working class." Bourgeois apologist Bauer "called upon" capitalists to renounce receiving surplus value, "four ninths" of their income, from their commanding positions in the economy. V. I. Lenin in "Notes of a Publicist" subjected the pharisaical fabrications of social-traitor Bauer to devastating criticism. "Can he really think," wrote Lenin, "—after the imperialist war and during such a war, which brought even the victor countries to the brink of ruin,—after the start of the civil war in a number of countries,—after facts on an international scale proved the inevitability of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war, can he advocate, in the summer of the year of our Lord 1919, in the city of Vienna, 'ordered' and 'regulated' surrender by capitalists of 'four ninths' of their income,—for this one must be either insane or an old star of the old great German poetry, who enthusiastically moves 'from little books to bigger books'"[348].

Over a period of many years, under the smokescreen of "democratic socialism," the leadership of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party masked its service to the ruling bourgeois class, its transformation into an agency of fascism.

Such was the treacherous role of Austrian Social-Democracy in the first government of the young Austrian Republic during the years following the First World War. Austrian Social-Democrats, supporting in the Austrian people disbelief in their own strength, for many years paralyzed the struggle of Austrian workers against the bourgeoisie. Through their policy, they gradually prepared the seizure of Austria by Hitler.

---

348 V. I. Lenin. *Works*, Vol. 30, p. 335.

"Democratic socialism" of Austro-Marxists was exposed by life itself. The practice of victorious socialist construction in the USSR, the elimination of private ownership of the instruments and means of production, the elimination of exploitation of man by man as a result of implementing the dictatorship of the working class in the Soviet Union definitively exposed the treacherous nature of the theory of "democratic socialism." Acting under the banner of "Labourite socialism," Renner uses it as a cover for his subservience to Anglo-American imperialism and its reactionary ideology.

It is known to all that in fact the British Labourites in 1945, just like the Austrian Social-Democrats in 1919 upon coming to power, rushed to abandon their promises and adopted a pro-American course in both domestic and foreign policies of England. Measures carried out by the Attlee government in no way touched the private-capitalist interests of British monopolists. On the contrary, the share of profits of British monopolies in the national income of England increased from 32.8% in 1948 to 34.1% in 1949, whereas the share of workers' wages decreased from 41.4% to 40.2%.[349]

Labourite "democratic socialism" thus led to an increase in profits for British monopolists and an increase in the exploitation of the working class and laboring people of England. This was one of the reasons why the laboring masses, disappointed in the false socialist demagogy of the Labourites, gave part of their votes in the 1951 elections to the Conservatives. Millions of working people in England and other bourgeois countries are becoming increasingly convinced

---

[349] Journal *Bolshevik*, No. 20 for 1951, p. 43.

of the false nature of right-wing socialist babble about special British "democratic socialism"; all the more clearly do they understand that right-wing socialists are tools of imperialist aggressors, enemies of the camp of peace and true socialism. Propaganda of "Labourite socialism" serves as ideological cover for the betrayal by right-wing socialists of Austria of the interests of the working class, national interests of the entire Austrian people in favor of Anglo-American pretenders to world domination.

Patriarch of Austrian social-traitors Renner called upon all socialists of the world to direct their efforts toward liquidating national states, toward creating world unions headed by American imperialism.

In the works of Renner widely propagated in Austria, internal contradictions rending capitalist countries are obfuscated, and the era of imperialism is presented as an era of complete political and economic merger of all nations and states into a single world state. This cosmopolitan idea of Renner fully corresponds to the practical goals of American imperialism implementing its aggressive policy under the banner of cosmopolitanism.

Back at the beginning of the 20th century, leaders of Austrian Social-Democracy Renner and Bauer created the reactionary theory of cultural-national autonomy, expressing the chauvinistic sentiments of the Austrian labor aristocracy occupying a privileged position in multi-national Austria-Hungary. This theory of Austro-Marxists, as is known, entered the international arena during that period and became a serious danger for the European labor movement. Then this pseudo-scientific theory was defeated by V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin.

In 1913, V. I. Lenin in "Theses on the National Question" showed that the slogan of cultural-national autonomy contradicts the principles of proletarian internationalism, class struggle of the proletariat, and facilitates the attraction of the proletariat into the sphere of influence of bourgeois nationalism.

Comrade Stalin in his brilliant work *Marxism and the National Question* revealed the essence of the theory of cultural-national autonomy as a "refined form of nationalism," exposed the great danger of social demagogy with which Austro-Marxists covered up their bourgeois viewpoint on the national question. "...Nationalism is not so transparent," wrote Comrade Stalin, "for it is skillfully masked in socialist phrases, but it is all the more harmful for the proletariat. One can always deal with open nationalism: it is easily spotted. It is much harder to fight against nationalism masked and unrecognizable in its mask. Shielded by the armor of socialism, it is less vulnerable and more viable. Living among workers, it poisons the atmosphere, spreading harmful ideas of mutual distrust and isolation of workers of different nationalities."[350]

Renner on the issue of cultural-national autonomy occupied the most reactionary position, which was expressed especially clearly in his desire to preserve and strengthen at all costs the monarchical Austro-Hungarian state, condemning oppressed national minorities to a wretched existence within the framework of this empire.

Austrian Social-Democrats then as well denied the right of small nations to independent existence. After the end of World

---

350 J. V. Stalin. *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 331.

War II, for the purpose of struggling for world domination and liquidating the national independence of European countries, Anglo-American warmongers began to persistently instill the ideology of cosmopolitanism, masking their chauvinism and nationalism.

Cosmopolitanism propagated by modern right-wing socialists of Austria is a continuation of their old national-chauvinistic theory and practice. This propaganda serves the cause of enslaving European peoples, including the Austrian people, by US imperialists.

Modern right-wing socialists of Austria attempt to depict any aggressive measure of American imperialism aimed at enslaving small nations as a step on the path toward "progress" and "internationalism."

The aggressive North Atlantic Pact, cobbled together by US imperialists, Austrian right-wing socialists pass off as the first step toward creating a "United States of Europe." Sophistically attempting to portray cosmopolitanism as internationalism, Pollak goes so far as to declare: "We would cease to be socialists if we were not cosmopolitans."[351] Apparently, Pollak considers that one cannot be a right-wing socialist without simultaneously being a cosmopolitan, a servant of US imperialists.

Declaring himself a "citizen of the world," Pollak strives to conceal behind broad cosmopolitanism the black betrayal by right-wing socialists of the national interests of Austrian working people and the cause of the entire working class. Pollak denies the right of nations to independent state

---

[351] Newspaper *Arbeiter-Zeitung* of March 21, 1949.

existence. Back in 1942, he provided ideological preparation for the adoption of the "Marshall Plan" in order to economically and politically enslave Austria. Not without reason was Pollak's "theory" on the "United States of Europe" so warmly received by representatives of American imperialism.

The reactionarity of Pollak's views, his desire to "theoretically" justify the necessity of liquidating Austria's national independence, is expressed especially clearly in his booklet *The Voice of Underground Europe*, in which he presents arguments to prove the "absolute necessity of uniting Europe." The most cynical of these "arguments" states that the "unification" of Europe by Hitler, i.e., the "new order" established in Europe by Gestapo men and SS men, allegedly proved its "necessity and progressiveness." Here Pollak openly declares himself a servant and follower of Hitlerites and American invaders. He advocates liquidating the sovereignty of small countries allegedly in the interests of the "common man." He, like Hitlerites, assures that "the era of small national states has passed," that their economic independence has become completely impossible. "To restore their political sovereignty would be a step backward in history,"[352] declares Pollak. Now Pollak sells his country to the Americans just as he previously sold it to German fascists.

Renner also put forward a number of arguments in favor of the need to liquidate Austria's sovereignty. He agreed with Pollak's false arguments that the development of industry and trade has

---

[352] Oskar Paul Pollak. *Underground Europe Galled*, p. 40. London, 1942.

long led to "internationalization," that under conditions of imperialism the goals and tasks of the state have gone beyond individual states and countries, and therefore all state issues can be resolved only on a global scale, relying on the ideology of cosmopolitanism. To pander to American monopolists, Renner defined the task of all socialist parties as follows: "It consists in avoiding conflicts with the bourgeoisie in every way possible and including one's country in a universal world economic and political community."[353] To no one is it a secret that this "community" is the aggressive Anglo-American bloc aimed at preparing a new war. Such in brief is the program of betraying the interests of working people and serving American bankers and executioners.

In his interview with a correspondent of the American newspaper *Neue Zeitung* published in Munich, Renner stated that Austria favorably views the "creation of a Western European bloc and expresses the intention itself to join this bloc in the future." In other words, Renner advocated the enslavement of Europe by America, the loss by Austria of its national state independence, and the dragging of Austria into an aggressive bloc under the aegis of the USA. This statement by Renner was made to pander to those forces that completely hand Austria over to the power of American capital and want American occupation of Austria to be preserved forever, transforming Austria into a colony of US imperialists and a military base for American militarism. In this respect, the statement of O. Pollak on the role of the USA in the "unification" of Europe is also characteristic: "As for America,

353 K. Renner. *Die neue Welt und der Sozialismus*, p. 23.

it is possible that even capitalists will have nothing against clearing away the heap of European petty sovereign states and other things, which they have always gravitated away from."[354] Thus, Austrian right-wing socialists stand for "clearing away" for American capitalists the sovereign states of Europe, including Austria. Here is the extent of humiliation and mockery right-wing socialists commit against their own people, against the working class of Austria!

V. I. Lenin characterized the relationship of the bourgeoisie and its lackeys to the motherland as follows: "...The alliance of imperialists of all countries, an alliance natural and inevitable for the defense of capital, which knows no motherland, proved by many major episodes in world history that above the interests of the motherland, the people, or anything else, capital places the defense of its alliance of capitalists of all countries against the working people."[355]

Propaganda of a "world government" by Austrian right-wing socialists pursues the goal of subjecting all states of the world to American imperialism. The official representative of the USA to the United Nations, Jessup, openly declared that the Atlantic Pact will lead to the creation of a "world governmentment," while the British philosopher warmonger Russell explained that by "world government" one should understand the world domination of American imperialism. This is what Austrian right-wing socialists preach about.

It is completely clear that the entire theoretical and practical line of right-wing socialists on the national question represents

---

354 Oskar Paul Pollak. *Underground Europe Galled*, p. 63.

355 V. I. Lenin. *Works*, Vol. 27, p. 330.

direct apology for and assistance to the reactionary policy of American imperialism, covered up by cosmopolitanism.
At present in Austria, a sharp demarcation of political forces is taking place. Around the reactionary leadership of the Socialist Party, colluding with the reactionary People's Party, all pro-fascist, pro-American elements are grouped. On the other hand, the onslaught of internal and external reaction and the anti-popular policy of Austrian ruling circles meet with increasingly organized resistance from the country's democratic forces. In "Marshallized" Austria, democratic forces lead a decisive struggle for peace, against warmongers of a third world war, for national honor, freedom, and independence of the Austrian people.
The Communist Party of Austria fights for a lasting democratic peace, against the machinations of American imperialism in Austria and remnants of fascism, for the unity of the working class, for uniting all supporters of democracy and peace.
Being the inspirer of the struggle of democratic forces for the implementation of its demands, the Communist Party exposes the machinations of reaction and warns the country about the danger of the anti-popular course of the government of the "People's" and Socialist parties, which turn Austria into a colony and military springboard for American imperialism.
The most important obstacle encountered by the expansionist program of the USA in Western European countries is the class unity of workers. Therefore, right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic Party of Austria try by any means to achieve a split in the working class and thereby paralyze the forces of democracy. With particular clarity, this decision was demonstrated by the presidium of the Federation of Austrian

Trade Unions not to participate in the World Congress of Trade Unions in Milan, as well as the disgraceful attitude of Austrian right-wing socialist officials toward the World Federation of Trade Unions, which represents 78 million organized workers across 56 countries of the world. To the whole world it is known that the World Federation of Trade Unions chose Vienna as its headquarters at the invitation of a huge number of factory committees in Austria. But right-wing socialists, alarmed that for the Austrian people the international labor movement is a powerful support in its struggle against the criminal American plans for the remilitarization of Austria, hastened to adopt appropriate police measures against the presence in Vienna of the World Federation of Trade Unions. The Austrian Communist Party, condemning this new betrayal by leaders of the Socialist Party, rightfully characterized this decision as support for reactionary splitting elements in the international trade union movement.

Back in March 1948 at a plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Austria, CPA Chairman Johann Koplenig noted that as a result of the treacherous, splitting political line of right-wing socialists, unlike in France and Italy, the Austrian Trade Union Federation is not an active, militant factor, but represents a kind of attachment to the coalition policy of the right-wing leadership of the Socialist Party. Instead of daily struggle for the interests of workers, right-wing socialists pursue a policy of close cooperation with capitalists.

The policy of right-wing socialists in trade unions leads to a restriction of the rights of the working class and to a worsening of its position. The Socialist Party back in 1947 passed a

reactionary law on factory committees. Contrary to the demand of Austrian trade unions and the Chamber of Labor for establishing control over production by workers at factories numbering no fewer than 880 people, and regarding the procedure for firing workers only with the knowledge of the factory committee, socialists together with the "People's" Party voted in parliament for a new anti-democratic law restricting the rights of trade unions. Right-wing socialists achieved a situation where factory committees in Austria now have no right to interfere in the production life and financial affairs of an enterprise.

Leaders of the Socialist Party with their splitting policy turn trade unions into a blind tool of American reaction. They banned trade unions from participating together with Communists in the celebration of May Day in 1951. At the same time, together with the reactionary "People's" Party in October 1951, they adopted a disgraceful decision to contribute forty thousand dollars to the "American aid fund for Korea." Recently, the leadership of the Socialist Party has especially intensified its reactionary activity aimed at splitting the single trade union movement. The threads of this splitting activity stretch from the European center of the AFL, with whose representatives right-wing socialist trade union leaders of Austria are linked in the closest manner.

The desire of right-wing socialists to grovel before their American patrons is especially clearly manifested in their malicious struggle against supporters of peace. While the decision of the Secretariat of the World Peace Council to hold the next session of the Council in Vienna received warm approval from all honest people of Austria, right-wing socialist

leaders met this decision with hostile and provocative statements. Following the example of Hearst propaganda in everything, they assert that the World Peace Council is allegedly a "pro-communist organization." This attack by right-wing socialists against the combat headquarters of the international movement of supporters of peace once again demonstrates their true face—the face of direct accomplices of American warmongers. But right-wing socialists in vain disregard the willingness of the Austrian people, believing that by police measures they will manage to stop the striving of Austria's working class for unity in the struggle for peace and democracy.

The treacherous pro-American policy of the leaders of the right wing of the Socialist Party, aimed at subjecting Austria to the interests of American capital, causes increasing indignation and resistance among rank-and-file socialists. In connection with this, left-wing elements in the ranks of the Austrian Socialist Party have noticeably intensified their activity. There are many instances where rank-and-file members and even functionaries of the Socialist Party openly speak out for the unity of the working class.

In 1951, for example, 40 workers of the "Nova" oil company resigned from the Socialist Party and joined the ranks of the CPA. Among them was 63-year-old worker Karl Schwarz, who, after a twenty-year stay in the ranks of the Socialist Party, declared: "When the Socialist Party began to conduct a policy to pander to the capitalist West, I lost the last remnants of trust in it."[356] Among rank-and-file members of the Austrian

[356] Newspaper *Die Österreichische Zeitung* of December 25, 1951.

Socialist Party there are supporters of democracy and peace who are ready to fight reaction and the remnants of fascism and who speak out against the policy of reactionary leaders.
The recent congress of the Socialist Party, held in November 1951, clearly demonstrated the growing dissatisfaction of rank-and-file members of the Socialist Party with the activity of the Central Committee of the SPA. The course of the congress showed that a significant portion of delegates does not wish to take part in anti-Soviet propaganda conducted by the leadership of the Socialist Party. Resolutions of individual party organizations presented to the congress testify to the dissatisfaction of broad circles of rank-and-file members of the Socialist Party with its reactionary right-wing socialist leadership.
Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Austria, Fürnberg, characterized the internal disagreements in the ranks of the Socialist Party of Austria as follows:
"The internal weakness of the Socialist Party is growing. This weakness consists in the fact that the leadership of the Socialist Party has completely placed itself at the service of foreign imperialism and internal reaction, while the mass of members and functionaries wants to go along the path of socialism. Even the most sophisticated machinations of the leadership of the Socialist Party and malicious baiting against the Communist Party can lead to the fact that this party, as was once the case in its history, will break apart at the moment of the most decisive battles."[357]

[357] Newspaper *Die Österreichische Volksstimme* of November 30, 1948.

The efforts of Austria's democratic forces are currently directed toward leading the country out onto a democratic path of development through relentless struggle against reaction. The Communist Party of Austria considers the struggle against the influence of right-wing socialists to be the primary task of Austrian Communists.

The formation of the Socialist Workers' Party of Austria and the open stance of E. Schärf in defense of a genuinely social-democratic line, exposing the treacherous policy of the leaders of the Socialist Party, made a great impression on rank-and-file members of the Socialist Party. Dissatisfaction in the ranks of the working class was manifested especially clearly in responses of rank-and-file socialists to E. Schärf's book *I Cannot Remain Silent*.

On the pages of the central weekly organ of the left opposition of the Socialist Party, the newspaper *Der neue Vorwärts*, rank-and-file members of the Socialist Party as well as individual functionaries speak out exposing the leadership's policy of the SPA. A group of socialists in its letter addressed to Schärf writes: "We will not remain silent; we assure You that we join You and will fight against Your leadership for a democratic Austria."[358]

Held in Vienna in the spring of 1951, the first congress of the Socialist Workers' Party showed significant growth in the movement of left socialists. Participants in the congress sharply condemned the treacherous policy of the leaders of the Socialist Party. Steyr worker Blaschke stated: "One cannot without disgust read *Arbeiter-Zeitung*... this newspaper daily

---

358 Newspaper *Der neue Vorwärts* No. 2 for 1949.

poisons the consciousness of workers with lies and slander."
The congress noted with satisfaction that the influence of left socialists has grown. In its resolution, the congress expressed a decisive protest against attempts by right-wing socialists to split international working-class unity. At present, the Socialist Workers' Party, together with Communists, leads an active struggle against warmongers, against the colonial policy of American occupation troops in Austria.
The Socialist Workers' Party supports the CPA's struggle for the national independence of the country. It advocates the unity of all democratic forces against reaction, against warmongers, for the implementation of democratic demands of the people. Facts show that despite opposition from the government of Western powers, the drive of democratic forces toward the struggle for a sovereign Austria is growing stronger. The main demands of workers—the conclusion of a treaty, which is systematically disrupted by Western powers turning Austria into a military base for their aggressive policy, and the withdrawal of occupation troops from Austria.
The 15th Congress of the Communist Party of Austria, held in November 1951, correctly and soberly assessed the relationship of political forces in present-day Austria, noting that the Communist Party must not be caught unawares by reaction. Emphasizing that imperialism acts through force and terror, it calls upon the working class of Austria to do everything so that warmongers do not defeat the forces of democracy and supporters of peace.
The Party, taking into account the experience of revolutionary changes in neighboring countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe and the experience of Austria's working class in 1934,

calls upon the working class to save the country from a national catastrophe and ensure the political rule of the working class and working masses of Austria. The solution of these tasks is possible only on the path of struggle against external and internal reaction, against turning Austria into a military base and colony of American aggressors. Chairman of the Communist Party J. Koplenig emphasized that Austria fell into bondage to American aggressors by virtue of the treacherous policy of the "People's" and Socialist parties, that the "Marshall Plan" is not an instrument of peace, but a plan for war. The smoke has cleared, and behind the staged "American aid" the picture of preparing for war emerges. Communists now face the task of ensuring that the history of past years is not repeated.

Before the working class and all working people of Austria stands the task of ensuring the independence and freedom, the democratic development of their country, fighting against the machinations of American aggressors and their Austrian lackeys.

13. FOR THE LENINIST TEACHING ON MOTION
D. I. BLOKHINTSEV

In connection with the discussion of G. I. Naan's article published in the journal "Voprosy Filosofii" No. 2 for 1951, I consider it necessary to make a few remarks.

First of all, one should keep in mind that there is no relativity of accelerated motions. The understanding of the general theory of relativity as a doctrine of the relativity of all motions in general, characteristic of foreign physics standing on the position of philosophical relativism, is in fact scientifically groundless.

This understanding found its most vivid expression in A. Eddington's well-known book "The Mathematical Theory of Relativity," where the author engages, starting from the very first pages, in verbal-mathematical equilibristics from which nothing other than sophisms and paradoxes can follow.

In reality, the general theory of relativity is a theory of gravitation, and not at all a doctrine of the relativity of all motions. This circumstance was emphasized long ago by W. Pauli in his course on the theory of relativity; attention was drawn to it in a popular book by the author of the present note and S. I. Drabkina ("Einstein's Theory of Relativity," Gostekhizdat, 1940); the same thing in a most clear and exhaustive form was shown in V. A. Fock's article in the collection dedicated to Copernicus ("Nikolai Kopernik.

Collection of articles for the quadricentennial of the day of death," 1947).

The equivalence of a gravitational field and accelerated motion takes place only in infinitely small regions of space and time and is violated when we turn to finite regions of space and time.

Together with this falls the theoretical basis for asserting the relativity of accelerated motions. For this same reason, Copernicus's and Ptolemy's systems are by no means equal, as is customary to assert in almost any foreign book on the theory of relativity[359]. For this same reason, in foreign literature there exists an incredible confusion (started by E. Mach) on the question of the relativity of rotational motion, which in fact can in no way be relative, since there is no gravitational field "equivalent" to the rotation of a body.

Thus, the problem of absolute motion is a problem of inertial, uniform, and rectilinear motion. From the special theory of relativity it is well known and confirmed by a colossal number of experimental facts that physical phenomena proceed in an identical manner, regardless of the general rectilinear and uniform motion of the system of bodies in which these phenomena occur^2[360].

---

[359] It should be kept in mind that the question of the equal status of Copernicus's and Ptolemy's theories has nothing in common with the question of the arbitrary choice of one or another reference system. Any system can serve as a reference system. The choice of one or another system is a matter of convenience and expediency.

[360] Usually they say: "independently of the uniform and rectilinear motion of the observer." This typical formula for positivists is non-rigorous for the reason that the observer—here a completely accidental figure—from the presence or absence of

By virtue of this principle it is usually considered that the question of absolute motion is meaningless, as there is no physical method allowing one to detect such motion.

This conclusion is accepted as the main result of painful searches for absolute motion relative to the world ether, searches to which were devoted the multi-year investigations of physicists at the end of the last century. However, connecting absolute motion with one or another representation of the ether means taking a very narrow position.

The essence of the question of absolute motion consists in the representation of the existence of a selected inertial system, regardless of its nature (be it ether or something else). At first glance, the special theory of relativity rejects such a selected reference system, proving that all inertial reference systems are equal.

But right here occurs a confusion of good physics with bad philosophy.

The point is that inertial systems are realized in reality only approximately. Moreover, one and the same system of bodies or body can be considered for some phenomena as inertial, and for others—as non-inertial.

For example, the rotation of the Earth significantly affects the movement of air masses in the atmosphere, but it exerts no influence on the movement of electrons in a discharge tube. Therefore, for these electrons the Earth is an inertial reference system, while for the movement of air masses it is a rotating

---

whom nothing changes in physical laws.

system. In considering the motion of the Moon, one had to take into account that the Earth describes an ellipse around the Sun. In the next approximation, the inertial system will be the Sun, further—the system of distant stars. For the Galaxy as a whole, the system of stars is already non-inertial, so one must turn to the system of distant Galaxies.

Hence it is clear that as space and time scales expand, one system after another falls away, systems which for smaller space and time scales could with sufficient accuracy be considered inertial.

Together with this, at each stage of development of science there always exists a selected inertial system. This system stands out due to the fact that it is "more inertial" than any other.

One cannot hope that tomorrow the "most inertial" system of reference out of all inertial ones will be found. Gradually, with the development of our knowledge of the Universe as a whole, this "most inertial" system is refined, and along with it our knowledge of absolute motion is refined.

The rejection of absolute motion is based on an insufficient understanding of the Leninist teaching on the relationship between absolute and relative truth.

The essence of the matter lies precisely in the fact that in a number of fields of physics, especially in atomic physics, the majority of bodies can, with excellent practical accuracy, be considered inertial systems. Therefore, artisans of science think

that absolute motion in general, and along with it absolute space and time, are meaningless.

In reality, absolute motion is cognized in the process of development of science, as the "most inertial" reference system is refined. Such an understanding of absolute motion fully corresponds to the spirit of the Leninist teaching on motion, space, and time, and rejects the absolutization of the relativity of motions.

14. ON THE THEORY OF RELATIVITY
P. G. KARD (Tartu)

In the course of the ongoing discussion on issues of the theory of relativity and even earlier, many authors took a position toward this theory that is in fact nihilistic. Although in words they advocate a correct, materialistic understanding of the theory of relativity, however, unfortunately, they do not state what this correct understanding should consist of. In their arguments one can find only general and low-substance phrases, while the theory of relativity itself they decisively reject.

In the present article we want to show that this position is incorrect and that the correctly understood theory of relativity is deeply materialistic.

In connection with this formulation of the question, it is necessary at the very beginning to emphasize that we will consider only the theory of relativity, and not the numerous idealistic fabrications of reactionary bourgeois scientists which are passed off as the theory of relativity, but have nothing in common with it. This remark is very essential, since one of the main sources of errors of all those who reject the theory of relativity is usually that, starting with criticism of idealistic fabrications, they end with criticism of the theory of relativity itself.

One of the reasons for this error is that in many cases they do not know **what the theory of relativity is**. They think that

wherever the words "theory of relativity" are pronounced, there it should be sought.

Meanwhile, one should take into account that modern theory of relativity is no longer the former "theory of Einstein". It has entered the main fund of physical science. Its development went over several decades in parallel with the development of physics. Therefore, to learn what the theory of relativity is, one can only know how physical science developed, what it achieved, and what problems stand before it today. Various scraps that use only the name of the theory of relativity and have not the slightest relation to its development (which, we repeat, is inseparable from the progress of all physical science), give no grounds for classifying them as part of the theory of relativity. Destructive criticism of these scraps is necessary and useful, but it is possible only if we fully grasp the positive role of the theory of relativity.

In what follows we will speak only about the so-called special theory of relativity, calling it simply the theory of relativity.

The central place in the theory of relativity belongs to the Lorentz transformations, which are the mathematical expression of two main principles of this theory. On one of them—the principle of relativity—it is necessary to dwell in more detail, as its usual formulation (given also in the article by Comrade Naan) is unsatisfactory. It bears the direct traces of Machist views of Einstein, and therefore the materialistic essence of the principle of relativity turns out to be heavily veiled.

Thus, Comrade Naan writes: "...All laws of physics (and not only the laws of mechanics) are identical in all inertial reference frames"[361].

The vagueness of this formulation often gives rise to misunderstandings.

Is it really the case that in pre-relativistic physics, for example, in the classical theory of the stationary ether (in the electronic theory of Lorentz), the laws of physics depend on the reference frame? Is this really how classical physics differs from relativistic physics? If, according to the theory of the stationary ether, in an inertial frame moving relative to the ether there must exist an "ether wind," whereas in a frame at rest relative to the ether there is none, does this mean that the laws of physics in such systems are different? On the contrary, the law of physics in classical theory is precisely that the presence and speed of the "ether wind" are determined by the choice of the inertial frame. For the speed of the "ether wind" is equal in absolute magnitude and opposite in sign to the speed of the inertial system itself relative to the ether. If we are to consider the difference of speeds of the "ether wind" in various inertial systems as a difference of physical laws in them, it will turn out that the speed of a given inertial system is its physical law. But this is absurd. Thus, not only in the theory of relativity, but also in any non-absurd physical theory, the laws of physics are identical in all inertial reference frames[362]. This means that the

---

[361] Journal "Voprosy Filosofii" No. 2 for 1951, p. 65.

[362] Academician V. A. Fock also pointed this out. See his article "The System of Copernicus and the System of Ptolemy in Light of the General Theory of Relativity." Collection "Nikolai Kopernik," p. 183. Ed. AN SSSR. 1947.

phenomena observed in any reference frame are explained by any non-absurd physical theory using the same basic propositions—laws.

Thus acts, for example, mechanics, explaining the origin of centrifugal and Coriolis forces in a rotating reference frame. The classical theory of the stationary ether of Lorentz acted in the same way, explaining on the basis of physical laws (although later turned out to be erroneous) concerning the propagation of light and independence from the choice of one or another inertial system, the presence or absence of an "ether wind" in these systems.

But, besides non-absurd physical theories, there exist also absurd "theories". Apparently, Einstein gave the principle of relativity the above-mentioned (in the formulation of Comrade Naan) form precisely because, being under the influence of Machism, he imagined physical reality to be identical with the aggregate of observations of an observer sitting in a reference frame. And if there were no principle of relativity in nature, then according to this representation there would indeed be obtained a "theory," absurd for a materialist, but acceptable to a Machist. In this "theory" (one should not confuse it with the materialistic theory of the stationary ether) it would indeed turn out that the laws of physics are different in different reference frames, since the results of observations of observers located in these reference frames would be different. And what lies at the basis of these differences, the Machist does not ask—for him there is no reality outside observations (sensations).

So, the principle of relativity takes away from Machists the possibility to consider physical laws as depending on the observer. But this does not prevent Machists from nevertheless considering the observer's sensations identical with physical reality (despite the fact that observers in different inertial systems derive the same physical laws). And so Einstein formulates the principle of relativity in such a way as to emphasize, as it were, that physical laws could also depend on the choice of frame. Such a formulation is a tribute to Machism.

For a materialist, such a formulation cannot serve as a characterization of the true content of the theory of relativity. Accepting this formulation, one can easily succumb to the erroneous opinion that the theory of relativity represents some logical necessity and that earlier it was unknown only, so they say, because without criticism, without due logical analysis, they accepted some basic concepts, such as, for example, the concept of simultaneity. From this erroneous representation it follows that it is enough to make a logical analysis, enough to give accurate definitions, and the theory of relativity will obtain by itself. This error is made, for example, by Prof. S. E. Khaikin[363].

The true meaning of the principle of relativity consists in asserting the **equal status of all inertial systems**, that is, in recognizing that there is no preferential inertial system. This

[363] See S. E. Khaikin. Mechanics, p. 566. 2nd ed. Gostekhizdat. 1948. 3$ It should be emphasized that this impossibility is not a logical impossibility, as it in no way follows from logical analysis of the concept of speed; it is a factual impossibility.

principle is a generalization of very numerous experimental facts showing the complete failure of all attempts to determine absolute velocity of motion.

But if it is impossible to determine the absolute velocity of motion3$, then from here only one conclusion is possible that is acceptable for a materialist: **no body has an absolute velocity of motion**. Every body moves (and in this sense motion is absolute), but for no body is there a preferential, "true" velocity of motion. One can even say: every body moves with an infinite set of speeds, and each speed from among these various speeds corresponds to a relationship realized by means of one or another inertial system.

Such an understanding of the principle of relativity is the only possible one reflecting the truly materialistic essence of this principle and the entire theory of relativity. To verify this, let us examine in the light of such an understanding several essential questions.

First of all, one should note the error of the views of those who draw (like, for example, Comrade Naan) a sharp line between the *philosophical* and *physical* understanding of the principle of relativity. It cannot be forgotten that the achievements of all natural sciences, including physics, inevitably find reflection in general philosophical views on the world. Therefore, it is wrong to think that the principle of relativity holds true only in physics. True, it was originally established in physics, but it is well known that precisely the most general principles of physics (for example, the law of conservation and transformation of energy), such as the principle of relativity,

turn out, as a rule, to hold true in other branches of natural science as well. Of course, applying the principle of relativity (or the theory of relativity in general) in other branches of natural science, one must not arbitrarily change the content of this principle. Meanwhile, the arguments of A. A. Maksimov[364] against the applicability of the theory of relativity in biology and geology are based, evidently, precisely on such an arbitrary change, since what Comrade Maksimov asserts corresponds to the theory of relativity, and does not contradict it. Therefore, Comrade Maksimov's examples refute not the theory of relativity as applied to biology or geology, but something else, which is implied by him under the name of the theory of relativity and which, indeed, is inapplicable either in these sciences or in physics. For example, the sequence of events separated by so-called time-like intervals ("levels in the 'stadium' development of a given plant or animal"), is absolute (invariant), but this is not the result of "more high relations," but a general output of the theory of relativity. In the same way, the simultaneity of events occurring at one and the same place (in one and the same organism) is absolute.

As for the application of the theory of relativity outside physics in general, factually this has not been realized so far. But this does not mean that the theory of relativity is inapplicable, for example, in biology. For Langevin already noted that the relativistic properties of time are very essential from the point of view of biological feasibility of intragalactic and inter galactic flights. Although at the present time this question is

[364] See journal "Priroda" No. 1 for 1949, p. 11.

not topical, it nevertheless cannot be considered devoid of fundamental interest.

