Voprosy Filosofii

(Journal of PROBLEMS OF PHILOSPHY)

SELECTED ARTICLES

1953

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

Source: Selected Articles from АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК, СССР ИНСТИТУТ ФИЛОСОФИИ, ВОПРОСЫ ФИЛОСОФИИ, 1953

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

Voprosy Filosofii

(Journal of PROBLEMS OF PHILOSPHY)

SELECTED ARTICLES

1953

Table of Contents

1. FROM THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION, THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR AND THE PRESIDIUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR.....13
2. THE BASIC ECONOMIC LAW OF MODERN CAPITALISM.18
E. Ya. BREGEL.....18
3. THE STRUGGLE OF ITALIAN COMMUNISTS FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE.....56
E. Ya. EGERMAN.....56
4. THE MAIN ENGINE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES.....88
F. V. KONSTANTINOV.....88
I.....88
II.....102
5. DRIVING FORCES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY.....126
I. V. MALYSHEV.....126
6. Development of the Productive Forces of Agriculture Under Socialism.....156
Academician V. S. NEMCHINOV.....156
I.....157
II.....163
III.....173
IV.....181
7. On the Objective Character of the Laws of Development of Soviet Socialist Society.....194
N. E. OVANDER (Kiev).....194
8. Discovery and Substantiation by Comrade Stalin of the Basic Economic Law of Socialism.....216
A. M. RUMYANTSEV.....216

9. ON THE COEXISTENCE OF THE TWO SYSTEMS—CAPITALIST AND SOCIALIST.....267
I. A. SELEZNEV.....267
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin on the Inevitability of a Period of Coexistence of Capitalism and Communism.....270
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin on the Real Basis of Peaceful Coexistence and Cooperation Between Capitalism and Communism.....281
Conditions for Peaceful Coexistence of States of Two Systems.....289
10. THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING CLASS OF CAPITALIST COUNTRIES AT THE PRESENT STAGE...303
A. I. SOBOLEV.....303
I.....304
II.....316
III.....328
11. THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING CLASS OF CAPITALIST COUNTRIES AT THE PRESENT STAGE...346
A. I. SOBOLEV.....346
I.....347
II.....359
III.....371
12. On the Question of the Relationship Between Logic and Grammar.....389
D. P. GORSKY, N. G. KOMLEV.....389
1. Formulation of the Question.....389
2. Logical Categories and Means of Their Expression in Language.....406
13. SCIENCE IS AN ENEMY OF CHANCE.....435
N. V. PILIPENKO (Yaroslavl).....435
14. ON CERTAIN LAWS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF PHILOSOPHY.....466
M. I. SIDOROV.....466

15. On the Specifics of Content and Form in Art.....490
A. I. BUROV.....490
16. Reality and the Beautiful in the Aesthetics of N. G. Chernyshevsky.....533
N. V. DRAGOMIRETSKAYA.....533
17. On the Objective Character of the Laws of Realistic Art.....561
V. S. KEMENOV.....561
I.....561
II.....577
III.....595
IV.....609
18. V. I. Lenin's Struggle Against Vulgarizing Views of Proletkult on Art.....618
F. Ya. MATYTSIN.....618
19. FOR MILITANT SOVIET SATIRE.....651
Ya. E. ELSBERG.....651
I.....651
II.....656
III.....666
IV.....677
20. Logical Empiricism—A Weapon of Imperialist Reaction.....684
K. S. BAKRADZE (Tbilisi).....684
21. Agents of American Imperialism.....701
Acad. A. M. DEBORIN.....701
22. BERTRAND RUSSELL — SQUIRE OF IMPERIALISM....739
E. KOLMAN.....739
23. MATERIALIST DIELECTICS AS A CREATIVELY DEVELOPING SCIENCE.....773
M. M. ROZENTAL.....773
1. Creative Development and Enrichment of the Content of Materialist Dialectics as a Science 776

2. Specification of the Law of the Struggle of Opposites as Applied to the Conditions of Development of Soviet Society.....798
3. Specific Character of the Operation of the Law of Transition from an Old Quality to a New One in Socialist Society.....811
24. ON THE OBJECTIVE CONTETNT OF LAWS OF FORMAL LOGIC.....823
P. V. TAVANETS.....823
25. WHOM DOES CYBERNETICS SERVE.....849
MATERIALIST.....849
25. CONTEMPORARY REACTIONARY AMERICAN-ENGLISH BOURGEOIS AESTHETICS IN THE SERVICE OF US MONOPOLIES.....871
P. S. TROFIMOV.....871
26. ON THE PHYSICAL MEANING OF THE WAVE FUNCTION 908
G. P. DISHKANT (Dnepropetrovsk).....908
27. On the Existence of Trajectories in Microparticles 912
A. V. SAVICH.....912
28. M. M. Rozental. *The Marxist Dialectical Method*. Gospolitizdat. 1952. 347 pp.*.....925
L. B. BAZHENOV.....925
29. A New Book on the Theory of Knowledge.....944
Adam Schaff. *Certain Problems of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of Truth*; 479 pp. General editing by Prof. S. A. Yanovskaya. M. Foreign Literature Publishing House. 1953.....944
D. P. GORSKY, M. S. IVANOV.....944
30. “LITERATURE AND NATIONAL LIFE” ANTONIO GRAMSCI.....967
E. YA. EGERMAN.....967

31. TASKS OF SOVIET PHILISOPHERS IN LIGHT OF THE DECISIONS OF THE SEPTEMBER PLENUM OF THE CC CPSU 990
V. M. KAIRYAN.....990
32. On the Results of the Conference on Psychology 1016
A. V. PETROVSKY.....1016
33. On the Results of the Discussion of the Philosophical Views of Academician L. I. Mandelstam.....1029
A. A. SEMENOV.....1029
APPENDIX.....1054

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

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

Dear comrades and friends!

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, with a sense of profound grief, inform the party and all working people of the Soviet Union that on March 5, at 9:50 in the evening, after a severe illness, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, **Iosif Vissarionovich STALIN**, passed away.

The heart of the comrade-in-arms and brilliant continuer of Lenin's cause, the wise leader and teacher of the Communist Party and the Soviet people — **Iosif Vissarionovich STALIN** — has ceased to beat.

The name of **STALIN** is endlessly dear to our party, to the Soviet people, and to the working people of the entire world. Together with Lenin, comrade **STALIN** created the mighty party of communists, nurtured and steeled it; together with Lenin, comrade **STALIN** was the inspirer and leader of the

Great October Socialist Revolution, the founder of the world's first socialist state. Continuing the immortal cause of Lenin, comrade **STALIN** led the Soviet people to a world-historic victory of socialism in our country. Comrade **STALIN** led our country to victory over fascism in World War II, which radically altered the entire international situation. Comrade **STALIN** armed the party and the entire nation with a great and clear program for building communism in the USSR.

The death of comrade **STALIN**, who devoted his entire life to the selfless service of the great cause of communism, is a most grievous loss for the party, the working people of the Soviet land, and the whole world.

The news of the passing of comrade **STALIN** will echo with deep pain in the hearts of workers, collective farmers, intellectuals, and all working people of our Motherland, in the hearts of the warriors of our valiant Army and Navy, in the hearts of millions of working people in all countries of the world.

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

The Soviet people harbor boundless trust and are imbued with warm love for their native Communist Party, knowing that the supreme law of all party activities is serving the interests of the people.

Workers, collective farmers, Soviet intellectuals, and all working people of our country steadfastly follow the policy

developed by our party, which responds to the vital interests of the working people and is aimed at the further strengthening of the power of our socialist Motherland. The correctness of this policy of the Communist Party has been proven by decades of struggle; it has led the working people of the Soviet land to historical victories of socialism. Inspired by this policy, the peoples of the Soviet Union confidently move forward to new successes in communist construction in our country.

The working people of our country know that the further improvement of the material well-being of all strata of the population — workers, collective farmers, intellectuals — and the maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the entire society have always been and remain the subject of special concern for the Communist Party and the Soviet Government.

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

The foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union has been and remains an unshakeable policy of preserving and strengthening peace, fighting against the preparation and unleashing of a new war, a policy of international cooperation and the development of business ties with all countries.

The peoples of the Soviet Union, faithful to the banner of proletarian internationalism, are strengthening and developing

fraternal friendship with the great Chinese people, with the working people of all countries of the people's democracy, and friendly ties with the working people of capitalist and colonial countries fighting for the cause of peace, democracy, and socialism.

Dear comrades and friends!

The great guiding and leading force of the Soviet people in the struggle for building communism is our Communist Party. The iron unity and monolithic solidarity of the party's ranks are the main condition for its strength and power. Our task is to guard the unity of the party like the apple of our eye, to educate communists as active political fighters for carrying out the policy and decisions of the party, and to further strengthen the party's ties with all working people, with workers, collective farmers, and intellectuals, for in this indissoluble bond with the people lies the strength and invincibility of our party.

The Party sees one of its most important tasks as educating communists and all working people in a spirit of high political vigilance, in a spirit of irreconcilability and firmness in the struggle against internal and external enemies.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, addressing the party and the people in these sorrowful days, express firm confidence that the party and all working people of our Motherland will rally even more closely around the Central Committee and the Soviet Government, mobilizing all their

strength and creative energy for the great cause of building communism in our country.

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

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

Long live our mighty socialist Motherland!

Long live our heroic Soviet people!

Long live the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union!

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR

PRESIDIUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR

March 5, 1953

Problems of Philosophy, No. 1, p. 3

2. THE BASIC ECONOMIC LAW OF MODERN CAPITALISM

E. Ya. BREGEL

The basic economic law of capitalism as a whole, which was active as far back as the epoch of pre-monopoly capitalism, was discovered by the founder of scientific communism—Marx. This is the law of surplus value, which provides, as Engels said, the key to understanding all capitalist production.

The law of surplus value reveals the essence of capitalist exploitation, and thereby the economic foundation of the class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which cannot be eliminated within the framework of capitalism and is becoming increasingly acute. This law explains the origin and nature of all types of income of the exploiting classes and groups in bourgeois society: industrial profit, commercial profit, loan interest, land rent. All these types of income, as Marx showed in Volume III of *Capital*, represent nothing other than transformed forms of surplus value. Emphasizing the decisive importance of the production of surplus value throughout the capitalist economy, Marx pointed out that the creation of surplus value is the "motive power of capitalist production" (*Archives of Marx and Engels*, Vol. II (VII), p. 153).

However, the law of surplus value, being a general law of capitalism operating at all stages of development of the capitalist mode of production, in itself does not yet characterize the specifics of modern, monopoly capitalism.

The law of surplus value at different stages of the development of capitalism is implemented in various concrete forms. Under the conditions of pre-monopoly capitalism, it was implemented primarily in the form of securing average profit. In the epoch of monopoly capitalism, as J. V. Stalin proved, the engine of capitalist production is not average profit and not superprofit, which represents, as a rule, only a certain excess over average profit, but maximum profit.