Let us turn to the next question. The principle of relativity, as stated above, asserts the equal status of all possible inertial systems. Here, by a possible inertial system is meant a physically (and not simply logically) possible system, that is, one in which some body could be at rest. Whether an inertial system is physically connected in some way to a body (medium) or not—is a question of a completely different order. Comrade Naan believes, on the contrary, that inertial systems spoken of in the theory of relativity must have a carrier in the form of a medium or body at rest in the corresponding inertial system. This, in Comrade Naan's terminology, is reference systems. In connection with this, Comrade Naan admits the presence of several trajectories or several speeds for one and the same body, but says nothing about an infinite set of trajectories or speeds.

We believe that Comrade Naan's point of view is wrong. The presence of a medium or bodies moving rectilinearly and uniformly and representing, thus, a certain inertial system, is not necessary for its existence in the sense of the principle of relativity. The thing is that inertial reference systems according to Naan do not exist in nature, strictly speaking, because every body moves with acceleration, even if small. Inertial systems exist not in the sense of material being, but are mathematical abstractions (like purely spatial coordinate systems, of which one can also say that their number is infinite). These abstractions are the same idealization of actually existing bodies as the concept of inertial motion is an idealization of

actual motions. Therefore, although an inertial system does not necessarily have to be represented (or realized) by some body or medium, in principle **every** inertial system is realizable, that is, it is fundamentally possible that some body rests in it, even if briefly. Even if there is no such body, nevertheless there is no reason to consider this inertial system excluded from the entire infinite set of inertial systems.

The stated view seems to us the most correct and also because it excludes in the simplest and most direct way the notorious "observer" and takes away from him that role which Machism strives to assign to him. In the Machist interpretation, as was already noted above, sensations, observations, measurements of the observer are identified with physical reality. In our interpretation, every observer is free to observe (being armed with the theory of relativity) not only in that inertial system in which he rests, but also in any other. Factually, physicists act so all the time. This does not mean, of course, that to observe in that inertial system in which an electron flying in a laboratory rests, the observer must "sit atop the electron" (as Comrade Naan writes). Such a "problem" does not arise for us at all. The question consists only in applying the corresponding inertial system.

Let us dwell in a little more detail on the role of the observer and on other related questions. Relics of Machist views in the understanding of the theory of relativity, often still found even among Soviet scientists, are rooted in the underestimation of the role of theory in the process of cognition (and this underestimation, in its turn, is a Machist survival).

The observer with his observations and measurements figures often in one-sided treatments of the theory of relativity because authors want to assign special value to **direct** observations and measurements as allegedly most reliable. Explicit Machists go further: they assert that these direct observations of the subject **are** the sole reality. Materialist physicists are far from this absurdity, but nevertheless one often has to encounter the opinion that knowledge obtained by direct observation is something more reliable than that given by theory.

Such an opinion must be considered erroneous. First of all, there is no possibility at all to draw a sufficiently sharp line between direct and indirect measurements (or observations). Every measurement, even the simplest, presupposes a corresponding theory. Whether we measure temperature with an ordinary thermometer, measure the distance to the Moon, or the charge of an electron, the interpretation of the results of all these measurements inevitably includes elements of some theory. If we wanted to find such an observation or measurement that would be completely free from any theory, nothing would be left for us but the readings of instrument needles. But even in this case it would be necessary to say that we measured not the charge of an electron, but the deflection of such-and-such needles. But even this last measurement does not dispense with theory, and at least without the theory of the visual process. Thus, to free oneself from this last theory as well, it remains only to say that there were such-and-such sensations, and nothing more.

To precisely such a Machist absurdity leads the consistent implementation of the requirement of "directness" of

observations. Meanwhile, this requirement is based on nothing. The process of cognition is not exhausted merely by the accumulation and registration of facts, but includes as a necessary constituent part **theoretical generalizations and conclusions**. Precisely these conclusions give us the right to assert that "indirect" measurements can be more reliable than "direct" ones. Finally, the very distinction between "direct" and "indirect" observations loses in significant part its meaning if one properly considers the role of theory.

They may object that all this has long been known. Perhaps one can agree with this objection. However, if we consistently apply this point of view to the question of the significance of measurements and observations in the theory of relativity, we will obtain completely worthy results, which are valuable especially because they eliminate from the "traditional" exposition of the theory of relativity all sorts of traces of Machism.

It should be taken into account that the theory of relativity is not some "new" theory in the theoretical-cognitive sense. It could seem such only in the initial period of its existence simply because of the novelty and unusualness of its statements. The question of measurements and observations in the theory of relativity should therefore be treated "in a new way," or, on the contrary, completely in the same way as in other areas of physical cognition.

Let us examine in more detail the question of simultaneity, as it is precisely this point that is often primary in the exposition of the theory of relativity. They reason as follows: if two events

occur in different places, it is impossible to establish directly whether these events are simultaneous or not. Therefore they say that the concept of simultaneity needs a special **definition**. Further, at the basis of the **definition** of simultaneity they put the sending of light signals. From here they derive the relativity of simultaneity, Lorentz transformations, etc. Relativity of simultaneity in such a treatment receives inevitably the sense of **subjectivity of relativity**, that is, that sense that two events are simultaneous **for a given observer**, but for **another observer**, moving relative to the first, they can be non-simultaneous. This subjectivity is precisely the result of the requirement of **directness** of the definition of simultaneity, linking the fact of simultaneity with the "readings of needles," that is—more consistently—with the sensations of observers. Besides, the element of subjectivity enters the theory as a result of the notorious "definition" of simultaneity. It is legitimate to ask: what if we define simultaneity differently? Can the laws of nature really depend on these or those definitions?

It is clear that such a treatment is incorrect. Relativity of simultaneity, Lorentz transformations, and all consequences flowing from them are, of course, correct, but they are not based on the "definition of simultaneity." Further, simultaneity of two spatially separated events is indeed impossible to **establish directly**. But since this is so, one should not "save" directness, fussing over the definition of simultaneity, but one should try to find an **indirect** way allowing one to establish simultaneity or non-simultaneity of events. This indirect way can be found, as always, by constructing a corresponding

theory, the degree of reliability of which determines the reliability of this "indirect" way.

Such a theory in the given question is the theory of relativity. It shows that with the help of light signals we indeed learn whether events are simultaneous or not. This indirect way of learning the simultaneity of spatially separated events, however, is not inferior in reliability to direct establishment of simultaneity of two co-located events, as the theory of relativity possesses a very high degree of reliability.

Thus, the theory of relativity introduced nothing new into epistemological theory. It relies not on Machist recipes of materialistic method of cognition of nature, not on the requirement to **define simultaneity**, but, like any theory, relies on a well-chosen **hypothesis**, further, on **agreement with experimental facts** of this theory constructed on the hypothesis, and, finally, on justified **predictions** of the theory.

The main hypothesis of the theory of relativity is the **principle of relativity**, asserting, as stated above, that there is no preferential (absolute) inertial system. Supplementing this principle with the fact of **independence of the speed of light from the state of motion of the light source**, one can derive Lorentz transformations, from which flow both relativity of simultaneity and the possibility to learn simultaneity with the help of light signals, and much else. For the definition of simultaneity, spoken of so much in Machist treatments, there remains no room.

In such a treatment, the observer with his measurements does not figure at all in the construction of the theory. Spatially

separated events are simultaneous not because an observer located in the middle of the interval between events records light signals arriving from these events simultaneously, but on the contrary, this simultaneous registration of light signals is possible because the events are simultaneous. With all this, simultaneity is still relative; it depends on the choice of the inertial system. But since the **observer** does not enter into the **construction of the theory**, the choice of the **inertial system is equally arbitrary for any observer**. In other words, as was already noted above, every observer can observe in **any** inertial system. In that system in which he rests, he observes "directly"; in other inertial systems in which the observer moves, he observes "indirectly," that is, relying on the theory of relativity.

From what has been stated above, it follows in particular what consists the error of L. I. Mandelstam in his lectures on the theory of relativity[365]. Speech goes not about the factual content of the theory of relativity, but about the method of constructing and presenting the theory. Following Einstein, L. I. Mandelstam considers it necessary to define simultaneity of distant events. Thus, on page 186 we read: "How do we know that... two events in different points of space... occur simultaneously? Einstein answered: you cannot know this, you must give a definition of what it means that in two different points... two events occurred simultaneously..." This initial position Mandelstam repeats and varies over many pages.

[365] See L. I. Mandelstam. Full Collection of Works. Vol. V, pp. 90–305. Ed. AN SSSR. 1950.

In fact, as we have already seen, the basis of the theory of relativity is not the definition of what simultaneity means, but the principle of relativity, that is, a certain hypothesis about properties of objective space-time, a hypothesis dictating a very wide collection of experimental facts, moreover such that without this hypothesis stand in contradiction with each other. From this hypothesis flows independence of the speed of light from the choice of inertial system, and from here—the possibility to **learn simultaneity** of events with the help of light signals in any inertial system.

And in the Machist treatment everything is put upside down: instead of a hypothesis as a tool of cognition—definition as a means of "economy of thought." Such views, however, inherent in Machism on any issue, have not affected the content of the theory of relativity, as we have shown, in the slightest degree.

Now let us examine those objections against the proposed treatment of the principle of relativity that can be found mainly in the article by Comrade Stern[366]. Comrade Stern's arguments leading him to actual rejection of the theory of relativity are very revealing: in them are expressed most clearly those characteristic difficulties that prevent many from coming to a correct understanding of the meaning and significance of the principle of relativity.

The essence of these difficulties consists in the statement that the relativity spoken of in the theory of relativity is relativity in the theoretical-epistemological sense. Undoubtedly, the theory

[366] See journal "Voprosy Filosofii" No. 1 for 1952, pp. 175–181.

of relativity, like any other theory, is relative, and not absolute truth, but relativity of its truth has nothing in common with that relativity spoken of in this theory. The name "principle of relativity" by no means signifies accessibility for us of only relative knowledge, or existence of only relative truth, or anything of the kind, but expresses solely the absence in nature of a preferential inertial system. It is absurd to think that if the theory of relativity is relative truth, then there must allegedly be a "theory of absoluteness," expressing absolute truth, which refuted the theory of relativity.

But let us listen now to Comrade Stern. He believes that rejection of absolute space is incompatible with recognition of absolute truth. At the same time he does not specify the concept of absolute space. And meanwhile this is essential, since under absolute space he in the future figures not at all what is rejected in the theory of relativity. In fact, it is true that the theory of relativity rejects the existence of absolute space, but the meaning of this rejection is only that which is expressed in the principle of relativity: there is no absolute, selected, preferential over other inertial system in space. But this is not at all that property of space envisioned by Comrade Stern, calling it absolute. And from absolute space in Comrade Stern's understanding one cannot draw conclusions, as he does, about the existence of motion "relative to absolute space" (p. 178).

The representation that the principle of relativity signifies rejection of absolute truth, can be born and is born factually only in the case if one proceeds from the opinion that an absolute inertial system and absolute velocity of motion exist as absolute truth. But this is precisely the position that is

rejected in the theory of relativity. Thus, opponents of the principle of relativity, for its refutation, proceed from what they must prove. They identify absolute inertial system or absolute velocity with absolute truth. The statement about absence in nature of an absolute inertial system signifies not rejection of absolute truth, but a certain statement about what this absolute truth is. This statement (principle of relativity) is in itself, of course, relative truth, but, we repeat, this relativity has nothing in common with relativity of inertial systems.

With all this, of course, one should not think that the very concept of absolute space or absolute inertial system is devoid of meaning. One can even, despite all successes of physics within the framework of the theory of relativity, think that an absolute inertial system (super-inertial, in terminology of D. P. Blokhintsev) nevertheless exists. About all this one can argue, but in no case can one assert that absolute truth **must** consist only in the existence of an absolute inertial system and cannot consist in its absence. To argue so—means to build one's propositions independently from factual development of science. Such an approach has nothing in common with materialism; this is the crudest dogmatism.

Comrade Stern advocates absolute space. If by this is understood only that space "cannot move in any all-embracing system" (p. 178), then there is no need to object against this. Of course, no "all-embracing system" exists. But does such absolute space refute the principle of relativity, does there flow from it the existence of an absolute inertial system? Clearly not. Therefore, Comrade Stern's arguments about absolute space do not touch the principle of relativity, nor do they prove

the existence of motion "relative to space." Nevertheless he draws from his arguments the conclusion about the existence of such motion. The reason for such direct inconsistency is, as was already indicated, identification of absolute velocity of motion, absolute trajectory, etc., with absolute truth.

Be that as it may, Comrade Stern comes factually to rejection of the theory of relativity. And to give his rejection sufficient weight, he solidarizes factually with idealists, assigning to the theory of relativity various absurdities that in reality in no way follow from it. His argumentation is built on phrases like the following: "If A is said, must B be spoken?" What is this A and B? We read further: "Who rejects absolute space, absolute motion, must he not recognize the fundamental theoretical difference between any reference frames" (p. 178). And that's all. But Comrade Stern should bother to prove his assertion. Why, one asks, should one not recognize the difference between any reference frames? For this difference exists! If all inertial systems, according to the theory of relativity, are equal, does it follow in any way from here that non-inertial systems are equal not only to inertial ones, but to any others? Clearly, in no way. Even in the so-called general theory of relativity (more precisely, in the relativistic theory of gravitation) equal status of any reference frames is not asserted (since such equal status does not follow from the equivalence principle).

It is completely clear that arguing by such a method, it is very simple to "refute" the theory of relativity.

I consider it necessary to dwell on one more proposition defended by Comrade Stern: on his assertion about absolute

time. He cites a long quotation from Engels and thinks that this refutes the consequence flowing from the theory of relativity about relativity of time. It is not difficult to see that in this quotation Engels speaks only about abstract time, that is, about **the possibility to abstract the concept of time from 'admixtures.'** What are the properties of this abstract time, Engels in the given quotation says nothing. Very likely, true, that Engels imagined this abstract time as absolute in Newton's sense; this is natural, for one cannot assume that Engels could know the theory of relativity. The main thing, however, is that one cannot assign to Engels the opinion that abstract time must be absolute time simply because it is time.

The theory of relativity of abstract time does not reject at all; it only shows that the properties of this abstract time are not such as Newton endowed them with. Relativistic properties of time are such that allow calling this abstract time **relative**. This means, for example, that the time interval between two events has an infinite set of values, each of which corresponds to certain inertial systems; among these values there is no true one; true is their aggregate, simply because all inertial systems are equal. In other words, the relativistic time interval between two events is expressed not by one definite number, but by one definite infinite ensemble of numbers.

For clarification of the character and significance of consequences flowing from main propositions of the theory of relativity or, say, from Lorentz transformations, it is useful to present an instructive analogy with another "theory of relativity," which for a long time now causes no objections in

anyone, but, on the contrary, firmly entered the circle of basic natural-scientific and philosophical representations.

Speech goes about the so-called properties of homogeneity and isotropy of space, or, otherwise, about absence of center and about equal status of all directions in space, or, finally, about equal status of all spatial (that is, stationary relative to each other) coordinate systems. This fact seems to us now ordinary and natural, but it was far from always so, and establishment of general validity of this fact was not without struggle. In the initial representation of flat Earth there is no isotropy of space; there exists a selected direction—absolute vertical. But even in representations of spherical Earth, as long as Earth was considered the center of the world, there was no equal status of coordinate systems, since there was no homogeneity of space: there exists an absolute center, absolute origin of coordinates. One can say that only Giordano Bruno for the first time fully realized and philosophicallysubstantiated the theory of relativity in three-dimensional space.

The principle of relativity in four-dimensional world (space-time) signifies the same as the fact of absence of a selected coordinate system in three-dimensional space. Namely, according to the principle of relativity, in space-time there is no selected inertial coordinate system. Therefore, philosophical significance of the theory of relativity is at least as great as philosophical significance of the teaching of Giordano Bruno about absence of world center and about multiplicity of worlds. Factually, the theory of relativity has even greater significance, since it operates with a larger number of dimensions, of which one—time—is essentially different from others. Therefore,

conclusions of the theory of relativity are richer, more diverse, and lead to cognition of new truths.

In conclusion, let us consider one concrete output from the theory of relativity, namely the question of relativity of length. From Lorentz transformations it flows that length of a body in an inertial system where the body rests (even if only at a given moment) is greater than its length in any other inertial system. Since all inertial systems are equal, we must draw the conclusion that every body has an infinite set of lengths, of which one is the greatest. Strictly conditionally one can consider this greatest length (length of rest) "absolute" or "true" length. However, this does not mean that length of a moving body is in reality equal to this "absolute" length and that actual length is only apparent. The thing is that length (or, rather, volume) of a body is a projection of space-time being of the body onto space, and as space (taken separately from time) is relative, so projection, that is volume, can be different. One can present here an analogy, true, incomplete. A rod placed vertically to the earth casts onto earth a shadow, length of which depends on height of the Sun. Shadow is a projection of the rod and can therefore have different lengths.

One can foresee sharp objections that will, probably, be made against given treatment, and especially in connection with the presented analogy. They will say, look, agnosticism; this means that objects are declared unknowable, that about them it is proposed to judge only by their "shadows." However, such an objection would reveal misunderstanding of the essence of the question. The thing is that here we speak not about spatial being of a body and about corresponding measure, that is,

about volume. Undoubtedly, it is true that bodies exist in space, as in time, but in no way **separately in space and separately in time**. Therefore, purely spatial existence of a body, torn from its temporal being, has no independent reality; this is, indeed, only a "shadow," or, rather, a projection of real spatial-temporal being onto space. But from this it does not follow that volume or length of a body are unreal. We assert only that this reality is not self-contained. It is fully legitimate to consider volume or length of a body as one of the characteristics of its real being; with this one should only remember that this characteristic in the presented sense is relative and therefore by itself does not give full knowledge of the object. This result of the theory of relativity is in full accord with the known proposition of dialectical materialism stating that every object must be cognized in its development and that it is impossible to fully cognize an object or phenomenon, examining it in only one moment of time, that is, discarding its temporal existence, tearing it from its history. This proposition of dialectical materialism is, of course, broader than the output of the theory of relativity about relativity of volume, which is an application of the indicated proposition to mechanical phenomena.

Within narrow limits of the present article we strove to a certain degree to illuminate the real, materialistic content of the theory of relativity. Physics is by its very essence a materialistic science; therefore it is impossible for a theory that turned out to be so fruitful for the development of physics not to have materialistic content.

15. ON THE CONTENT OF MODERN PHYSICAL THEORY OF SPACE AND TIME[367]

Ya. P. TERLETSKY

1. Space and time are forms of existence of matter. They are as inexhaustible as matter itself. World space is boundless, and time lasts infinitely — in this lies their quantitative inexhaustibility. Qualitative inexhaustibility determines the change at certain stages of development of physics of some concrete physical ideas about space and time by others, more perfect.

At the beginning of our century, a number of facts were accumulated in physics about processes propagating at a speed comparable to the speed of light. These facts turned out to be in contradiction with old ideas about space and time. As a result, a new physical theory of space and time arose, resolving these contradictions. It received the name "theory of relativity"[368].

Thus, the theory of relativity is a physical theory of space and time of material processes propagating at speeds comparable to the speed of light.

The founders of dialectical materialism in the last century established the inseparable unity of space, time, and motion.

---

[367] Publication of this article continues the discussion of questions on the theory of relativity (see journal "Voprosy Filosofii" No. 2 for 1951 and No. 1 for 1952).

[368] It will be shown below that this name does not correctly reflect the content of the theory; however, we will use it, since other names have not yet been discussed.

They foresaw the development of physical science for many years ahead.

The theory of relativity revealed concrete forms of the connection between space and time. It established that space and time represent a kind of unified "geometric" manifold. This "geometric" connection was not discovered by physics dealing with speeds far less than the speed of light. The establishment of this concrete form saved space and time and represents the main content of the theory of relativity.

Bringing to new physical concepts of space and time, that is, of forms of existence of matter, the theory of relativity disclosed a new content: it formulated general laws of motion of matter in the realm of high speeds and energies. These so-called relativistic laws are widely confirmed by practice and are the physical basis for a number of new areas of technology. Relativistic laws of motion of fields and particles serve as the basis for calculating modern particle "accelerators" (cyclotrons, synchrotrons, betatrons, and other accelerators) and for analyzing nuclear reactions.

As relativistic laws of motion, as well as concepts of space and time, became an effective theoretical working tool not only for theoretical physicists, but also for practicing engineers of a number of specialties.

2. The theory of relativity is divided into two parts: special relativity and the so-called general theory of relativity.

Special relativity does not take into account the effects of gravitational fields and considers only "inertial frame systems". General relativity considers arbitrary frame systems in the

presence of gravitational fields and, in fact, is a relativistic theory of the gravitational field.

Practical applications have almost exclusively special relativity. When talking about reliable experimental foundations of relativity, they mean special relativity, as not all conclusions of general relativity are reliably confirmed experimentally. Experimentally confirmed are only some consequences of general relativity.

Below we will consider questions relating primarily to the field of special relativity.

3. The theory of relativity was created mainly by the works of Lorentz, Poincaré, Einstein, and Minkowski. However, it should be noted that the core idea of relativity about the geometric connection of space and time was prepared by the works of Lobachevsky. Only the revolutionary ideas of Lobachevsky allowed freeing oneself from the metaphysical view on space and time. Of special significance were Lobachevsky's ideas for the theory of gravitational fields. The very idea of the dependence of space properties on the distribution of matter, underlying general relativity, belongs to Lobachevsky.

   Further, through the works of Langevin, Laue, Langevin, and other physicists, many fundamentally important questions of relativity were developed, revealing its physical content, as a theory of the space-time manifold of material processes propagating at speeds comparable to the speed of light. Relativity theories arose as a result of the development of electrodynamics and the creation of electron theory.

Newtonian concepts of space and time, correctly reflecting relatively slow mechanical processes, turned out to be inappropriate for reflecting electromagnetic processes propagating at the speed of light. This contradiction between the old form and the new content led to a review of Newtonian concepts of space and time, culminating in the appearance of new concepts.

4. Lorentz in 1904 first found transformations of spatial coordinates and time (corresponding to the transition from a stationary reference system to a moving one), leaving unchanged (invariant) the equations of the electromagnetic field. In these transformations, a new concept of space and time was already contained. However, Lorentz, not understanding the main content of his transformations, did not consider transformed coordinates and time as real as the original ones. He looked at them as mathematical auxiliary variables for considering electromagnetic phenomena in moving bodies. Lorentz could not yet break away from Newtonian concepts of absolute time, although he came close to new concepts following from his transformations.

5. The next step was taken in 1905 almost simultaneously by Poincaré and Einstein. Both formulated the so-called postulate or principle of relativity, placing it at the foundation of new views on space and time.

   The theories of Poincaré and Einstein differ somewhat in form.

   Poincaré, as is known, taking Lorentz's transformations and considering them from the point of view of the postulate of relativity in electrodynamics, revealed the quantitative

connection of space and time contained in them. On the basis of these ideas, Poincaré developed the relativistic theory of the electron and developed the mathematical apparatus of the new theory.

Einstein, in contrast to Poincaré, derived Lorentz transformations from two principles — the principle of relativity and the principle of constancy of the speed of light — and clearly formulated the definition of simultaneity of distant events. Einstein's theory differed from Poincaré's theory by a clearer physical трактовка (interpretation) and was much easier to perceive by physicists than Poincaré's purely mathematical theory.

Einstein and Poincaré found a concrete form of connection of space and time, expressed quantitatively in Lorentz transformations, as well as in formulas for changing the simultaneity of distant events, changing the length of moving rods, and time dilation of moving clocks. Changes in the fundamental laws of motion of material bodies in the realm of speeds close to the speed of light were revealed.

6. However, the most essential of these concepts of space and time was revealed only in 1908 by Minkowski. Minkowski established that Lorentz transformations have a geometric character, that space and time form a four-dimensional manifold with a special four-dimensional geometry. Identifying time with a "fourth coordinate," Minkowski immediately revealed the deep qualitative difference of the time coordinate from spatial ones. Minkowski showed that "postulates of relativity" are not the main content of the theory of relativity, and proposed to change even the name of the main postulate.

Minkowski's spatial four-dimensional mechanics and electrodynamics (it is customary to say: relativistic mechanics and electrodynamics). Only on the basis of four-dimensional representations of Minkowski could Einstein develop further general relativity.

Minkowski's theory with full right can be considered as a further development of ideas laid down by Lobachevsky.

7. Starting with Einstein and Poincaré, relativity theory was used to "substantiate" philosophical relativism. Exposure of attempt of idealistic interpretation of content of relativity theory is significantly hampered by the fact that its recognized author, Einstein, applied and applies no small effort to use relativity theory against materialism. Positivism of Einstein deeply penetrated into formulations of initial concepts, conclusions, and mathematical apparatus of relativity theory. The very name "theory of relativity" does not reflect the essence of this theory. Obscured by Machist views of Einstein, it contributes to idealistic interpretations.

   Dogmatic interpretation of relativity theory in an idealistic spirit severely delayed the development of this physical theory. Numerous attempts by Einstein to construct, based on starting ideas, a unified field theory or to generalize it into a synthetics, discrediting the physical content of the theory. All attempts by Einstein over the past 35 years to complete the theory, which generalized the relativistic concept of Mach, proved fruitless.

   It is completely obvious that before Soviet physicists and philosophers stands the task: to uncover and cleanse from idealistic formulations and to highlight the true materialist

content of the so-called theory of relativity; to discard, as hindering the development of relativity theory, various fictions established in the theory since the first formulations of Einstein; to identify all new and developing ones and wholeheartedly support them in order to bring physical science out of an idealistic impasse. Special attention should be paid to the development of progressive ideas of Lobachevsky and Minkowski.

8. The content of the principle of relativity is the assertion of the independence of the mathematical form of physical laws from the choice of inertial reference system. In other words, it is asserted that physical laws are invariant with respect to coordinate transformations corresponding to the transition from one inertial reference system to another.

   Let us stop first of all on the concept of "reference system". Often a reference system is identified with a "reference body," however, such an identification narrows the broad concept of a reference system. By a reference system is understood in physics an imaginary coordinate grid depicting all points of three-dimensional space, and a linear sequence of numbers depicting uniformly passing time. An inertial reference system differs from all other possible non-inertial systems by the fact that motion by inertia (that is, in the absence of external forces acting on bodies) is depicted in these systems as changing coordinates of a body proportional to time, that is, in the form of a linear dependence of coordinates on time.

   Inertial reference systems, as well as non-inertial ones, can be imagined in infinite quantities, but each of these systems

depicts real properties of one and the same objective space-time.

Usually, reference systems are associated with some concrete bodies in space (clocks). Einstein considers this necessary and self-evident. He agrees with this presentation, that it is meaningless to talk about bodies that are not directly measured using certain operations. Such an "operationalist" approach, although it seems natural from the point of view of practical measurements, leads to a distortion of the concept of "reference system". Every physicist knows well that to depict in our consciousness any phenomenon, one can choose a variety of coordinate systems and temporal sequences, while not caring about bodies and clocks measuring coordinates and time. A reference system can be connected with the center of the Sun or an electron, with a laboratory setup, or with the center of mass of a system of interacting elementary particles not connected with any real body.

In theoretical physics, the choice of reference system is determined not by the presence of any real reference bodies, but by the formulation of the problem and methods for its solution.

Thus, a reference system is only a way of depicting real space and time existing independently of our consciousness.

From the point of view of four-dimensional geometric representations, a reference system is a generalization of a coordinate system to a four-dimensional space-time manifold. Just as a coordinate system in analytical geometry, a reference system in relativity theory can be chosen arbitrarily.

9. However, speaking of arbitrary choice of reference system, one should not lose sight of the limit of applicability of this projection, conditioned by properties of real space-time depicted by a coordinate-time grid. Not every coordinate-time grid can correctly depict space and time of all possible material objects and processes.

   If a Cartesian coordinate system and a uniform time sequence correctly depict macroscopic processes within small distances, then for describing processes propagating at light speeds across stars, it is necessary to use a non-Euclidean space-time reference system. It is also known that non-inertial reference systems correctly depict space and time only within a limited space-time region. Thus, for example, Ptolemy's reference system, tied to the Earth, correctly depicts space and time only in a limited sphere around the Earth, and outside this sphere it becomes false.

   Therefore, the choice of reference system is by no means arbitrary, but is limited by actual properties of space and time, reflected in representations of reference systems.

   The operationalist approach to reference systems usually ignores this limitation in their choice and absolutizes the concept of an arbitrary choice under these conditions. With such an approach, the choice of reference system is entirely determined by measurement capabilities available to the subject, and not by properties of real space-time depicted through reference systems. The operationalist approach only outwardly seems materialist, for in it the coordinate grid and time sequence are as if they exist in reality, as represented by real bodies and clocks. In fact, this approach leads to the

concept of conditional space-time manifold. Indeed, if space is identified with rulers, and time with clocks, then space and time become subjective categories, since position and scales of rulers, as well as clock rate, can be chosen to a significant extent arbitrarily depending on the observer's intention[369].

10. Thus, choice of reference system is considered as main content of theory. For a materialist, however, it is not how we depict space and time that is important, but their existence, independent of methods of depiction. It is important to know that space and time possess objective properties independent of methods of depicting them in human consciousness. These properties must be disclosed as absolute truth, compiled from a sum of relative truths.

    Undoubtedly, it is correct to rename the term "principle of relativity" to "postulate of covariance" or, better still, "postulate of independence of physical laws from choice of inertial reference system".

---

[369] An attempt to consistently carry out the concept of identifying space and time with concrete scale rulers and clocks was made by Academician L. I. Mandelstam in lectures on the theory of relativity, edited and processed by Prof. S. M. Rytov (L. I. Mandelstam. Full Collection of Works. Vol. V, 1950). However, this attempt led to explicit idealism. According to L. I. Mandelstam, it is impossible to say what distance or time is, until we give a definition of what is called length or time. In L. I. Mandelstam's lectures it is stated: "I... did not know what length was, but I defined what I would call length"; "The concept of time also relies on a definition based on presenting some real process. Usually, the rotation of the Earth is presented as such a process... This is a definition. One cannot ask: does the Earth really rotate uniformly into equal times? We thus defined equal times" (pp. 178, 179). Thus, according to L. I. Mandelstam, space and time are conditional definitions, physical forms, and not forms of existence of matter, independent of our consciousness.

In accordance with true content of relativity theory, it is appropriate to call it not "theory of covariance" (since "postulate of covariance" does not cover the full essence of theory), but simply "four-dimensional theory" in accordance with representations revealed by Minkowski. Of course, about terms one can dispute.

11. Minkowski's concept of a four-dimensional geometric space-time manifold and looking at reference system as only a method of depicting space and time removes difficulties in interpreting so-called "relativity" of simultaneity, length, and time intervals.

Space and time are absolute as forms of existence of matter, but they are inextricably linked, which quantitatively is expressed in Lorentz transformations, and cannot be considered in isolation from each other. All "paradoxes" arise from attempts to separate spatial and temporal forms of material bodies.

Just as in ordinary three-dimensional geometry, choice of coordinate system does not affect geometric forms and dimensions of body, so in four-dimensional space-time theory, choice of reference system does not affect space-time form of physical processes, which remains absolute under any choice of reference system. Only spatial and temporal projections change, just as in three-dimensional geometry forms of projection of bodies onto coordinate planes change when rotating coordinate system.

The relativity of space-separated events in relativity theory remains relative, depending on choice of reference system.

However, in this position there is nothing paradoxical, for completely analogously projections of two separated points onto a plane can either merge or diverge depending on choice of direction of plane in space. Similarly, time interval between space-separated events is a projection of a four-dimensional interval in four-dimensional space-time manifold, which changes depending on choice of hypersurface onto which it is projected.

Thus, in the realm of physical processes propagating at speeds comparable to the speed of light, spatial and temporal forms of existence of matter act in inseparable geometric connection. Absolute is space-time, while division into space and time acquires in this realm in known degree a relative character.

In relativity theory space-time dimensions of body are measured no longer as "length" and "time interval," but as "interval," which in particular cases can express either length or time interval.

12. Let us analyze the question of relativity of speed and trajectory to resolve relativistic ideas. Often, relativity of speed and trajectory is depicted as position of relatively moving body. Speed of moving body and form of spatial trajectory indeed depend on choice of reference system. A physicist calculating a particle accelerator chooses various reference systems for depicting motion of individual electron depending on which aspect of motion interests him. Speed of electron and its trajectory will have different values each time depending on choice of reference system. Does this mean relativity of motion overall? It is obvious that it does not. Motion of matter is absolute. Only in our consciousness can motion of physical

objects be depicted differently, depending on chosen units of measurement, direction of axes, and motion of origin of coordinates of chosen reference system — in short, on method of depicting space and time. However, motion will not be taken until in this relative depiction of it open properties of absolute motion. Thus, absoluteness of motion of individual body is disclosed by considering its interactions with surrounding bodies. Similarly disclosed is absolute meaning of trajectory of individual body.