Concretizing and developing the law of surplus value as applied to the conditions of monopoly capitalism, J. V. Stalin discovered the basic economic law of modern capitalism.

"The main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism," writes J. V. Stalin, "might be formulated roughly in this way: the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 38). This classical definition, which is a theoretical generalization of modern capitalist reality reveals both the goal of capitalist production under the conditions of monopoly capitalism and the means used by monopolies to achieve this goal.

Maximum profit represents a special economic category, significantly different from average profit. They differ: 1) by recipients, 2) by magnitude, 3) by sources.

Average profit in the epoch of pre-monopoly capitalism was received by every individual capitalist whose enterprise utilized socially normal conditions of production. As for maximum profit, typical for the epoch of monopoly capitalism, it is appropriated by no means by all capitalists, but only by monopoly associations of capitalists. Non-monopolized small and medium-sized capitalist enterprises do not receive maximum profit. Moreover, since monopolies increase their profits including through pumping out by various methods part of the surplus value of non-monopolized enterprises, the acquisition of maximum profit by monopolies leads directly to a decrease in the profits of non-monopolized enterprises.

Further, in its magnitude, maximum profit significantly exceeds average profit. Bourgeois statistics do not give accurate data on either the average rate of profit or the maximum profit received by capitalist monopolies. However, even those few pieces of information available on this issue testify to how much the profit rate of capitalist monopolies exceeds the average rate of profit. Thus, in 1929, the profit rate of all US corporations after tax deductions was 6.7%, while the profit rate of 615 large companies was 13.4%. Naturally, these figures are greatly understated, since capitalist companies, falsifying their balance sheets, conceal significant profits under the guise of exaggerated depreciation deductions and various overt and covert reserves. However, in this case, absolute figures are not as important to us as their ratio, and the fact that the profit rate of 615 large companies turned out to be twice as large as the profit rate of all corporations testifies to how much maximum profit exceeds average profit.

But this excess will be much more significant if we take not all large corporations, but only the largest monopoly associations. For example, in 1951 the profit rate in the entire manufacturing industry of the USA (before taxes) was 27.9%, but at the same time the "DuPont de Nemours" company received 43.3% profit on its capital, "General Electric Company" — 52.8%, and "General Motors Corporation" — 61.6%; on the other hand, for small and medium-sized companies with assets up to 250 thousand dollars, the profit rate was only 17.2%. Thus, billionaire corporations receive a rate of profit several times larger compared to non-monopolized enterprises.

Maximum profit differs from average profit not only in quantitative terms, but also in qualitative terms. While average profit in the epoch of pre-monopoly capitalism had as its source surplus value created by the labor of wage workers[1], maximum profit, characteristic of the epoch of monopoly capitalism, is obtained not only through the exploitation of wage workers, but also through the exploitation of small commodity producers both in the capitalist countries themselves and in colonial and dependent countries. Thus, if the category of "average profit" expressed production relations between the class of wage workers and the class of capitalists, the category of "maximum profit" expresses relations, firstly,

[1] Of course, even under conditions of pre-monopoly capitalism, the bourgeoisie subjected to exploitation not only the working class, but also small commodity producers. However, this is not characteristic of average profit, in the analysis of which Marx completely abstracts from pre-capitalist forms of production and considers pure capitalism, that is, a society consisting of only two classes—wage workers and capitalists. The specificity of average profit consists in the fact that it represents surplus value created by the labor of wage workers and distributed among capitalists of various branches of production proportionally to advanced capital.

between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the working class, secondly, between the monopoly bourgeoisie and small commodity producers within capitalist countries, thirdly, between monopoly capital of metropolises and the exploited working masses of colonial and dependent countries.

The circumstance that the monopoly bourgeoisie subjects the entire mass of working people to exploitation allows communist parties to win over the majority of the people.

Maximum profit differs from average profit also in the methods of its appropriation. For monopoly capitalism, the primary characteristics are the sale by monopolies of their goods above their value and the purchase by them of labor power below its value.

A characteristic feature of maximum profit is also that it expresses different relations within the capitalist class than average profit. While the law of average profit means the equalization of the rate of profit for capitalists of all branches of production, the law of maximum profit, on the contrary, places various capitalists in an unequal position, since it assumes the redistribution of surplus value within the capitalist class in favor of monopolists and to the detriment of non-monopolized enterprises.

It would be wrong to assume that with the emergence of the law of maximum profit, the law of average profit ceases its action. V. I. Lenin pointed out that monopoly capitalism is a superstructure over the old capitalism of the epoch of free competition. The laws inherent to capitalism in general do not cease to operate in the epoch of monopoly capitalism as well.

The question of how exactly the law of average profit operates under conditions of monopoly capitalism requires special development and goes beyond the scope of this article.

Substantially differing from average profit, maximum profit at the same time also differs from the usual superprofit received back in the epoch of pre-monopoly capitalism.

A typical way of obtaining superprofit is the improvement of technology at individual capitalist enterprises, leading to an increase in the degree of exploitation of workers at these enterprises. As a result of introducing technical improvements at individual capitalist enterprises, the individual value of goods at these enterprises decreases compared to the social value of the same goods, and the difference between social and individual value individual capitalists appropriate in the form of excess surplus value or superprofit[2]. In this case, they receive superprofit only temporarily—until their enterprises outpace other enterprises of the given branch of industry in terms of their technical equipment and, consequently, in the level of labor productivity.

Unlike superprofit, maximum profit is a phenomenon not short-term, but long-term. Of course, maximum profit is not a constant magnitude, for it is subject to spontaneous fluctuations, in particular due to the succession of industrial booms, crises, and depressions. Nevertheless, compared to the

[2] It should be borne in mind that in his works on imperialism V. I. Lenin uses the term "superprofit" in a specific sense—not as a synonym for excess surplus value received by individual capitalists as a result of introducing technical improvements at their enterprises, but, in essence, in the sense of maximum profit characteristic of monopoly capitalism.

profit of non-monopolized enterprises, it always stands at a significantly higher level.

The concept of maximum profit as the engine of modern capitalist production has a definite content. Maximum profit is not simply the largest profit. Every capitalist at all times strives to obtain precisely the largest profit. Marx in *Theories of Surplus Value* and other works emphasized that the goal of capitalist production is always the creation of maximum surplus value with minimum advanced capital. It is in pursuit of the largest profit that capitalists withdraw capital from sectors with a low profit rate and invest it in sectors with a high profit rate. However, this flow of capital objectively, regardless of the will and desires of capitalists, leads to the formation of an average profit rate.

Along with inter-industry competition, expressed in the transfer of capital from some branches of production to others, intra-industry competition also takes place. Individual capitalists in pursuit of the largest profit introduce technical improvements at their enterprises, increasing the organic composition of their capital. But, since all capitalists act in the same direction, the objective result is an increase in the organic composition of aggregate social capital, and this, in turn, gives rise to a tendency toward a fall in the average rate of profit.

Monopoly capitalism differs from pre-monopoly capitalism in that obtaining precisely maximum profit, as a profit exceeding not only average profit, but also superprofit, becomes an economic necessity for it. The point is not that the bosses of modern monopoly capitalism strive for maximum profit, but

that the appropriation of maximum profit is an objective necessity, a mandatory condition for expanded reproduction.

Why is maximum profit necessary for the realization of more or less regular expanded reproduction under conditions of monopoly capitalism, whereas in the epoch of pre-monopoly capitalism average profit was sufficient for this?

A characteristic feature of monopoly capitalism is the concentration of production at large and gigantic capitalist enterprises[3]. With a huge amount of total capital invested in large enterprises, they have a very high proportion of fixed capital invested in machinery and equipment, factory buildings and structures. With a faster growth of constant capital compared to variable capital, that part of constant capital embodied in fixed capital grows at the fastest pace. Thus, for example, in American industry during the period from 1899 to 1929, the cost of raw materials used increased by 5.9 times, while the cost of machinery wear and tear increased by 10.4 times. But the larger all capital functioning in enterprises, and the larger, in particular, fixed capital, the larger additional (compared to previously functioning) capital is required for expanded reproduction. As Marx pointed out, "the proportions

---

[3] Opportunists and renegades have repeatedly attempted to revise Marx's proposition on the displacement of small-scale production by large-scale capitalist production. Recently, such an attempt was undertaken by the French right-wing socialist Jules Moch. Facts utterly shatter the fabrications of pseudo-socialists about the "deconcentration" of production and the "dispersion" of the proletariat under modern capitalism. Thus, for example, the share of large enterprises employing 500 or more people in all manufacturing industry in the USA alone during the period 1939–1944 grew from 48.3% to 61.8% (relative to the total number of workers). In France in 1950, 50.6% of all workers were concentrated at the largest enterprises, which made up only 7% of the total number of enterprises.

in which production can be expanded are not arbitrary, but prescribed by technology" (*Capital*, Vol. II, p. 74, 1949). At a high level of technology at large capitalist enterprises, substantial additional capital is required for expanded reproduction, and therefore not every profit is sufficient for expanded reproduction.

The necessity of large additional investments of capital is also conditioned by the fact that with rapid development of technology, moral obsolescence of old equipment occurs very quickly, as a result of which capitalists often have to renew their fixed capital long before its physical wear and tear, this renewal usually being accompanied by an increase in the total amount of functioning capital. True, in the epoch of monopoly capitalism an opposite trend also operates: monopolies, having invested large capitals in the equipment of their enterprises and fearing the loss of part of these capitals in the event of equipment renewal before the expiration of its physical usefulness, delay the renewal of fixed capital. Nevertheless, competitive struggle, which in the epoch of monopoly capitalism not only does not cease, but, on the contrary, becomes more acute, forces them from time to time to renew fixed capital subjected to moral obsolescence.

If even for expanding existing enterprises at a high level of technology very large capitals are required, even larger capitals are necessary for organizing new enterprises. In his work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, V. I. Lenin quotes the following words of H. Levy, author of a special study on monopolies in England: "...Concentration has led to the fact that an enterprise has to spend huge sums of capital;

therefore, new enterprises face increasingly higher demands in terms of the size of required capital, and this hinders their appearance" (Works, Vol. 22, p. 187).

Thus, under conditions of monopoly capitalism, expanded reproduction requires investment in enterprises of very significant additional capitals. Meanwhile, as the organic composition of capital grows, the average rate of profit falls. If expanded reproduction were carried out only at the expense of average profit, the possibilities for growth of production would continuously decrease. Marx, noting that "with a fall in the rate of profit, the rate of accumulation also falls," pointed out: "Since the rate of self-expansion of total capital, the rate of profit, serves as the stimulus of capitalist production (just as the self-expansion of capital serves as its sole goal), a fall in the rate of profit slows down the formation of new independent capitals and thus appears as a threat to the development of the capitalist production process" (*Capital*, Vol. III, pp. 251–252).

An important factor in lowering the rate of accumulation under conditions of monopoly capitalism is the increasing unproductive use of national income. With the growth of parasitism and decay of capitalism, an ever larger share of national income is spent both on unproductive consumption by capitalists themselves and their numerous parasitic entourage, and on covering various unproductive expenditures—costs of maintaining an increasingly bloated sales apparatus, advertising costs increased with the sharpening of competitive struggle between capitalists, costs of maintaining a parasitic bourgeois state apparatus, etc. Finally, the rate of accumulation decreases as a result of the fact that under conditions of

monopoly capitalism economic crises become more frequent, intensify, and assume a protracted character, during which capital accumulation gives way to a sharp decline in production. An illustration of the reduction in the accumulation rate can be the fact that the share of accumulation in the national income of the USA was in 1889–1898 an average of 16.2%, in 1919–1928 — 10.2%, and in 1929–1938 — only 1.4%; in England, the share of new capital investments in national income equaled 12.2% in 1907, 8.1% in 1924, and 6.9% in 1935.

Thus, on the one hand, colossal concentration of production, a high level of technology, and a large share of fixed capital subject to rapid moral obsolescence lead to the fact that expanded reproduction requires investment of huge additional capitals; on the other hand, as a result of the growth of parasitism and decay of capitalism, the unproductive use of surplus value and total national income increases. By virtue of these conditions, to ensure more or less regular expanded reproduction in the epoch of monopoly capitalism, average profit is no longer enough; maximum profit is required.

It would be, of course, wrong to suppose that capitalist monopolies strive to obtain maximum profits for the sake of expanded reproduction. The goal of monopolies is not production growth as such, but precisely the appropriation of maximum profit. However, regardless of the motives by which capitalists are guided in their activities, the more or less regular realization of expanded reproduction is an objective necessity. Competitive struggle forces capitalists to expand production, for any capitalist who ceased expanding his enterprise would

inevitably be squeezed out by more powerful competitors and lose his capital. As Marx points out, "the development of capitalist production makes it constantly necessary to keep increasing the amount of capital laid out in a given industrial undertaking, and competition makes the immanent laws of capitalist production to be felt by each individual capitalist as external coercive laws. It compels him to keep extending his capital, in order to preserve it, but extend it he can only by means of progressive accumulation" (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 597).

The necessity of maximum profit for realizing more or less regular expanded reproduction by no means means that expanded reproduction under conditions of monopoly capitalism always takes place. Under capitalism in general, expanded reproduction does not have a continuous character, for capitalist production develops cyclically, with production growth during industrial booms being interrupted by economic crises. In the epoch of monopoly capitalism, this interrupted nature of development of capitalist production becomes even more pronounced, and overproduction crises leading to a decline in production and destruction of the productive forces of society become more frequent and severe. The greatest duration, depth, and severity of economic crises are characterized during the period of the general crisis of capitalism, which significantly contributes to slowing down the average rates of expanded reproduction. However, a reduction in the growth rate of production does not mean that expanded reproduction ceases to be an objective necessity and completely stops. Even at the modern stage of the general crisis of capitalism, when the productive forces of capitalism as a

whole are marking time and when the possibilities of growth of capitalist production are sharply narrowed due to the collapse of the single world market and the contraction of the sphere of application of the forces of the main capitalist countries to world resources, "the cyclical character of the development of capitalism — the growth and contraction of production — must still remain, although under modern conditions 'growth of production in these countries will take place on a narrowed base, for the volume of production in these countries will decrease'" (J. V. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 56).

***

Capitalist monopolies extract maximum profits primarily through the exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of the majority of the population of a given country, in the first place the proletariat.

The intensification of the exploitation of the proletariat in the epoch of monopoly capitalism is carried out by various methods, in particular, through the mechanism of monopoly prices, through the intensification of labor, through inflation, and taxation.

The systematic rise in prices in the epoch of imperialism is evidenced by the following data:

Wholesale Price Index[4]

Years	England	USA	Germany	France
1871–1880	100	100	100	100
1881–1890	77.7	79.5	78.5	78.5
1891–1900	68.7	65.2	78.3	69.1
1901–1910	75.9	79.6	85.9	76.6
1911–1920	133.2	124.0	115.8	150.3
1921–1930	124.8	124.2	119.0	112.7

As can be seen from the table provided, during the last three decades of the 19th century the average level of commodity prices showed a downward trend, and from the 20th century the average price level began to rise significantly. This is due

[4] The table is compiled according to data provided in the collection *World Economic Crises*. Vol. I, pp. 493–506. Sochekgiz. 1937. Price index for the entire period covered by the table calculated in gold.

to the fact that capitalist monopolies systematically raise prices for goods.

Along with wholesale prices, retail prices for consumer goods also grow, in connection with which the cost of living for workers increases. Thus, from 1900 to 1929 the cost of living index increased in England by 83%, and in the USA — by 124%.

Monopoly prices serve as a means of obtaining maximum profit, since they lead to a decrease in the real wages of workers and employees and thereby to an increase in the degree of their exploitation. The fall in real wages, which took place back under conditions of pre-monopoly capitalism, intensifies in the epoch of imperialism, with an important role played by price increases by monopolies. Thus, in England from 1901 to 1929 the real wage of employed workers decreased by 10%, and taking into account the unemployed — by more than 14%.

In the USA from 1900 to 1914, the cost of living index rose as a result of commodity price increases by 31%, whereas the index of average annual money wages per worker (including unemployed) — by only 23%, which meant a decrease in real wages by 6%, and for the period from 1919 to 1938 the fall in real wages amounted to no less than 25%.

Along with monopoly prices, a special factor in the fall of real wages is inflation, which is a chronic phenomenon throughout almost the entire general crisis of capitalism and especially at its present stage. On the huge scale of inflation in the countries of the capitalist camp after World War II, the following data

testify: from the end of 1937 to December 1952, the mass of currency in circulation increased in the USA by 4.9 times, in England — by 3.2 times, in France — by 22.6 times, in Italy — by 78 times, in Japan — by 182 times; wholesale price indices at the end of 1952 compared to 1937 increased: in the USA — by 2 times, in England — by 3 times, in France — by 30 times, in Italy — by 56 times, in Japan — by 273 times. Retail prices for mass consumer goods increased sharply, as a result of which, for example, in the USA the cost of living index rose compared to the pre-war level by almost 3 times.

The growth of commodity prices, which under modern conditions is a consequence both of setting high monopoly prices on goods by cartels and trusts and of increasingly acute inflation, leads to a sharp drop in real wages because nominal wages do not rise in accordance with the growth of prices for mass consumer goods. The gap between the movement of money wages and the movement of commodity prices is especially widening in connection with the policy of "freezing" wages conducted by bourgeois governments with the help of right-wing socialists and reactionary trade union leaders. Compared to the pre-war level, real wages fell in France and Italy by more than double, in England — by 20%, in the USA — by 30–35%.

Monopolies intensify the exploitation of workers not only through monopoly prices and inflation. One of the important instruments for increasing the degree of exploitation of the working class and appropriating maximum profit for capitalist monopolies is the intensification of labor, which reaches its highest degree in the epoch of monopoly capitalism. It is

precisely in this epoch that various speed-up systems (Taylorism, Fordism, bonus systems of wages, etc.) received widespread adoption, leading to maximum increase in labor intensity for workers. In manufacturing and mining industries of the USA average output per 1 man-hour increased from 1915 to 1921 by 10%, from 1922 to 1933 — by 47%, from 1933 to 1941 — by 27%. It should be borne in mind that under conditions of monopoly capitalism and especially during the general crisis of capitalism (to which the provided data relate), it is precisely labor intensification that is the main factor in increasing output per worker. Thus, according to data of a study conducted by the International Labour Office under the League of Nations during the "prosperity" period preceding the 1929–1933 crisis, maximum output growth per worker was achieved by introducing assembly lines, bonus wage systems, and "rationalization of worker movements," that is, through labor intensification, this growth being 2–4 times greater than output growth due to equipment improvement. In an American brochure published a few years before World War II, it was noted: "The increase in output per worker over recent years... cannot be fully or even largely attributed to new or better machines and technological improvements" (*Machinery, Employment and Purchasing Power*, p. 91. New York, 1935, National Industrial Conference Board).

A further sharp increase in labor intensity is observed after World War II. Thus, for example, American capitalists through widespread application of speed-up systems achieved an increase in output per worker in mining, construction, and manufacturing industries for the period from 1945 to 1950 by

45%. The Labor Research Association in the USA characterized the increased application of speed-up systems in the post-war period as follows: "Increase of load per worker was produced by speeding up conveyor movement, overall acceleration of work rhythm, and through threats and administrative pressure, mainly in those branches of industry where unemployment and fear of dismissal grew especially large. The largest load increase on the worker was achieved during transition from time-rate to bonus wage systems. Average workers often more than doubled output, striving to receive 'bonus payments'. In this way, an increase in production output by 80–100% was achieved on the scale of entire enterprises, and the amount of bonus payments paid for such a large output increase on average did not exceed 20–30% of basic hourly pay" (*Facts on the Condition of Working People in the USA*, p. 63. Foreign Literature Publishing House, 1949).

One of the concrete illustrations of modern methods of labor intensification in capitalist countries can serve the introduction at Ford plants after World War II of a special automated device — "chronolog" — to account for all movements of a worker in order to maximize speed-up. In a Ford workers' union bulletin, this device was characterized as "one of the most cruel inventions, freezing the blood. This apparatus accounts for even fractions of a second throughout the working day; the apparatus does not take into account the fatigue of the worker or the total weight of loads he has to lift; the machine is deaf and dumb, cruel and heartless; with the help of this apparatus, the Ford company pursues its goal — to squeeze out of each worker all his energy to the last drop".

Finally, the intensification of exploitation of the proletariat in the epoch of monopoly capitalism is carried out through tax burden growth. Tax rates in capitalist countries increased especially sharply during and after World War II, with taxes on workers increasing to a significantly greater degree than the total amount of taxes. Thus, from 1938/39 to 1950/51 the total amount of direct taxes in England increased almost 4 times, while income tax on workers' wages increased by more than 109 times (without taking currency depreciation into account). In France, the total tax amount increased from 1937 to 1950 by 45 times (without taking currency depreciation into account), while income tax on wages, salaries, and pensions increased by 205 times. In the USA direct taxes falling on average per worker in manufacturing industry grew from 1939 to 1952 by almost 33 times. Along with direct taxes, indirect taxes also increase significantly, the burden of which falls mainly on the working class. For the period from 1937/38 to 1951 the share of taxes in workers' and employees' wages rose in the USA from 12 to 41%, in England — from 29 to 53%.

Funds pumped out by bourgeois states from workers in the form of taxes are transferred into the pockets of monopolists through the mechanism of profitable state orders. Tax growth under conditions of modern capitalism is inextricably linked with arms race and militarization of capitalist economy, serving as an important means of extracting maximum profits by monopolies.

Capitalist monopolies within their countries appropriate maximum profit not only through monstrous exploitation of the

proletariat, but also through intensified exploitation of non-proletarian working masses, in particular the peasantry.