Motion of individual body occurs only relative to other bodies. An isolated body is only an abstraction, sometimes necessary, but unable to turn into real if absolutized, considering it not as a snapshot from objective reality, but identifying it with matter itself. Thus, motion of matter is absolute, but its reflection in our consciousness relative to a particular body always depends to a degree on chosen point of view.

This question is especially clarified in relativity theory. It turns out that in four-dimensional manifold every body has an absolute trajectory and absolute four-dimensional speed (square of four-speed in all coordinate systems equals minus speed of light squared). Ordinary three-dimensional trajectory is only a projection of absolute four-dimensional trajectory onto a spatial hypersurface. Naturally, form of this projection will significantly depend on choice of "laying out" spatial hypersurface. From choice of reference system, it turns out, depends also "direction" of four-dimensional vector of speed, while speed itself in absolute magnitude in all coordinate systems is constant.

Thus, motion of material objects is absolute and does not depend on consciousness. Relative are only methods of depicting motion of bodies, isolated in our abstraction from surrounding ones.

13. One should not confuse question of absoluteness of motion with question of existence of absolute reference system. Recognition of absoluteness of motion does not mean assertion of existence of absolute reference system. Space-time manifold is unified for all material world, but it is as inexhaustible as matter itself. No concrete reference system can exhaustively depict properties of world space. Any proposed reference system with exhaustive completeness can depict only space and time of a bounded combination of material objects. There is therefore no single "world" reference system relative to which one could count all matter as stationary. There is no such system, just as there is no single "central" body of infinite universe. However, for any, arbitrarily large combination of material objects one can specify a reference system in the best way depicting space-time of this combination. In a number of existing physical ideas about space and time, such a spatial reference system coincides with the most inertial (non-inertial).

One can also show that for very large or very small material systems space and time acquire new qualitative features, not depicted by ordinary reference systems. For depicting space-time of such systems, radical changes of modern representations will be required, following from relativity theory. One of important tasks of theoretical physics is establishing limits of applicability of concepts of relativity theory in space and time.

14. In his article "On the Question of the Principle of Relativity in Physics"[370] G. I. Naan attempts to give a materialist position of the principle of relativity and discard its idealistic distortions. Author does not solve this task satisfactorily. All his very detailed analysis of coordinate transformation formulas in relativity theory G. I. Naan builds, considering main content of this theory to be "the principle of relativity". To save from idealistic conclusions following from dogmatization of this principle, G. I. Naan proposes, first, to consider "physical relativity" having nothing in common with "relativism in philosophy," and, second, to separate "observer" from "reference system".

G. I. Naan writes: "From the very beginning it must be emphasized that the problem of physical relativity in no way can be identified with the problem of relativism in philosophy, with the problem of relativity of our knowledge — application to motion, space, time. These are completely different things" (p. 57).

Thus, G. I. Naan attempts to substantiate a certain concept of objective physical relativity existing independently of human and cognitive capabilities. For this purpose, all physical quantities and concepts he refers to reference systems, which he considers depicted coordinate-time grids, but real bodies and processes. G. I. Naan attempts to treat physical relativity as objective relations between real bodies. He does not notice, however, that this point of view cannot save from subjective elements which he considers unacceptable. For any given body

---

[370] Journal "Voprosy Filosofii" No. 2 for 1951.

is in objective relations with all other bodies of universe. When considering motion of a given body, physicists choose one single reference system connected (according to Naan) with one single reference body. But choice of reference system always depends on measuring observer.

Thus, attempt to separate physical relativity from philosophical leads, at best, to masking subjective side of considered relativity in physics, and does not contribute to uncovering objective content of physical theory of relativity.

Deeply mistaken is G. I. Naan when arguing about Einsteinian thesis of identity of reference system and reference body, considering that such a representation in reference system knocks ground from under feet of physical idealists. He believes that idealistic conclusions "...are based on sophism, which consists in replacing reference system with observer and his point of view, replacing objective with subjective"; further he asserts: "At the basis of reference system lies body, medium, material system, which for brevity are called 'reference body'. It exists objectively, outside and independently of our consciousness" (p. 70).

No doubt, reference system can be connected with real body, but this does not make reference system something independent of our consciousness. The very name "reference system" speaks of the fact that something is referenced, i.e., measured. It is clear that concept of "reference system," as well as general concept of "measurement," is deprived of any meaning without participating cognitive subject.

Here we encounter the same trick by which some physicists try to save Machist principle of complementarity in quantum mechanics, giving fundamental significance to "classical instrument," considering that instruments can measure without any participation of observer.

Thus, task set by G. I. Naan is not solved satisfactorily.

Principle of relativity is not main content of relativity theory. Position on invariance of physical laws from choice of inertial reference system relative to which these laws are formulated is only a premise for establishing geometric connection of space and time, constituting main content of theory.

To idealist leads not mixing physical and philosophical concepts of relativity, as G. I. Naan asserts, but excessive exaggeration of role of relativity principle in physical theory and its unlawful absolutization. Restructuring and further development of relativity theory, or better to say, four-dimensional theory of space-time, must be based on materialist ideas about space, laid down by Lobachevsky and expanded by Minkowski onto space-time manifold.

16. A NEW BOOK ON LOGIC FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
M. N. ALEKSEEV

The resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) "On the Teaching of Logic and Psychology in Secondary Schools," published in 1946, obligated the Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR and the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR to publish a logic textbook for higher education in 1947.

At the end of 1946, "Logic" by M. S. Strogovich appeared, and in 1947—"Logic" by V. F. Asmus.

Discussions of these books in various places and at various times showed that not one of them fully satisfies the requirements of our school. As noted in published reviews, these books contain, in addition to factual errors, serious methodological shortcomings, direct idealistic and metaphysical distortions in the interpretation of a number of fundamental questions of logic.

However, over the course of subsequent years up to 1951, not a single book on logic was published that could serve as a textbook for teachers and students of higher educational institutions.

With all the greater interest, logic teachers greeted the "Logic" by K. Bakradze published in 1951[371] in the hope that, perhaps,

[371] K. Bakradze. Logic. Editor — S. Tsereteli. 455 pp. Ed. Tbilisi State University named after I. V. Stalin. Tbilisi. 1951.

this book would not contain those serious errors that were inherent in previously released books on logic.

In K. Bakradze's book, the following questions are considered: logic, its subject and tasks; the doctrine of the concept; the theory of judgment; the theory of inference; the doctrine of traditional logic on syllogistic inferences; the theory of deductive inferences; the doctrine of induction; analogy and hypothesis; laws of thought; the doctrine of proof.

The content of the book testifies that its author is well erudite in questions of logic, knows its problems, and knows how to reveal weak spots in existing logical views and theories. One can judge this if only by how subtly and thoroughly the author exposes the shortcomings and contradictions in the theory of deductive inferences currently widespread among logicians.

In K. Bakradze's book, one can find material that in existing textbooks on logic either finds no place at all or, if it does, does not receive sufficiently full coverage. This is material on the critique of bourgeois theories of logic, giving an idealistic interpretation of forms and laws of thought, on the question of the nature of judgment and its structure, on the logical views of Karinsky and Rutkovsky, etc.

K. Bakradze's book has a philosophical introduction devoted to questions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge. There is no need to prove how necessary such an introduction is in a logic textbook intended for universities.

However, equipping a course with interesting factual material and presenting an introduction to this course in a philosophical vein—this does not mean doing everything necessary to create

a full-fledged logic textbook. The main thing is to give the factual material the correct illumination, to outline in the philosophical introduction the correct line and carry it through the entire book from beginning to end. For it may turn out that the factual material itself is good, the book has a philosophical introduction, but this introduction itself is incorrect, and the illumination of the factual material will be incorrect. So it partially turned out in K. Bakradze's book.

Already on the first pages of his work, K. Bakradze declares that formal logic is a philosophical science, moreover, to the same degree philosophical as dialectics is.

Declaring formal logic without any reservations in the section "Philosophical Sciences" leads the author to include it in Marxist philosophy, and consequently, in Marxism (because we do not recognize any other philosophy besides Marxist philosophy). And this, in turn, leads, as will be shown below, to serious methodological errors.

K. Bakradze in many places in his book tries to strictly demarcate the circle of questions dealt with by logic from the circle of questions dealt with by dialectics. He warns: "...one must not confuse these two sciences, one must not let logic solve problems facing dialectics, just as one must not let dialectics solve specific tasks of logic" (p. 3)[372].

But having unreservedly recognized logic as a philosophical science, having included it in Marxist-Leninist philosophy, K. Bakradze in fact identified it with dialectics.

[372] Parentheses indicate the pages of the reviewed book.

"Formulated above, the problem (the problem of the relation between logic and dialectics—*M. A.*) solves the subject of logic: it constitutes one side, one aspect of the broader subject of dialectics as a theory of knowledge. Therefore, logic as a science is a moment, a part of the theory of knowledge, i.e., dialectics" (p. 74). About the same is said on p. 86.

It should be noted that this confusion of logic and dialectics, the inclusion of formal logic into dialectics, occurs in the author not only in words, but also in deeds. Let us give a few examples.

On page 82, the author quotes the famous statement of I. V. Stalin on the force of logic in the speeches of V. I. Lenin[373]. How does he explain what the force of logic in Lenin's speeches is? It turns out that the force of formal consistency of thoughts, logic as the correct derivation from premises of conclusions, knowledge and observance by Lenin of elementary rules of inference.

Of course, Lenin never had violations of the rules of inference, just as there were no violations of other forms of thought. Lenin always observed the elementary rules of logic, his reasoning in this respect is a model for everyone. But this does not constitute the peculiarity of the force of logic in Lenin's speeches.

The force of logic in Lenin's speeches is the force of insightful, deep, dialectical analysis of reality, the force of taking into account all concrete conditions and vicissitudes of struggle.

[373] See I. V. Stalin. Coll. Works, Vol. 6, p. 55.

One cannot reduce the logic of Lenin to the observance of formal rules of inference. Whoever reduces the force of logic in Lenin's speeches to a simple sequence of thoughts in reasoning, to the agreement of one thought with another thought, accepts the logic of Luther.

And K. Bakradze embarked on this path because he confused logic and dialectics, trying to explain dialectics with formal logic.

Expounding the traditional classification of judgments by quantity, quality, relation, and modality, K. Bakradze inappropriately inserts into it the dialectical-materialist classification of judgments given by F. Engels (see "Dialectics of Nature"), thereby violating the system of this classification. In opposition to Engels, K. Bakradze declares all judgments of Engels's classification to be general.

"All these judgments," writes K. Bakradze, "which Engels formulates, are general judgments: 1) friction is a source of heat (singular judgment), 2) all mechanical motion is capable of turning into heat (particular judgment) and 3) any form of motion is capable of turning into any other form of motion (universal judgment)" (p. 215).

Considering the law of contradiction, the author, alongside the correct formulation of this law, also gives an incorrect formulation. He writes:

"The law of contradiction can be formulated as follows: in the process of reasoning one must not contradict reality" (p. 421).

But what does such an evaluation of the essence of the law of contradiction mean? To understand the law of contradiction in this way means to place it at the basis of the theory of reflection. In this formulation, the law of contradiction acts not as a law of the connection of thoughts (although reflecting reality), as it is primarily and considered in formal logic, but as a law of cognition, reflecting the properties of objective reality. Consequently, in K. Bakradze's work, this law is dialecticized, placed at the basis of the theory of reflection, the theory of knowledge, dialectics.

The same happens with the law of the excluded middle. The law of the excluded middle K. Bakradze extends to those cases where a choice between the alternatives "either-or" is given (p. 426), not taking into account that the examples he cites, taken from the works of classical Marxism, cannot be subsumed under the formal-logical law of the excluded middle.

In all the cited examples, K. Bakradze substitutes dialectics with formal logic, subjects dialectics to formal logic. He attempts to explain the results achieved by dialectical logic through the means of formal logic.

It is clear that such confusion leads to the distortion of correct propositions defining the laws of logic, forces the author to contradict himself, and confuses the reader. It is difficult for the reader to understand what judgments are: "friction is a source of heat," "all mechanical motion is capable of turning into heat," "any form of motion [is capable] of turning into any other form of motion"—general judgments, as the author classifies them in one place, or the first as singular, the second as particular, and the third as general, as he states in another

place. On this question, the book gives two directly opposite answers.

Further, K. Bakradze believes that Marxist dialectics is in no way logic. On page 5 he writes: "Logic has its own problems, its own tasks; no other science can solve them; dialectics does not solve them either".

But what are these problems, what domain do they constitute? We learn about this on page 69, where the author, attempting to cite F. Engels, highlights that "domain which formal logic ignores. This domain is—thinking and its laws". Dialectical logic, says K. Bakradze, "is not the doctrine of forms and laws of correct, consistent thinking, but the general methodology of knowledge, the methodology of practical activity" (p. 79). Inference, with the help of which, according to the author, "the most valuable knowledge of reality is acquired" (p. 47), is completely excluded from the competence of dialectical logic.

Consequently, according to Bakradze, dialectical logic is not logic at all (meaning, of course, "logic" in the higher sense of the word), but only a method, a theory of knowledge.

Is it surprising after this that the author, in his understanding of materialist dialectics, departed from the basic principle of identity, the identity of logic, dialectics, and theory of knowledge?[374]

By metaphysically absolutizing formal logic, K. Bakradze passes it off as the only science of the laws and forms of thought.

[374] See V. I. Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks, p. 215. Gospolitizdat. 1947.

The metaphysical exaggeration of the importance of formal logic is also reflected in the author's work in that he removes from it the elementary doctrine of forms and laws of thought into a reliable tool that guarantees against reactionary philosophical views and trends.

"Logic," writes K. Bakradze, "is a reliable weapon against sophistry, casuistry, mysticism, and irrationalism" (p. 91).

There is no need to prove how incorrect such an exaggeration of the significance of formal logic is. Formal logic, necessary, indispensable, is far from sufficient to fight against sophistry, irrationalism. Formal logic alone cannot destroy irrationalism. To declare formal logic a reliable, sufficient weapon of struggle against these reactionary philosophical trends means to underappreciate that reliable weapon which dialectical materialism is.

Unconsciously exaggerating the role and significance of formal logic, the author goes so far as to begin to subject dialectics to it.

Here is what he writes on page 76:

"Dialectics reigns supreme everywhere: lower and simpler relations and complex relations between things and phenomena are subject to it. But cognition cannot accomplish its (i.e. dialectical—*M. A.*) subordination to the laws of logic. This is not simply a given position, that all thinking, including dialectical thinking, must observe the rules of formal logic. K. Bakradze asserts another: objective dialectics, reigning supreme everywhere, should, in his opinion, in the field of cognition submit (!) to the principles of formal logic.

K. Bakradze in general terms writes about the organic connection between truth and correctness; however, in his book he actually excludes from logic the question of truth. This is all the stranger since K. Bakradze himself considers logic a philosophical science. Thereby, K. Bakradze tears correctness away from truth.

It is also necessary to note another detail characterizing how the author uses statements of the classics of Marxism-Leninism to substantiate his incorrect assertions.

K. Bakradze repeatedly quotes the following position of Engels:

"If our premises are correct and if we apply the laws of thought correctly to them, the result must correspond to reality..."[375].

But K. Bakradze each time cuts off this quote and does not cite the following words of F. Engels, directed against the absolutization of the rules of formal logic.

"But, unfortunately," writes F. Engels further, "this almost never happens, or happens only in very simple actions"[376].

These concluding words of F. Engels K. Bakradze silently passes over, because they reveal the narrowness of formal logic.

An incorrect solution to the question of the relationship between logic and dialectics, the denial of dialectical truth as

---

[375] F. Engels. Anti-Dühring. From preparatory notes for "Anti-Dühring", p. 317. Gospolitizdat. 1950.

[376] Ibid.

the truth of cognition, the reduction of the problem of logical correctness to mere formal correctness led K. Bakradze to the conclusion that logic can be considered only as the science that studies formal correctness.

Departure from materialism in K. Bakradze's book is also manifested in the interpretation of formal-logical laws. Explaining the essence of formal-logical laws, K. Bakradze emphasizes reader attention not on what connects them with the laws of being, as every materialist should do, and on what distinguishes them, moreover, he does not see this distinction where it actually exists. At the beginning of the book, K. Bakradze poses the question: "...what do the so-called laws of thought represent: are they the same laws as the laws of a certain field of reality, or the laws of reality itself?" (pp. 6–7).

At the end of the book, an answer to this question is given.

"...the specific nature of thinking," writes K. Bakradze, "as a peculiar quality compared to nature and society, indicates the specific regularity of thinking; therefore, one cannot identify the laws of objective reality with the laws of logical thinking" (p. 413).

If the author saw the specific nature of thinking in that it is ideal, as distinct from material reality, then there would be no arguing with him. However, the author understands this specific nature differently: namely, as the fundamental difference of logical thinking from the laws of being. In K. Bakradze's understanding, rational identity, non-contradiction, excluded middle, sufficient reason act only in the sphere of thinking and do not act at all in the sphere of nature; these

specific traits of human thinking. It turns out that, for example, concepts are, as logic teaches, definite, concepts are translated into identity, then reflected in these concepts things are not definite, but dissolved in some unknown flow of processes.

It is well known that, according to the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, the laws of thought, in essence, do not differ from the laws of being, but only take another form of existence.

"Over our whole theoretical thinking," writes F. Engels, "reigns with absolute power the fact that our subjective thinking and the objective world are subject to one and the same laws and that therefore they cannot contradict each other in their results, but must agree with each other"[377].

K. Bakradze not only adheres to an incorrect view of the essence of the laws of thought, he accuses all those who do not agree with this view of metaphysics.

"...The laws of thought," he writes, "and therefore the law of identity, are not laws of nature and society; to identify the logical law of identity with the laws of things and phenomena means to stand on a metaphysical point of view" (p. 418).

Of course, one cannot identify the logical form of manifestation of the "law of identity" with the form of its manifestation in the objective world, one cannot identify the thought of a thing with the thing itself. However, K. Bakradze says something else: he wants to erase the fundamental

[377] F. Engels. Anti-Dühring. Notes to "Anti-Dühring", p. 349. Gospolitizdat. 1950.

difference of logical law as an identity from the moment of identity existing in objective things. Apparently, the author forgets that metaphysics in the exposition of the laws of thought stems not from recognizing them as a reflection of the laws of being, but from completely correct speaking on other pages of the book, but from absolutizing these laws (taking them within the bounds of human thinking), from transforming them into universal and sole laws.

Such methodological errors of the reviewer's book testify to the fact that its author in explaining the basic problems of logic departs from the principles of dialectical materialism.

In "Logic" by K. Bakradze there are other mistakes.

The author insufficiently fully reveals the significance of the works of I. V. Stalin "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics" for logic. It is not shown, for example, what significance for defining the subject of logic has the definition of grammar given by I. V. Stalin. Giving a critique of the theory of knowledge of representatives of pre-Marxist materialism (mainly chapter 1), the author does not use the works of Russian revolutionary democrats, who, in contrast to other materialists, approached close to dialectical materialism in this question.

K. Bakradze's book is not free from objectivism. Criticizing philosophical trends hostile to us (chapter 1), the author does not always show their class, socio-political essence.

In the exposition of concrete questions of logic, the author insufficiently reveals the cognitive significance of individual forms, rules, and laws of thought. In the book, there is much

material that has not, in our view, practical and scientific-theoretical significance (for example, special rules of the fourth figure of the syllogism, antilogism, etc.). At the same time, very important questions of logic were not given sufficient coverage in the book (for example, categories), while others (definition, analogy, hypothesis) received coverage clearly insufficient.

Serious objections are raised by the very questionable and insufficiently argumented attempt by the author to classify deductive inferences, in which a quite essential distinction existing between deductive and traductive... is actually erased.

inferences. The author solves the problem of deductive inferences verbally, by means of an extended use of the term "deduction".

In K. Bakradze's book, there are many incorrect assertions, inaccurate formulations and definitions. Here are some of them.

On page 99, an essentially Hegelian interpretation of the relationship of concept and judgment is given: "judgments create concepts and concepts create judgments". On page 104, an incorrect thought is expressed, as if "in everyday life people mostly use not concepts, but representations". On page 128, the author erroneously speaks of some similarity between the conceptualist theory of general concepts and the Marxist-Leninist theory. On pages 405–406, the author for some reason asserts that Marx created only a hypothesis about the essence of capitalist society, which only later was proven by history. K. Bakradze does not take into account the directive of V. I. Lenin

that "now—since the appearance of 'Capital'—the materialist conception of history is no longer a hypothesis, but a scientifically proven proposition..."[378]

The book by K. Bakradze is not free from contradictions, testifying that the author lacks full clarity in understanding individual questions of a principled character. For example, on page 60, it is said that thinking "has no own, independent, objective world-independent regularity," while on page 413 something directly opposite is asserted: "the specific nature of thinking, as its peculiar quality compared to nature and society, indicates a peculiar regularity of thinking..." On page 154, the author rightly criticizes the idealistic view, according to which the predicate of judgment is expressed relatively to the subject of judgment, while on page 159 he himself expresses this erroneous view, contradicting what he said a few pages earlier: "In an affirmative judgment, the predicate is affirmed relatively to the subject; in a negative judgment, the predicate is denied relatively to the subject."

"Logic" by K. Bakradze, due to the serious methodological errors present in it, cannot be considered a book that satisfies the requirements of our higher school.

[378] V. I. Lenin. Coll. Works, Vol. 1, p. 125.

17. ON THE NEW EDITION OF THE SHORT PHILISOPHICAL DICTIONARY[379]

I. D. ANDREEV, V. I. GAZENKO, M. I. IMSHENIN (Ivanovo), V. P. ROZHIN, M. N. RUTKEVICH (Sverdlovsk), P. V. TAVANETS

The third edition of the *Short Philosophical Dictionary* has been published. The need for such a publication is huge. The first two editions of this book (1940 and 1941), which until recently the reader had to use, were in many respects outdated.

Compared to the previous second edition, the dictionary has undergone major changes. Its volume has grown almost twofold and exceeded thirty printed sheets; the circulation reached half a million. Thus, the new edition of the dictionary to a certain extent satisfies the need for a reference manual, the acute shortage of which is felt by all teachers and students of the philosophy of Marxism.

The third edition of the *Short Philosophical Dictionary*, published in 1951, compares favorably with the previous ones both in format and content. It fills many gaps of previous editions and gives a deeper coverage of the fundamental questions of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

---

[379] *Short Philosophical Dictionary*. Under the editorship of M. Rosenthal and P. Yudin. Third edition, revised and expanded. 614 pp. Circulation 500,000 copies. Price 16 rubles. Gospolitizdat. 1951. (Page references for the reviewed book are given in the text. — *Ed.*)

Before the editor and authors of the reviewed dictionary stood a complex and responsible task. They had to briefly cover the main content of the philosophical works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, give an explanation of the main philosophical concepts and categories, briefly characterize the views of the most prominent representatives of philosophical thought, and show the reactionary essence of various trends in modern bourgeois philosophy. Moreover, all this was to be done with full scientific conscientiousness, involving concrete facts from modern science and practice, in the spirit of militant Bolshevik partisanship.

The editors M. Rosenthal and P. Yudin succeeded in doing much in this direction. They undoubtedly carried out serious work to eliminate those errors and shortcomings that were made in the first two editions of the dictionary. For the new edition, almost all articles were rewritten, with few exceptions, revised, and expanded; many new articles were included that were not in the previous editions.

The revision of the dictionary was caused by the fact that the compilers strove to reflect in it the world-historical victories of the Soviet people and the entire camp of socialism and democracy over the last decade, the further development of Marxism in these years in the works of I. V. Stalin *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, as well as the decisions and directives of the CC AUCP(b) on ideological issues, and to show the achievements of advanced Soviet science.

In the new edition of the dictionary, the problems of the history of Marxist philosophy are covered much more fully, the

content of the philosophical works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, which are the main landmarks in the development of dialectical and historical materialism, is explained more broadly and deeply, although it cannot be recognized that all articles devoted to the works of the classics of Marxism were written at the proper theoretical level.

The articles "Base and Superstructure," "Language," "Transition of Quantitative Changes into Qualitative," and a number of others were written anew in the light of the ideas contained in the work of I. V. Stalin *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*. However, even these works are far from being fully taken into account by the authors of the articles in covering certain philosophical questions.

The dictionary includes many new articles explaining philosophical and political concepts: "people's democracy," "national question," "nation," "language," "patriotism," "criticism and self-criticism," etc.

Significantly expanded and clarified is the explanation of such concepts and categories as "determinism," "indeterminism," "causality," "race," "bourgeois objectivism," "cosmopolitanism," and others.

An essential virtue of the new edition of the dictionary is also that it presents many data from the field of natural sciences, explains the philosophical significance of the scientific discoveries of the genial Soviet scientists I. P. Pavlov and I. V. Michurin, reaffirming the inviolability of the main tenets of Marxist philosophical materialism and the Marxist dialectical method.

The disclosure of philosophical categories and concepts is given on examples from the field of natural science and social life taken from Soviet advanced science and the practice of socialist construction in our country. Thus, when explaining the word "atom," the history of atomism is briefly outlined and it is explained what an outstanding contribution to the study of the atom was made by great Russian scientists Lomonosov, Butlerov, Mendeleev, and what Soviet scientists are doing in this field of science.

In accordance with the assessment given by the CC AUCP(b) in 1944 to Volume III of *History of Philosophy*, the editors and authors of the dictionary seriously revised and expanded the articles on questions of the history of philosophy. Errors in the assessment of Hegelian philosophy and on the question of the origin of Marxism were corrected. Compared to the past, the history of philosophical thought of the Russian people, the peoples of the USSR, and the countries of people's democracy is illuminated better. Greater attention, though still insufficient, is paid to the development of philosophy in China, India, and other countries of the East.

As an important positive moment, it should be noted that the new edition of the dictionary includes a large number of articles exposing modern bourgeois idealistic philosophy, which is a tool of imperialist warmongers. Significantly more space than in the first editions is given to exposing the reactionary essence of modern pseudo-scientific, idealistic theories propagated by diplomaed lackeys of Anglo-American imperialism.

On the whole, the third edition of the dictionary should be considered, in essence, as a new collective work of Soviet philosophers, as a useful manual helping to master the philosophy of dialectical materialism. Most articles in the dictionary are written creatively, at a high ideological-theoretical level. Complex philosophical problems are set out in them in accessible form for a wide range of readers.

However, the reviewed book is not free from significant flaws and shortcomings, partly "inherited" from previous editions of the dictionary and not fully overcome, partly arising in the process of preparing the book.

The composition of the *Short Philosophical Dictionary* was insufficiently thought through, as a result of which the dictionary lacks articles on certain important questions of Marxist philosophy and lacks explanations of certain philosophical concepts found in the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

It causes surprise that the dictionary lacks the articles "Imperialism," "Narodnichestvo," "General Crisis of Capitalism," etc.

The dictionary omits a number of concepts that have a direct relation to philosophy and are found in Lenin's work *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*: "apodictic," "definition," "doctrine," "coordination," "obscurantism," "cognition," "cognizability of the world," "psychophysical parallelism," "consciousness," "substratum," "theory of symbols," "economy of thought," "energy," etc.

In the reviewed dictionary we will not find explanations of the concepts "demiurge," "critical point," "method," "world soul," found in the work of I. V. Stalin *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*.

Especially noticeable are gaps in the coverage of the history of philosophy. The dictionary lacks articles about such philosophers of the past as Parmenides, Pythagoras, Protagoras, Montaigne, etc. Little space is dedicated to outstanding thinkers of Eastern countries.

It should be recognized as completely inadmissible that the dictionary contains no articles about leading contemporary thinkers. There is no special article on Mao Zedong; missing are articles about modern progressive philosophers of France, England, Italy, Germany, USA, and other countries, while modern ideologies of imperialism are represented in the dictionary quite broadly.

Significant shortcomings exist also in the exposition of individual important questions of Marxist philosophy. In some articles, devoted to philosophical works of classics of Marxism-Leninism, the content of these works and their significance for science and revolutionary practice are still insufficiently deeply disclosed.

The article *Anti-Dühring* cannot satisfy readers; the theoretical significance of this classic work of F. Engels is disclosed weakly. On Engels's development of materialist dialectics in the article, literally the following is said: "Chapters XII and XIII are devoted to the presentation of the laws of materialist dialectics" (p. 16).

In the article "*Materialism and Empirio-criticism*" the authors insufficiently disclosed the significance of this genial work for exposing modern Machism and other trends of bourgeois idealistic philosophy of the era of imperialism. Presenting chapter by chapter the content of Lenin's book, the authors do not write about Lenin's development of the problem of truth and the Marxist understanding of the criterion of truth in Chapter II, the question of partisanship in philosophy in Chapter VI, where Lenin's formulation of the question of partisanship in philosophy relates exclusively to the "Conclusion".

In the article devoted to Stalin's work *On the Foundations of Leninism*, the authors, outlining the content of the third chapter of this work ("Theory"), say nothing about the Leninist theory of the proletarian revolution, generalized and developed by I. V. Stalin.

In the article on the work of I. V. Stalin *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, a too brief characterization of this classic work is given. It causes surprise why in this article there are no references to the articles "Marxist Dialectical Method," "Marxist Philosophical Materialism," "Conditions of Material Life of Society," which, in essence, are devoted to this same work of I. V. Stalin.

In the article there are imprecise formulations. On the third feature of production, the authors write: "New productive forces and production relations arise not separately from the old order, but in the depths of the old order, arise not as a result of deliberate, conscious activity, but spontaneously, unconsciously, independently of the will of people" (p. 355) —

and on this finish the presentation of the question. No wonder with such a "truncated" presentation the essence of the matter is distorted, since the feature of production under consideration speaks not only of the spontaneous and evolutionary development of production, but also of the conscious revolutionary activity of the masses, without which the old mode of production cannot be replaced by a new mode of production.

Weakly disclosed is the content of the genial work of I. V. Stalin *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*. As is known, characterizing the difference of language from superstructure, I. V. Stalin points to four main features distinguishing superstructure from other social phenomena, including language. However, in the article of the dictionary, when characterizing the superstructure, three are arbitrarily given, and when characterizing the difference of language from superstructure — only two features out of four, indicated by I. V. Stalin (cf. pp. 254–255). The significance of this work of I. V. Stalin for the development of Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the national question is not illuminated. I. V. Stalin's position that dialectical materialism is the product of the development of sciences, including philosophy, for the preceding period, received no coverage in the dictionary.

It is necessary to note a serious flaw in the new edition of the dictionary: the absence of a special article devoted to the work of I. V. Stalin *The National Question and Leninism*.

The overwhelming majority of articles on questions of historical materialism, published in the *Short Philosophical Dictionary*, are written at a high ideological-theoretical level.

The authors of these articles relied on the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. In the articles, the role of Lenin and Stalin in the development of historical materialism is shown and to a significant extent the latest achievements in building communist society in the USSR, as well as socialist construction in the countries of people's democracy, are taken into account.

The article "Base and Superstructure" as a whole correctly explains the essence of these categories of historical materialism. However, the author of the article does not show concretely what new was introduced by V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin into the development of the question of the relationship between base and superstructure. In other articles touching upon this question, the authors give imprecise formulations, not explaining, as should be done in the light of the work of I. V. Stalin *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, the relationship between social being and base. On p. 343 we read: "Social being — the economic structure of society — is primary, determining social consciousness..." And on p. 258 it is stated: "Marx proved that the economic structure, material conditions of production, and not ideas are the basis on which rises the political and ideological superstructure..." These formulations are given without explanation that the economic structure of society is the totality of production relations. The absence of such a clarifying formulation can engender in the reader an incorrect representation, as if the concepts "economic structure of society," "social being," and "material conditions of production" coincide. But, as is known, the concept "being" is included in the concept "social being" and "conditions of

material life of society," but base is not equivalent to these broader phenomena of social being.

In the article it is insufficiently emphasized the reactionary role of the bourgeois superstructure today; it is not explained that the capitalist structure is supported by the entire sum of political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical views of bourgeois society and corresponding institutions.

In the reviewed book, errors were made in characterizing the role of social consciousness in the development of pre-socialist society. In socialist society, we read in the dictionary, leaps "can be the result only of non-spontaneous development" (p. 265); "in the old structure no one prepared leaps spontaneously, no one prepared them consciously" (p. 382). It turns out that in pre-socialist society (and consequently, in the period of bourgeois revolutions and even in the period of proletarian revolution) advanced ideas and political institutions allegedly played no role in revolutions! This is a clear error, going along the line of underestimating the subjective factor in revolution, which is also noted in the inaccuracy in the presentation of the third feature of production.

It cannot be recognized as correct that the authors did not show significant differences between the concepts "contradiction," "opposite," "difference" applicable to social phenomena. Indicating that "non-antagonistic contradictions... are overcome through erasing contradictions," the authors do not emphasize that this "erasing" is the result of the struggle of the new with the old.

Significant shortcomings exist also in those articles of the dictionary in which the elimination of opposites between city and country, between mental and physical labor is discussed (pp. 193, 261, 414, 418, 475–476, etc.). With the construction of socialism these opposites were eliminated in the USSR. As for existing significant differences between city and country, between mental and physical labor, they are successfully overcome in the course of communist construction, in the process of the struggle of the new with the old.

In the article "Communist Education of Working People," the process of forming the new spiritual profile of the Soviet person is correctly reflected, and the enormous role of the party and the Soviet state in creating communist culture is emphasized; the greatest importance of propagating the Marxist-Leninist worldview, arming Soviet people with knowledge of laws of social development, laws of building communist society, is underlined. However, in the article it is not explained why among a certain part of Soviet people there still takes place a known lag of consciousness from social being. In the article it was necessary to point out the reactionary role of capitalist encirclement, striving in every way to retard the growth of socialist consciousness of Soviet people.

The question of driving forces of development of Soviet society did not find proper coverage in the dictionary. On friendship of peoples, moral-political unity of Soviet society in the dictionary, in essence, nothing is said, and about Soviet patriotism it is said explicitly insufficiently. Weakly covered is the question of the necessity of the new, progressive.

The reader cannot but be dissatisfied also by the too brief presentation of the theory of scientific communism in the philosophical dictionary.

An essential shortcoming of the dictionary is also that in it the class struggle in capitalist countries at the present stage is weakly shown, the sharpening of class struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie and the growth of the leading influence of communist parties in the struggle of working masses against imperialist slavery are not shown.

The growth of the communist movement is an objective law of social development, and no forces can abolish this objective law of development of society in our era. However madly imperialists rage, whatever measures they take to eliminate this objective law, they will not succeed. The communist movement grows and will grow. This is conditioned by the whole course of development of capitalist society, doomed to perish, by the growth of contradictions devouring this society.

In covering a number of questions of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in certain articles of the dictionary, important directives of the classics of Marxism-Leninism are not used, and important sides of considered problems are unreasonably hushed up. In connection with this, in the dictionary there are quite a few non-exact formulations and vague definitions. Let us give examples.

In defining historical materialism, the authors depart from the Stalinist definition given in the work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* (cf. p. 161).

In the article "History of Philosophy as Science," the continuity in the development of philosophy of Marxism is not shown.

In explaining the concept "idealism," the dictionary sets out at length the whole pedigree of idealism, but fails to give a sharp and deep characterization, given by Marx to idealism.

"All idealists, — writes Marx, — both philosophical and religious, old and new, believe in inspirations, revelations, saviors, miracle workers, and only on the degree of their education depends whether this faith takes a crude, religious form or a transparent, philosophical one..." [380]

In the article "Criticism and Self-Criticism" there is no indication of I. V. Stalin that no science can develop without struggle of opinions, without freedom of criticism.

In the article "Feudalism" the authors depart from the Stalinist characterization of the feudal mode of production given in the work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, asserting that the feudal structure was based on "extra-economic coercion" (p. 545). In reality, the basis of the feudal structure is the ownership of the feudal lord in land and other means of production.

In the article "Social Revolution" the question of bourgeois-democratic revolution as a special form of bourgeois, anti-feudal revolution is not considered.

---

[380] K. Marx and F. Engels. *The German Ideology*, p. 532. 1933.

In the article "Sociology," when characterizing Marxist sociology, no mention is made of I. V. Stalin's indication of sociological laws having relation to all phases of social development.

In the article "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," it is stated that during the period of socialist construction peaceful, organizational-educational, cultural work comes first, which "does not exclude the violent side (in view of capitalist encirclement)" (p. 120). Meanwhile, it is wrong to link the violent side of the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of socialist construction, when exploiting classes were not yet eliminated, only with capitalist encirclement.

In the article "Culture," productive forces are categorized entirely as human culture, and thus material culture includes its creators — people.

The basis of socialist morality is not the socialist principle of distribution, as asserted on p. 306, but as a whole the economic base of socialist society.

Socialist society has as its basis not a planned management of the economy, as stated on p. 332, but a socialist mode of production of material goods and objective economic laws of its development.

The overwhelming majority of articles devoted to explaining the most important concepts and categories of dialectical materialism are written at a sufficiently high theoretical level, taking into account the latest achievements of science and advanced practice.

Along with this, it should be noted that certain articles on dialectical materialism also contain errors and suffer from serious shortcomings. Thus, for example, in the article "Dialectics," only the history of the development of dialectics is set out, and that mainly of the pre-Marxist period. In it a detailed characterization of spontaneous dialectics in ancient Greek philosophy, elements of dialectics in the philosophy of Descartes, Spinoza, Diderot, and Hegelian dialectics is given, and the struggle of classics of Russian philosophy of the 19th century (Belinsky, Herzen, Chernyshevsky) for the materialist revision of Hegelian dialectical method is covered in detail (p. 113). However, the essence of Marxist-Leninist dialectics is set out in a few lines.

In the article, the essence of the revolutionary turn in philosophy, accomplished by Marx and Engels, the creators of materialist dialectics, is weakly disclosed, and the greatest merits of Lenin and Stalin in the creative development of the Marxist dialectical method are not covered at all. True, this gap in the article "Dialectics" is partly filled in the article "Marxist Dialectical Method," but in this article too, the decisive importance of the Marxist dialectical method for genuinely scientific substantiation and creative development of philosophical materialism, for creating the theory of scientific communism and working out tactical foundations of revolutionary struggle of the working class is insufficiently shown.

In the article "Dialectics" it was necessary to disclose all sides of Marxist dialectics in the light of the works of classics of Marxism-Leninism and show that "dialectics grew up in

struggle with metaphysics, and in this struggle it won glory for itself" (Stalin). It was necessary also to show that the significance of the Marxist dialectical method grows even more in the era of imperialism, when all contradictions of capitalist society sharpen to the limit and the period of stormy social conflicts arrives. Only possessing Marx's dialectical method can one understand the exceptionally complex and contradictory modern situation, correctly assess the sense of unfolding social events, foresee the course of development of events in the future and actively influence the process of social development, contributing to progress.

Only on the basis of the Marxist dialectical method and materialist theory can a true philosophical generalization of scientific achievements be given, complex theoretical positions advanced by scientific thought understood, and idealistic interpretations of new discoveries exposed.

Attempts of idealists to use difficulties in the development of science for struggle against materialism, for propaganda of their anti-scientific views, acquired in the era of imperialism an especially brazen and persistent character.

That is why Lenin and Stalin, defending and strengthening the revolutionary party of the working class, applied enormous efforts to defend against enemies of Marxism the dialectical method, enrich and develop it further on the basis of new achievements of science and revolutionary practice.

All these questions received no coverage in the articles "Dialectics" and "Marxist Dialectical Method".

It is incomprehensible why in the article "Marxist Philosophical Materialism" (as well as in the article "Theory and Practice"), speaking of the significance of Marxist philosophical materialism for the practical activity of the party of the proletariat, the authors do not cite Stalin's formula on the unity of theory and practice as a guiding star for the party of the proletariat.

Nor can one recognize as successful the coverage in the dictionary of questions of Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge. The arrangement of material in the dictionary is such that the reader far from immediately finds the answer to the question of interest. Strange as it may seem, the dictionary lacks special articles: "Cognizability of the World and Its Laws," "Process of Cognition" or "Cognition," "Consciousness". All main data on the question of cognizability of the world are given in the article "Theory of Reflection," but this article is not free from confusion.

In the second edition of the dictionary (1941), the famous Leninist formula on the path of cognition: "From living perception to abstract thought and from it to practice — such is the dialectical path of cognition of truth, of cognition of objective reality" [381] — was interpreted by the authors as speaking of three stages of cognition, with the third stage of cognition called practice. But Lenin in the above-cited formula nowhere speaks of practice as a stage of cognition. Indeed, can one consider practice, the material activity of people, only as

[381] V. I. Lenin. *Philosophical Notebooks*, pp. 146–147. Gospolitizdat. 1947.

some part, an element of that complex spiritual activity of people which we call cognition?

As Lenin indicated, practice is above theoretical cognition [382]. Consequently, it cannot be considered as a stage of cognition. Even more incorrect is to consider practice as the third stage of cognition, i.e., to assert that the role of practice is revealed only in the process of cognition and only as a criterion of truth. In reality, practice is not only the criterion of truth, but also the source of development of knowledge, the basis of the whole process of cognition both at the stage of living perception and at the stage of abstract thinking.

At first glance, the impression is created that this error in the last edition of the dictionary was corrected. On p. 521 sensory and logical cognition are correctly indicated as two main stages of cognition, while practice is considered as "the basis of the whole process of cognition and of each of its stages," as "the highest criterion of the truth of acquired knowledge". But following this on the same page we read: "Practical verification of our knowledge is the highest stage of the process of cognition". Thus, the authors returned to the position that practice is a stage, and moreover the highest (third) stage, of the process of cognition, i.e., to the repetition of an old error.

In the articles of the dictionary devoted to problems of dialectical materialism, there are instances of repetition that could be avoided with a different layout of material.

---

[382] See ibid., p. 185.

Characterizing the law of dialectics on the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones are the articles: "Quality," "Quantity," "Measure," "Leap," "Negation of Negation," "Evolution and Revolution," "Transition of Quantitative Changes into Qualitative".

Would it make sense to combine some of these articles to avoid repetitions? The categories of quality and quantity (as well as the category of measure, which in the dictionary is explained separately) should be considered together, similarly to mutually related categories of dialectics: content and form, necessity and chance, etc. A leap is the transition from old quality to new quality, and therefore in the explanation of this word references to the article "Transition of Quantitative Changes into Qualitative" should have been given.

"Negation of negation," as is known, is a term of Hegelian philosophy. The classics of Marxism-Leninism revealed the "rational kernel" of the Hegelian law of "negation of negation," and this obliged the authors to place the corresponding article in the dictionary. However, the authors of the article correctly noting that "negation of negation" characterizes certain sides of the progressive development of nature and society, do not show how "negation of negation" is treated by Engels and Lenin. "Development, as if repeating already passed stages, but repeating them differently, on a higher basis ('negation of negation'), development, so to speak, in spirals, and not in a straight line..." [1] — thus characterizes V. I. Lenin one of the core features of Marxist dialectics. In this article it is not shown that "negation of negation" should be understood as a repetition of passed stages at a higher level of development.

The dictionary asserts that Marxist materialism opened specific laws of each form of motion of matter (cf. p. 265). Such an assertion is to some extent a return to natural philosophy. The task of researching specific forms of motion of matter is the business of concrete sciences, natural and social.

It causes bewilderment that in some articles of the *Short Philosophical Dictionary*, genial tenets advanced by I. V. Stalin in his work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* on the transition of quantitative changes into radical, qualitative ones through the gradual extinction of elements of the old quality and gradual accumulation of elements of the new quality received no reflection. This position, which is a further development of Marxism, as well as genial ideas of I. V. Stalin on the enormous significance of scientific abstraction, are completely undisclosed in such articles of the dictionary as "Quantity," "Quality," "Scientific Abstraction," etc.

Bypassed by the authors were questions on the relationship of such concepts as leap, transition from old quality to new, explosion, revolution. It is not explained whether the forms of transition from old quality to new quality indicated by I. V. Stalin take place, namely: the path of gradual extinction of elements of the old quality and gradual accumulation of elements of the new quality, and by way of explosion in natural phenomena.

Completely wrong is the gradual transition from socialism to communism characterized as a leap, for which the Soviet state under the leadership of the Communist Party with the active participation of the entire Soviet people only "prepares conditions" (p. 465), whereas this transition from socialism to

communism is already successfully being realized by the Soviet people.

On the whole, articles devoted to the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones create the impression of incompleteness and incomplete account of the most important directives on this question given in the work of I. V. Stalin *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*.

A serious omission is the fact that the dictionary lacks a clear and complete definition of such an important category of Marxist philosophy as practice. The article "Practice" is not in the dictionary, while in the article "Theory and Practice" a definition of practice is absent.

In this article nothing is said about the inseparable unity of theory and practice under conditions of Soviet socialist society and the huge role of practice in the development of science. The article does not reflect the struggle of Lenin and Stalin for the unity of theory and practice, and their role in substantiating and creatively developing this question is not shown. The author confined himself only to citing certain quotes from the work of I. V. Stalin, but in essence did not disclose them as appropriate.

In the articles "Sophistry" and "Eclecticism," incomplete definitions of these concepts are given, as Lenin's assessments of these methods of metaphysical thinking, given in the work of V. I. Lenin *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, were not placed at the basis of the presentation.

Inaccurate formulations and essential errors exist in those articles of the dictionary in which speech goes about truth.

Truth is defined as "correspondence of concept, idea with object" (p. 150). This definition is insufficiently precise, since it omits such a feature of truth as sensations, perceptions, and representations.

In the article "Law" it was necessary to show differences between laws of nature and society, on the one hand, and laws of science, which are more or less exact reflections of laws of objective world, on the other. It would follow to emphasize the objectivity of laws of nature and society, as well as laws of science, in contrast to laws issued by the state. Required are corrections in some articles of the dictionary in which transformation of objective economic laws is discussed (see, for example, p. 262).

There are erroneous formulations in articles devoted to natural science questions. On p. 241 of the reviewed book it is said: "A great scientific discovery of Lomonosov was the discovery (long before Lavoisier) and theoretical and experimental substantiation of the law of conservation of matter and motion".

From this text it can be understood that Lavoisier discovered the law of conservation of matter and motion. This is wrong. Lavoisier spoke only of the conservation of weight of matter, and not of matter and motion.

In the article "Weismannism-Morganism" it is not said concretely what harm was brought by this reactionary bourgeois theory to the development of natural science, the practice of socialist agriculture, the cause of training specialist cadres, etc.

In the article "Malthusianism" the vile role of modern neo-Malthusianism as a direct justification of the colonial policy of imperialists is not characterized.

In the article "Cell" it is asserted that Schleiden and Schwann are the founders of the theory of the cellular structure of the organism. However, the article omits to mention that Russian scientist Goryaninov and Czech scientist Purkyne established the foundations of this theory a few years before them. The article correctly shows the significance of the outstanding scientific discoveries of Soviet scientist O. B. Lepeshinskaya in the struggle against Virchowism. The discovery of cell formation from non-cellular living substance, which has no cellular structure, disproved Virchow's metaphysical assertion: "A cell only from a cell." But the article lacks a detailed critique of Virchowism.

In the article "Science" the Marxist proposition "Science is the enemy of contingencies" is neither provided nor explained.

On the whole, a serious shortcoming of the reviewed book is that the presented natural science material in many cases is given in isolation from philosophy (see, for example, the article "Atomic Nucleus").

What has been said applies also to certain articles on great figures of science. Articles on Butlerov, Williams, Dokuchaev, Severtsov could with equal success be placed both in a philosophical dictionary and in any other reference publication. The worldview of these scientists and the philosophical

significance of their works are covered in passing and not always correctly.

The article "Psychology" will hardly satisfy the reader. It gives no idea of the subject of this science, nor of its tasks at the present time. The definition of psychology as a science given in this article reflects the confusion that exists at the present time among psychologists on the question of the subject of psychology.

"Psychology, — it is said in the dictionary, — is the science of the psyche as a property of highly organized matter, consisting in reflecting objective reality in the mind of human (animals)" (p. 420). Further it is asserted that Soviet psychology is "the science of laws of formation of human psyche, purposeful education of people with a new moral-spiritual profile, active fighters for communism" (p. 422). These two definitions of psychology are not connected with each other.

There are in the dictionary significant errors in the treatment of questions of logic. In the article "Concept," it was either unnecessary to cite the position that concepts contain in themselves all the richness of the individual, single, for this position is given, or it was necessary to explain how to understand it. Otherwise it may create the impression that the authors stand on the incorrect point of view prevalent among some of our philosophers, as if concepts include all known features of individual objects, and not their essential features.

In the article "Judgment" there is no definition of judgment. Completely erroneously it is asserted that the predicate by means of copula reveals the content of the subject. In reality,

the predicate by means of copula reflects the content of connection of predicate with subject.

In the article "Inference," all the time judgments and inferences are confused. Thus, for example, the article states: "Logic examines such inferences as conditional and disjunctive" (p. 534) — and right after this, as an example of a conditional form of inference, the following conditional judgment from the work of Comrade Stalin *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* is given: "If the world is in continuous motion and development, if the dying of the old and the growth of the new is a law of development, then it is clear that there are no longer 'inviolable' social orders..." And further this judgment is interpreted again as an inference.

The authors give further an "example of a disjunctive form" and do not explain what is being discussed — a judgment or an inference: "Either fascism, or the rule of capitalists, or forward to democracy in deed, to decision by majority" (pp. 534–535). This is an example of a judgment. However, the authors interpret it again as an example of an inference.

The authors fail to distinguish immediate inference from mediate. As an example of immediate inference, they give the following example of mediate inference: "If we know that all chemical elements can change qualitatively, then from this directly follows that chemical element uranium is capable of qualitative transformations" (p. 533). The authors do not notice that they fall into a contradiction, for the example of mediate inference given by them right after this: "All unicellular reproduce by simple division; amoeba is unicellular, consequently, amoeba reproduces by simple division" — in no

way differs from the above-cited inference called by them immediate.

Imprecise is the assertion of the authors that a syllogism is an inference from general to particular. Under this definition fits only a conditional syllogism, and not the third figure of categorical syllogism. Maybe the authors have their own understanding of syllogism, distinct from the generally accepted? Then this should be stated in this article. Otherwise, such an unreserved assertion is perceived by the reader as an error of the authors.

In the coverage of the history of philosophy in the dictionary, serious gaps are made.

Rightly did the editors put a number of articles representing figures of advanced, progressive thought of Slavic countries. However, it should be noted that the compilers of the dictionary approached the selection of historical-philosophical material and the evaluation of scientific and philosophical views of philosophers and naturalists of the past insufficiently critically.

The Soviet reader demands a scientific, objective analysis of the views of thinkers of the past. Unfortunately, the dictionary contains serious shortcomings in this respect as well. Thus, in the dictionary "a known consistency" of views of morphologist A. N. Severtsov with "the main tenets of Michurinist biology" is noted. Meanwhile it is known that although A. N. Severtsov owns major services in developing problems of morphology, his school cannot be ranked among supporters of Michurinist biology.

In presenting the views of the outstanding French utopian socialist Fourier, it is completely undisclosed that he not only strove to reconcile his socialist views with a religious worldview, but tried to prove that his socialism stems from religious teaching.

A. A. Zhdanov in his speech at the philosophical discussion subjected to critique Academician G. F. Alexandrov for his errors in assessing philosophical, sociological, and political views of the past. In particular, A. A. Zhdanov stopped on the non-Marxist presentation by Academician G. F. Alexandrov of Fourier's views. In the dictionary, however, the old error is repeated, and not only in relation to Fourier, but also in relation to other thinkers of the past. In the article devoted to the outstanding French naturalist and biologist Lamarck, nothing is said about the errors committed by him in explaining the causes conditioning expediency of organic forms.

There are other errors in the coverage of questions of history and history of philosophy. In the periodization of the history of ancient philosophy, IV century BC for some reason fell out (pp. 18–19).

It is incomprehensible also why the materialist tradition in Chinese philosophy authors trace only from Wang Chong (i.e. 1st century AD), and not from earlier thinkers (p. 555).

From the text of the article "Slave-owning system," one can conclude that this system first became dominant in Greece and Rome, and not in the East (p. 423).

In the article "Gens and Gens Community," doubts are raised about the position: "Violence in the gens community was

absent" (p. 443). Special apparatus of violence in the form of a state indeed was absent then, but this does not mean that violence on the part of members of the community in relation to, for example, violators of its customs, was absent.

In certain articles about philosophers of the past, their most important works are not indicated (for example, in the article on Ogarev).

In the article "Plekhanov," much is said about Plekhanov's errors, but his error on the question of the origin of Marxism (his theory of "synthesis") is not mentioned.

The dictionary reveals negligence in editorial work. Many repetitions could easily be avoided with the help of references to other articles of the dictionary. For example, across 20 pages the views of the Miletian school in ancient Greek philosophy are set out three times (pp. 259, 277, 290), with almost coinciding expressions. In general, references to other articles of the dictionary are given arbitrarily: in some cases they exist, in others they are absent. It is incomprehensible why, for example, at the end of the article "Kant" there is no reference to the article "Neo-Kantianism."

For ease of using the dictionary, all terms and surnames covered in special articles are italicized. This good rule is applied in the philosophical dictionary insufficiently consistently.

The creation of a full-fledged philosophical dictionary is one of the important tasks facing Soviet philosophers. Despite the significant shortcomings, the reviewed dictionary, undoubtedly, is a step forward compared to previously

published editions and, unconditionally, will be a useful reference manual in studying dialectical and historical materialism. The need for such a manual is huge, and therefore one must wish the editors of the dictionary, Tms. M. Rosenthal and P. Yudin, without delay, to proceed with preparing for print a new edition of the dictionary based on all-round account of these numerous critical remarks expressed in discussions of the dictionary at university departments, in seminars of teachers of social sciences, and in research institutes.

18. FOR A SCIENTIFIC ILLUMINATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE ORGANS OF SOVIET STATE POWER BODIES
R. A. ZLOTNIKOV (Chernikovsk)

At the end of 1949, the All-Union Institute of Juridical Sciences issued a collective work "Outlines on the History of the Organs of Soviet State Power"[383]. This work represents the first attempt to set forth the history of the organs of Soviet state power and to summarize theoretically the richest experience in building the socialist state. The authors have done significant work: they gathered and in a certain sense systematized factual material, with some sections, for example, on local organs of state power, written satisfactorily and able to serve as a textbook for studying the history of the Soviet state. On the whole, however, the book does not correspond to those requirements that readers are entitled to present to a scientific work on the history and theory of state and law, and does not fulfill those tasks that stem from the resolution of the CC VKP(b) "On the Expansion and Improvement of Legal Education in the Country."

The theoretical basis of a scientific history and theory of the Soviet state is the complete and finished doctrine on the socialist state created by I. V. Stalin.

---

[383] Outlines on the History of the Organs of Soviet State Power. All-Union Institute of Juridical Sciences of the Ministry of Justice of the USSR. State Publishing House of Legal Literature. M. 1949.

Only from the point of view of the Stalinist teaching on phases and functions of the Soviet state can the principles of organization of Soviet state power, the activity of its various organs, and all measures carried out by the Soviet state be fully understood and correctly explained.

Relying on the Stalinist teaching on the socialist state, the authors should have shown how various organs of state power carried out the functions of the Soviet state in the first and second phases of its development, and revealed the specific features in the implementation of state functions by higher and local organs of power.

But this was not done.

The book does not even give a brief characterization of the two main phases in the development of the Soviet state and almost nothing is said about the tasks, functions, and forms of the Soviet state in the first and second phases of its development.

In the book it is not shown that the functions of the organs of state power are determined by the main task of the Soviet state in each phase of its development (cf. p. 67). Concrete tasks of individual periods are set forth in detachment from the main task of a given phase of development of the Soviet state as a whole, and the activity of the organs of state power in various periods of development is illuminated without connection with the main functions of the state characteristic of one or another phase. In the same spirit, i.e. in complete detachment from the Stalinist teaching on the phases and functions of the Soviet state, the presentation of the tasks and activity of the organs of

state power is constructed in a number of other places in the book (cf. pp. 38, 66, 164).

True, in section 3 of chapter VI, A. I. Lepeshkin expresses the correct thought that "the functions of local organs of state power are determined, in the final analysis, by the functions of the socialist state" (cf. p. 283). But this correct proposition, which applies also to higher organs of state power, is not developed in the book.

In the course of presentation, the authoring collective failed to reveal on concrete historical material the guiding methodological instruction of I. V. Stalin that "the dictatorship of the proletariat has its periods, its peculiar forms, diverse methods of work"[384].

In the reviewed book, the history of the organs of state power is set forth in accordance with the periodization established in the "Short Course of the History of the VKP(b)," but in it the deep dialectical connection of the main phases in the development of the Soviet state with the periods or stages within these phases is not shown, in which the main task and functions common to the phase as a whole receive their concrete expression and implementation in new methods of work of the Soviet state and its organs of state power.

Methodologically incorrect approach to the question of the ratio of phases of development of the socialist state with concrete historical periods in its development leads to an incorrect illumination of the activity of organs of state power

[384] I. V. Stalin. Works. Vol. 8, p. 31.

during the transition of the Soviet state from the first phase to the second.

About changes in the organization and activity of organs of state power in connection with the tasks of the second phase, the authors begin to write only in chapter VI, where the history and activity of organs of state power during the period of struggle for the completion of the construction of socialist society and the implementation of the new Constitution are set forth (cf. pp. 232–236). In the book, measures mapped out earlier regarding organs of Soviet state power that were implemented in 1933 and 1934 remained unnoticed, whereas they were aimed at solving a new main task marking the entry of the Soviet state into the second phase.

In the report at the joint Plenum of the CC and CCC VKP(b) in January 1933, I. V. Stalin said: "The results of the five-year plan showed that it is fully possible to build a socialist society in one country, for the economic foundation of such a society has already been built in the USSR"[385]. On the basis of building the economic foundation of socialist society, the Soviet state acquired a new main task and functions stemming from it. In particular, instead of the function of military suppression of overturned classes within the country, there appeared in the state the function of safeguarding socialist property from thieves and embezzlers of public property, and the function of economic-organizational and cultural-educational work of state organs received full development. To this change in the

[385] I. V. Stalin. Works. Vol. 13, p. 214.

functions of the Soviet state, I. V. Stalin pointed in the report at the XVIII Party Congress[386].

Thus, by the end of the first five-year plan, the Soviet state develops a new main task with corresponding functions, whereas the change in the form of the state occurred somewhat later on the basis of the adoption of the new Constitution.

In connection with the fact that kulakism as a class was already liquidated and Soviet power in the countryside began to rely on a solid base of collective farming, I. V. Stalin in the report on the results of the first five-year plan placed before the party and government with all force the task of organizational-economic strengthening of collective farms. Economic-organizational and cultural-educational work both in the city and in the countryside becomes henceforth the main function of the Soviet state and, consequently, the main direction of activity of all organs of state power.

In the reviewed book, the expansion and strengthening of the economic-organizational and cultural-educational activity of organs of state power that began as early as 1933 and 1934 is not shown.

Moreover, characterizing the resolution of the CEC and SNK USSR of August 7, 1932 "On the protection of property of state enterprises, collective farms, and cooperatives and the strengthening of public (socialist) property," the author (N. P. Farberov) says not a word about how this resolution testified to the appearance in the Soviet state of a new independent

[386] See I. V. Stalin. Problems of Leninism, p. 606. 11th ed.

function characteristic of the second phase—the function of safeguarding socialist property from thieves and embezzlers of public property (cf. pp. 190–191).

From all this it is clear that the authors failed to fulfill the promise made in the preface—to consider the character of the activity of organs of state power in the first and second phases of development of the Soviet state in accordance with the periodization of the history of the VKP(b).

It is known that "the whole spirit of Marxism, its whole system demands that every proposition be considered only: (a) historically; (b) only in connection with others; (c) only in connection with concrete experience of history"[387].

This most important requirement of Marxist-Leninist methodology is not observed in the reviewed work in a proper manner.

In a number of cases, the historical necessity of these or those changes in the organization and activity of organs of Soviet state power is not shown or revealed. Thus, for example, the author of paragraph 2 of chapter VI, Yu. A. Galembo, explains the liquidation of Sovnarkom's Economic Council solely by the improvement of the state apparatus. He writes: "...in the process of improving the state apparatus, the Economic Council was liquidated..." (p. 271). Naturally, in the history of organs of Soviet state power their improvement occurs on the basis of summarizing experience of their activity, but to explain changes in organs of state power solely by their

[387] V. I. Lenin. Works. Vol. 35, p. 200.

improvement—means to approach the phenomenon under consideration in a one-sided manner, to violate the principle of historical approach to analysis of phenomena, not to take into account the concrete historical setting.

The major methodological flaw of the book is that in it the organs of state power and their changes are considered by themselves, and not in the process of their creative work in the socialist and communist transformation of Soviet society, in the construction of new socialist economics. The authors failed to illustrate on the history of organs of state power the Stalinist proposition that after the socialist revolution power is used as a lever for the restructuring of the old economics and the organization of the new.

It is impossible not to note that in "Outlines on the History of Organs of Soviet State Power" almost nothing is said about the superiority and advantages of the Soviet state system and organs of state power over the organs of state power of capitalist countries.

In the reviewed book, the process of strengthening the organs of Soviet state power in the process of struggle of the Soviet people against all enemies of our Motherland is also not revealed.

I. V. Stalin in the report at the XVII Party Congress said that a classless society "...must be won and built by the efforts of all working people—by strengthening the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat, by unfolding class struggle, by

destroying classes, by liquidating remnants of capitalist classes, in battles with enemies both internal and external"[388].

In the work "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," I. V. Stalin again emphasized that in the presence of capitalist encirclement, "the country of the victorious revolution must not weaken, but in every way strengthen its state, state organs, intelligence organs, army, if this country does not want to be crushed by the capitalist encirclement"[389].

It is known that the party determines the policy of the state, tirelessly caring for its strengthening. "The party is the main guiding force in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat"[390].

Strange as it may seem, in the reviewed work the guiding role of the Bolshevik party in the building of the Soviet state is shown very poorly. The role of Lenin and Stalin in the creation and strengthening of the Soviet multinational state is insufficiently revealed. The book does not even give a brief characterization of the socio-economic conditions of each period, which is also an essential drawback of the book. Without such a characterization, the history of organs of state power cannot be properly revealed.

Serious methodological shortcomings and the low theoretical level of the presentation must be shown on an analysis of individual chapters of the book.

---

[388] I. V. Stalin. Works. Vol. 13, p. 350.

[389] I. V. Stalin. Marxism and Problems of Linguistics, p. 50. Gost Politizdat. 1950.

[390] I. V. Stalin. Works. Vol. 8, p. 35.

The first chapter is devoted to the history of organs of Soviet state power during the period of carrying out the Great October Socialist Revolution (1917–1918). Major events in the history of the emergence and strengthening of the Soviet socialist state are set forth in this chapter in detachment from the major Leninist-Stalinist characterizations of this period. "The period of 1917–1918 was a turning point for the party and the state. The party for the first time became the ruling power. For the first time in human history a new power arose—the power of the Soviets, the power of workers and peasants. To turn the party, previously illegal, onto new rails, to create organizational foundations of the new proletarian statehood, to find organizational forms of mutual relations between the party and the Soviets, to ensure the party's leadership, and to the Soviets their normal development—such was the most complex organizational task that stood then before the party"[391].

The authors not only fail to present this guiding statement of Comrade Stalin, but also throughout the chapter do not reveal the deep meaning of the Stalinist characterization.

Speaking of the emergence of the Soviet state, they also do not present classical Leninist-Stalinist propositions on the essence and characteristic features of Soviet state power[392].

In the second chapter, the history of organs of state power during the period of foreign military intervention and civil war (1918–1920) is set forth. Here the authors present concrete

[391] I. V. Stalin. Works. Vol. 6, p. 278.

[392] See ibid., pp. 118–122.

historical material, without giving a clear characterization of the policy of war communism carried out by the Soviet state during this period, whereas without connection with the policy of war communism it is impossible to explain changes in the organization and activity of organs of Soviet state power in 1918–1920.

Not by chance, the unresolved role of the People's Commissariat for Military and Naval Affairs, the Cheka, the People's Commissariat of Food, the People's Commissariat of Labor, and the VSNKh turned out to be in this chapter. To the activity of all these People's Commissariats the author I. I. Evtikhiev deemed it possible to devote only a few lines (cf. p. 66).

It causes surprise and the fact that neither in the first nor in the second chapter do the authors emphasize the world-historical significance of the organization and activity of the People's Commissariat for Nationalities.

The resolution of the II All-Russian Congress of Soviets on the creation within the Soviet government of the People's Commissariat for Nationalities was of world-historical significance. For the first time in the history of multinational states, a state organ was created to implement the policy of national equality, mutual assistance, and cooperation of peoples in the cause of socialist construction. Of the huge significance attached by the party to the People's Commissariat for Nationalities, the fact testifies that at the head of this People's Commissariat was placed the closest associate of the great Lenin, Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin.

"From the very first days of the existence of the Soviet government and up to 1923, Stalin—the People's Commissar for Nationalities. He directly headed all the work of the party and Soviet power in resolving the national question in the USSR. Under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, the workers and peasants of the former tsarist colonies created Soviet republics... There was not a single Soviet republic in the organization of which Stalin did not take an active and guiding part"[393].