Exploitation of working masses of peasantry by capitalist monopolies is carried out mainly through the mechanism of monopoly prices. Capitalist monopolies, dominating the market, establish monopoly-high prices on goods sold by them and monopoly-low prices on farm products purchased by them. In the USA during the period from 1931 to 1938 prices for industrial goods bought by farmers averaged 120% relative to price levels existing prior to World War I, whereas prices for farm products equaled only 94%.

Capitalist monopolies, purchasing farm products at prices not covering their cost, sell these products to urban consumers at prices exceeding their cost, and achieve in this way maximum profit through exploitation of working masses of both city and countryside. According to a California farmer, in 1952 he sold grapefruit from his orchard to a large commercial company at one cent apiece, while those same grapefruits were sold in Chicago at 30 cents apiece. "After all, probably," he said, "Chicago workers scold me, but they ought to scold monopolists who skin both of us alive".

Capitalist monopolies exploit working masses of the countryside through credit mechanisms as well. With the development of capitalism in agriculture, farmer indebtedness grows. Thus, for example, total indebtedness of American farmers in 1952 reached 14 billion dollars, having increased over a year by almost 2 billion, and for the entire post-war period — by almost 7 billion dollars. In West Germany in just 3 years — from mid-1948 to mid-1951 — agricultural

indebtedness rose from 2.5 billion marks to 4.3 billion, that is, by 72%. But along with indebtedness, the amount of funds pumped out by monopoly capital from working peasant masses in the form of interest payments also increases.

Taxes serve as an important instrument of exploitation of working masses in the countryside. Marx pointed out that if individual capitalists exploit individual peasants with the help of mortgages and usury, the capitalist class exploits the peasant class through state taxes (see Works, Vol. VIII, p. 76). In the epoch of monopoly capitalism, and especially under modern conditions, the arms race in capitalist countries is accompanied by unprecedented tax growth on working masses of the peasantry. In the USA, for example, in 1952 direct and indirect taxes absorbed over 1/3 of farmers' incomes. In Japan during the period after World War II taxes on peasants rose by 10 times.

Ruthless exploitation by monopoly capital of working masses of the countryside leads to mass ruin of small and medium farmers. Thus, in the USA, according to the latest agricultural census, the number of farms decreased in 15 years by 1.5 million, with over 750 thousand farm holdings ruined from 1940 to 1950 alone.

Another way of securing maximum capitalist profit is, as J. V. Stalin teaches, enslavement and systematic robbery of peoples of other countries, especially backward countries. Main methods of robbing peoples of colonial and dependent countries by capitalist monopolies serve non-equivalent exchange and export of capital.

Non-equivalent exchange, expressed in export of industrial goods from capitalist countries to colonial and dependent countries at monopoly-high prices and simultaneous pumping out from there of raw materials and foodstuffs at monopoly-low prices, intensified especially after World War II. Thus, for example, in 1939 Brazil gave 20 bags of coffee for one Ford motor car, while in 1949 for the same car it was forced to give already 200 bags of coffee.

Tribute paid by foreign buyers to American monopolies as a result of the gap between prices on foreign and domestic US markets according to the most conservative estimate amounted in 1948 to over 2.5 billion dollars.

At the same time, capitalist countries, in particular the USA, pump out raw materials and foodstuffs from colonial and dependent countries at monopoly-low prices. Thus, for example, export price of coffee in ports of Latin America constitutes less than half of price paid by consumers for coffee in the USA. In 1948 all expenses of "United Fruit Co." in Central America per pound of bananas amounted to 1.7 cents, whereas retail price of bananas in the USA was 15.9 cents, that is, 9 times higher. Net profit of US monopolists from import of bananas alone amounted in 1948 to 330 million dollars. In Chile US monopolies pay for copper half the lower price than copper price on world market. Matters stand similarly in other colonial and dependent countries.

In recent years price scissors on goods of metropolises and colonial products became even wider. Thus, in report of UN Secretariat on world economic situation for 1952 it is noted that for 32 countries extracting raw materials, purchasing

power of funds derived from exports declined in 1951–1952 by 14% against 1950–1951 and by 21% compared to annual level for first half of 1951.

Pursuing a policy of economic blockade against socialist camp countries, imperialist powers headed by the USA obstruct in every way trade relations of colonial and dependent countries with the USSR and people's democracy countries. This artificially restricts sales opportunities for colonial and dependent countries and contributes to falling prices on their goods. Thus, according to Dutch newspaper *Nieuwe Haagsche Courant*, rubber export from Indonesia decreased in 1952 by 1 billion guilders as a result of American monopolists buying rubber in Indonesia at low prices while at the same time preventing its sale to Soviet Union, Chinese People's Republic, and European people's democracy countries.

Along with non-equivalent exchange, a huge role in robbing peoples of colonial and dependent countries by capitalist monopolies and obtaining maximum profit by these monopolies is played by capital export to backward countries, where profit is usually high, for capital is scarce, land price is relatively small, wages are low, raw materials are cheap.

Capital export enables monopolies to appropriate huge profits through ruthless exploitation of peoples of colonial and dependent countries. Back in 1929 income of three imperialist powers — USA, England, and France — from their foreign capital investments amounted, according to incomplete data, to about 2.3 billion dollars.

After World War II the USA to a huge extent increased capital export, surpassing all other capitalist countries combined in the amount of capital placed abroad. Total amount of US capital investments abroad rose from 12.5 billion dollars at the end of 1939 to 36.1 billion at the end of 1951, of which 20 billion fell on private capital investments, 70–80% of which were placed in colonial and dependent countries.

Over 5 post-war years — from 1946 to 1951 — US income from foreign investments increased from 1.1 billion to 2.7 billion dollars, that is, by 2.5 times. In this connection, income of American monopolies from oil extraction abroad alone amounted in 1951 to approximately 1 billion dollars.

The rate of profit on foreign capital investments significantly exceeds the rate of profit on capital invested inside the country. Thus, if we take 100 as the rate of profit in US manufacturing industry in 1951, the rate of profit on capital invested in Latin American countries is 166, in colonies of West European countries — 145, and in other colonial and dependent countries — 214. Especially high profits are received from exploitation of peoples of colonial and dependent countries by the largest monopolies. This is evidenced by the fact that trust "General Motors" in 1950 received a 34.9% profit on its domestic capital investments, and on foreign capital investments — 115%.

Capitalist monopolies, exporting part of their capitals to colonial and dependent countries, extract maximum profits through brutal exploitation of workers of these countries. Thus, US monopolies squeezed out of each worker in Venezuela 4 thousand dollars profit in 1946, and 14 thousand dollars in 1951, which significantly exceeds profit squeezed out of a

worker in the USA. In the oil industry of Arab countries wages constitute less than 1/10 of average wages of US oil industry workers. At copper mines of Tsumeb in South West Africa, belonging to "Newmont Mining Corporation," net profit per ton of ore is 8 times higher than paid wages. As progressive American economist V. Perlo notes, "a rate of exploitation of 1,000 percent and more is not unusual for monopoly operations in semi-colonial and colonial countries" (*American Imperialism*, p. 91. Foreign Literature Publishing House, 1951).

An important instrument for securing maximum profit for monopolies serves artificial preservation by imperialism of feudal remnants in colonial and dependent countries. Feudal-landlord exploitation, as well as trade-usurious capital exploitation closely associated with it, press down on the colonial peasant and force him to sell his products at the lowest prices, which foreign monopolies use to obtain highest profits. The weight of feudal remnants together with imperialist colonial yoke brakes development of industry in colonial and dependent countries, and delay in industry development contributes to foreign monopolies hiking up commodity prices on colonial markets and appropriating maximum profits.

Besides non-equivalent exchange and income from capital export, monopolies pump out huge profits from colonial and dependent countries by transporting goods of these countries on their ships, insurance, etc. According to incomplete and understated data, total sum of profits received by American monopolies from dependent countries amounted in 1948 to 7.5 billion dollars, including from sale of their goods above value

— 2.5 billion, from purchase of dependent country goods below value — 1.2 billion, from foreign investments — 1.9 billion, from transport, insurance, etc. — 1.9 billion dollars (see ibid., p. 86).

American monopolists appropriate huge profits also through exploitation of peoples of developed capitalist countries, converting them through the "Marshall Plan," "military assistance" programs, etc. into debtors of American imperialism. The USA exports capitals not only to colonial and dependent countries, but also to Western Europe and Japan, imposes its goods on them at high prices, etc. Thus, for example, American monopolies sell raw material to Japanese aluminum plants at 20 dollars per ton at a cost price of 13 dollars, export coal to West Germany at prices double those at which coal is exported from Germany. In just one year (second half of 1950 and first half of 1951) non-equivalent exchange with West European countries gave American monopolies 1.6 billion dollars.

A third method of securing maximum profit for monopolies serves wars and militarization of national economy.

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin repeatedly pointed out that wars serve as a means of extracting colossal profits by capitalist monopolies, that huge war profits are made by monopolists through robbery of popular masses and extreme reduction of working people's standard of living. They drew special attention to the fact that wars lead to scandalous enrichment of a handful of rich and unbelievable plight of the masses.

Even World War I gave capitalist monopolies abundant yield of bloody profits. Profits of the Krupp concern increased in 1916–1917 by 2.3 times compared to 1913–1914, reaching 95% of total share capital; in England dividends of shipping companies rose during the war by 9.5 times, iron-making companies paid dividends in final war years of 30–40%.

To a huge extent monopoly capital of the USA enriched itself on war. Highest profit received during war years exceeded 1914 profit for chemical trust DuPont by 13 times, for steel trust — almost 12 times, for largest oil companies — by 3–6 times, for copper industry company — by 4 times and more. Huge growth of mass profit was accompanied by a significant increase in profit rate. Thus, profit on common shares of steel trust "United States Steel Corporation" was in 1915 about 10%, and in 1916 — 48.5%; for some companies profit rate in war years reached even higher levels.

In World War I capitalist monopolies made huge profits, but even more grandiose profits they squeezed out of working people during World War II. Especially large were profits of American monopolies, receiving colossal war orders from government at inflated prices. On monstrous enrichment of American monopolies on blood and sweat of popular masses testifies the fact that over 6 years of World War II (1940–1945) profits of American corporations amounted to 116.8 billion dollars against 26.6 billion for 6 pre-war years, which means an increase of 4.4 times. As for large monopolies, their profits increased to an even greater degree. Thus, profit of 34 companies in 1942 exceeded average annual profit for 1936–

1939 by 10 times, and profit of 5 largest companies — by more than 100 times.

A new arms race and militarization of national economy of capitalist countries in post-war period secure for capitalist monopolies profit growth unprecedented in entire history of capitalism. Over 6 post-war years (1946–1951) profits of American corporations amounted to about 200 billion dollars, that is, 1.7 times more than for 6 years of World War II, and 7.5 times more than for 6 pre-war years.

Juxtaposition of monopoly profit growth with growth of military expenditures of bourgeois state reveals a definite regularity: the higher military expenditures of bourgeois state, the higher profits of capitalist monopolies. Thus, for example, in the USA state military expenditures and corporation profits were:

Budget Years	**Direct Budget Expenditures for Military Purposes (in bln. dol.)**	**Years**	**Corporation Profits (in bln. dol.)**
1937/38	1.0	1938	3.3
1947/48	12.5	1946	23.5
1948/49	14.5	1947	30.5
1949/50	17.8	1948	33.8

Budget Years	Direct Budget Expenditures for Military Purposes (in bln. dol.)	Years	Corporation Profits (in bln. dol.)
		1949	27.1
1950/51	26.4	1950	39.6
1951/52	49.7	1951	42.9

In 1952 profits of largest US monopolies, especially in war industry, continued to grow at rapid rates. Thus, net profit of 6 largest aviation companies in III quarter of 1952 increased compared to III quarter of 1951 by 54%, and net profit of "General Electric Company" and "Sylvania Electric Products," engaged in manufacturing atomic weapons, electronic and television equipment for army, increased over same period by 126%.

Arms race became a source of monstrous enrichment for capitalist monopolies, especially for American billionaires. But maximum profit is appropriated not only by American monopolies. Basic economic law of modern capitalism operates in all capitalist countries, and recipients of maximum profit are also English, French, and other monopolists. Characteristic is that for period 1947–1951 alone profits of English joint-stock companies increased from 1,933 million pounds sterling to 2,953, that is, more than 1.5 times, and in

1952 profits of 2,772 companies rose again compared to 1951 by 12%.

Three methods of securing maximum profit characterized above are in closest connection with each other. Wars and militarization of national economy secure maximum profits to monopolists because they lead to increased exploitation of working people in both a given country and other countries. Arms race causes inflation and price increases, fall in real wages, and tax burden growth. Financing of war orders by bourgeois state is carried out at the expense of funds squeezed out of working masses through taxes and issuance of paper money. Along with this, militarization of national economy in capitalist countries is accompanied by pumping out at low prices war-strategic raw materials from colonial and dependent countries, sharpening non-equivalent exchange between metropolises and colonies. Militarizing their economy, leading imperialist powers impose arms race on other countries as well, and themselves enrich on profitable deliveries of armaments. Thus, wars and militarization of national economy give maximum profit to monopolists not by themselves, but through increased exploitation of working masses in both capitalist countries and colonial and dependent countries.

***

Basic economic law of modern capitalism determines all main sides and all main processes of development of capitalist production at its monopoly stage. It plays a decisive role in capitalist economy, determines extreme sharpening of contradictions inherent to imperialism.

This law explains most important phenomena in economy and politics of imperialism. First of all it should be emphasized that action of basic economic law of modern capitalism is reflected in all five features of imperialism discovered by V. I. Lenin.

Economic foundation of imperialism is monopoly. Monopoly associations of capitalists in all their activities are guided by pursuit of maximum profit. Precisely for obtaining highest profit large capitalists unite into monopolies which establish high prices on goods and subject working masses to harshest exploitation and robbery both inside their countries and abroad. For obtaining maximum profit monopolies conduct fierce competitive struggle with each other and with non-monopolized enterprises, crush and strangle those who do not submit to their yoke.

Pursuit of maximum profit permeates activities of bank monopolies as well. Bourgeois apologists in every way conceal fact that true goal of both industrial and bank monopolies is appropriation of highest profit; they falsely depict monopolies as "organizers" of economic life allegedly carrying out "conscious regulation" of economy in interest of society. Exposing lackeys of money bag, Lenin pointed out that "conscious regulation" through banks consists in robbing public by a handful of organized monopolists.

Merger, or coalescence, of monopoly bank capital with monopoly industrial capital, leading to formation of finance capital and financial oligarchy, is also closely tied to basic economic law of modern capitalism. Ever greater penetration of large banks into industry through buying up shares of industrial enterprises, issuing securities, and participating in

founding new joint-stock companies serves as a means of appropriating maximum profit by bank monopolies. "Financial capital, concentrated in few hands and enjoying virtual monopoly, takes a huge and ever-increasing profit from founding, from issue of stock, from state loans, etc., cementing dominance of financial oligarchy, imposing tribute on whole society for benefit of monopolists" (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 22, p. 220).

One of typical features of monopoly capitalism is capital export, which is closely tied to basic economic law of modern capitalism. As was already shown above, capital export serves as an important instrument of extracting maximum profit by monopolies through systematic robbery of peoples of other countries, especially backward countries. Driving motive of capital export to backward countries is precisely pursuit of maximum profit.

Among main features of imperialism belong economic division of the world among international monopolies and territorial division of the world among largest imperialist powers. And these features of imperialism are closely tied to basic economic law of modern capitalism. Pursuit of maximum profit conditions organization of international monopoly associations which divide world among themselves in economic respect and receive huge incomes thanks to their dominant position on world market. To secure maximum profit for monopolies imperialist powers carry out their territorial expansion, as a result of which in epoch of imperialism world turned out to be divided among a handful of "great powers".

Being monopoly capitalism, imperialism at the same time is parasitic or decaying capitalism, which again is explained by action of basic economic law of modern capitalism.

Main expression of decay of capitalism at its monopoly stage is delay by monopolies of technical progress. Monopolies hinder introduction of technical improvements in order, through limiting volume of production, to maintain monopoly prices on goods securing maximum profits for them. Besides, having invested significant capitals in old equipment, monopolies out of fear of losing these capitals artificially delay renewal of production apparatus of industry. Striking modern example of delay of technical progress by monopolies is fact that American monopolists stubbornly prevent application of atomic energy in civilian industry, using it only for production of atomic weapons bringing them monstrous profits.

Retardation of technology development in epoch of imperialism, as J. V. Stalin notes, is explained "only by basic economic law of modern capitalism, that is, necessity of obtaining maximum profits. Capitalism stands for new technology when it promises him largest profits. Capitalism stands against new technology and for transition to manual labor when new technology no longer promises largest profits" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 40).

Decay of capitalism finds its expression also in bribery by imperialist bourgeoisie of upper stratum of working class, serving as economic basis of opportunism in labor movement. In turn, this bribery is possible precisely because bourgeoisie of imperialist countries enslaves and subjects to systematic

robbery peoples of colonial and dependent countries, drawing at expense of this maximum profits.

Under modern conditions American monopolies, robbing peoples of entire capitalist world, have possibility at expense of their grandiose profits to bribe corrupt leaders of right-wing socialist parties and reformist trade unions both in the USA and in Western European countries. These people, bought with dollars, serve not only as watchdogs of domestic bourgeoisie, but also as agents of American monopolies.

Decay of capitalism at its monopoly stage is not limited only to economic sphere, but permeates entire political life of capitalist countries. Main expression of decay in political field is reaction along all lines inherent to imperialism. Political reaction, characteristic for epoch of imperialism and especially intensifying during general crisis of capitalism, is explained in the final analysis by action of basic economic law of modern capitalism.

First, liquidation of democratic freedoms serves as an instrument of intensifying exploitation of working class for sake of securing maximum profits for monopolies. In particular, reactionary anti-labor laws like Taft-Hartley law are directed at liquidating workers' right to defend their economic interests and thereby contributing to increasing degree of exploitation of working class.

Second, fascization in sphere of domestic policy is closely tied to aggression in sphere of foreign policy, for without suppression of working class it is impossible to unleash new imperialist wars. J. V. Stalin back at XVII Party Congress

pointed out that curbing working class and terror in sphere of domestic policy serve as necessary means for strengthening rear of future war fronts. And since wars serve for monopolies as one of most important methods of securing maximum profit, introduction of fascist regime in this respect is subordinate to requirements of basic economic law of modern capitalism.

Significance of this law consists, finally, in that it determines extreme sharpening of all internal and external contradictions inherent to capitalism.

In epoch of imperialism main contradiction of capitalism — contradiction between social character of production and capitalist form of appropriation of production results — sharply intensifies. In pursuit of maximum profit monopolies concentrate in their hands ever greater part of total social capital and production, enlarge their enterprises, capture world sources of raw materials, routes and means of communication, etc. As a result, social nature of production strengthens in sharp contradiction with which stands private capitalist form of appropriation.

Pursuit by monopolies of maximum profit and associated harshest exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of popular masses lead to sharpening of discrepancy between growth of production capacities of capitalism and reduction of effective demand, which inevitably conditions frequency, deepening, and sharpening of crises. Along with this, monopolies, striving to secure high profits for themselves, try to preserve high prices on their goods even during crises, which prevents absorption of surplus goods and leads to protracted crises. However, no matter how monopolies try to preserve high

profits during crises, suspension of sales of goods and sharp drop in commodity prices inevitably lead to fact that during crisis years profits of monopolies fall sharply as well. Dialectics are such that for sake of maximum profit monopolies to the extreme intensify exploitation and impoverishment of working masses; impoverishment of masses with simultaneous growth of capitalist production leads to crises, and crises are accompanied by drop in mass and rate of profit.

Imperialism is dying capitalism, eve of socialist revolution, for in epoch of imperialism maximum sharpness of contradiction between labor and capital, between metropolises and colonies, between imperialist states themselves is reached.

Contradiction between labor and capital in epoch of monopoly capitalism sharply intensifies by virtue of fact that exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of working masses as a result of action of basic economic law of modern capitalism reach unprecedented degree. This inevitably causes growth of indignation of working class and in final analysis leads to proletarian revolution.

Exploitation, enslavement, and robbery of colonial peoples for securing maximum profit for capitalist monopolies lead to growth of discontent of these peoples, to rise of national liberation struggle against imperialism, and this conditions emergence and sharpening of crisis of colonial system of imperialism, transformation of colonial and dependent countries from reserves of imperialism into reserves of proletarian revolution.

Basic economic law of modern capitalism causes further sharpening of contradictions in very imperialist camp. Struggle of monopolists of individual countries for maximum profit impels them to seek monopoly possession of colonies and spheres of influence, for precisely monopoly dominance on markets of colonial and dependent countries secures possibility of appropriating highest profit. However, under conditions when world is already divided to the end among a handful of "great powers," and various capitalist countries develop extremely unevenly, struggle for maximum profit inevitably transforms into struggle for redivision of world by imperialist war. Thus, action of basic economic law of modern capitalism, as well as law of uneven development of capitalism in epoch of imperialism subordinate to it, conditions inevitability of clashes, conflicts, and wars between imperialist powers. J. V. Stalin, emphasizing that Leninist thesis on inevitability of wars between capitalist countries remains valid today, notes that England and France cannot endly tolerate colonial expansion of American imperialism threatening catastrophe for high profits of Anglo-French capitalists, and that to secure an independent position and high profits they will be forced in the end to enter into conflict with the USA.

Decisive significance of basic economic law of modern capitalism in preparing conditions for revolutionary transformation of capitalist system was emphasized by G. M. Malenkov in following words: "This law reveals and explains crying contradictions of capitalism, discloses causes and roots of aggressive predatory policy of capitalist states. Action of this law leads to deepening of general crisis of capitalism, to

inevitable growth and explosion of all contradictions of capitalist society" (*Report of XIX Party Congress on Work of Central Committee of All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)*, p. 104).