Set forth legal acts in the field of national-state construction in 1918–1920, the authors bypass the question of the essence and advantages of Soviet federation and autonomy, saying nothing of the elasticity of Soviet autonomy allowing it "...to cover all the diverse outskirts of Russia, standing at various levels of cultural and economic development"[394].

Decisions of the VII All-Russian Congress of Soviets on questions of Soviet construction are set forth without proper connection with the major directive instructions on these questions of the VIII Congress of the RKP(b) and the VIII Party Conference. On concrete material, the decision of the VIII Party Congress laying the basis for the resolution of the VII Congress of Soviets on Soviet construction is not shown, the guiding role of the party in the construction and strengthening of organs of state power is not shown; not a word is said that the VIII Congress of the party "gave a rebuff to the

[393] "Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin. Short Biography," p. 67, 2nd ed.

[394] I. V. Stalin. Works. Vol. 4, p. 355.

opportunist group of Sapronov–Osinsky, which denied the guiding role of the party in the work of the Soviets"[395].

Essential shortcomings exist also in the third chapter, in which the history of organs of state power in the period of transition to peaceful work on the restoration of the national economy is set forth. In it, a brief characterization of the new economic policy is not given, nothing is said about the X Party Congress which adopted the decision on the transition to this policy.

In connection with the transition to NEP and changed conditions, a restructuring and improvement of the work of organs of state power was required. In this period, in the works "How We Should Reorganize Rabkrin," "Better Fewer, But Better," "Letter to I. V. Stalin for the Members of the Politburo," and some others, V. I. Lenin sets forth major propositions on the improvement and strengthening of the Soviet state apparatus. The authors of the chapter do not use the richest material of these Leninist works.

In particular, nothing is said about the exposure by V. I. Lenin of the wrecking attempts of Trotsky to achieve the liquidation of the People's Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection for the purpose of depriving the party of this powerful weapon in the struggle against distortions in the work of the state apparatus[396].

The activity of higher organs of state power is considered in this chapter chiefly from the point of view of the number of

---

[395] "History of the VKP(b). Short Course," p. 225.

[396] See V. I. Lenin. Works. Vol. 33, pp. 316–318.

discussed questions (cf. pp. 118 and 123). "The Union STO," writes on p. 123 Comrade Evtikhiev and Moravsky, "as its predecessor the STO of the RSFSR, developed huge activity. As early as the second half of 1923, the Council of Labor and Defense examined up to 927 questions, whereas during the same period the Presidium of the CEC of the USSR examined 195 questions, and the SNK of the USSR—402."

In such a presentation, the activity of the STO is as if opposed to the activity of the Presidium of the CEC and SNK of the USSR.

In presenting the content of the 1924 Constitution, its world-historical significance is not emphasized and it is not indicated that it finally reinforced the form of the Soviet state in the first phase of its development.

Major omissions exist in chapters IV and V.

The history of organs of state power during the period of struggle for socialist industrialization in chapter IV is insufficiently linked with major program speeches of I. V. Stalin emphasizing the specific features of socialist industrialization and the role of the state in its realization.

In the chapter, the question of the revitalization of the Soviets and the further unfolding of Soviet democracy in light of the Stalinist instructions that "the dictatorship of the proletariat does not weaken, but is strengthened, namely through the revitalization of the Soviets and the involvement of millions of the best people from the peasantry" is poorly illuminated[397].

[397] I. V. Stalin. Works. Vol. 7, p. 186.

As for chapter V, in which the materials relating to the period of struggle for the collectivization of agriculture (1930–1934) are set forth, it should be noted that the most important decisions on collective farm construction were not reflected in it.

Suffice it to say that the chapter contains no mention of the Resolution of the CC VKP(b) of January 5, 1930 "On the rate of collectivization and measures of state assistance to collective farm construction" and the Resolution of the CEC and SNK of the USSR of February 1, 1930 "On measures to strengthen the socialist restructuring of agriculture in areas of complete collectivization and to fight against the kulaks," which, as is known, formalized and reinforced the transition from the policy of limiting and squeezing out kulakism to the policy of its liquidation as a class on the basis of complete collectivization. Nothing is said also about the Resolution of the CC VKP(b) of February 4, 1932 "On current measures for the organizational-economic strengthening of collective farms," put forward by the brigade as the most important chain in the organization of labor on collective farms, about the Resolution of the CEC of the USSR "On strengthening collective farms," adopted in 1933, etc.

In a proper manner, the economic-organizational and cultural-educational activity of organs of the Soviet state in the cause of establishing collective and state farms and the socialist transformation of the countryside is not covered. In setting forth the events of 1933–1934, the authors failed to show the strengthening and growth of economic-organizational and cultural-educational activity of the Soviet state connected with

its entry into the second phase of its development; they failed to show also the dying away of the function of military suppression inside the country and the appearance instead of it of the function of safeguarding socialist property.

Chapter VI is written significantly better than the others. In it, the necessity of adopting the new Constitution, which legislatively reinforced the victory of socialism in our country, is more fully substantiated, the socialist democratism of the Stalinist Constitution is revealed, and the activity of the organs of state power on its basis is shown.

A common drawback of the main chapters (VII and VIII), characteristic, as we have noted, also for other chapters, is that the presentation is conducted in detachment from the Stalinist teaching on the phases of development of the Soviet state. The history of organs of Soviet state power is set forth mainly through the prism of state acts and resolutions, and examples from the activity of organs of state power aimed at fulfilling adopted laws and resolutions, with rare exceptions, are not cited.

In chapter VII, the work of organs of state power in the period of the Great Patriotic War in the cause of liquidating the consequences of the reign of fascists in regions liberated from occupation is insufficiently shown. "This is a big, nationwide task," pointed out Comrade Stalin. "We can and must solve this difficult task in a short period of time"[398]. It is known that this task was solved by the Soviet state in a short period of time.

---

[398] I. V. Stalin. On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, p. 121. Gost Politizdat. 1951.

Meanwhile, the authors of the chapter do not mention the Resolution of the SNK and CC VKP(b) of August 21, 1943 "On urgent measures for the restoration of the economy in regions liberated from German occupation," in which major measures for solving this task were outlined.

In chapter VIII, covering the activity of organs of state power in the post-war period, it is insufficiently concrete and convincingly shown that in the post-war period "...the party adopted measures for the further strengthening of organs of state power, strengthening their organizational role in solving economic and cultural construction tasks, for further strengthening the ties of Soviet organs with the masses"[399].

In the book it would be desirable to cite and disclose the statement of Comrade Malenkov quoted by us.

The book is poorly edited. The uneven distribution of material across chapters catches the eye.

Thus, for example, chapter III occupies almost three times more space in volume than chapter IV or VIII, devoted to such important periods as the period of struggle for socialist industrialization and the post-war construction period.

The necessary unity and integrity in the presentation are lacking. On pages 55 and 66, the exact same expressions about the activity of the higher organs of state power in the period between the VI–VII Congresses of Soviets are repeated; on p.

---

[399] G. Malenkov. On the activity of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). "Information Conference of Representatives of Some Communist Parties in Poland at the End of September 1947," p. 142. Gost Politizdat. 1948.

164 also without any necessity the first paragraph of Chapter IV ends and the second begins with the exact same sentences. On p. 354, readers are informed that "the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR scheduled elections to local Soviets for December 21, 1947," whereas in other union republics elections were scheduled for January 1948, and on p. 357 they learn that on December 21, 1947 "elections were held to local Soviets of Working People's Deputies of the RSFSR, Ukrainian SSR, Moldavian, Armenian, and Karelo-Finnish SSR."

Summing up all the above, it should first of all be emphasized that the reviewed book contains serious shortcomings of a methodological character. The authors failed to give a deep theoretical analysis and generalization of the rich factual material on the history of organs of Soviet state power, failed to set it forth in accordance with the Stalinist teaching on the main phases of development, main tasks, functions, and forms of the Soviet state. The guiding role of the Bolshevik party in the construction of the Soviet state is poorly shown. The dialectic of the development of the Soviet state and its organs of state power, as well as their revolutionary-transformative role in all areas of life of Soviet society, is not revealed.

The publication of works on the history of organs of Soviet state power is a useful and necessary matter. The All-Union Institute of Juridical Sciences acted correctly by including this important and responsible topic in its publishing plan; however, the reviewed book testifies to an insufficient degree of exactingness displayed by the All-Union Institute of

Juridical Sciences toward the idea-theoretical level of this work.

19. AGAINST TALMUDISM AND VULGARIZATION OF MARXISM IN A LOGIC TEXTBOOK FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS[400]

B. M. KEDROV

The creation of a good, popular textbook on logic for secondary schools is one of the most important tasks facing Soviet philosophers. Unfortunately, this task still cannot be considered solved. The reason lies in the fact that authors of various draft school logic textbooks stubbornly attempted to somehow "combine," "reconcile," and "connect" formal logic with dialectics. In doing so, they completely overlooked the fact that among school subjects there is a course in dialectical and historical materialism, and therefore the very question of the relation of formal logic and dialectics for schoolchildren is secondary. But the main flaw of attempts to "connect" formal logic with dialectics lies not even in this methodological unsoundness, but in their principled error. Instead of expounding school or formal logic, schoolchildren are taught some kind of eclectic mixture of chunks of formal logic as a school discipline and mechanically pasted, incomprehensible to students quotes taken from the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, pertaining no longer to formal logic, but to the Marxist dialectical method.

---

[400] S. N. Vinogradov and A. F. Kuzmin. *Logic. Textbook for secondary school*. 3rd ed. 1949; 4th ed. 1950; 5th ed. 1951 (with the participation of N. I. Kondakov).

In the draft of the first chapter of the school textbook on logic written by Professor V. F. Asmus and published in 1944 in Nos. 4–5 of the journal *Under the Banner of Marxism*, two completely different issues were conflated, which is why this draft represented an example of illogical thinking. Reading this chapter, it was impossible to determine what, in fact, the author was setting out to present to secondary school students: formal logic, which studies the most elementary rules of logical thinking and represents the most ordinary relationships of things, or Marxist dialectics.

In 1946, a decree of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) was published, obligating public education authorities to introduce the teaching of logic in secondary schools, and the Institute of Philosophy to prepare for publication a popular textbook of logic for secondary schools.

Fulfilling the instruction of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), the Institute of Philosophy published in 1947 the "Textbook of Logic" written by S. N. Vinogradov. Professor P. S. Popov took part in compiling the preliminary draft of this textbook, who, proceeding from the erroneous premise of "combining" formal logic with dialectics, attempted eclectically, in the spirit of the grossest vulgarization of Marxism, to "permeate" the textbook draft written by S. N. Vinogradov with his pseudo-Marxist, pseudo-dialectical reasoning and examples. From all this unnecessary rubbish, S. N. Vinogradov's textbook was cleaned up by workers of the Institute of Philosophy, after which it was

approved by the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR as a textbook for secondary schools.

The published textbook was not free from serious shortcomings. Its main one was detachment from modern socio-political life, which provides a vast, highly interesting, and completely accessible material for illustrating the elementary rules of logical thinking to clearly demonstrate what leads to their violation, intentional or unintentional. Instead of a skillful selection of lively, topical examples matching the content, the author S. N. Vinogradov and the editor of the textbook A. A. Chudov allowed themselves to be carried away by traditional examples from old textbooks on logic, with their invariable "Socrates is mortal." Thus, for example, students were asked to determine what error lay in the following reasoning: "All living beings desire life; Socrates is a living being; consequently, Socrates desires life," or to answer the question of how to solve the following dispute: "In Protagoras's famous pupil Protagoras sued his pupil Euathlus. Payment for tuition was divided into two parts such that Euathlus was to pay the second half of the tuition fee after winning his first lawsuit. Since Euathlus did not appear in court, Protagoras brought suit against him and addressed Euathlus with the following dilemma: 'If you win our lawsuit, you must pay me according to our contract; if you lose the lawsuit, you must pay according to the court's judgment; but you will either win the lawsuit or lose it, therefore, in either case you must pay me the specified sum.' Euathlus replied with the opposite dilemma: 'If I win our lawsuit, then by virtue of the court decision I should not pay; if I lose the lawsuit, I

should not pay by virtue of our contract; but I will either win or lose it, therefore, in either case I should not pay the money' (pp. 106–107)."

With such scholastic "examples," the textbook literally clogged the heads of Soviet schoolchildren, taking up time for analyzing sophistical tricks as if they were to become court lawyers or casuists in the future.

Another, no less significant shortcoming of the textbook was almost complete absence in it of factual, especially scientific-natural material with which students are familiarized at school. The examples illustrating logical rules were contrived and did not rely on the knowledge of students acquired in school while following the school curriculum, although it was precisely from this body of knowledge that the author of a textbook intended for secondary school students was obligated to proceed.

Generally speaking, textbook author S. N. Vinogradov turned out to be a formalist, detached from life, which made his old, scholastic logic textbooks shine through. V. I. Lenin's directive on the necessity of presenting formal logic in Soviet school "with corrections" was ignored not only by the author, but by the textbook editor as well.

A sharply negative review by V. P. Rozhin soon followed the "Textbook of Logic" by S. N. Vinogradov in *Uchitelskaya Gazeta* on October 25, 1947. Correctly noting a number of defects of the textbook, the reviewer, however, drew the incorrect conclusion that to eliminate these defects, it was necessary to return to the already rejected orientation towards

"blending" school, or formal, logic with Marxism. This flawed, vulgarizing, anti-Marxist orientation was supported by someone among the staff of the Ministry of Education. People standing on positions of "blending" formal logic with dialectics, with Marxism, were drawn into revising S. N. Vinogradov's textbook as authors and editors. In 1948, the logic textbook for secondary schools by S. N. Vinogradov was revised by A. F. Kuzmin and published under two names: author and co-author; subsequent editions (3rd, 4th, and 5th, one for each year starting from 1949) appeared with the following publisher's note: "For the present edition, the authors used all positive material of the textbook 'Logic' by S. N. Vinogradov as revised and edited by A. F. Kuzmin (pub. 1948). Part of the text was radically revised; most of it was written anew by A. F. Kuzmin with the participation of N. I. Kondakov."

A. Kuzmin and N. Kondakov transferred to the school logic textbook that very same erroneous orientation published in *Uchitelskaya Gazeta*. They showed no special concern for filling the textbook with examples taken from life and from the body of knowledge of students, although some minor improvements in this direction were made. However, such scholastic examples of hook-checking and casuistry as the cited court case of Protagoras with his pupil were transferred almost unchanged into the new logic textbook. Instead, the "co-authors" Kuzmin and Kondakov directed all their efforts toward filling the school textbook on formal logic with material borrowed from the domain of Marxist-Leninist class analysis. This intention the "co-authors" realized rudely

violating all considerations of pedagogical character and absolutely disregarding whether students would comprehend complex party material and whether students would not simply cram Marxist-Leninist terms without understanding their meaning. Positions leading to dogmatism, named "co-authors," presented such an approach to Marxism and student youth. It is well known that all kinds of "Proletkultists," Rappists, Marrists, etc., were vulgarizers of Marxism. Covering themselves with "Marxist" phraseology, Marxist terms and vulgarized Marxism, they created various kinds of anti-scientific "teachings," like the "new doctrine of language."

In exactly the same way act the vulgarizers of Marxism in the field of logic. In connection with this, the following fact should be noted. In the first editions of the "Textbook of Logic" by S. N. Vinogradov (1947), a very important and deep Marxian thought was carried out that thinking is connected with language as a tool of communication between people, that it is not enough to think correctly oneself: it is also necessary to be able to correctly convey one's thoughts to other people in the process of communication with them. About this, it was directly stated in § 1 of the first chapter of the textbook: "Thinking is always clothed in verbal form, i.e., is expressed in words. The need to convey one's thoughts to other people forces us to take care that surrounding people understand the structure of our thought and agree with the conclusions. We try to construct our thinking in such a way that as a result we obtain conclusions that are obvious to other people. Consequently, logic, being the science of correct thinking, is thereby the science of the rules of formulating thoughts in

verbal expressions" (pp. 3–4). Moreover: in the first chapter there was a special paragraph devoted to the relationship between logic and grammar (see pp. 6–7). In this paragraph, it was correctly stated: "Thinking developed and developed together with speech in the process of socio-labor practice. We noted (§ 1) that logical thought is thought expressed in words, or formulated thought. This formulation of thought consists in selecting such words and such expressions that accurately and correctly convey concepts and transitions from one of our thoughts to other thoughts. If thinking and speech could not be separated, then grammar could not exist isolated from logic. Logic teaches how to think correctly, so that thinking is correct; it also teaches the correct transmission of the results of thinking. From this it follows that logic and grammar are closely connected sciences. He who studies logic must often refer to grammar. He who studies grammar must turn to logic in order to learn on grammatical forms how to make the correct choice for a more precise expression of his thoughts."

"Co-authors" Kuzmin and Kondakov effectively proceeded from directly opposite premises, rejected Marxist assertions about the classlessness and reliability of language. Attempting to invent some special, "Soviet" logic, fundamentally different from old, formal, supposedly bourgeois logic, they stood on the path of vulgarization. The "re-elaboration" of the logic textbook by Kuzmin and Kondakov was expressed primarily in that from the textbook were completely thrown out the above-cited correct propositions on the relationship between language and thinking, grammar and logic, because they hindered the "co-authors" from dragging into the textbook a flawed,

essentially Marrist orientation requiring viewing language and thinking as connected with its logical thinking as phenomena of class, superstructural character. Even the very paragraph "Logic and Grammar" was excluded by Kuzmin and Kondakov from the textbook (cf. editions of 1949 and 1950).

In contrast to the correct view on logic and thinking in their connection with language, Kuzmin and Kondakov declared logic class-based, since "the struggle of directions in philosophy is an expression of class struggle" (see p. 7 of the 1949 and 1950 ed.).

Thus, the "co-authors" arbitrarily threw out of the textbook the correct treatment of logic in its connection with grammar and thinking in its connection with language as a tool of communication among people, and replaced this correct treatment with an erroneous, essentially Marrist treatment, according to which logic, and hence logical thinking, are considered as class phenomena reflecting the exacerbation of class struggle in the history of society and in modern society. Completely clear that such "re-elaboration" by Kuzmin and Kondakov did not improve the textbook of S. N. Vinogradov, but significantly ruined it.

Throwing out from the first chapter § 3 ("Logic and Grammar") and re-arranging the chapter so that formal logic and its studied laws of thinking did not appear as universal human ones, Kuzmin and Kondakov inserted into this chapter a new paragraph (§ 2) entitled "On Materialist Understanding of Thinking" (pp. 6–10 of the 1949 and 1950 ed.). Not considering that students have no philosophical preparation, the

"co-authors" crammed into the textbook (in quotation marks and without quotation marks) a whole series of complex philosophical propositions of Marxism, requiring for their understanding a formed philosophy level of knowledge. At the same time, they did not even try to explain these propositions in a language accessible to secondary school students. Thus, as an example, the "co-authors" cited without any explanation the well-known thought of Lenin from *Philosophical Notebooks* in the following presentation: "Human practice, repeating billions of times, is fixed in the consciousness of man by figures of logic. In the course of time, these figures of logic acquire a stable character" (p. 10 of the 1949 and 1950 ed.). And that is all that was said about the origin of logical figures in human practice. Not a single explanation or even hint as to how exactly and in what concrete figures of practice "fixed" in human consciousness was provided to the student. To a student who does not understand the meaning of this Leninist proposition, only one thing remains: conscientiously to cram it word for word. Such unintelligible philosophical formulas in the textbook are numerous. On pages 14–15 we find the following formulations, which students due to the absence of any intelligible explanation were forced to cram: "Thinking is an indirectly reflected and generalized real reality"; "Thinking is a qualitatively different form of cognition, superior compared to sensory cognition," etc., etc. On two pages, the "co-authors" managed to list a whole series of complex gnoseological problems and give their answers in short sentences, without saying anything to the student, freeing themselves from the obligation of explaining at least somewhat what they write in their textbook. As a result, all these

propositions students had to memorize mechanically. Can, for example, a secondary school student understand the following proposition from Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks*, given in the textbook without any explanation: "Correct thinking does not deviate from reality, but approaches it, not directly, but in a zigzag, reflecting reality deeper, fuller, more completely than sensory perception" (p. 14 of the 1949 and 1950 ed.)? Are the following propositions from *Philosophical Notebooks* by V. I. Lenin accessible for the understanding of a secondary school student, as presented in the textbook without quotation marks, "in own words": "Representations are not main images of objects, phenomena of Nature; impossible, for example, to have a representation of the speed of light, just as impossible to get a visual image of such motion. But to think the speed of motion we can. We have a concept of motion with a speed of 300,000 km per second" (p. 24 of the 1949 and 1950 ed. and p. 21 of the 1951 ed.). The "co-authors" did not take the trouble to explain why it is impossible "to get a visual image of such motion" (they wanted to say: of motion with such a high speed). And without an answer to this question, the whole argument remains incomprehensible to the student and again pushes him to simple memorization of the cited text, without understanding its meaning.

Fluently, superficially, purely dogmatically, the "co-authors" set out the fundamental question of philosophy. No explanations, no examples, only bare formulas, two or three phrases (p. 8 of the 1949 and 1950 ed. and p. 6 of the 1951 ed.). Dryly, without revealing the deep content of philosophical propositions, the "co-authors" present formulas relating to the

materialist theory of knowledge. Not being scientists, theoretical concepts of this section will inevitably be crammed by students, like other propositions, remaining incomprehensible to them. If Kuzmin and Kondakov decided to edit a school logic from the standpoint of Marxist philosophical materialism, they were obligated first of all to clearly, accessibly explain to the secondary school student the essence of this teaching, and not present one formula after another, not caring about how the student will assimilate all these unintelligible formulas and bare formulations.

Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin give classical examples of how to explain to the people the most complex theoretical propositions. The "co-authors" do not follow in this respect the example of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and do not attempt to explain to students the propositions given in the textbook; they confuse and obscure Marxist philosophical material in the eyes of secondary school students, replacing deep explanation of its main propositions with a certain number of quotes, torn out of context, classics of Marxism-Leninism, and bare, saying nothing to the student formulas. As a result, here too the "co-authors" push Soviet schoolchildren onto the path of dogmatic memorization of the propositions of Marxism, without understanding and assimilating the sense of these propositions.

And so are presented in the textbook all examples taken by the "co-authors" from the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Analysis of such an example, as well as comparison, the "co-authors" bring without any explanation of the quoted citation from Lenin's work directed against the Mensheviks:

"V. I. Lenin notes that sleep (i.e. Menshevism) connects citation—B. K.) 'erases boundaries between bullet, reactionaries, peasant ideas about socialist revolution with reactionary liberal policy in bourgeois revolution'" (p. 16 of the 1949 and 1950 ed.). And nothing more, no explanation, as if the question of unprincipledness and other reactionary ideas was clear to schoolchildren without words.

Let us cite a few more examples of logical nature. In the textbook, again without any explanation, words of V. I. Lenin are cited: "Logical contradiction—under condition, naturally, of correct logical thinking—must not be in economic or political analysis" (p. 87 of the 1949 and 1950 ed., p. 84 of the 1951 ed.). In this case, it was not even said that V. I. Lenin did not allow "logical inconsistency" at all under any conditions. Thus, a student reading this place might form the erroneous representation that Lenin considered unacceptable "logical contradiction" only in economic and political analysis! At the same time, the textbook gives no explanation as to what such an analysis consists of. One of two things: either this citation should not have been brought at all, or bringing it, it was necessary to explain its meaning, which the "co-authors" did not bother to do.

In the paragraph "Rules of Proof," the "co-authors" also provide incomprehensible examples for students and full of torn citations. Thus, on page 149 of the 1949 and 1950 ed. it is stated: "In one of the articles directed against Mensheviks, V. I. Lenin notes that Mensheviks in debate about participation of Social-Democrats in provisional revolutionary government repeatedly attempted 'to substitute one disputed question for

another.' What were these 'menshevik' and what question with what other and with what purpose they tried to substitute—about all this the 'co-authors' decided to keep silent. As a result, the 'explanation' turned into some kind of rebus over which students had to break their heads. On page 160 of the same editions another statement of Lenin is given, again, as if on purpose, so stated that nothing can be understood: 'When at the third party congress during discussion of the Statute delegate Ivanov moved a proposal to elect one party center instead of two provided for in the Statute, V. I. Lenin in his speech with speech, which began with words: 'Must be admitted that arguments with which comrade Ivanov defends his idea of single center seem to me unsubstantial.' Kuzmin and Kondakov, citing these words of Lenin, managed to bypass everything, including what the arguments of Ivanov consisted of and why Lenin considered them unsubstantial. By this very fact, they not only failed to give a clear example, but, as everywhere in the textbook, silently pushed the student onto the path of mechanical memorization of the given 'examples,' since it is impossible to understand them.

The absence of elementary correct approach to quoting the works of the classics of Marxism, careless use of text, non-understanding of the fact that such quoting without serious, thoughtful explanation of the cited text can lead to distorted understanding of Marxist propositions—all this characterizes the frivolous attitude of Kuzmin and Kondakov to that responsible task with which they were entrusted.

"Textbook of Logic" in the "processing" of Kuzmin and Kondakov testifies to the fact that someone, apparently,

through negligence, is trying to instill in our Soviet youth on the school bench real Talmudism and scholasticism, dogmatic approach to Marxism, mechanical memorization of Marxist propositions without understanding their meaning, their essence. In this consists first of all that huge harm brought by "Textbook of Logic," "processed" by Kuzmin and Kondakov. The danger of such "processing" is the greater, because it covers itself with the name of Marxism, conducted on behalf of Marxism, "buttressed" by citations from works of classics of Marxism.

Naturally, in words the "co-authors" against dogmatism, but in fact they obtain something completely opposite. For example, on page 7 of the textbook edition of 1951, the following reasoning is still preserved: "At the first clash with living reality, uncritical dogmatic thinking is overthrown by logical reality. V. I. Lenin pointed out: 'No presupposition against Marxism of "dogmatism" will hold up against unbending logic of events. History in many facts proved this.'"

Here Lenin used the word "dogmatism" in quotes, for opponents of Marxism tried to slander Marxists, called their adherence to revolutionary teaching of Marx dogmatism. Logic of events, i.e. life itself, refuted this slander of enemies of Marxism. "Co-authors" presented this quote so that it sounds as condemnation of dogmatic approach to Marxism.

Especially outraged is the inclusion in the number of school exercises of exercises on important propositions of Marxist theory (p. 160–165 of the 1949 and 1950 ed., p. 161–166 of the 1951 ed.). "Co-authors" bring these propositions not for

students to grasp their meaning and sense, but solely for formal exercises, so that students find in them subject, predicate, copula, replace subject with predicate, etc. "Co-authors" thought of nothing better than along with already mentioned casuistic cases of legal dispute of Protagoras with his pupil to recommend to students for exercises such solemn statements: "Materialist vulgarization means simply understanding nature as it is, without any foreign additions" (Engels); "Theory becomes practice" and others. Even as examples for exercises such propositions of materialism, as "net without cause" and others. Kuzmin and Kondakov irresponsibly set before school students the task: "Bring to clear logical form the following propositions." It turns out that, according to the main authors of the textbook, these materialist propositions, in their opinion, are expressed logically unclearly, and school students are recommended to bring them to clear logical form.

"Co-authors" recommend school students to engage in conversion of judgments along with example "Some women are doctors" as example for exercises one of the main propositions of dialectical materialism: "No movement without matter." Fittingly to ask: was it really appropriate for "co-authors" to use for school exercises such philosophical propositions of deep content? Might it be, they thought that after several exercises students of secondary school assimilate these materialist propositions? By analogous reason Engels criticized scholastic exercises of Dühring: "Actual unity of the world consists in its materiality, and this latter is proved by

long and difficult development of philosophy and natural science."[401]

Kuzmin and Kondakov, apparently, do not agree with Engels and believe that they can teach school students basic propositions of Marxist philosophical materialism by "converting judgments" and other elementary logical exercises. Obviously, Laurent gives no peace to some of the modern vulgarizers of Marxism...

Vulgarizing approach revealed in "co-authors" and in characteristics of discovery of great Russian naturalists. Expounding formal-logical rules of division, "co-authors" point out that one of the visual division of objects into groups is classification, and as a quality example of such classification refer to the periodic system of elements of D. I. Mendeleev (p. 49 of the 1949 and 1950 ed.). Well known that only idealists—agnostics and energetists like L. Meyer and Ostwald—evaluated Mendeleev's periodic system as a visual classification scheme created for considerations of subjective order. On the contrary, Mendeleev with all his strength emphasized objective content of the system of elements, relying on strict law of nature. To reduce this system to formal-logical classification based on non-transcendental application of the simplest rules of division of concepts means to distort the very essence of the great discovery of Mendeleev. In works of F. Engels and V. I. Stalin shown that Mendeleev's periodic system of elements represents concrete application of transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones. How could "co-

[401] F. Engels. *Anti-Dühring*, p. 42. Gospolitizdat. 1950.

authors", ignoring these instructions of classics of Marxism, use one of the greatest discoveries of modern natural science, deeply revealing dialectics of nature, as a result of school formal-logical rules of division of concepts?

And here is how "co-authors" reflect in textbook work of another great Russian scientist, founder of materialist physiology and psychology I. M. Sechenov. On p. 100–102 of the 1949 and 1950 ed. and on p. 98 of the 1951 ed. is brought the following reasoning regarding axiom: "Truth not requiring proof is called axiom. Axioms arise from practice and constantly confirmed by practice,—precisely why they for us have convincingness. 'If agreement were not reached, if convinced by experience that given color can be called light of another color, he would abandon his trade' (I. M. Sechenov). Nothing more suitable for showing materialist view of Sechenov on thinking and its logical forms "co-authors" did not find.

"Co-authors" attempt to fit into narrow frames of formal logic as school discipline not only achievements of great Russian scientists, but also statements of classics of Marxism-Leninism. Remarkable depth and strength of logic of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin they try to reduce to observing elementary rules of logical thinking. On p. 10–11 of the 1949 and 1950 ed. and on p. 8–9 of the 1951 ed., pointing out that study of logic elevates culture of human thinking, "co-authors" bring high-flown statements about this from Herzen, Ushinsky and Timiryazev: "Outstanding Russian thinker A. I. Herzen strongly recommended studying logic. Remarkable Russian educator K. D. Ushinsky said that main reasonable speech consists in

logical thinking. Famous Russian scientist K. A. Timiryazev considered prime duty of every citizen to develop in himself capacity for logical thinking."

Completely clear that in all these three cases speech is about elementary logical literacy, compulsory for all culturally developed, educated people, same as knowledge of rules of spelling and mathematical rules, multiplication table and four arithmetic operations or elementary facts from history and geography.

But not here, as direct continuation of such understanding of observance of rules of logical thinking, Kuzmin and Kondakov bring famous Stalinist assessment of strength of logic in speeches of V. I. Lenin in contrast to logic of A. I. Mikoyan. These assessments, accompanied by own thoughts, "co-authors" place in close connection with preceding text so that student inevitably must come to conclusion: logic in works of Lenin and Stalin—this is the same logic taught in textbook for secondary school. Such conclusion follows from the whole context of § "Meaning of Logic."[402]

Should add that after appearance of work of J. V. Stalin "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics" Kuzmin and Kondakov hastened to restore thrown-out paragraph "Logic and Grammar." In edition of 1951 this paragraph reconstituted under title "Thinking and Language." Replacing whole

[402] Characteristic that on fifth edition of textbook of logic S. N. Vinogradov and A. F. Kuzmin, published in 1950, was written review published already above V. P. Rozhin (see "Soviet Science" No. 7 for 1950, pp. 68–72). Noting a number of shortcomings of this edition, reviewer kept silent about presence in textbook of gross vulgarization of Marxism.

polemics, this whole paragraph consists almost entirely of citations brought without any explanation, which helped student to understand and assimilate deep thoughts of J. V. Stalin on connection of language and thinking.

Bringing citations from work of J. V. Stalin "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," "co-authors" managed to distort contained in this work proposition directly related to activity of abstracting thinking, and consequently to logic. As known, J. V. Stalin revealed distinguishing feature of grammar consisting in that grammar "gives rules of change of words, having in mind not concrete words, but words in general without any concreteness; it gives rules for sentence construction, having in mind not concrete sentences, but general sentences, regardless of concrete form of this or that sentence."[403] J. V. Stalin indicated that "abstracting from specific and concrete, as in words, so in sentences, grammar takes general that lies at the base of word changes and combination of words into sentences..."[404] Speaking of results of abstracting work of human thinking, J. V. Stalin refers also to mathematics: "In this respect grammar resembles geometry, which abstracts from concrete objects, considering them as bodies, deprived of concreteness..."