Dying capitalism is opposed by steadily growing and strengthening camp of socialism, peace, and democracy. Opposition of two laws: basic economic law of modern capitalism, condemning popular masses to severe suffering, poverty, unemployment, and bloody wars, and basic economic law of socialism, securing steady growth of working people's welfare, reflects opposition of two systems and vividly testifies to decisive superiority of socialist system over capitalist one. Knowledge of these laws gives working people of whole world clear orientation in modern historical events, opens clear revolutionary perspective, arms with firm confidence in final victory of communism over capitalism.

Problems of Philosophy, No.5, p.21

3. THE STRUGGLE OF ITALIAN COMMUNISTS FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

E. Ya. EGERMAN

Modern Italy is an arena of intense struggle by the democratic forces of the country, led by the Italian Communist Party, against the policies of imperialist reaction.

The policy of the Italian bourgeoisie in the past was always characterized by half-measures, inconsistency, and narrow, selfish interests. Acting as the "leading" class in the struggle against feudalism and for the liberation and reunification of the country, the Italian bourgeoisie, as is known, did not fully carry out its historical role in forming the nation and the national state. By all means, it tried to exclude the broad popular masses, the peasantry, from participation in the national liberation and social struggle of the *Risorgimento* period (1830s–1860s). And although Italy was essentially unified through a revolutionary path and the Italian people showed many remarkable examples of decisive class struggle, the *Risorgimento*, as noted by the founder of the Italian Communist Party, Antonio Gramsci, "did not lay the foundations of a firm national democracy." (Quoted from *«Quaderno dell'attivista»*, April 1947, p. 209). Coming to power, the Italian bourgeoisie created a bloc of large industrialists of Northern Italy and land magnates-latifundists of the South and the islands (Sicily and Sardinia). It, as Engels

wrote, "did not destroy the remnants of feudalism and did not reorganize national production on a modern bourgeois foundation. Unable to provide the country with the relative and temporary benefits of the capitalist order, it loaded onto it all the weight, all the difficulties of the latter" (K. Marx and F. Engels. Works. Vol. XVI, Part II, p. 377).

However, maneuvering under the pressure of the growing labor and peasant movement, the Italian bourgeoisie in the first decades of its rule was often forced to abandon a policy that was "too monopolistic, too violent, too direct" (Gramsci). Like the bourgeoisie of other countries, it passed itself off as the head of the nation, a guardian of national interests—which it was forced to consider to a certain extent—allowed itself to be liberal, flaunted bourgeois-democratic freedoms, and implemented a certain expansion of electoral rights. It created theories of Italian liberalism.

In the speeches of the General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, P. Togliatti, the following illustrative examples are given. In 1900, during the period of brutal violence by the so-called "international corps" against the Chinese—participants in the Boxer Rebellion—a number of bourgeois Italian political figures raised their voices in the Chamber of Deputies in protest against the barbaric actions of the imperialists, calling in the name of humanity and for the sake of national honor of Italy to decisively condemn the murderers and recall Italian military units from China. Among these political figures was the famous leader of the so-called left liberals, Giolitti.

Being bound by a treaty with Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which conducted aggressive policy preparing for World War I, the Italian bourgeois government, "showing the presence of at least a minimal understanding of the national interests of Italy," made known attempts between 1900 and 1914 to evade imperialist adventures, not allowing Italy to be dragged into the preparing war (*«L'Unità»* of June 22, 1952, p. 5).

The coming of fascists to power under conditions of economic and political crisis in Italian society, which began after World War I, showed how narrow and weak the base of Italian bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism was. Fascism—the dictatorship of monopolistic groups of the Italian bourgeoisie, a regime supported also by large agrarians, the military caste, the royal court, and the highest church hierarchy—pursued an unrelenting policy of suffocating the remnants of bourgeois-democratic freedoms and parliamentarism, a policy of creating a totalitarian dictatorship. This meant the collapse of bourgeois-liberal theories, replaced openly by fascist theories. In 1923, with the direct and active assistance of the Catholic "People's Party," then headed by De Gasperi, the so-called "Acerbo Law" was enacted, based on a majority electoral system and ensuring fascists a majority of seats in the 1924 elections. Bourgeois theorists who boasted of their liberalism directly or indirectly supported and justified this law, which opened the path to totalitarian dictatorship in 1926 for the fascists.

Fascism destroyed the national economy of Italy and dragged it into World War II as an ally of Hitler's Germany. It is known

what all this led to. The territory of Italy found itself under the heel of fascist occupiers. The anti-people and anti-national policy of the fascist government with its delusional plans to create a "great Italian empire," with its aggressive blocs, etc., led to the fact that Italy itself, ruined and weakened, became an object of takeover policy by foreign imperialism. Italian communists tirelessly pointed out to the people that the policy of fascist totalitarianism leads to the loss of national independence, to the enslavement of Italy by stronger imperialist predators.

"Creating grandiose plans of dominance," wrote Gramsci regarding the policy of Italian monopolists and their political henchmen, "they do not notice how they themselves become the object of foreign dominance; building imperialist plans, in reality they turn into an object of imperialism of other states" (*«Quaderni del carcere»*. T. 5, p. 84. Einaudi, 1950). These words of Gramsci, written by him during his imprisonment in the 1930s, were fully confirmed by the entire course of history.

The suppression of democratic freedoms and foreign occupation meant the beginning of a national catastrophe for Italy. From this catastrophe, Italy was saved by the heroism of the working masses led by communists, who received the opportunity, under the conditions of the great victories of the Soviet Army over the Nazi hordes, to launch a decisive offensive against the fascist regime, overthrow it, and free their motherland from Hitler's occupiers.

In the vanguard of the anti-fascist and national liberation movement were the working masses, led by communists, socialists, and left democrats. Partisan brigades consisted 85%

of workers and peasants, and 15% of students, technical staff, and employees. Privileged groups of the bourgeoisie and clerics, on the contrary did everything possible to disrupt the victorious offensive of the popular forces. It should be emphasized that Italy would not have been occupied at all if the ruling classes and the monarchy had not deliberately pursued their selfish class policy. "It would have been possible to prevent the occupation of Italy by the Nazis," said the Deputy General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, Pietro Secchia, "if the monarchy and the ruling classes, fearing to arm the people and see them fighting side by side with the army, had not preferred assistance to the full defeat of the army itself and Nazi occupation. This happened because the ruling classes of Italy, striving to monopolize patriotism, always felt themselves greater friends and allies of foreign capitalists (yesterday German, today American) than of the Italian people" (*«L'Unità»* of September 10, 1952, p. 5).

In the decisive struggle against fascism and in the liberation war, the working masses saved the national independence of the country and defended the possibility of democratic development for Italy. After the defeat of Hitler's Germany and Italian fascism, a broad path of democratic development and national rebirth opened before Italy. However, reaction did everything possible to turn the country away from this path.

Bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms, which were laid at the foundation of the Italian republican constitution and which the Italian people defend now in a decisive struggle against reaction, owe their existence to the struggle of the working

class and the working masses against fascism, for democracy, and national independence.

The main, primary outcome of the twenty-year resistance to fascism and the struggle for national independence was, says Togliatti, "the arrival of the advanced forces of the people to the leadership of political life and all national life through the leadership of the struggle that the nation was bound to lead and led for its freedom, its salvation" (*«L'Unità»* of May 19, 1952, p. 5).

The anti-fascist and liberation struggle of the working masses left its mark on the bourgeois constitution of Italy. This constitution provides for a number of bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms: the right to work, freedom of speech and opinion, freedom of the press, the right to strike, as well as certain measures aimed at social progress and development of the national economy—land reform, nationalization of certain branches of industry, etc.

The years that have passed since the monarchy was overthrown in Italy and the republican system was established have shown that the democratic regime, and consequently the struggle for the eradication of the remnants of fascism and the democratization of society, for social and economic progress, and national independence will exist only on the condition that the working masses participate in the political life of the country, and the working class with its parties exercises a leading role in the life of the nation. Only the working class and the working masses of Italy are capable of standing and actually do stand guard over the democratic rights of the people

recorded in the constitution, fighting for their implementation into life.

The reactionary bourgeoisie has now definitively broken with the people, set out on the path of full suppression of democratic rights, and abandoned national sovereignty. The policy of providing monopolistic groups with maximum profit, preparing the rear for a new world war against the Atlantic Pact—all this, naturally, is in full contradiction with national interests and the constitution of Italy. Therefore, reaction with all its strength sought to liquidate the constitution and the democratic regime, to remove from participation in political governance of the country the grown and matured democratic forces of the people; the working class with its tested, hardened in multi-year struggle for the good of the people Communist Party, and to secure thereby monopolistic rule. The ultimate political goal of the "undertakers of democracy" is the destruction of universal suffrage, parliament, the annulment of the republican constitution, and the revival of fascist totalitarianism. It is known that throughout its existence, the De Gasperi government sabotaged legislation aimed at securing one or another article of the republican constitution in every possible way. On the contrary, every act of its domestic and foreign policy was a direct violation of the constitution. Reaction loaded onto the shoulders of the Italian people all the weight of the "Marshall Plan." Ruling circles not only failed to take any measures for the nationalization of certain vital industries, but in every way resisted and oppose the implementation of state control in these industries, monopolized by the largest Italian industrialists. Italian industry for many years has been in a state

of depression and crisis. A process of reduction and closure of factories and plants working for civilian industry is underway; the standard of living of workers engaged in production is steadily declining; the reserve army of unemployed workers is growing, having reached 2 million people (according to official data). The Italian constitution speaks of a republic "founded on labor," while De Gasperi suggested that the working people of Italy "learn foreign languages and seek work abroad." In defending the privileges of Italian monopolists, the clerical government met the most energetic support from the Vatican. In one of his messages to Austrian Catholic workers, the Pope declared that the labor question in Europe at present is already fully resolved, and resolved in such a way that workers have nothing better to wish for, and that now allegedly all efforts must be directed toward resolving the question of "personal freedom" and the protection of "sacred and inviolable" private property (the Vatican means plans to nationalize the largest enterprises, which it decisively disapproves of).

In the interests of large landowners, the implementation of agrarian reform was disrupted. With the help of various tricks and maneuvers, the government prevented the implementation into life of decrees passed in 1944 by Minister Gullo (a communist, former Minister of Agriculture in the coalition government, which previously also included representatives of the Communist Party) on granting uncultivated estate lands to landless peasants. The government demanded that peasants buy out uncultivated lands from landowners; farmhands occupying these lands were mercilessly shot by carabineers. The government resorted to all sorts of tricks, saving large land

ownership. For example, part (and a fairly significant one) of vacant, uncultivated lands was intended to be saved from expropriation by calculating land area per each landowner's son (including deceased ones) at a 15% quota.