Proceeding from these Stalinist propositions, formal logic should also be considered as result of abstracting work of human thinking, which revealed elementary laws and rules of logic. Formal logic operates with logical forms generally as

---

[403] J. Stalin. *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, p. 24. Gospolitizdat. 1951.
[404] Ibid.

deprived of any concrete content, and therefore applicable to thoughts of any content. When formal logic asserts: *A is A*, this is a certain abstract formula, under which can be brought any concept, any thought about object, for example, "table," "chair," "Ivan," etc. Abstracting from content, considering form of thinking as deprived of any concreteness, of content—base of formal logic. Between them direct proportion, as follows from work of J. V. Stalin "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," "co-authors" introduced in textbook on logic after appearance of work J. V. Stalin's reasoning: "Logic studies logical forms. But this does not mean that logic is not interested in content of thinking. Study of form without connection with content would have for us no sense. However, study of it in connection with content does not mean that we in necessary cases in interest of study of thinking abstract this form" (p. 6).

Consequently, only "in necessary cases" (and what are these "necessary cases" and how often they occur—about this nothing is said in textbook) "co-authors" allow thinking to abstract logical form from concrete content of thoughts in their study. But in general study systematic study of forms of thought, abstracting from content, by own admission of Kuzmin and Kondakov, "would have for us no sense." If "co-authors" were logically consistent and extended their incorrect thesis to grammar and geometry, they would have to admit that from their point of view, study of grammatical forms in abstraction from concrete content of words and sentences or geometric forms in abstraction from concrete, material content

would also be senseless. Here to what incorrect conclusions push school students "co-authors."

In general, reviewed logic textbook for secondary school represents an example of irresponsible attitude of "co-authors" to preparation of textbook. Well known instruction of A. A. Zhdanov and S. M. Kirov that to writing textbook one should approach with special responsibility, that in textbook should be weighed every word and every definition. Completely obvious that Kuzmin and Kondakov did not observe this guiding instruction. Instead of working to improve textbook, care that every word, every example was accessible for understanding of students, helping them master foundations of logic and helping them to deeper assimilation of other school disciplines, they by their "processing" of textbook only damaged it. "Fixes" made by "co-authors" in textbook in no way can be considered realization of directive of V. I. Lenin on necessity of introducing corrections into formal logic: they facilitate development in Soviet youth skills of dogmatism and Talmudism.

Inclusion in school textbook of logic philosophical propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge in that form as they are presented in textbook, testifies that "co-authors" got confused in simple and clear propositions of Marxism, forming this three non-standing orientation in questions, on which they undertook to write textbook. Textbook in "processing" of Kuzmin and Kondakov is example of grossest vulgarization of Marxism.

Should note that in spirit of same vulgarizing mixing of formal logic with Marxist dialectics composed program on logic[405], as well as methodological aids on logic for secondary school[406]. Should, however, note that in these publications still no such gross vulgarization of Marxism as in textbook of Vinogradov and Kuzmin, although movement along line of mixing formal logic with Marxist dialectics in them present.

Guilt for fact that creation of popular textbook on logic, and consequently, whole business of teaching logic in secondary school starting from 1948 passed into hands of vulgarizers, lies also on Institute of Philosophy, which released in 1947 not fully satisfactory textbook of logic for secondary school by S. N. Vinogradov, following behind that withdrew completely from this business.

Textbook of logic for secondary school requires radical overhaul, liberation from errors and vulgarizations brought into it by Kuzmin and Kondakov. Ministry of Education of RSFSR must immediately take into its hands this business.

Generally should draw special attention to literary activity of some authors, who specialized in appearing in role of "co-authors," editing textbooks. Written by other authors, terminology of dialectical materialism, but in fact vulgarizing Marxism. Kuzmin and Kondakov not sole representatives of

---

[405] See "Syllabi of Secondary School. Logic." Uchpedgiz. 1951.

[406] See, for example, "On Teaching Logic in Secondary School. Methodological Letter Prepared by Institute of Psychology of Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of RSFSR" (author — D. P. Gorsky). And "Exercises for Students of Secondary School. Logic. X Class." (Compiled by D. P. Gorsky.) Uchpedgiz. 1951.

this "specialty." Ministry of Education of RSFSR and leadership of Uchpedgiz should more closely look at activity of such kind "co-authors" and "editors," who by their unprincipled "processing" worsen textbooks for secondary school.

20. AN OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF CREATIVE MARXISM
A. I. SOBOLEV

Mao Tse-tung. Selected Works. Vol. 1. Translated from Chinese. M. Foreign Languages Publishing House. 1952, 534 pp.

Marxism-Leninism is a great, invincible doctrine that renews the world. This teaching is a theoretical generalization of the world revolutionary movement. It is continuously enriched with new tenets, new formulas as the liberation movement develops.

An outstanding example of the creative application of the basic tenets of Marxist-Leninist teaching to the solution of concrete questions of the liberation struggle is the policy, strategy, and tactics of the Communist Party of China, which for over 30 years has been leading a heroic struggle for the liberation of the Chinese people, for a progressive path of development. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Chinese people broke the bonds of imperialist oppression, overthrew their landlords and monopolists, created a strong people's democratic state, and are successfully solving the tasks of economic construction.

At the head of the Communist Party of China stands the battle-tested leader of the Chinese people, Mao Tse-tung, who is the most outstanding representative of Marxist-Leninist thought in China. In the works of Mao Tse-tung, his theoretical

embodiment and generalization of the rich and multifaceted experience of the Communist Party of China in leading the liberation movement in the country found expression.

Consistently and steadfastly guided by Marxism-Leninism, creatively applying Marxist-Leninist teaching to the solution of concrete issues of the Chinese revolution, Mao Tse-tung gave a scientific substantiation of the political line of the Communist Party of China at various stages of struggle, taught the party to change tactics, forms, and methods of struggle and to advance new political slogans depending on changes in historical conditions, pointed out to the Chinese people the most effective ways to win freedom, and led the country onto the path of progressive development.

The works of Mao Tse-tung are of great international importance. For the communist parties of those countries that have not yet achieved freedom, especially colonial and dependent countries, they are an example of the creative use of Marxism-Leninism as a powerful theoretical weapon in the struggle for the liberation of peoples from the yoke of imperialism.

At present, a four-volume collection of selected works of Mao Tse-tung, prepared by a commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and reviewed by the author, is being published in China. The first volume of the selected works of Mao Tse-tung has been translated into Russian and published by the Soviet Foreign Languages Publishing House. This volume includes works related to the period of the First

and Second Revolutionary Civil Wars (March 1926 – July 1937).

The works of Mao Tse-tung are a theoretical generalization of the experience of the Communist Party of China for a period filled with the richest events; they give a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the strategy and tactics of communists during the period of the rise of the revolution and during the years of the decline of the revolutionary wave, and comprehensively illuminate the heroic party work on educating the masses, strengthening ties with them, and mobilizing Chinese working people for the struggle against imperialist and feudal oppression.

In his works, Mao Tse-tung gave truly scientific, Marxist-Leninist answers to fundamental questions of political life raised by the development of the revolution, showed the social roots of opportunism and the theoretical poverty of opportunists of all shades, and ensured the correctness of the political line of the Communist Party at various stages of the struggle.

The book considers a large number of questions related to the activities of the Communist Party of China, but all of them are grouped around four main problems, which represent the greatest interest: 1) determination of the strategic stage of development of the revolution, disclosure of the content of the Chinese revolution, its features, and driving forces, substantiation of the leading role of the working class in the democratic Chinese revolution; 2) determination of the political line and tactics of the Communist Party of China at

various stages of development of the revolution; 3) development of military strategy and tactics; 4) elaboration of philosophical questions that form the theoretical basis of the policy of the Communist Party.

All these questions were of greatest interest during the period 1926–1937, as they affected the most important, fundamental aspects of the activities of the Chinese Communist Party.

In connection with the rise of the national liberation movement, questions of revolutionary struggle acquired urgent significance and stood at the center of theoretical thought of Marxists. Lenin and Stalin developed a theory of revolution in colonial and dependent countries under the epoch of imperialism, showing that the liberation movement in colonial and semi-colonial countries is an important integral part of a single revolutionary process aimed against imperialism, which weakens capitalism as a whole.

Lenin and Stalin foresaw a powerful rise of the revolutionary movement in China and paid serious attention to it. In his works, Comrade Stalin revealed the specific nature of the revolution in China and the specific alignment of class forces; he showed that to understand the historical processes taking place in China, it is necessary to take into account: a) the semi-colonial position of China and the financial-economic domination of imperialism; b) the yoke of feudal remnants, aggravated by the yoke of militarism and bureaucracy; c) the growing revolutionary struggle of millions of working masses of workers and peasants against feudal-official oppression, against militarism, against imperialist oppression; d) the

political weakness of the national bourgeoisie, its dependence on imperialism, its fear of the scale of the revolutionary movement; e) the growing revolutionary activity of the proletariat, the growth of its authority among the broad masses of working people; f) the existence of a proletarian dictatorship neighboring China.

The combination of all these historical, economic, and social factors of China's development determined the character of the Chinese revolution as a bourgeois-democratic revolution. However, as Comrade Stalin points out, the specific feature of the Chinese revolution lies in the fact that its edge is directed against imperialism, i.e., it is predominantly anti-imperialist in nature. Thus, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution is an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution.

Revealing the significance of the anti-imperialist struggle in the general chain of the world-historical revolutionary process, Comrade Stalin at the same time proved that the main content of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China is the agrarian revolution.

Showing the weakness of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, Comrade Stalin formulated an important proposition on the need to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat, its leading role in the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The Leninist-Stalinist theory of imperialism and the theory of the national-colonial question, Leninist-Stalinist propositions on revolutions in the epoch of imperialism are the cornerstone for determining the political line of communist parties in oppressed and dependent countries.

In his theoretical works and practical activities in leading the liberation movement of the working people, Mao Tse-tung is consistently and steadfastly guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism, defends and safeguards Leninist-Stalinist ideas about revolution in colonies and semi-colonies in the epoch of imperialism.

* * *

An important issue in the political life of China in the period 1926–1937 was the question of the character of the revolution, the alignment of class forces, and the interrelations between classes, and the role of the proletariat in the unfolding revolution.

Guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung primarily defined the specifics of the historical and social conditions of pre-revolutionary life in Chinese society, and on this basis, in full accordance with Marxism-Leninism, formulated the fundamental strategic tasks facing the Chinese working class: liquidation of foreign imperialist oppression and winning national independence, destruction of feudalism, implementation of agrarian revolution, and winning democratic freedoms.

"China," points out Mao Tse-tung, "urgently needs a bourgeois-democratic revolution, and its accomplishment is possible only under the leadership of the proletariat" (p. 100).

Defining the character of the Chinese revolution as a bourgeois-democratic revolution, Mao Tse-tung nevertheless,

in a number of his works, analyzes its features and reveals its specifics.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that national independence is an indispensable prerequisite for the progressive development of any nation, therefore the struggle for national freedom, against foreign oppressors, is the starting point of the liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries. As is known, China was a semi-colonial, dependent, and completely enslaved country; naturally, the edge of the revolutionary movement in China was directed primarily against imperialism, as imperialist oppression held back the economic and political development of the country and prevented the liquidation of remaining feudal relations. The success of the struggle against feudalism was directly dependent on the successes of the anti-imperialist movement. It is impossible to destroy the feudal yoke, solve the agrarian question, win democratic rights and freedoms without destroying foreign imperialist rule, without achieving national independence. All these circumstances made questions of struggle against imperialism most urgent and burning questions of the Chinese revolution up to its victorious development in 1946–1949.

The anti-imperialist orientation of the Chinese revolution did not negate its main content as an agrarian revolution; on the contrary, it was a necessary prerequisite for destroying feudal-landlord domination in the countryside and achieving a democratic solution to the agrarian question.

In his "Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan," Mao Tse-tung develops and concretizes this

proposition: "The feudal-patriarchal local tyrants and evil gentry, the tyrannical landlords—these are the basis of despotism that has existed for thousands of years, the pillar of imperialists, militarists, and corrupt officials—tax collectors and bribe-takers. Overthrowing these feudal forces is the true goal of the national revolution" (p. 41).

In a number of articles, the inseparable connection between anti-imperialist and anti-feudal streams of the Chinese revolution is detailed and thoroughly revealed, and an important strategic proposition is formulated:

"Our main enemies in the revolutionary war in China are imperialism and feudal forces" (pp. 326–327).

The Chinese revolution, which solved general democratic tasks, was broader than an ordinary bourgeois-democratic revolution; it broke the chains of imperialism that bound China, thereby weakening imperialism as a whole, shattered its position, and therefore was an important component of the world liberation movement.

Having examined the historical situation prevailing in China, correctly defined the strategic stage of development of the revolution and its content, Mao Tse-tung developed very important theoretical questions for China—questions of the alignment of class forces, interrelations between classes, and the role of the proletariat in the Chinese democratic revolution.

In the Communist Party of China during the period of the First Revolutionary Civil War, an intense struggle took place over the alignment of class forces.

Right opportunists headed by Ch'en Tu-hsiu insisted on cooperation only with the national bourgeoisie and Kuomintang, and opposed an alliance with the peasantry, which inevitably meant capitulation to the bourgeoisie, loss of independence of the working class in the revolution. It is clear that such a political line inevitably led to the defeat of the revolution.

Adherents of the "left" deviation headed by Chang Kuo-t'ao, noisily declaring the exclusive nature of the working class, denied the necessity of cooperation with the national bourgeoisie and alliance with the peasantry, which condemned the working class to isolation, isolating it from its allies. It is completely clear that this political line was also disastrous for the revolution.

Both Right and "Left" opportunists, ignoring Marxist-Leninist teachings on allies of the working class in the democratic revolution, weakened the working class and condemned the revolution to defeat. The question of friends and foes of the Chinese working class acquired paramount importance.

As a true Marxist, Mao Tse-tung taught how to correctly approach the question of allies of the proletariat depending on concrete historical circumstances. From Marxist-Leninist positions, he thoroughly and comprehensively analyzed the economic situation of classes in China and their relation to the revolution. Two articles are specially devoted to the analysis of the class structure of Chinese society: "Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society" and "How to Differentiate the Classes in the Rural Areas."

Mao Tse-tung showed that the enemies of the Chinese people are landlords and the comprador bourgeoisie, who defend and maintain everything obsolete, reactionary in China, and are simultaneously real vassals of the international bourgeoisie:

"These classes represent the most backward and reactionary relations of production and impede the development of productive forces in China. Their interests are completely incompatible with the goals of the Chinese revolution. This applies especially to big landlords and big compradors, who always stand on the side of imperialism and represent an extremely counter-revolutionary force" (p. 16).

Political representatives of landlords and comprador bourgeoisie at that time were a clique of fascist-minded politician-nationalists and right-wing Kuomintang members.

An important place in the structure of Chinese society was occupied by the middle, so-called national bourgeoisie, which represented capitalist production relations. The articles give a deep characterization of the behavior of the middle bourgeoisie, showing its vacillations and political instability.

Experiencing all the heavy blows of foreign capital and the yoke of militarists, the middle bourgeoisie, on the one hand, is interested in revolution and views favorably the revolutionary movement directed against imperialism and militarism; on the other hand, it fears the domestic proletariat, fears revolution, and therefore exhibits vacillation. Depending on the concrete situation, the middle bourgeoisie may support the revolution or turn away from it.

The middle bourgeoisie dreams of an "independent" revolution, of creating its own state. "Its political platform," states the article 'Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society,' "is the creation of a state in which one class—the national bourgeoisie —shall rule" (p. 16). However, in the epoch of imperialism, when an intense struggle between the proletariat and monopolistic bourgeoisie is unfolding, the hope of the middle bourgeoisie to create its "independent" state is doomed to failure. Historical events in China confirmed the correctness of this proposition of Mao Tse-tung.

Revealing the contradiction in the behavior of the bourgeoisie, Mao Tse-tung defined the relation to it from the working class, showing that the middle bourgeoisie, especially its left wing, can be used in the struggle against foreign imperialists and their vassals within the country.

To the class of the petty bourgeoisie, Mao Tse-tung includes owner-peasants (i.e., peasants owning land), owners of handicraft enterprises, lower layer of intelligentsia (students, teachers of secondary and primary schools, petty officials, petty clerks, petty lawyers, petty traders). For correct policy towards various representatives of this class, it is necessary to take into account that the most well-off part of the petty bourgeoisie represents its right wing, the least well-off part represents its left wing, and a significant layer of the petty bourgeoisie occupies a middle position.

Then the position and behavior of semi-proletarian layers of the population are analyzed, which Mao Tse-tung includes the

vast majority of semi-owner peasants, peasant-poor, petty artisans, shop assistants, street vendors.

Mao Tse-tung showed that semi-owner peasants and poor peasants who were subjected to ruthless exploitation by landlords were interested in revolution. He specially emphasizes that "the overwhelming majority of semi-owner peasants together with poor peasants constitute a huge semi-proletarian mass. And that the peasant question is primarily a question of these layers" (p. 21). The book convincingly and vividly shows the interest of urban semi-proletarians in revolution.

Great attention is given by Mao Tse-tung to the proletariat. During the period when the article "Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society" was written, the number of the proletariat was only about two million. The small size of the industrial proletariat was explained by the economic backwardness of the country. Extensively illuminating the economic situation of the proletariat, Mao Tse-tung points out that although the number of industrial proletariat is small, it is the most progressive class of modern China, the leading force of the revolutionary movement of the country.

On the basis of a deep Marxist-Leninist analysis of the class structure of Chinese society, Mao Tse-tung correctly defines the alignment of class forces in the Chinese revolution, the behavior of classes, and their interrelations.

"From all that has been said," writes Mao Tse-tung, "it can be seen that all militarists, bureaucrats, compradors, and big landlords allied with imperialists, as well as the reactionary

part of the intelligentsia dependent on them, are our enemies. The industrial proletariat is the leading force of our revolution. The entire semi-proletariat and petty bourgeoisie are our closest friends" (pp. 26–27).

Mao Tse-tung substantiated the possibility of a bloc with the middle bourgeoisie, especially with its left wing, pointing out the need to take into account the vacillations of the middle bourgeoisie and prevent its attempts to disorganize the revolutionary front.

The work of Mao Tse-tung was a powerful blow against right and "left" opportunists, revealing their theoretical helplessness and political short-sightedness; it gave a correct, Marxist setting on the question of driving forces of the Chinese revolution.

The great historical merit of Mao Tse-tung lies in the fact that he defended and concretized Marxist-Leninist definitions of the revolution in China as a bourgeois-democratic revolution by its content, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal; gave a deep Marxist analysis of class forces of Chinese society; and correctly solved the question of the hegemony of the proletariat in the democratic revolution, its allies in the struggle against imperialists, landlords, and compradors. The development of all these questions retains its practical-political and theoretical significance for the further development of the revolutionary national liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries.

* * *

Marxism-Leninism teaches that political struggle of the working class is subject to certain laws, and to achieve victory, it is necessary to know them and be guided by them. It is necessary to take into account that laws change if conditions change under which political struggle develops. Mao Tse-tung shows that ignoring laws of political struggle, amateurishness in politics, subjectivism, and arbitrary tactics inevitably lead to defeat of the revolution.

An indispensable condition for a victorious revolution is a correct political line of the proletariat, determined by the Communist Party, which takes into account national features of struggle, fast and flexible change of tactics, forms and methods of struggle depending on changes in historical conditions, education of masses on their own experience, advancing slogans reflecting needs of social development understandable to masses, etc.

The Communist Party of China, led by Mao Tse-tung, mastered the complex art of political leadership of the revolutionary movement of masses. Strategy and tactics of the Communist Party of China, developed by Mao Tse-tung, are genuinely Marxist, scientific, and creative, distinguished by necessary flexibility for a revolutionary party while maintaining deep adherence to principles.

In the first volume, the policy and tactics of the Communist Party in China during the First and Second Revolutionary Civil Wars are comprehensively and deeply revealed, and the necessity of changing policy in connection with Japanese aggression is substantiated.

As is known, the Chinese revolution of 1925–1927 began as a nationwide united front revolution directed mainly against external imperialist oppression. The national bourgeoisie, supporting the revolution, sought to limit its scope and aimed primarily at expanding territorial gains. The task of the proletariat was to use the bourgeoisie in the struggle against foreign imperialists to win national independence, destroy feudal foundations, and create a democratic republic. Under these conditions, it was necessary to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and strengthen the alliance of the working class with the peasantry.

Right opportunists headed by Ch'en Tu-hsiu failed to understand this crucial Marxist proposition; they occupied an incorrect position and essentially pushed away the main ally of the proletariat—the peasantry—which led to the isolation of the working class and ultimately to the defeat of the revolution.

During the march of the National Revolutionary Army from Guangdong to the north in 1926–1927 in the southern provinces of China, a broad movement of peasant masses began, and an agrarian revolution unfolded. The national bourgeoisie, frightened by the scale of the revolution, turned onto the path of betrayal and soon went over to the counter-revolutionary camp. A transition began from a nationwide front revolution to an agrarian revolution, which was intended to realize the unresolved tasks of the anti-imperialist revolution. Failing to understand the essence of this turn and the changes in the alignment of class forces, right opportunists turned away from the peasant movement and sought in every way to limit it so as not to "alienate" the national bourgeoisie.

Mao Tse-tung resolutely opposed this incorrect, opportunist stance. He traveled to Hunan province, where the agrarian movement took on especially wide scope, studied the situation on site, and formulated his conclusions in the "Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan," published in early 1927. The historical significance of this article lies in the fact that Mao Tse-tung, guided by Leninist-Stalinist propositions on allies of the proletariat, despite right opportunists, advanced the idea of all-out development of the agrarian movement, revealing the great revolutionary potential of this movement.

Mao Tse-tung showed that the working peasantry represents a powerful revolutionary force that, under the leadership of the proletariat, can play a primary role. The agrarian revolution, he writes, is a "typhoon before which everything must bow down or perish" (p. 38).

The article convincingly demonstrates the anti-feudal content of the peasant movement and its true people's character:

"...Broad peasant masses gathered together to fulfill their historical mission; democratic forces of the village arose to overthrow feudal forces" (p. 41).

Analyzing the alignment of class forces during the period of broad agrarian movement in Hunan province, Mao Tse-tung stresses that the most revolutionary element in the village are poor peasants, and that leading position of poor peasants in peasant unions is a major condition for success of the revolution: "Without poor peasants ('barefoot,' as haters call them), a revolution in the village could never achieve its

present scale; without them, it was impossible to overthrow local tyrants and evil gentry and complete the democratic revolution" (p. 50).

Based on the analysis of the peasant movement in Hunan province, Mao Tse-tung concludes that the bourgeois-democratic revolution is entering its second phase—the anti-feudal, agrarian phase, when the main burden is transferred to liquidating feudal remnants in the country.

Giving paramount importance to the agrarian peasant movement, seeing it as the future of the revolution, Mao Tse-tung, as a true Marxist, called on all party members "to stop as quickly as possible all kinds of reasoning directed against the peasant movement, to correct as quickly as possible all erroneous measures of revolutionary authorities regarding this movement. Only thus can one contribute to the further unfolding of the revolution. For at the present moment, the peasant movement acquires paramount importance. Very little time will pass—and in all provinces of Central, Southern, and Northern China, hundreds of millions of peasants will rise; they will be swift and irresistible, like a typhoon, and no force will be able to hold them back" (p. 36).

Mao Tse-tung resolutely supported the peasant movement; he sought to have the proletariat lead it; however, right opportunists holding leadership posts in the party refused to recognize the correctness of Mao Tse-tung's point of view and continued to insist on their errors, weakening the party itself, the working class, and its connection with the peasantry. The

capitulatory line of right opportunists was one of the factors causing the defeat of the 1925–1927 revolution.

After the defeat of the revolution, the situation in China changed significantly. The alignment and class forces underwent modification. The Communist Party again faced the acute question of defining political line and tactics of struggle in relation to various classes. Developing a correct political line took place in fierce struggle against various opportunists.

A small group of Trotskyites, contrary to obvious facts, tried to prove that the Kuomintang had allegedly completed the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the task now was to prepare for a socialist revolution. "Left" opportunists in the CC, taking no account of the defeat of the revolution, demanded immediate revolutionary action on a wide scale.

Right opportunists, on the other hand, believed that the defeat of the revolution was long-lasting and did not believe in a new rise; essentially, they fell into pessimism and despondency.

Mao Tse-tung demonstrated the theoretical insolvency of opportunists of all shades and substantiated the political line of the party under new historical conditions, outlining a new tactic of struggle.

Critiquing the insolvency, groundlessness, and falsity of Trotskyite arguments about the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, Mao Tse-tung convincingly showed that the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution remained unresolved, and the Chinese people had to solve them.

"The program of the Chinese democratic revolution is," says Mao Tse-tung in the article "The Struggle in the Chingkang Mountains," "in foreign policy—overthrowing imperialist rule and achieving full national liberation; in domestic policy—liquidating comprador bourgeoisie in the city, completing agrarian revolution, eliminating feudal relations in the village, and overthrowing militarist government. Only through such a democratic revolution can a true foundation be created for the transition to socialism" (p. 157).

Under new historical conditions, tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution could be resolved only under leadership of the working class in alliance with semi-proletariat and petty bourgeoisie of village and city, with hegemony of the working class. Accordingly, analyzing the alignment of class forces in the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War, Mao Tse-tung advanced a new political slogan—creation of a worker-peasant republic, advanced and defended the idea of creating red power.

Such was the orientation of the Communist Party of China toward implementing anti-militarist, anti-feudal revolution. This orientation ensured mobilization of forces of the Chinese people for winning national independence and democratic freedoms.

Mao Tse-tung also dealt a powerful intellectual blow to panic-mongers and pessimists from the camp of right opportunists who did not believe in a new rise of revolution, in the possibility of destroying imperialist and landlord oppression in China. He showed that despite uneven development of

revolution in the country, the revolution consists of ebbs and flows, victories and defeats, but ultimately must end in victory.

A firm and unyielding faith in revolutionary forces of the Chinese people led by the proletariat shines through all works of Mao Tse-tung. He called on Chinese communists not to succumb to despondency from defeat, but to draw necessary conclusions. Contrary to panic-mongers and petty-minded individuals, he declared: "What is a real impregnable wall? People, millions of masses who with all their heart and mind support the revolution. This is a real impregnable wall that no force can destroy. Counter-revolution cannot crush us, but we shall crush it. Rallied around the revolutionary government, millions of masses, unfolding our revolutionary war, can destroy counter-revolution, free all of China" (p. 254).

Under severe conditions of white terror, Mao Tse-tung put forward a bold plan for further unfolding the revolution.

Taking into account the necessity of changing tactics of struggle depending on changed conditions, Mao Tse-tung, using Marxism-Leninism, substantiated a new tactical line for the party. He proposed creating base revolutionary areas in rural regions—red power areas—which would serve as centers for accumulating and preparing revolutionary forces, centers for mobilizing and educating masses in the spirit of revolution. He proposed starting the transition from Red Guard detachments to creating a strong Red Army.

Mao Tse-tung created a guerrilla detachment called the "First Division of the Worker-Peasant Army," which came with this detachment to the Chingkang Mountains and in late 1927

created the first red power region. In spring 1928, a detachment led by Chu Teh arrived in the Chingkang Mountains. The detachments of Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh merged and laid the foundation for the Chinese Red Army.

The ideas of Mao Tse-tung on creating red power regions, developing and strengthening the Red Army, set forth in articles "Why Is It That Red Political Power Can Exist in China?", "The Struggle in the Chingkang Mountains," etc., reflected urgent needs of the liberation movement in China and stemmed from a sober, scientific analysis of the situation.

The possibility of origin, existence, and development of red power regions in China, according to Mao Tse-tung, is determined by the following conditions: 1) fragmented economy split into self-contained regional peasant economies; 2) imperialist policy of dividing China into spheres of influence; and 3) disagreements and wars in the camp of warlords.

For the existence and development of revolutionary bases, activity of masses, a strong party organization, a sufficiently strong Red Army, favorable local geography for military actions, and minimum economic resources are required.

Mao Tse-tung proved that creating revolutionary bases shakes ruling power in China facing huge difficulties, strengthens internal decay of red power, accelerates revolutionary rise across the country. "Only thus," says the article, "can we inspire revolutionary-minded masses across the country with

the same hope that the Soviet Union inspires in the world" (p. 195).

Under leadership of Mao Tse-tung, under the banner of creating a worker-peasant republic, with correct tactical orientation—creation and strengthening of revolutionary bases—a national revolution unfolded in China, red power regions emerged and expanded, and the Red Army grew and matured.

In red regions, popular power was established, landlord power was liquidated, and land was handed over to peasants. Successes in creating revolutionary bases made it possible to form the Central People's Government, headed by Mao Tse-tung. Red power by its class content was a dictatorship of working class and peasantry.

Kuomintang forces conducted several military campaigns against red regions, setting the goal of liquidating revolutionary bases, destroying the Red Army, but all campaigns failed one after another.

The correct political line of the party, creatively found form of struggle, organization, education, and mobilization of masses—creation of revolutionary bases and heroic organization of party work that bravely led anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution—all this ensured major victories for the Chinese people in their struggle for freedom. These victories were achieved because the leader of the Communist Party, Mao Tse-tung, skillfully led revolutionary struggle. In each concrete situation, he correctly found the main link to solve tasks at hand.

The tactical line of creating and strengthening revolutionary bases proved its viability, facing attacks from "left" opportunists led by Li Li-san, who temporarily seized party leadership.

In 1930, during the repulse of the third Kuomintang campaign against the Border Region (central base), Li-sanists put forward an adventurist plan for immediate armed uprising in major Chinese cities, demanding an offensive by the young Red Army against central cities, claiming the Chinese revolution would trigger world revolution and only under this condition could it be victorious. Simultaneously, they worked out "left" adventurist positions that inevitably led to defeat of the revolutionary movement.

Mao Tse-tung exposed the adventurist character of Li Li-san's directive for immediate armed uprising on a national scale, showing its harm. In September 1930, Li Li-san's supporters were removed from leadership posts, and Li Li-san admitted his mistakes. After the Li-san line was exposed, resistance to the creation of revolutionary bases was shown by a new group of "left" opportunists led by Ch'en Shao-yu (Wang Ming) and Ch'in Pang-hsien (Po Ku).

Declaring Li-san directives right-opportunist, they put forward a new political program that actually developed the Li-san line and condemned the revolution to defeat.

During four years (1931–1935), when this line predominated, party and revolution suffered severe losses: the party lost about 90% of its members, the Red Army suffered severe defeats and

shrank significantly, territory of revolutionary bases was lost, and millions lived under severe terror from Kuomintang forces.

Incorrect political and tactical line of "left" adventurists weakened revolutionary forces and slowed development.

The erroneous line of "left" opportunists was exposed and condemned at the Zunyi conference of party leadership. The correct, Marxist line of Mao Tse-tung triumphed.

The immense historical significance of Mao Tse-tung's theoretical works of this period lies in the fact that under new historical conditions, he formulated and substantiated a new political and tactical line for the Communist Party of China. In conditions when the national bourgeoisie changed its stance and Japanese aggression began in the country, Mao Tse-tung correctly defined the content of revolution, defending the hegemony of the working class and strengthening the alliance of proletariat with peasantry, advancing the slogan of creating a worker-peasant democratic republic and arming the party with a new tactical line aimed at creating revolutionary bases in the countryside. Historical experience proved the correctness and vitality of the political line developed by Mao Tse-tung.

When, in connection with Japanese imperialism's attack on China, the international and domestic situation changed significantly, Mao Tse-tung formulated a new political line that fully responded to new historical conditions.

In accordance with changed historical conditions in China, a regrouping of class forces began, and a new phase of revolution started. The threat of total loss of national

independence, the threat of turning China into a colony of Japanese imperialists, affected the interests of almost all classes and layers of Chinese society. Faced with national tasks, resolution was possible only under working class leadership, with a correct political line. Under these conditions, Mao Tse-tung correctly poses and solves the problem of internal and external contradictions in China's political life.

"Contradictions between China and Japan," he writes, "became primary, while internal contradictions became secondary, subordinate... in class relations and interrelations within the country changes occurred; these changes marked the beginning of a new stage of development" (p. 449).

In a new historical situation, the Communist Party of China, armed with Marxism-Leninism led by Mao Tse-tung, formulates a new strategic and tactical line. The party clearly formulates the main task: struggle for national independence, against Japanese imperialists and their henchmen—comprador bourgeoisie and landlords. To solve this task, the party sought to unite all patriotic forces and consistently implement a Marxist-Leninist tactic of a united front under the slogan of creating a people's republic.

"Organize multi-million masses, move a huge revolutionary army—that's what is required today for revolution's attack on counter-revolution," teaches Mao Tse-tung. "Only such a force can defeat Japanese imperialism and Chinese national traitors; this is an obvious truth. And therefore tactics of a united front are Marxist-Leninist tactics" (pp. 280–281).