Embarking on the path of violating the peace treaty and participating in the preparation of a new world war, the ruling reactionary circles of Italy committed new acts of violation of the republican constitution. Hardened fascist criminals were released from prisons, such as collaborator Prince Borghese, who exterminated Italian partisans during the liberation war; Anfuso, guilty of the death of the democrat Rosselli brothers; Graziani and Spampanato, accomplices in barbaric fascist reprisals against the civilian population. Contrary to the first paragraph of Article 64 of the peace treaty with Italy, which determines the total number of aircraft for the Air Force of Italy at 350, the Ministry of Defense intends to build over 1,000 jet aircraft in 1953. And aircraft, armored divisions, and Alpine brigades currently being formed with feverish haste—all this is intended for the "European Defense Community," for the so-called "European Army," i.e., is being done by no means in the national interests of Italy. The principle of national sovereignty—one of the main bases of the constitution—has long been cast aside by Italian reaction.

General Ridgway inspected the Italian army without having even formal rights to do so, as the London agreement on the inclusion of Italian armed forces into the so-called "European Army" was not ratified by the Italian parliament. On the territory of Italy—in Naples, Livorno, Brindisi, Udine, Friuli,

and along the entire eastern border—American air bases and occupation units are stationed.

At the same time, Italian reaction severely persecutes supporters of peace, fighters for national independence, and the democratic rights of the people. For five years, one of the leaders of the partisan movement in the liberation war against the Nazis—Dante Gorreri, newly elected Member of Parliament—has been held in prison without trial or investigation and has not yet been released.

Beginning with an attack on individual constitutional rights, reaction, in view of the powerful and ever-growing resistance to its anti-people policy from democratic forces, sought the full liquidation of all democratic rights and freedoms, the execution of a coup d'état, and the monopolization of power, thereby clearing the way for a fascist dictatorship.

The ruling party all recent years went along the line of removing multi-million masses of working people with their revolutionary and democratic parties from participation in the management of the political life of the country. The Italian people saw this with particular clarity when the clerical government put forward its fraudulent bill on "reform" of electoral law. This bill turned out to be an exact copy of the so-called "Acerbo Law." Despite decisive opposition resistance and its refusal to participate in the vote, the Chamber of Deputies on January 21, 1953 approved the anti-democratic electoral "reform"; on March 29, under conditions of gross violation of regulations and full arbitrariness on the part of the speaker, the bill on "reform" was passed by the Senate and soon signed by the President of Italy, Einaudi.

The Italian people, all honest citizens who value constitutional rights, met the decision of the Chamber of Deputies with stormy protest. A powerful wave of demonstrations, rallies, and strikes swept across the country. To the passage of the law by the Senate, the people responded with a general national strike.

Italian communists resolutely stood in the vanguard of the struggle for the creation of a movement of broad democratic unity in defense of democratic freedoms, peace, and national independence. Speaking at the festival of the newspaper *«L'Unità»* in Forlì in September 1952, Deputy General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party Luigi Longo stated: "The party of clerics, which is once again taking the path leading to fascism and seeking to recreate a chamber of deputies not much different from that under fascism and corporations, with the only difference being that instead of blackshirts, affairs will be managed by black cassocks—must be opposed with the broadest and most powerful union of the people in defense of the republican constitution, in defense of democratic freedoms" (*«L'Unità»* of September 9, 1952, p. 6).

It is known that detachment of the bourgeoisie from the people constitutes a major condition for the work of revolutionary and democratic parties in capitalist countries. The Communist Party of Italy fully takes these conditions into account and fights for the creation of a broad democratic movement aimed at defending constitutional rights, national independence, and peace.

In their struggle for democratic rights of the people, Italian communists proceed from Marxist-Leninist teachings. The

question of the struggle for democracy received serious and deep theoretical development in the works of Italian communists, which provided that scientific basis allowing Italian communists to correctly orient themselves in the political situation, to timely and convincingly expose and unmask anti-constitutional maneuvers plotted to the detriment of national interests by reactionary classes, and to correctly determine the main tasks facing the national-democratic front. The scientific, Marxist development of issues regarding the struggle for democracy, confirmed by the entire course of social and political life in Italy, by daily practice, acquires immense significance also in mobilizing democratically inclined strata for the struggle for constitutional rights, especially in conditions where the bourgeoisie and reactionary parties, going against history, ever more decisively abandon bourgeois democracy, placing their bet on a policy of force and terror.

As already indicated, the *Risorgimento* did not lay the foundations of a firm national democracy, just as the Italian bourgeoisie, mortally afraid of "Jacobin" movements and popular revolution, refused a radical change in economic structure and made a deal with feudal-clerical reaction. In the works of Antonio Gramsci, the inability of the Italian bourgeoisie to solve main national problems in a democratic direction was shown, and the reactionary character of the Italian bourgeois state, narrow-caste, conservative tendencies of the ruling class were exposed. In a concrete Marxist analysis of modern Italian society, Gramsci showed that problems affecting the life of the entire nation can be resolved in the

interests of the people only under the condition of the leading role of the working class. But the working class of Italy, led by the communist party, wrote Gramsci, will not be able to immediately after the overthrow of fascism transition to the realization of its historical function—the building of socialism. The immediate strategic task will be the struggle for the eradication of fascism and the democratization of society, for the establishment of a democratic republic.

Analysis of the conditions, prospects, and concrete forms of development of the democratic movement in Italy, begun by Gramsci, was continued and developed in the works and speeches of P. Togliatti, L. Longo, P. Secchia, and other Italian communists, who summarized the results and generalized the experience of twenty years of resistance of the working class and working masses to fascism, the experience of the liberation war against Hitler's occupiers.

Italian communists view the struggle for democracy as a necessary step on the path of socio-economic progress of Italian society, as a "precondition and necessary condition for movement along the path to a classless society, to socialism" (see *«Italian Communist Party». A Brief Historical Essay.* Translated from Italian, p. 121. M. 1951).

In Italy, writes Umberto Terracini in the article "Italian Constitution, Democracy and Socialism," we are talking about a democratic revolution, about "completing that revolution which, having begun in our country in the middle of the last century in the form of a national revolution aimed at achieving unity and independence, stopped at this stage due to the fact that broad popular masses were not involved in the movement,

once again turned out to be on the agenda during the years of World War II for independence, with the difference, however, that now the leading role in it belonged to the working class."

This democratic revolution, writes Terracini, is characterized mainly by three features: "it developed in a country that the dictatorship of privileged strata brought to the brink of ruin; it developed in a country whose working class reached a high degree of political maturity and possessed strong organizations, and this dictated the necessity of resolving economic and social problems that were not set, and consequently, not resolved by democratic revolutions that occurred in the past in other countries; finally, it developed in a country that survived economic shocks and was ruined, so that for its restoration it was necessary not to refuse the broadest participation of private capital, to prevent, however, the dominance of selfish interests of individual groups, since economic life had to be regulated in accordance with the principles of national solidarity" (collection *«Thirty Years of Life and Struggle of the Italian Communist Party»*. Translated from Italian, p. 534. M. 1953).

On the basis of a deep analysis of modern Italian democracy, its origins, the role of the working class and working masses in winning democratic rights, conditions for preserving and developing the democratic system, Togliatti showed that in Italy we are talking not in general about bourgeois-democratic rights, but about the defense of those concrete democratic gains achieved by the people as a result of a long and victorious anti-fascist and liberation struggle, which received their reflection in the republican constitution. The peculiarity of democracy for

which the Italian people must fight, "progressive democracy," as Togliatti called it, consists in the fact that this is "not the former inert and cowardly democracy, incapable of resisting its enemies and coping with them, but an anti-fascist, fighting, progressive democracy relying on a broad network of popular organizations and organized and acting in such a way that reactionary forces will never again be allowed to raise their head" (*«Italian Communist Party». A Brief Historical Essay*, p. 94).

The content of such democracy, as Togliatti points out, is primarily anti-fascism, and then—movement on a democratic basis toward socialism. From these propositions flow two other most important conclusions. The struggle for progressive democracy, for a democratic constitution creates that political base on which the interests of broad democratic strata of the people are united, deeply interested in the eradication of fascism, in changing the unfair economic structure, in preserving peace and national independence. This struggle presupposes the participation of broad democratic masses of the people in the political life of the country, the creation of a united national front of democratic forces led by the most consistent and uncompromising anti-fascist force—the working class and its revolutionary party.

The Marxist-Leninist development of the problems of Italian democracy in theoretical works of Italian communists formed the basis of the work of the V Congress of the Italian Communist Party (December 20, 1945 – January 6, 1946), dedicated to the question of democratic rebirth of the country,

and the VI Congress (January 5–10, 1948), which adopted the decision to create a National Democratic Front.

In the course of the further development of the Italian people's struggle for democratic rights, Italian communists continued to develop and enrich the theoretical development of the problem of struggle for democracy, as well as the question of the leading role of the working class, the Communist Party of Italy in the life of the nation. This theoretical work took place under conditions of irreconcilable ideological struggle against various political, philosophical, sociological, and historiographical "theories" coming from the camp of reaction and aimed at liquidating the democratic regime and establishing a clerical dictatorship of a fascist type. These "theories" directly supported the anti-communist struggle conducted in Italy for many years by the Vatican, the Christian Democratic Party, and its satellites.

Striving to turn history back toward fascism, Christian Democrats used the sociological "theory" of so-called "Thomistic communitarianism" with the aim of opposing its theories to scientific socialism. Italian communists showed that this "theory" represents a stale doctrine of fascist corporatism wrapped—in conditions of clerical reaction—in religious-Catholic attire. This "theory" legalizes social inequality in the spirit of the official teaching of the Catholic Church—Thomism; it is called upon to lull the popular masses, deprive them of activity, and prevent the struggle for socio-economic transformations. Speaking in the Chamber of Deputies on February 10, 1950, P. Togliatti exposed the essence of "Thomistic communitarianism," pointing out in particular that

this doctrine "explains the sympathies of Christian Democrats toward Francoist Spain" (*«L'Unità»* of February 12, 1950).

Events of recent years have shown with complete clarity that leaders of the Christian Democrats strove precisely to create a fascist regime in Italy similar to the Francoist one. If their plans had succeeded, Togliatti said in a report at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party on July 2, 1953, "in Italy the democratic constitutional system based on parliament would have yielded place to a regime of the type that Portuguese and Spanish peoples are currently forced to submit to" (*«Pravda»* of July 4, 1953).

The desire of Christian Democrats to monopolize power and suppress the broad democratic movement of the working masses was served also by the philosophical concept of Benedetto Croce, known as "Croceanism." The political content of Croceanism boils down to countering the political activity and revolutionary action of the masses and saving the capitalist system. After World War II, Croce did not limit himself to opportunism, but acted as a supporter of clerical reaction, a helper of American imperialism. The Italian communist journal *«Rinascita»* pointed out "a number of coincidences in the philosophy of Croce with Catholic ideology" (No. 1 for 1950, p. 33). Following Pope Pius XII, who declared the class structure of society and exploitation of working people to be eternal, unchangeable, established by nature itself, Croce asserted that the class, "corporate" structure of society corresponds to the "divine structure of things, which nature itself established among people to facilitate their existence through such specification." Croce denied the

existence of class struggle in society, calling it a "fiction," and referred to Marxist philosophical and socialist ideas as "empty aspirations, not reality, in a word, words and not concepts" (*«My Philosophy»*, pp. 83–114. London. 1949).