The Communist Party of China appealed to all Chinese citizens, all political parties and groups, regardless of political views, to all military formations, to build a united anti-Japanese national front. "Our united front," points out Mao Tse-tung, "covers both bourgeoisie and all who are ready to defend their motherland... this united front of the whole country against external enemy. Fulfilling the task of creating such a front is not only necessary, but also possible" (pp. 450–451). Some communists spoke out against cooperation with national bourgeoisie in struggle against Japanese imperialism, considering participation temporary. Mao Tse-tung showed that refusal to cooperate with national bourgeoisie was deeply reactionary, essentially Trotskyite, representing a manifestation of worst sectarianism and adventurism, recalling Lenin's directive on necessity to use every opportunity to fight the enemy.

Establishing cooperation of proletariat with bourgeoisie did not mean giving up independent position of proletariat in united national front. On the contrary, Mao Tse-tung showed that successful resolution of national tasks was possible only if proletariat took leadership of anti-Japanese struggle. "In current situation," he writes, "without political leadership of proletariat and its party, a united anti-Japanese national front cannot be created" (p. 466).

"This circumstance," points out Mao Tse-tung, "places even greater responsibility on proletariat and its party for political leadership. Taking main role of sacred duty of communist party..." (pp. 466–467).

Thus, alignment of class forces in China changed significantly. Main driving forces remained working class and peasantry, broad masses of petty bourgeoisie, and revolutionary intelligentsia as most reliable allies. After hesitation, middle bourgeoisie joined, as well as some groups of big bourgeoisie.

Change in situation raised necessity to define main link in solving tasks facing party under new historical conditions, replacing outdated slogans with new ones.

As known, during change in national bourgeoisie's stance, driving forces remained proletariat, peasantry, and petty bourgeoisie. Communist Party stood as sole organizer of masses, advancing slogan of creating worker-peasant republic, playing important role in uniting masses for new revolutionary action. It fully answered needs of historical development...

In new historical conditions, tasks of struggle against Japanese imperialism became central, requiring unity of all patriotic forces of the country; the slogan of creating a worker-peasant republic no longer met the situation, as it did not unite, but divided various classes fighting against aggressors, and weakened the united anti-Japanese national front.

Therefore, this slogan was withdrawn and replaced by another slogan.

"The slogan of a worker-peasant democratic republic," writes Mao Tse-tung, "was correctly advanced in the past and is correctly withdrawn at present" (p. 464).

Creatively analyzing the prevailing historical situation, Mao Tse-tung advanced and theoretically substantiated the idea of

creating a national democratic republic that would unite all anti-imperialist forces.

The CC of the party points out that a democratic republic is the most suitable form for a united front. It can spread its influence over broader territory than a democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants, becoming a far more progressive political system, best way to unite all anti-Japanese forces, drawing broad masses into political life, creating scope for free activity of the proletariat, representing a major step in China's democratic development.

"A people's republic will throw off imperialist oppression, lead China to freedom and independence, overthrow landlord yoke, free China from semi-feudal order; this meets interests of not only workers and peasants, but other layers of population" (p. 286).

Thus, the question of political line and tactics was solved by the leader of the Chinese people in new conditions. Red power areas were renamed, and the Red Army reorganized.

Very important to note, struggle for national liberation was consistently linked with struggle for democratic freedoms, considering winning democracy main link in general chain of revolution.

"In political sphere," writes Mao Tse-tung, "winning democratic freedoms is main condition ensuring victory in war with Japanese invaders" (p. 456).

Holding high the banner of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, the Communist Party of China linked general democratic struggle with socialist tasks of the proletariat, pointing out that democratic revolution will pass through several stages, growing into socialist revolution.

"Communists," said Mao Tse-tung, "never give up their socialist and communist ideals; passing through stage of bourgeois-democratic revolution, they will reach socialist and communist stage" (pp. 461–462).

The Communist Party of China, raising masses to solve urgent tasks, linked Chinese liberation movement with international front against reaction, viewing Chinese revolution as part of world revolutionary process. Consistently adhering to principles of proletarian internationalism, party expanded ties with fraternal parties, especially CPSU—"Shock Brigade" of world movement, fighting for strengthening friendship between Chinese and Soviet peoples.

Mao Tse-tung persistently points out that Chinese people need help from foreign brothers, especially Soviet Union, helping with blood ties of interest (p. 290).

The political line developed by Mao Tse-tung formed basis of Communist Party activities in China and fully justified itself.

* * *

Much attention is given by Mao Tse-tung to questions of military strategy and tactics, covered in special work "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War." It summarizes experience of Second Revolutionary Civil War,

gives Marxist analysis of war essence, revealing difference between just and unjust wars. Mao Tse-tung formulates laws of revolutionary war in China, showing link between strategy and tactics.

"We must study laws of war," writes Mao Tse-tung, "must study laws of revolutionary war in China" (p. 308).

Studying specific laws of revolutionary war in China, Mao Tse-tung takes into account experience of Civil War in USSR: "Experience of Civil War led by Lenin and Stalin has world significance for all communist parties, including the Communist Party of China" (p. 332).

Revealing the immense importance of the Civil War experience in the USSR for all revolutionary wars, Mao Tse-tung nevertheless warns against mechanical transference of this experience to China, pointing to features of revolutionary war in China that must be taken into account to win victory. In accordance with these features, Mao Tse-tung formulated principles of strategy and tactics for the second revolutionary war.

Political, tactical, and military directives of Mao Tse-tung passed severe historical testing, showed vitality at various stages of revolution, ensured a correct line of behavior for the Chinese people, and enabled them to achieve victory.

Under the banner of creative Marxism, led by the heroic Communist Party headed by Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese people accomplished a victorious democratic revolution, drove out foreign imperialists, won national freedom, finished off

domestic reaction, and achieved broad democracy. The Chinese people created a free, independent, democratic state.

* * *

The correct political tactics of the Communist Party of China were developed in fierce struggle against right and "left" opportunists based on creative application of Marxism-Leninism to solving questions of the Chinese revolution, overcoming opportunist distortions and attempts at dogmatic application.

Struggle against dogmatism and empiricism in theory, against adventurism and subjectivism in politics acquired special acuteness in 1931–1934.

During this period, a group of executive workers—adherents of dogmatism—existed in the party, long denying the experience of the Chinese revolution, ignoring directives of Marxist-Leninist theory that Marxism is a guide to action, isolating individual phrases from Marxist works. Cut off from practical struggle, these dogmatists constructed various schemes trying to impose them on the party as Marxist. On the other hand, another group—adherents of empiricism—did not understand the importance of theory for revolutionary struggle, sliding on the surface of events, unable to see underlying connections, working blindly.

Empiricism and dogmatism were the methodological basis of subjectivist errors in the party in 1931–1934, causing serious damage to the revolutionary movement. Theoretical exposure of empiricism and dogmatism became a vital necessity to

creatively use Marxism-Leninism. This task was brilliantly fulfilled by Mao Tse-tung in "On Practice."

The outstanding significance of this work lies in the fact that Mao Tse-tung, examining questions of Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, subjected epistemological roots of adventurism and subjectivism to merciless criticism, showing that correct policy can only be built on a scientific basis of knowing laws of the objective world.

Mao Tse-tung consistently and deeply develops the Marxist-Leninist proposition on the organic connection between knowledge and action, that practical activity lies at the base of knowledge, serving as starting point and criterion of truth.

Man learns causal connections of the external world through material production activity, participating in political struggle, cultural life, etc.

The Marxist concept of practice includes the sum total and multifaceted nature of social relations.

Further, Mao Tse-tung shows that continuous development of social practice, movement of society from lower to higher stages, serves as material basis for deepening process of knowledge from simple to complex, from one-sided to multifaceted worldview, true science of society—Marxism-Leninism.

Revealing the connection between knowledge and social practice, Mao Tse-tung shows how human knowledge arises from practice, acting as knowledge tested in practice.

The article shows that the starting point of knowledge is practice, experience. "Knowledge begins with experience," writes Mao Tse-tung, "this is materialism in theory of knowledge" (p. 518).

The first step in knowledge is human contact in practical activity with objects and phenomena perceived by sense organs. This stage of sensory knowledge, where sensations and representations arise under external influence, reflects only external sides of things and phenomena, establishing immediate connections.

In the article, an example is given characterizing sensory knowledge. The proletariat in the initial period of its activity perceived only individual sides of capitalism, rising spontaneously to fight for partial demands.

In other words, sensory knowledge, being the first step, cannot reveal laws of development of the objective world, reflecting only superficial aspects. At this stage, people cannot form deep concepts or make logical conclusions. Thus, sensory perception is insufficient. Development of productive activity generates necessity and possibility of transition to a new stage—to logical knowledge.

The article details the transition from sensory to logical knowledge, revealing the significance of theoretical thinking in human life.

"Sensation," points out Mao Tse-tung, "can solve only questions of external sides of phenomena; essence is solved only by theoretical thinking" (pp. 511–512).

Mao Tse-tung attaches great importance to logical thinking, showing that the power of human knowledge is expressed in correctness of logical thinking, which in concepts and judgments establishes internal connections of things, revealing causes of movement and formulating laws of the objective world.

The article details the Marxist-Leninist proposition that true task of knowledge consists in ascending from sensation to thought, to understanding internal contradictions objectively existing in things, to understanding internal connections between processes.

"Logical knowledge," writes Mao Tse-tung, "differs from sensory knowledge in that it reflects overall, internal connections, grasping phenomena as a whole..." (pp. 510–511).

Substantiating qualitative difference between sensory perception and logical thinking, Mao Tse-tung establishes their connection, showing sensory and rational forms as two stages of knowledge united on the basis of practice (p. 511).

Relying on Lenin's famous statement that all scientific abstractions reflect nature deeper and fuller, Mao Tse-tung shows the progressive nature of knowledge, where logical thinking plays key role for social practice and Chinese liberation movement.

The article serves as a vivid example of creative exposition of philosophical questions. Categories of knowledge are filled with rich content, reflecting human practice. Revealing importance of theoretical knowledge, Mao Tse-tung points out

that knowing general laws of class struggle is necessary for leading the revolution. To achieve this, severe criticism of dogmatists who ignored theory was required and could not grasp general connections of historical events.

"...Short-sighted dogmatists," points out Mao Tse-tung, "...bow before experience and ignore theory, failing to grasp objective process as a whole; lacking broad perspective, they take pride in temporary successes. If such people led the revolution, they would lead it into a dead end" (p. 519).

Mao Tse-tung calls on Chinese communists to learn, master knowledge, master theory.

"If you want to gain knowledge," says the article, "you must participate in practice that changes reality... If you want to know theory and methods of revolution, you must participate in revolution" (p. 513).

This formula is directed against dogmatists who isolated theoretical knowledge from life and practice. Dogmatists in the Communist Party of China sought to impose abstract schemes without considering real class relations, causing damage to the liberation movement. Mao Tse-tung exposed these views and reduced their influence to nothing.

Simultaneously, the article critiques "left" phrase-mongers who, as dogmatists, detached theoretical propositions from historical context, running ahead to advance slogans before conditions matured, leading to adventurism. Mao Tse-tung also critiques conservatives whose ideas lagged behind historical development.

Thus, the article consistently defends and develops the Marxist proposition on the connection between knowledge and practice, truth and action, fighting against subjective views detached from practice.

Mao Tse-tung showed that reflecting the objective world in class society bears a class character.

In full accordance with Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, Mao Tse-tung solves the question of goals of knowledge through concrete examples of the Chinese revolution, showing Marxists seek to understand laws not just to explain the world, but to transform it. Practice serves as the test of truth.

Currently, responsibility for correct knowledge and transformation of the world rests on the proletariat and its party.

The article shows that transforming the objective world is accompanied by re-educating man, and this process is already taking place in the USSR and on this path enters China.

* * *

Creatively using Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, Mao Tse-tung established unity of concrete knowledge and concrete action as applied to Chinese conditions, giving an example of solving concrete revolutionary tasks.

The victory of the Chinese revolution is a new triumph of Marxism-Leninism, confirming the great transforming power of Marxist-Leninist theory across humanity.

The works of Mao Tse-tung are an outstanding example of creative application of Marxism-Leninism to solving tasks of the Chinese people's revolution, serving as a theoretical weapon in building a new life in China and for triumph of democracy and peace worldwide.

21. STUDY OF J. V. STALIN'S WORK "ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE USSR" AND THE HISTORIC DECISION OF THE PARTY CONGRESS

S. Z.

The work of I. V. Stalin "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR", his historic speech at the 19th Party Congress, the decisions and materials of the 19th Congress were widely discussed in all philosophical scientific institutions of Moscow and in the philosophical departments of the Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Higher Party School, the Moscow Order of Lenin Lomonosov State University, and other higher educational institutions.

* * *

In the **Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR**, Academician G. F. Alexandrov delivered a report on the tasks of Soviet philosophers in light of the new works of I. V. Stalin and the decisions of the 19th Congress. In his report, he characterized the significance of I. V. Stalin's work for the further elaboration of problems of dialectical and historical materialism.

G. F. Alexandrov noted that Soviet philosophers make errors of a subjectivist-idealistic nature in works on historical materialism, and work little on the problems of the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge. The works prepared by the Institute of Philosophy (a textbook on dialectical materialism published recently, a collection "On Dialectical Materialism,"

and a number of other books) suffer from significant shortcomings.

Soviet philosophers still evade the study of deep processes in the development of Soviet society, from creative solutions to complex problems, often skimming the surface of phenomena, and weakly developing criticism and self-criticism.

An example of a deep creative study of the laws of social development are the works of I. V. Stalin.

The work of I. V. Stalin "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" provides a program for further struggle to build communism; the leader's historic speech at the 19th Party Congress outlines prospects for the development of the international working-class movement and the struggle of fraternal communist and workers' parties for peace, democracy, and socialism.

Relying on the works of I. V. Stalin and the decisions of the 19th Party Congress, collectives of Soviet philosophers working at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and in philosophical departments of higher educational institutions must create scientific works that receive deep, genuinely Marxist illumination on the question of objective laws of the development of nature and society, especially on the question of objective sociological and economic laws of the development of socialist society. G. F. Alexandrov further pointed to a number of problems that acquire special relevance in light of I. V. Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR".

Soviet philosophers must launch an offensive against voluntarism and agnosticism in modern bourgeois sociology, which denies the objective nature of the laws of social development, and generally against the subjectivist-idealistic trend in philosophy and sociology. It is necessary to conduct the most decisive struggle against subjectivist-idealistic errors in the works of Soviet philosophers. (The speaker gave examples of such errors). In connection with this, it is necessary to revise, in light of I. V. Stalin's new works, books previously published by Soviet philosophers, reveal the errors in them, and create new works dedicated to propagating the ideas contained in the new works of I. V. Stalin and the decisions of the 19th Congress.

F. V. Konstantinov spoke about the tasks facing the journal "Voprosy Filosofii" in connection with the publication of I. V. Stalin's new work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" and the decisions of the 19th Party Congress. The work of I. V. Stalin represents a model of creative application and further development of dialectical and historical materialism. This work determines the content of our scientific work in the field of philosophy, including the tasks of the journal "Voprosy Filosofii". Soviet philosophers must expose idealism not only in the field of philosophy, but also invade other sciences to beat idealism everywhere it finds a loophole.

But first and foremost, we need to subject to criticism errors of an idealistic and metaphysical nature that were permitted by philosophers in some books, as well as in some articles published on the pages of the journal "Voprosy Filosofii".

Many philosophers and economists made an error by considering planning as an economic law of socialist society. The book "Historical Materialism," with an overall correct characterization of the laws of development of socialist society as objective laws, contains an incorrect formulation stating that planning allegedly "has the force of an economic law".

Some philosophers, proceeding from the correct proposition about the decisive role of the Party and the Soviet state, about the decisive role of policy in the development of our society, came to the deeply erroneous conclusion that Marx's discovered law "social being determines social consciousness" allegedly loses its force in socialist society. In this spirit, the problem of the primacy of politics over economics was treated, as if Marxist teaching on the determining role of the base in relation to the superstructure under our conditions had lost its force. Statements were even made that Soviet power is half-base, half-superstructure, that the Soviet state is a base, not a superstructure. Such views are a manifestation of idealism and have nothing in common with Marxism.

Enemies of Marxism, revisionists, tried to raise the question of the source of development of productive forces. I. V. Stalin gave an answer to this question as well: the main engine of productive forces is new relations of production. In our theoretical and propaganda work, a larger place should be occupied by the question of the law of obligatory conformity of production relations to the character of productive forces, a law that found its most brilliant and comprehensive coverage in the work of I. V. Stalin.

The new work of Comrade Stalin and the new tasks posed by the 19th Party Congress require us to raise the theoretical and ideological level of the journal's work.

The plan of the journal, taking into account the new tasks facing Soviet philosophers, was drawn up and discussed at meetings of the active contributors and readers of the journal. A large job must be carried out by the collective of authors of the collective work "Historical Materialism" to rewrite all problems in light of I. V. Stalin's new work.

Taking part in the discussion of I. V. Stalin's work were: G. E. Glezerman, N. I. Arbuzov, Z. V. Smirnova, B. M. Kedrov, M. P. Baskin, N. P. Vasilyev, S. L. Rubinstein, I. V. Kuznetsov, E. D. Varnakova, I. B. Astakhov, N. E. Ovander.

G. E. Glezerman spoke about how, after the release of I. V. Stalin's work "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," Soviet philosophers launched a struggle against equating the base with the productive forces of society, as such equating leads to a nihilistic attitude toward productive forces, toward so-called capitalism. The new work of I. V. Stalin reveals another side of the question, showing that equating the base with productive forces leads to ignoring the necessity of economic changes for the transition from socialism to communism.

Up until now, in scientific literature, we meet manifestations of subjectivist views on the role of the state, as evidenced by N. A. Kuznetsov's article published in issue No. 4 of the journal "Voprosy Filosofii" for 1951, and a number of articles in the journal "Soviet State and Law". The source of these erroneous views is the denial of the applicability of the basic laws of

historical materialism to Soviet society. Frequently, in the works of Soviet philosophers and economists, the question of the relationship between productive forces and production relations was incorrectly illuminated. Comrade Glezerman noted that, in particular, his brochure incorrectly treated full conformity between productive forces and production relations as allegedly inherent only to socialist society.

Comrade Glezerman further pointed to a number of problems requiring elaboration in light of I. V. Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR".

N. P. Vasilyev noted one of the most important shortcomings of many scientific works on issues of philosophy—the absence of a creative approach to solving philosophical problems, a superficial description of our reality, failing to reveal deep tendencies of social development. Thus, for example, in M. M. Rosenthal's article published in a collection issued by the Academy of Social Sciences, all propositions are correct, but examples are taken from the past, and they do not orient toward revising outdated concepts on the basis of new practice.

Until now, philosophers have not created works revealing the dialectic of the relationship between productive forces and production relations. The question of contradictions in socialist society is underdeveloped. Particular importance is now acquired by the question of Soviet patriotism and internationalism, the struggle of the new against the old, and the relationship between old form and new content.

N. I. Arbuzov pointed out that in the Institute of Philosophy, many pressing questions of dialectical materialism have not

received deep elaboration until now: on freedom and necessity, on the struggle of the new with the old. Those few works that concerned the latter issue contained errors that served as the basis for the so-called "theory of conflictlessness," which found its defenders among literature and art workers. V. Chertkov's article on this issue was subjected to fair criticism in "Literaturnaya Gazeta" and "Sovetskaya Kniga".

For a number of years, the plan of the Institute of Philosophy contained no works on questions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, and therefore it is no coincidence that in the interpretation of the laws of logic, errors of a subjectivist-idealistic nature were permitted.

Z. V. Smirnova spoke about the significance of I. V. Stalin's work for developing questions of the history of philosophy. Until now, the weak point in works on the history of philosophy was the analysis of the concrete historical situation that conditioned the emergence of a particular system of views. Sometimes these views were derived directly from the state of the productive forces of a given epoch without a deep analysis of production relations. In some works, a vulgarizing, anti-historical approach to philosophical systems of the past still exists, for example, in Golosov's work on the history of 17th-century English materialism.

Insufficient attention is paid to criticizing reactionary, idealistic concepts in philosophy and sociology, concepts denying objective laws of the development of science and society. The most important task at present is the criticism of subjectivist idealism, exposure of the remnants of anti-Marxist

Bogdanovite "theories," and struggle against vulgarization in treating questions of the history of philosophy.

Member of the editorial board of the journal B. M. Kedrov spoke about the importance of I. V. Stalin's work for developing questions on leaps and gradualness as forms of development in general and forms of development of Soviet society in particular, as well as for developing questions of dialectical logic. B. M. Kedrov subjected to criticism the work of the Institute of Philosophy on logic, including the logic textbook prepared for secondary schools, in which the question of the relationship between formal logic and Marxist dialectics is confused.

M. P. Baskin highlighted the question of the significance of I. V. Stalin's work for exposing modern bourgeois philosophy and sociology and for the correct classification of modern sociological schools. All modern bourgeois sociologists are apologists for the basic law of capitalism. A striking example is Hoover's book, in which it is asserted that business is the driving force of history.

Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR S. L. Rubinstein, in his speech, emphasized the significance of I. V. Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" for the development of psychology.

Up until now, the subjectivist-idealistic view of psychology as a science that allegedly must study not the objective laws of human mental activity, but merely subjective states not subject to any laws, has not been eradicated. The erroneous view that there are no laws in psychology still has currency. But in light

of I. V. Stalin's work, it is obvious to everyone that if there are no psychological laws, then there is no psychology as a science.

The laws of higher nervous activity discovered by I. P. Pavlov have immense significance for explaining mental phenomena. They answer the question of how mental phenomena are formed in the nervous system, in the brain. But the answer to this question does not exhaust the explanation of mental phenomena. Psychology has its own laws. The work of I. V. Stalin "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics" requires from us a deep study of the specifics of phenomena. The task of psychology as a science consists in researching mental phenomena as forms of reflecting the objective world by the brain in the process of active interaction of the subject with the objective world, and in clarifying the role mental reflections play in human behavior and activity.

The work of I. V. Stalin "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" puts before Soviet psychologists the task of elaborating three problems: problems of needs, all-around development of abilities, and the educational role of labor in forming personality.

I. V. Kuznetsov spoke about the fundamental importance of I. V. Stalin's work for developing theoretical issues of natural science and the history of natural science, for fighting against "physical" idealism and other idealistic theories, and indicated the need to conduct a struggle against manifestations of subjectivist idealism in the works of certain Soviet scientists,

for example, in the works of the late physicist Mandelstam, as well as in the works of Prof. Landau.

E. D. Varnakova subjected to criticism the conference on psychology questions, which considered psychology problems in isolation from practice, from the tasks of educating Soviet people. The work of I. V. Stalin "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" directs Soviet psychologists toward studying objective laws of psychology and resolving cardinal questions of this science.

* * *

Speakers subjected to criticism errors of a subjectivist-idealistic nature made by Soviet philosophers, economists, legal scholars, and historians in interpreting the laws of social development; however, criticism of these errors was insufficiently sharp and concrete.

Heads of sectors of the Institute of Philosophy and scientific personnel reported on how research work across all sectors and topics of candidate and doctoral dissertations is being restructured.

Concrete proposals submitted by speakers regarding restructuring the plan of scientific research work of the Institute of Philosophy were reflected in the decision of the Academic Council.

In the adopted decision, the Academic Council outlined a series of measures corresponding to new requirements facing theoretical workers in connection with the release of the

programmatic work of I. V. Stalin "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR".

The Academic Council of the Institute of Philosophy deemed it necessary to revise topics for doctoral and candidate dissertations and the institute's scientific research plan, enriching it with new topics, as well as to review the structure and content of all works performed by the institute.

The plan of the Institute of Philosophy outlines the preparation of the following works under the section "Development of the Marxist-Leninist Theory by I. V. Stalin":

> Development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" by I. V. Stalin.
>
> I. V. Stalin on the base and superstructure of socialist society.
>
> Politics and ideology of the modern bourgeoisie in light of the basic economic law of capitalism.
>
> Marxist philosophical materialism.
>
> I. V. Stalin on the dialectic of development of productive forces and production relations.
>
> I. V. Stalin on the objective nature of laws of science.
>
> Marxist-Leninist teaching on truth.

Under the section "On the Gradual Transition from Socialism to Communism":

I. V. Stalin on main preliminary conditions for transition from socialism to communism.

Elimination of antithesis between town and country in the USSR and ways to overcome essential difference between them.

Criticism and self-criticism—driving force of development of socialist society.

I. V. Stalin on liquidating essential difference between physical and mental labor.

Multinational socialist state, its features and paths of development.

Socialist nations during gradual transition from socialism to communism.

Fundamentals of communist morality.

Questions of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics.

Under other sections:

Dialectical materialism and modern natural science.

Philosophical questions of language and thinking in light of I. V. Stalin's works on linguistics.

It is also planned to prepare a series of works on philosophical and natural-scientific bases of psychology. (Materialist teaching of I. P. Pavlov on signal systems, etc.)

A whole series of institute works will be devoted to exposing the aggressive policy of American-British imperialism and its

reactionary ideology. Among these works: the book "Significance of Comrade Stalin's Work 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR' for Struggle Against Modern Bourgeois Philosophy of Imperialist Bourgeoisie", the collective work "Collapse of Bourgeois Democracy", the books "American Bourgeois Sociologists—Enemies of Culture", "Austrian Right-Wing Socialists—Agents of US Imperialism", and a number of other works aimed at exposing subjectivist idealism and agnosticism in modern bourgeois philosophy: "Criticism of Subjectivist Idealism in Modern Bourgeois Philosophy and Sociology", "Pragmatism—Philosophy of American Imperialism", etc.

The institute's plan also includes the topic "Struggle of Progressive Forces of England Against Reactionary Bourgeois Philosophy".

The Institute of Philosophy alongside this will continue work on other planned topics and preparation of a number of textbooks and study guides for higher educational institutions and the party education network.

* * *

At the **Department of History of Philosophy of the Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU**, in the discussion of I. V. Stalin's work and the decisions of the 19th Party Congress, scientific staff and graduate students participated.

Academician G. F. Alexandrov delivered a report on "The Work of I. V. Stalin—Program for Building Communism". (In

revised author form, the report is published in this issue of the journal).

Comrades G. L. Strelchenko, O. Ya. Stechkin, and others raised the question of the significance of I. V. Stalin's work for scientific elaboration of the history of philosophy. Comrades A. F. Okulov, G. S. Vasetsky, M. D. Tsebenko, M. I. Sidorov made a number of concrete proposals on measures to improve the work of the department of history of philosophy.

G. L. Strelchenko spoke about the need to launch critique of bourgeois ideology more broadly. It is necessary to ensure intake into the library of the Academy of Social Sciences of the latest foreign philosophical literature, so as to have the opportunity to expose modern reactionary concepts of bourgeois philosophers—ideologists of imperialism. G. L. Strelchenko spoke about the need to raise the level of teaching foreign languages, and in connection with this, subject the work of the foreign language department to criticism.

O. Ya. Stechkin emphasized the need to develop the question of laws of history of philosophy as a science, in connection with the fact that I. V. Stalin in "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" specially raised the question of laws of natural sciences. I. V. Stalin requires distinguishing general laws and specific laws, penetrating into the depth of phenomena rather than skimming the surface.

O. Ya. Stechkin in his speech subjected to criticism the work of the department of history of philosophy, emphasizing that the head of the department of the Academy, G. F. Alexandrov, must pay more attention to the work of the department.

G. S. Vasetsky submitted a proposal to develop a number of practical measures to improve the department's work. Soviet philosophers must provide all-around assistance to progressive foreign philosophers. Propaganda of ideas contained in I. V. Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" will undoubtedly help all progressive philosophers in their fight against reaction.

I. V. Stalin's work will help Soviet philosophers correctly resolve those questions in which they permitted errors. Thus, for example, in Soviet philosophical literature, confusion was frequently permitted in interpreting the question of driving forces of Soviet society. Confusion in interpreting philosophical questions was the result of insufficient deep study of works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. I. V. Stalin brought full clarity to this question alongside other most important theoretical problems.

The task of Soviet philosophers consists in carefully studying how most important problems of philosophy are posed in works of V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin. Soviet philosophers must give an analysis of productive forces of Soviet society. This is one of the urgent tasks facing philosophers. However, along with developing theoretical problems, Soviet philosophers must pay great attention to developing organizational questions in light of decisions of the 19th Party Congress.

M. D. Tsebenko reported that in the first year, a seminar on dialectical and historical materialism was conducted. Reports and speeches discussed theoretical issues in light of I. V. Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR"

and decisions of the 19th Congress of the CPSU. First-year graduate students successfully passed candidate minimum exams on history of pre-Marxist philosophy. In their answers, graduate students showed the significance of I. V. Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" for deep study of history of pre-Marxist philosophy. In lectures on history of philosophy given recently, lecturers were guided by the new works of I. V. Stalin and materials of the 19th Congress of the CPSU.

Course participants of the department also used I. V. Stalin's work and congress materials in their dissertations. However, one cannot rest content with what has been achieved. The work of the department needs to be raised to a new, higher level. A common shortcoming of lectures and dissertations is descriptiveness. Meanwhile, in I. V. Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR", it speaks of the necessity of researching deep processes.

The department needs to undertake development of the question of the law and development by I. V. Stalin of the Marxist dialectical method. The department must also revise dissertation topics in connection with the release of I. V. Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" and materials of the 19th Congress. It is necessary to strengthen criticism of subjectivism, and in connection with this, include in dissertation topics and lecture topics a series of topics devoted to criticism of subjectivism. It is necessary to give several dissertation topics on F. Engels's work "Anti-Dühring". As is known, I. V. Stalin in his work pays great attention to this work by Engels.

M. I. Sidorov in his speech pointed to the need to focus attention of the department's collective on the struggle of Marxism against subjectivism in the history of philosophy. Great importance in this connection acquires coverage of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. It is necessary to show how classics of Marxism-Leninism in their works substantiated the law-governed nature of social development, constantly returning to this question, and persistently emphasizing the full importance of developing this problem. In modern conditions of ideological struggle, major significance is acquired by scientific coverage of the question of revolutionary, progressive, democratic traditions of all countries. It is necessary to show how Russian communists under difficult conditions of the tsarist regime were able not only to defend and safeguard the valuable heritage in the history of Russian social thought, but also in every way enrich progressive traditions at each new stage of historical development in accordance with conditions of class struggle. It is also necessary to show how in modern conditions communist parties and all progressive forces in France, Italy, and other countries fight for progressive national traditions. Soviet philosophers must render all-around assistance to progressive philosophers abroad in their struggle for progressive, democratic, revolutionary traditions.

* * *

In the **Marx–Engels–Lenin Institute under the Central Committee of the CPSU**, in the **Academy of Social Sciences**, in the **Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR**, and in other scientific-research institutions,

scientific sessions were held devoted to I. V. Stalin's work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR", decisions of the 19th Party Congress, and Comrade Stalin's speech at the closing session of the congress.

Discussion of I. V. Stalin's work, materials, and decisions of the 19th Party Congress contributes to deeper mastery of most important problems of dialectical and historical materialism, broad deployment of criticism and self-criticism, and development of a number of concrete measures for raising scientific-research and educational-training work in philosophical institutions to a higher ideological-theoretical level.

22. DISCUSSION OF THE PROSPECTUS FOR THE BOOK "DIELECTICAL MATERIALISM AND MODERN NATURAL SCIENCE" N. F. OVTCHINNIKOV, L. N. PLYUSHCH

Under the five-year plan (1951–1955), the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, together with other institutes of the Academy of Sciences, is preparing the book *Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science*.

The book should present a theoretical generalization of the achievements of advanced Soviet science in physics, chemistry, biology, and physiology. It will demonstrate the struggle of materialism against idealism, and dialectics against metaphysics in modern natural science, as well as the struggle of advanced Soviet science and progressive scientists abroad against distortions of science by reactionary scientists who serve imperialism.

The task of the book is to show that the development of modern science is possible only on the basis of dialectical materialism, and to reveal the decisive importance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the successful development of natural science.

General theoretical questions of physical, chemical, and biological sciences must be presented in the book from the standpoint of dialectical materialism. At the same time, the book should contribute to the solution of a number of concrete

theoretical problems of modern natural science that have not yet received resolution in light of dialectical materialism.

The book must show in detail and concretely that the development of natural sciences serves to further substantiate and develop the dialectical-materialist worldview.

The collective work *Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science* should be a single monographic study written according to a unified plan. This work must cover the main branches of modern natural science and illuminate its fundamental problems.

At the end of 1951, an expanded meeting of the Scientific Council of the Institute was held at the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences to discuss the prospectus of the book. Over one hundred people took part in the discussion: philosophers, physicists, chemists, biologists, and workers of other specialties from Moscow and other cities.

On behalf of the Sector of Philosophy of Natural Science, which prepared the prospectus of the book, G. V. Platonov, Head of the Sector, spoke. In his speech, he noted that Soviet scientists, naturalists, and philosophers face the task of providing, as a result of joint creative work, a philosophical generalization of the successes of modern natural science. In recent years, the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences has carried out several measures to organize joint work between naturalists and philosophers. In 1951, the collection of articles *Philosophical Questions of Modern Biology* was published, in which prominent Soviet biologists participated alongside philosophers. Work on the collection

Philosophical Questions of Modern Physics has been completed. However, in the field of philosophical generalization of the achievements of modern natural science, very little has been done so far.

The book *Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science* should become a monographic study of the most important theoretical questions of modern natural science. It should show, on the one hand, that modern natural science is a brilliant confirmation of the truth of dialectical materialism, and, on the other hand, that dialectical materialism is the only scientific method for the development of natural sciences. This task can be satisfactorily accomplished only when considering, in light of dialectical materialism, the most important questions of theoretical natural science, such as, for example, questions of quantum mechanics and theory of relativity in physics, the problem of chemical structure in chemistry, questions of the unity of organism and environment, questions of the origin of life and speciation in biology, the problem of thinking and speech, and I. P. Pavlov's doctrine of signal systems in psychology, among a number of others. The book should help scientists figure out the most complex theoretical questions, outline paths for a dialectical-materialist solution to urgent problems of modern natural science, and deal a crushing blow to idealism and metaphysics in the field of natural sciences.

Undoubtedly, in the course of preparing the book, many difficulties will have to be overcome in order to work out a common viewpoint on controversial issues. A number of discussions will likely need to be held, in particular, on questions of quantum mechanics, theory of relativity, internal

and external contradictions in living nature, the subject and tasks of psychology, and several other issues.

During the discussion of the prospectus at the meeting, philosophers and scientific workers of other specialties spoke. All speakers spoke of the great importance of the work *Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science* for the development of science and Marxist philosophy. The prospectus in its main directions was approved. At the same time, the comrades who spoke subjected a number of sections of the prospectus to detailed and businesslike criticism.

Academician V. A. Fock (Leningrad) proposed including in the prospectus of the chapter "Modern Understanding of Relativity Theory."

Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences S. M. Rytov (Physical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences) noted that in terms of covering basic problems, the prospectus seems sufficiently complete. However, in the prospectus, mainly in its physical and chemical sections, the content of certain chapters and especially individual points is not defined clearly enough. For example, in the prospectus of the third chapter of the first section, it is stated: "Interrelation between the most general features of the dialectical method and specific techniques and methods of research in concrete sciences." But what these interrelations are is not indicated in the prospectus, even in general terms.

In the prospectus, it is not explained what, exactly, the author must state in the following points: "The Role of Theory in Measurement," "Significance of Direct and Indirect Inferences

in Establishing Physical Laws," "Structure and Development of Physical Theory." The same, says Comrade Rytov, can be said regarding certain other provisions of the prospectus. The content of the chapter "Forms of Motion of Matter" is insufficiently developed.

Thus, the prospectus requires a number of clarifications.

Candidate of Philosophical Sciences M. A. Medvedev (Yaroslavl) subjected certain shortcomings of the draft book to criticism. The prospectus for section four (section II) — "Philosophical Questions of Modern Cosmology and Cosmogony" — is too brief (7 lines); it completely lacks any indication of the necessity of fighting against idealism, which is deeply rooted in modern bourgeois cosmological theories.

There is a danger of repeating the same material in different chapters; for example, in the first and second chapters of section V (in both it is proposed to give an account of the struggle of materialism with idealism in the field of physiology in the second half of the 19th century) and in other chapters. To avoid repetitions in the book when presenting those questions to which one must repeatedly return, cross-references to previous chapters should be given.

The development of the teaching of I. P. Pavlov by his followers (K. M. Bykov and others) should expediently be illuminated in a separate topic (see chapter II of section V); this material should be better distributed across different chapters in accordance with the presentation of individual sections of Pavlovian teaching.

Unfounded, in the opinion of M. A. Medvedev, is the proposal of the authors of the prospectus to allocate "special attention" to teaching about types of nervous systems and temperaments.

Doctor of Biological Sciences I. I. Gunar (Moscow Agricultural Academy named after Timiryazev) said that biologists of the Academy follow the prospectus of the book under discussion with great interest. They expect from the joint work of philosophers and naturalists, in particular from the book, answers to the most important philosophical questions of modern natural science. The prospectus covers these questions.

When presenting questions of biology, a tight connection between Michurinist and Pavlovian teachings is necessary. One of the urgent problems requiring development is the unity of the organism and the environment. Until now, I. P. Pavlov's teaching on excitation and inhibition has not been used in plant physiology, although it provides many examples of such phenomena as stimulation and depression, excitation and inhibition.

In the chapter "The Teaching of I. P. Pavlov and Problems of the Development of Organic Nature," it is necessary to show what constitutes the unity of the teachings of Michurin and Pavlov. It is necessary to develop general physiology and overcome the isolation that currently exists between animal physiology and plant physiology.

It is also important to illuminate the philosophical question of the struggle and unity of opposites in connection with considering the unity of the organism and the environment.

Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences A. D. Alexandrov (Leningrad) believes that questions of quantum mechanics deserve special and detailed consideration. In the prospectus of the second chapter (section II) — "Modern Teaching on the Structure of Matter. The Problem of Field and Its Interrelation with Matter" — it is necessary to emphasize the qualitative distinctiveness of various forms of motion of matter.

The prospectus speaks of the planetary model of the atom, although it is already outdated and, in the opinion of A. D. Alexandrov, has no special philosophical significance; instead, a special chapter should be devoted to describing the quantum-mechanical model of the atom. The general theory of relativity was completely omitted from the prospectus. Issues related to this theory must be included in the prospectus in one form or another.

In connection with the topic "The Problem of Causality in Modern Physics" (fifth chapter of section II), the problem of statistics, which plays a major role in modern physics, must be covered. This topic needs to be expanded, shedding light on special phenomena of determination revealed by modern physics.

A special section or chapter should be devoted to mathematics, its relationship to natural science and especially to physics. It is necessary to specifically consider the question of the mathematization of physics and to analyze V. I. Lenin's most important statements on this issue. In this chapter, mathematics must be viewed as a natural science.

Active Member of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Yu. Yu. Nuut (Tallinn) noted that the book whose prospectus is being discussed will be very useful to specialist naturalists, and expressed the wish that the preparation of the book be accelerated. In Yu. Yu. Nuut's opinion, the prospectus of the book should be made more specific. In the prospectus, it is expedient to omit certain issues that have lost their relevance. The most relevant are questions: about causality in atomic physics, about spatio-temporal representations in the physics of "elementary" particles, about the relationship between objects and instruments, about the "thought" experiment, about the form and content of physical theories, and a number of others. The prospectus should define the scope of questions that must be considered in the book more clearly and outline paths for their solution.

Candidate of Philosophical Sciences N. I. Kipovsky (Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR) proposed creating a special chapter in which to consider the ideological connection and unity of the teachings of I. V. Michurin and I. P. Pavlov.

In the prospectus of the second chapter of section V, the content of I. P. Pavlov's teaching on higher nervous activity should be presented in more detail, and the connection of this teaching with the Leninist theory of reflection should be shown.

In the chapter "The Teaching of I. P. Pavlov and Problems of Psychology," only the second signal system is mentioned, and the first signal system is not mentioned. This creates a risk of severing the second signal system from the first.

I. E. Amlinsky (Department of Biology, MMSI) believes that in some sections of the prospectus there is no historical approach to certain doctrines and scientists. Thus, for example, Claude Bernard, progressive for his time, a spontaneous materialist, falls under the same rubric with the arch-idealist Uexküll. In the prospectus, Darwinism is characterized in a critical light; however, the progressive historical role of Darwin and other major figures of natural science of the past, who received high praise from the classics of Marxism-Leninism, should be shown. In the prospectus, this is shown insufficiently.

Comrade Amlinsky joined the opinion of the speakers who pointed out the need to illuminate the unity of the general biological ideas of Michurin and Pavlov in the book.

The Leninist-Stalinist teaching on two concepts of development, outlined in the prospectus in the chapter on stage development, should form the basis of the presentation of the material in all chapters.

Professor M. A. Markov (Physical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences) pointed out the necessity of including a special section on quantum mechanics in the prospectus. In the prospectus, in Professor M. A. Markov's opinion, an unjustifiably small amount of space is allocated to the problem of causality, while other important specific regularities of atomic systems have dropped out of the prospectus.

Professor M. A. Markov objected to A. D. Alexandrov's proposal to exclude consideration of the planetary system of the atom. This system played its historical role, and it is

featured in university programs. The planetary system of the atom is an indispensable stage in the development of our concepts of the atom, and this stage cannot be ignored. Professor M. A. Markov also objected to comrades who criticized the prospectus for not sufficiently disclosing the content of the chapters. Disclosing the content of the book in advance for a whole series of unresolved issues would be difficult and hardly expedient. The prospectus, naturally, gives general formulations of questions, the concrete content of which will be worked out in the process of working on the book, in the process of discussions and special reviews.

Candidate of Biological Sciences N. A. Shustin (Leningrad) noted that the question of joint work between naturalists and philosophers is on the order of the day in modern natural science. The development of I. P. Pavlov's teaching by individual physiologists led to a number of idealistic errors, which is especially visible in the examples of the work of Academicians L. A. Orbeli and I. S. Beritashvili.

In the prospectus under discussion, theoretical and methodological principles of I. P. Pavlov's teaching should be formulated: the principle of determinism, the principle of the unity of organism and environment, the principle of the unity of analysis and synthesis, wholeness, unity of structure and function, the principle of unity of theory and practice. Consideration of these materialist theoretical and methodological principles will reveal the unity of the teachings of I. P. Pavlov and I. V. Michurin. Perhaps a special chapter should be set aside: "Theoretical and Methodological Principles of I. P. Pavlov's Teaching."

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences F. N. Shemyakin (Academy of Pedagogical Sciences) believes that when considering the question of space and time, the history of the development of views on this subject should be presented (Newton, Leibniz, Kant, Lomonosov).

F. N. Shemyakin joined N. A. Shustin's opinion regarding the necessity of a special consideration of the methodological principles of I. P. Pavlov's teaching. He also noted that in the prospectus of the chapter "Leninist Theory of Reflection and I. P. Pavlov's Teaching on Higher Nervous Activity," nothing is said about analyzers. Yet it is precisely the teaching on analyzers that opposes idealism in the physiology of higher nervous activity.

In the chapter "The Work of I. V. Stalin 'Marxism and Problems of Linguistics' and Materialist Teaching of I. P. Pavlov on First and Second Signal Systems," the social conditionality of thinking must be revealed. Ignoring this provision inevitably leads to a number of theoretical misunderstandings.

Finally, in the chapter "The Teaching of I. P. Pavlov and Problems of Psychology," main attention should be paid to Pavlov's teaching on first and second signal systems. In this chapter, a critique of idealistic theories in psychology should be given, and it should be shown that Pavlov's teaching is incompatible with all varieties of idealism and requires a fundamental revision of a number of traditional concepts of psychology.

Professor B. V. Kukarkin (USSR Academy of Sciences) pointed out that the prospectus of the chapter "Philosophical Questions of Modern Cosmogony and Cosmology" does not meet the goals of the book. It does not reflect the sharp struggle between materialism and idealism in cosmogony and cosmology.

In the chapter on cosmogony and cosmology, a critique of idealistic theories developed in bourgeois science must be given, and the successes of Soviet cosmogony must be shown, in particular, the work of the conference on questions of the development of the solar system, and O. Yu. Schmidt's theory.

Candidate of Philosophical Sciences G. I. Pivaikin (Minsk) said that the prospectus on the whole is composed correctly and meets the goals of the book, but there are individual shortcomings in it. First of all, in all sections of the book, the struggle between materialism and idealism, dialectics and metaphysics, should be shown more sharply, and a critique not only of past, but mainly of modern idealistic theories should be given.

In the chapter "Dialectics of Necessity and Chance in the Development of Living Nature," the difference between Darwin's views and Weismannist-Morganist views on this subject should be shown, and Weismannist-Morganists who reduce development to chance should be subjected to criticism.

Candidate of Philosophical Sciences A. A. Rubashevsky (Kyiv) believes that the prospectus has a character that is too narrowly specialized and does not direct the attention of the authors toward resolving philosophical questions of natural

science. Meanwhile, this should be a book, says A. A. Rubashevsky, that resolves philosophical questions of modern natural science, showing prospects for its development, pointing naturalists toward how to resolve these questions from the standpoint of Marxist-Leninist methodology. The book should reveal Lenin's proposition on dialectics as the sum, total, and conclusion of the history of knowledge of the world. The creative role of dialectical materialism in all fields of natural science should be revealed, while at the same time showing how a bourgeois worldview distorts, cripples natural science, and hinders its development.

A. A. Rubashevsky proposed combining the chapter "Problem of Species and Speciation" with the chapter on the theory of stage development.

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences M. E. Omelyanovsky (Kyiv) admitted that the main problems are posed correctly in the prospectus and the main lines of solving these problems are set correctly. He pointed out, along with this, individual shortcomings in that part of the prospectus where it concerns philosophical questions of physics. The triumph of the ideas of dialectical materialism in physics, spoken of in the prospectus, is associated mainly with the works of Soviet scientists. And this needs to be stated in full voice. Although the prospectus is oriented toward criticizing idealism in physics, the term "physical idealism" is absent in the prospectus. A Leninist critique of "physical idealism" should be given. The works of Soviet scientists that enrich our knowledge of the structure of matter must be highlighted. In particular, the work of S. I. Vavilov needs to be covered.

In the chapter "Problem of Space and Time in Modern Physics," it is necessary to expose the idealistic twists of bourgeois scientists on questions of space and time (Einstein, the Copenhagen school, etc.).

More detailed coverage is needed in the prospectus regarding the theory of relativity. The works of Soviet scientists in the field of relativity theory and quantum mechanics must be thoroughly covered. The scope of the chapter on space and time should be increased. In the prospectus of the chapter "Problem of Causality in Modern Physics," the problem of causality in quantum mechanics should be treated in greater detail.

Unsuccessfully, in M. E. Omelyanovsky's opinion, named is the title of the chapter "Subject and Method of Modern Physics." This title may give cause to contrast modern physics with physics of the past. It is known that idealists of the Copenhagen school draw a sharp epistemological boundary between modern and so-called classical physics. The title should be changed to "Subject and Method of Physics" and include a new point: "Critique of Copenhagen, Cambridge, and Other Idealistic Trends in the Question of the Subject and Method of Physical Science."

Academician G. F. Alexandrov, in his concluding remarks, noted that the discussion that took place on the prospectus of the book *Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science* testifies to the great interest of scientific workers of all specialties in this book. Firm business foundations are being

laid for joint creative work between philosophers and natural experimenters.

The prospectus will be discussed further, and all valuable comments made during the discussion will be taken into account.

Academician G. F. Alexandrov submitted a motion to adopt a resolution noting the important value of the work *Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science* for propagating the Marxist-Leninist worldview, which firmly relies on natural science.

From the very first steps of the author collective's work, it is necessary to introduce into practice a broad discussion of materials presented by the authors—first in the scientific councils of the respective institutes together with philosophical workers, and then within the author collective itself with the involvement of specialists.

After discussing the prospectus at the Scientific Council of the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the editorial board of the book *Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science* began working with the authors to take into account the comments made. In doing so, the editorial board decided:

1. Strengthen the philosophical side of the book so that it does not turn into a simple retelling of natural-science theories; show more strongly the guiding role of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in resolving concrete questions of natural science.

2. Sharpen to a greater extent the criticism of idealism on the issues considered in the chapters of the book, exposing reactionary representatives of foreign science.

3. Show more broadly the significance of the dialectical-materialist solution to the questions under consideration for the struggle of the Soviet people for the transformation of nature, for the building of communism.

4. Include in the prospectus a chapter on mathematics; expand the criticism of idealistic distortions in the interpretation of the theory of relativity in the chapter on space and time.

5. Due to the fact that at the meeting there were no speeches specifically on section III of the book —"Dialectical Materialism and Chemical Sciences"—organize its discussion at the Department of Chemical Sciences of the USSR Academy of Sciences and at the Faculty of Chemistry of Moscow State University (MSU), conducting the corresponding revision of the prospectus after the discussion.

6. Include in the prospectus a special chapter on the scientific-theoretical unity of the teachings of I. V. Michurin and I. P. Pavlov.

At the request of the Institute of Philosophy, the question of the book *Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science* will

be considered at the Secretariat of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences; alongside this, the preparation plan proposed by the Institute of Philosophy for this collective work was approved jointly by five divisions of the USSR Academy of Sciences: history and philosophy (Institute of Philosophy), physical and mathematical sciences, chemical sciences, geological and geographical sciences, and biological sciences.

The publication of the book's materials was suggested to be carried out preliminarily in the form of individual issues by section. After a broad discussion of all issues and their corresponding revision, the entire work *Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science* should be published in 1954. The question of the progress of preparing the book for publication will be discussed at a meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

APPENDIX

Index of articles and materials published in the journal "Voprosy Filosofii" [Problems of Philosophy] for 1952

Comrade STALIN'S Answer to questions from a group of editors of American newspapers , No. 2, p.3

J. V. STALIN — Speech at the 19th Party Congress , No. 5, p.3

J. STALIN — Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR , No. 5, p.6

EDITORIALS AND LEADING ARTICLES

On the Significance of Militant Materialism , No. 2, p.4

V. I. Lenin’s Brilliant Work on the Ideological Foundations of the Marxist Party , No. 3, p.13

The Fifth Anniversary of the Philosophical Discussion and the Tasks of Soviet Philosophers , No. 3, p.3

The Triumph of the Ideas of Marxism-Leninism , No. 5 , p.52

The 19th Congress of the Communist Party and Issues of Ideology Work , No. 6, p.3

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM SECTION

Acad. ALEKSANDROV G. F. — J. V. Stalin on the Role of Superstructure in Society's Development , No. 1, p.3

Acad. ALEKSANDROV G. F. — J. V. Stalin's Work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" — A Program for Building Communism , No. 6 , p.41

GAK G. M. — On the Importance of Cognizing the Specifics of Phenomena , No. 1 , p.145

GAPOCHKA P. N. — Eliminating the Opposition Between Town and Country in the USSR , No. 4, p.3

GLEZERMAN G. E. — On the Conscious Application of the Laws of Social Development Under Socialism, p.3 , p.58

DOBRUSKIN M. E. (Kharkov) — The New Intelligentsia in the People's Democracies , No. 1 , p.85

DUDINSKY I. V. — Industrialization — The Key Link in Building the Foundations of Socialism in European People's Democracies , No. 5 , p.132

IOVCHUK M. T. — Struggle of Opinions and Freedom of Criticism — A Vital Condition for the Development of Advanced Science , No. 2 , p.14

KAMMARI M. D. — On the New Outstanding Contribution of J. V. Stalin to Marxist-Leninist Philosophy , No. 6 , p.18

KOZLOVSKY V. E. — On the Question of the Nature of Contradictions in Soviet Society , No. 2 , p.54

KON I. S. (Leningrad) — On the Role of Political and Legal Views in the Development of Society , No. 5 , p.95

KONSTANTINOV F. V. — Main Features of Socialist Ideology , No. 2, p.32

KUZNETSOV I. A. — The Bolshevik Party — The Leading Force of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat , No. 2 , p.168

MAKAROVSKY A. A. — Socialist Relations of Production — Main Motor of Productive Forces in the USSR , No. 6 , p.84

ORATOVSKY V. T. (Kiev) — Soviet Patriotism — Expression of the Ideology of Proletarian Internationalism and Soviet National Pride , No. 4 , p.50

RUBINSHTEIN N. L. — Marxism-Leninism — Scientific Basis of Soviet Foreign Policy , No. 1 , p.44

Corr. Member of USSR Acad. Sci. FEDOSEEV P. N. — The Basic Principle of Socialism , No. 5 | 76

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM SECTION

VOSTRIKOV A. V. — Classics of Marxism-Leninism on the Connection Between Language and Thought , No. 3 , p.47

GORSKY D. P. — On the Question of the Formation and Development of Concepts , No. 4 , p.64

DUDEL S. P. — Cognizability of the World and Its Regularities , No. 3 , p.168

KAGANOV V. M. — On the Ways of Transition from Old Quality to New in the Process of Development , No. 2 , p.65

KEDROV B. M. — On the Materialist Understanding of the Laws of Nature , No. 6 , p.63

LEONOV M. A. — The Place and Role of Philosophy in Social Life , No. 1 , p.54

LEONOV M. A. — Questions of Marxist Theory of Knowledge in Light of J. V. STALIN'S Work on Linguistics , No. 5 , p.115

ROZENTAL M. M. — Development of the Law of the Struggle of Opposites in K. Marx's "Capital" , No. 4 , p.46

STEMPKOVSKAYA V. I. — On the Flexibility and Definiteness of Concepts , p.5 , p.190

TUGARINOV V. P. (Leningrad) — On the Laws of the Objective World and Laws of Science , No. 4 | 78

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY SECTION

BELYAVSKY M. T. — Nikolai Popovsky , No. 2 , p.156

BUDREIKO N. A. — M. V. Lomonosov — Great Scientist-Innovator |No. 2 , p.140

DYNNIK M. A. — On the Philosophical and Aesthetic Ideas of Leonardo da Vinci , No. 4 , p.101

KRAVETS I. N. (Kharkov) — "Letters on Critical Philosophy" by A. S. Lubkin |No. 6 , p.151

MIKHAILOV S. I. — On the Role of Russian Revolutionary-Democratic Ideology in the Formation of Advanced Social Thought of the Peoples of Russia in the 19th Century , No. 5 , p.180

NARSKY I. S. — Edward Dembowski — Progressive Polish Philosopher of the 19th Century , No. 3 , p.140

PETROVSKY A. V. (Vologda) — Petr Lyubovsky — Advanced Psychologist of the Early 19th Century |No. 3 , p.511

SIDOROV M. I. — On the Question of Periodization of the History of Philosophy of the Peoples of the USSR , No. 4 , p.93

SOLOVIEV Yu. I., USHAKOVA N. N. — Russian Scientists of the 18th and 19th Centuries on M. V. Lomonosov |No. 4 , p.152

ULMAN G. S. (Kaliningrad) — On the History of the Creation of F. Engels' Classic Work "Anti-Dühring" , No. 6 , p.144

SCHIPANOV I. Ya. — On the History of Revolutionary Thought in Russia and the Revolutionary Traditions of the Russian People , No. 5 , p.161

AESTHETICS SECTION

DURYLIN S. N. — N. V. Gogol on Art , No. 3 , p.65

KEMENOV V. S. — The Artistic Heritage of Leonardo da Vinci , No. 3 , p.80

LEBEDEV N. A. — Soviet Cinema Art in the Struggle for Peace , No. 1 , p.68

LOMIDZE G. I. — For the Truthful Reflection of Life Conflicts in Literature , No. 5 , p.149

PRYAMKOV A. V. — "Pravda's" Struggle in the Pre-October Period for Progressive Literature and Art , No. 2 , p.81

RAZUMNY V. A. — On the Essence of the Realistic Artistic Image , No. 6 , p.99

PHILOSOPHY OF NATURAL SCIENCE SECTION

KEDROV B. M. — On D. I. Mendeleev's Statements on Philosophical Questions of Natural Science , No. 2 , p.112

KOVDA V. A. — Program for the Great Construction and Transformation of Nature , No. 4, p.36

KOMPANEYETS A. I. — N. A. Umov's Struggle for Materialism in Physics , No. 2 , p.128

NOVINSKY I. I. — On the Unity of Organism and Environment , No. 6 , p.114

SISAKYAN N. M. — On the Unity of External and Internal in Biological Metabolism , No. 1 , p.103

SPASSKY B. I. — Some Methodological Questions of the History of Physics , No. 5 , p.501

Acad. FESENKOV V. G. — Evolution and Origin of Stars in the Modern Galaxy , No. 4 , p.110

SHIROKOV M. F. — On Preferred Frames of Reference in Newtonian Mechanics and the Theory of Relativity , No. 3 , p.128

SHEMYAKIN F. N. — The Question of Representations in the Works of I. M. Sechenov and I. P. Pavlov , No. 2 , p.98

SHOROKHOVA E. V. — I. P. Pavlov's Teaching on Signal Systems in Light of the Leninist Theory of Reflection , No. 3 , p.104

SHUGAILIN A. V. — On the Philosophical Views of P. N. Lebedev , No. 3 , p.117

CRITIQUE OF BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY

BRUTYAN G. A. (Eerevan) — Irrationalism and Sophistry — Weapon of Warmongers , No. 4 , p.138

EPISKOPOSOV G. L. — "Atomic Sociology" — Ideological Weapon of American Imperialism , No. 2 , p.182

KALASHNIKOVA V. S. — Ideology of French Reaction , No. 4 , p.125

NIKIFOROV B. S. — Gangsterism in the Service of US Monopolies , No. 5 , p.528

MATERIALIST — A Jesuit Father in the Role of Critic of Dialectical Materialism (on G. Wetter's book "Dialectical Materialism. Its History and System in the Soviet Union," Vienna) , No. 6 , p.127

POLENTS O. E. — Modern "Theorists" of International Robbery , No. 3 , p.148

POLIKAROV A. P. (Sofia) — Idealistic Treatment of Quantum Mechanics in Heisenberg's New Presentation , No. 3 , p.164

SULZHENKO G. D. (Sverdlovsk) — Struggle of French Communists Against the Reactionary Philosophy of Existentialism , No. 2 , p.506

Acad. TARLE E. V. — Philosophers of the Atomic Bomb in Reflection and at a Crossroads , No. 1 , p.141

TER-ZAKHARYAN A. I. — Right-Wing Socialists of Austria — Agency of American Imperialism , No. 2 , p.195

TOPEKHA P. P. — Ideological Disguise of American Occupation in Japan , No. 1 , p.117

DISCUSSIONS AND DEBATES

BAZAROV I. P. — For a Dialectical-Materialist Understanding and Development of the Theory of Relativity , No. 6 , p.175

BOIKO E. I. — Some Issues of Restructuring Psychology on the Basis of I. P. Pavlov's Teaching , No. 1 , p.162

BLOKHINTSEV D. I. — For Leninist Teaching on Motion , No. 1 , p.181

BLOKHINTSEV D. I. — Reply to Academician V. A. Fock , No. 6 , p.171

VILNITSKY M. B. (Kiev) — For a Consistently Materialist Interpretation of the Relativity Principle in Physics , No. 1 , p.183

GOZHEV A. D. (Leningrad) — On Geographic Environment , No. 2 , p.530

KARD P. G. (Tartu) — On the Theory of Relativity , No. 5 , p.540

KIRIN F. Ya. (Dzaudzhikau) — On Unified Geography , No. 2 , p.537

KOZEVA T. A. (Sverdlovsk) — Against Manifestations of Dualism in Physiology and Psychology , No. 5 , p.548

KURSANOV G. A. (Sverdlovsk) — Toward a Critical Evaluation of the Theory of Relativity , No. 1 , p.169

MANSUROV N. S. — For the Application and Development of I. P. Pavlov's Teaching in Psychology , No. 1 , p.153

MASEEV I. A. — On the Social Nature of Art and Artistic Views of Society , No. 2 , p.517

NECHAEV S. S. (Pechora) — On the Wrong Path , No. 4 , p.180

On the Place and Role of Art in Social Life (Summarizing the Discussion) , No. 6 , p.155

Corr. Member USSR Acad. Sci. RUBINSHTEIN S. L. — I. P. Pavlov's Teaching and Certain Issues in Restructuring Psychology , No. 3 , p.197

SEVERSKY N. Ya. — On the Question of "Unified Geography" (Regarding F. Ya. Kirin's Article) , No. 2 , p.538

TERLETSKY Ya. P. — On the Content of Modern Physical Theory of Space and Time , No. 3 , p.191

Acad. FOCK V. A. — On So-Called Ensembles in Quantum Mechanics , No. 4 , p.170

SHLYAMIN B. A. — Once More About Geography , No. 4 , p.174

STERN V. (Berlin) — On the Philosophical Side of the Theory of Relativity , No. 1 , p.175

CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALEKSEEV M. N. — A New Book on Logic for Higher Education (on K. Bakradze's book "Logic." Pub. by Stalin Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, 1951) , No. 3 , p.523

ANDREEV I. D., ROZHIN V. P. — On Philosophical Articles in the Great Soviet Encyclopedia , No. 1 , p.193

ANDREEV I. D., GAZENKO V. I., IMSHENIN M. I. (Ivanovo), ROZHIN V. P., RUTKEVICH M. N. (Sverdlovsk), TAVANETS P. V. — On the New Edition of the Short Philosophical Dictionary , No. 4 , p.183

BASKIN M. P. — For Creative Development of Great Stalinist Ideas ("Questions of Dialectical and Historical Materialism in J. V. Stalin's Work 'Marxism and Problems of Linguistics'." USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy. 2nd ed., expanded. USSR Acad. Sci. Pub. House, M. 1951) , No. 1 , p.187

ZAVADSKAYA N. V. — Voice of Progressive Intelligentsia (on the journal "Cahiers du libre examen" [Notebooks of Free Inquiry], Brussels, 1950) , No. 1 , p.503

ZLOTNIKOV R. A. (Chernikovsk) — For a Scientific Coverage of the History of Soviet State Power Bodies ("Essays on the History of Soviet State Power Bodies." All-Union Institute of Juridical Sciences of the Ministry of Justice of the USSR. State Publishing House of Legal Literature, M., 1949) , No. 1 , p.198

KAIRYAN V. M., SEMENOV V. G. — A Book on the History of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy (on A. Okulov's book "Lenin and Stalin's Struggle for the Theoretical Foundations of the Marxist Party (1908–1912)." Academy of Social Sciences under the CC AUCP(b). Department of History of Philosophy. Gospolitizdat, 1951) , No. 4 , p.191

KEDROV B. M. — Against Talmudism and Vulgarization of Marxism in a Logic Text-Book for Secondary Schools (on the text-book by S. N. Vinogradov and A. F. Kuzmin "Logic. Text-book for Secondary Schools." 3rd ed., 1949; 4th ed., 1950; 5th ed., 1951 with the participation of N. I. Kondakov) , No. 3 , p.527

KON I. S. (Vologda) — Law and Morality in Socialist Society (on M. P. Kareva's book "Law and Morality in Socialist Society." USSR Academy of Sciences. Institute of Law. USSR Acad. Sci. Pub. House, M. 1951) , No. 2 , p.540

KOST A. N. — Homology in Organic Chemistry (on Yu. A. Zhdanov's book "Homology in Organic Chemistry." Pub. Moscow State University) , No. 2 , p.545

New Books , No. 6 , p.198

PEREL Yu. G. — On B. E. Raikov's Book "Essays on the History of the Heliocentric Worldview in Russia." USSR Acad. Sci. Pub. House, 2nd ed., M.-L. 1947 , No. 4 , p.196

SIDOROV M. I. — In False Positions (on the journal "Soviet Pedagogy" for 1951) , No. 3 , p.518

SOBOLEV A. I. — An Outstanding Example of Creative Marxism (Mao Tse-tung. Selected Works. Vol. 1. Translated from Chinese. Foreign Literature Publishing House, M. 1952) , No. 6 , p.186

Philosophical Literature Published in 1951 , No. 3 , p.534

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

VARNAKOVA E. D., SAKHAROVA T. A. — On Defended Dissertations in Psychology , No. 1 , p.520

In the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences , No. 3 , p.562

GARAUDY R. — On Contemporary French Philosophy (Lecture) , No. 6 , p.511

DONSKOY V. M. — On Improving the Teaching of Social Sciences in Higher Educational Institutions , No. 4 , p.190

Study of J. V. Stalin's Work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" and Historic Decisions of the 19th Party Congress , No. 6 , p.505

IOVCHUK M. T., KURSANOV G. A. (Sverdlovsk) — From the Work Experience of Philosophy Seminars for Scientific Workers of Sverdlovsk , No. 5 , p.550

KERBIKOV O. V., SARKISOV S. A. — I. P. Pavlov's Teaching and Issues of Medical Science , No. 1 , p.516

Scientific Session at the Academy of Social Sciences under the CC AUCP(b) Dedicated to J. V. Stalin's Works and Their Significance in the Development of Social Sciences (D. I. Nadtocheev. Introductory Speech. M. N. Maslina and V. G. Semenov. Report on the

Second Plenary Session and Joint Meetings of Departments) , No. 3 , p.540

NESTERENKO G. Ya., TROSHIN D. M. — Intensify the Propaganda of Philosophical Knowledge , No. 2 , p.550

Discussion of Issues of Marxist-Leninist Ethics in Czechoslovakia (Report of the Philosophy Department of the Czechoslovak-Soviet Institute. Prague) , No. 1 , p.525

OVCHINNIKOV N. F., PLYUSHCH L. N. — Discussion of the Book Prospectus "Dialectical Materialism and Modern Natural Science" , No. 1 , p.511