At the same time, Croce was an active participant in denying class struggle in Italy, one of the most active reactionaries of the peninsula, according to Gramsci's definition. In all his political speeches in parliament, Croce, a large landowner, was guided by the interests of his class, as manifested, for example, in the discussion on the bill of Minister-Communist Gullo on extending the terms of valid agricultural contracts (large landowners arbitrarily altered contractual conditions with tenants under the threat of terminating contracts).

Fausto Gullo in his diary published in the collection *«Thirty Years of Life and Struggle of the Italian Communist Party»*, exposed Croce as a defender of capitalists' privileges. Italian communists exposed the political essence of Croce's philosophical speeches. This was done mainly back by A. Gramsci, who showed in his work *«Historical Materialism and the Philosophy of Benedetto Croce»*, written in prison in the 1930s and published by the Italian Communist Party in 1948, the theoretical groundlessness and social background of the so-called "ethico-political" concept of history, which Croce opposed to historical materialism.

This concept, developed by Croce with particular insistence during World War I and after the October Socialist Revolution —which aroused in him panic fear and apprehensions regarding the stability of the capitalist system—denied the decisive significance of the conditions of material life of

society in the development of its history and reduced everything to "ethico-political" ideas and institutions. Croce's philosophy was aimed at removing broad masses of direct producers of material goods from active participation in the historical process. Croce asserted that "history moves from above," and recognized the right "to make history" only for ruling classes and ruling parties. All this practically meant a struggle against democratization of society, for preserving the rule of the bourgeoisie in Italy.

Fear of the movement of popular masses by the bourgeoisie was a constant obstacle on the path of socio-economic progress of the Italian people. Renewal of economic structure and social progress in Italy, as Gramsci repeatedly emphasized, "can arise only from below, when the entire national stratum standing at the lowest economic and cultural level takes part in radical historical action encompassing all life of the people" (*«Passato e presente»*, p. 10. Borino, Einaudi. 1951).

Articles by P. Togliatti and other Italian communists (see, for example, "Inanity and Contentlessness of Crocean Anti-Communism" in *«Rinascita»* No. 8–9 for 1949), exposing Croce's speeches, showed that this reactionary philosopher, who denied broad popular masses the right to active participation in the historical process, sought to deprive them of political leadership. Croce called for "isolation of communists," i.e., for removal from participation in political life of the nation of the most consistent and steadfast defenders of working masses' interests, democracy, and peace. Thus, the liberal Croce acted as an active helper of clerical reaction. To

such a position slid the entire Liberal Party, turning into a satellite of the Christian Democratic Party.

Italian communists have repeatedly pointed out that liberals coalescing with Christian Democrats inevitably fall into dependence on the policies of the latter. In the article "Clerical Obscurantism Against Italian Culture," communist K. Salinari quotes a characteristic statement from the Catholic newspaper *«Civiltà Cattolica»*—an organ of the Jesuits. Liberalism, says this newspaper, "exalts the idea of freedom incompatible with limitations set to natural reason by divine revelation. One cannot use the reputation of a good Catholic while being poisoned by errors of liberalism" (*«L'Unità»* of November 15, 1952, p. 3). Speaking in Cuneo in May 1953, P. Togliatti showed that the alliance with Christian Democrats—modern "Sanfedisti"—is disgraceful for liberals, that it goes against the traditions of liberalism from the *Risorgimento* era. Togliatti's speech, exposing the position of liberal leaders, was of great importance for the correct orientation of popular masses regarding the Liberal Party—one of the parties through which Christian Democrats tried to receive the desired percentage of votes and "bonus" in the elections of June 7, 1953.

Of enormous significance for the struggle for democratic rights of the people and national independence were speeches of Italian communists against cosmopolitan theories about "organization on a global scale of capitalism," which were preached by right-wing Social Democrats. A practical consequence of these theories was the call for the shutdown of national industry and trade, for the liquidation of national sovereignty—everything that found its expression in the policy

of De Gasperi's government, conducted over a number of years. This policy fully corresponded to plans of American imperialism, seeking to unleash a new war.

Italian communists act as carriers of the idea of peace; they expose American imperialist propaganda and war hysteria fanned in Italy, in particular by such newspapers as *«La Stampa»* and *«Civiltà Cattolica»*. To the misanthropic plans of a new war, Italian communists oppose a call for peaceful economic and cultural cooperation among peoples based on mutual respect and equal rights. In a speech at a festival in honor of *«L'Unità»* on September 23, 1951, P. Togliatti said: "We want friendly relations to exist between us and capitalist countries, and not relations of subordination. We want trade to be conducted with the USSR and countries of people's democracy, so that we can receive from there everything necessary for our economy and, above all, provide work for our plants and factories" (*«Pravda»* of September 25, 1951).

Just as in other capitalist countries, in Italy only communist and socialist parties can raise high the banner of democratic freedoms and national independence and carry it forward. That is why the struggle for the people's rights to manage the political life of the country acquires such great importance in the activities of Italian communists.

The Italian Communist Party carries on the struggle against reaction with full consciousness of that greatest responsibility for the fate of the motherland and people that lies upon it and upon the working class of Italy. Without the participation of working masses and, above all, the working class, revolutionary and democratic parties in the political life of the

country, Italy will inevitably turn into a colony of foreign imperialism.

"Our paramount duty," said Togliatti in the days of preparation for municipal elections, speaking in Rome in May 1952, "is to remain faithful to the Italian constitution, the foundations on which it rests, its historical prerequisites and conditions. Our duty is to demand the implementation into life of this constitution in all its fullness, in accordance with the spirit of the national liberation movement by which this constitution was born, so that a path to managing civic affairs at all levels of state life is once again open to popular masses and all parties (including the most advanced ones) that represent them" (*«L'Unità»* of May 19, 1952, p. 5).

The parliamentary group of communists, participating in the discussion on the bill condemning fascism, insisted on adopting practical measures ensuring the implementation of this law into life. "The constitution obliges us," said communist Amendola in the Chamber of Deputies, "to prevent this process (the process of development of neo-fascism in Italy.—*E. E.*). But communists—and this is the very essence of their arguments—openly declare that to prevent the rebirth of fascism, this law is insufficient. An anti-fascist policy is needed which, realizing aspirations and hopes for renewal coming from the ranks of fighters against fascism, would strike not only external manifestations, but also the very foundation of fascism, social forces supporting it... An anti-fascist policy is needed, a policy of implementing the constitution, respecting democratic freedoms, a policy of social renewal, peace, and independence" (*«L'Unità»* of June 7, 1952, p. 3).

Such is the main direction of the struggle of Italian communists for democratic freedoms. This struggle reached enormous tension in recent times, when reaction launched a decisive offensive against the constitution, particularly in connection with the preparation and implementation of an anti-constitutional fraudulent electoral "reform" based on the so-called majority-bonus voting system designed to secure for the bloc of reactionary parties a permanent overwhelming majority in parliament.

Speeches of communists before working people at meetings and rallies, in parliament, and in the press showed the Italian people that the maneuvers of reaction were caused by fear of the rapid growth of democratic forces of Italy, fear of the successes of the Communist and Socialist parties, their unbreakable union and unity of action in leading the working class and working masses. Municipal elections in 1951–1952 showed reactionary parties that the ground was slipping from under their feet. Christian Democrats lost about 4 million votes in these elections compared to the elections of April 18, 1948. Conversely, the number of votes cast for the bloc of communists with all honest democrats and patriots, particularly for the "civilian list" proposed by independent liberal Francesco Saverio Nitti, increased by several million despite all obstacles reaction created to the free expression of the people's will. Municipal elections of 1951–1952 were, according to Togliatti's assessment, "a new step forward on the path of raising the level of political consciousness of popular masses, on the path that should lead to strengthening the unity of democratic forces" (*«L'Unità»* of May 19, 1952, p. 5).

Particularly illustrative were victories won in elections to provincial and municipal councils in the South and on the islands of Italy (Sicily and Sardinia), the most backward regions of the country economically and culturally, which reaction had long considered its unchangeable base. The Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party regarding election results noted: "Based on data collected by the center and information from local organizations, party leadership notes with satisfaction that recent elections, held primarily in southern regions, in Sicily and Sardinia, showed significant solidarity and progress of the entire popular movement for political and social rebirth and democratization of these regions, abandoned to the mercy of fate by central and local authorities and most affected by fiscal pressure and exploitation by large monopolies and large land magnates-latifundists. The political awakening and progress of popular forces, manifested in these elections, is mostly undoubtedly due to the tenacity with which communist organizations year after year raised and achieved solutions to vital problems of the South and Islands. But communists and socialists have never found such broad, as in these elections, contact and fruitful cooperation with democratic groups and individual persons who hold other convictions, but understand that only through unity of the people can the path of the entire nation be renewed" (*«L'Unità»* of June 8, 1952, p. 1).

These victories of democratic forces alarmed reaction, showing it that under conditions of a more or less democratic electoral system it had no chance of remaining in power. Reaction undertook a furious campaign against the constitution. As

Togliatti said, right-wing parties decided "to definitively twist the neck of the regime" won by the resistance of working people to fascism, the liberation war, and the victorious uprising of April 25, 1945.

In the course of parliamentary discussion on electoral reform, the opposition, led by the parliamentary group of communists, exposed the fraudulent essence of the so-called majority-bonus electoral system, the introduction of which clericals stubbornly sought.

The struggle of communists in parliament against the reactionary bill deeply reflected on the development of the democratic movement in the country. Thousands of rallies, demonstrations, and strikes swept across all major cities and agricultural centers of Italy, growing into a nationwide movement in which workers, peasants, intelligentsia, and middle strata of the population participated.

Italian communists clearly defined the main tasks and goals of the struggle for constitutional rights facing the Italian people in the economic sphere. "We want," wrote Togliatti, "the working class and the entire mass of working people to participate through their advanced parties oriented toward socialism in managing civic affairs and through this participation succeed in renewing the current unfair and unsuccessful economic structure..." (*«L'Unità»* of September 13, 1952, p. 1). The Communist Party and trade unions lead an unceasing struggle against the slave labor regime created by industrialists and violations of workers' democratic rights. "Freedom to strike," says General Secretary of the CGIL (General Italian Confederation of Labor) Di Vittorio, "is one of the main pillars

of constitutional structure... a worker at a factory has the right to think as he wants, read what he wants, elect whom he wants —do everything that the constitution allows him" (*«L'Unità»* of September 21, 1952, p. 5).

Communists actively supported the plan of structural reforms put forward by the CGIL and fight for its implementation into life despite fierce resistance from reaction.

With unflagging effort, they lead the struggle for freedom of the press. The communist and democratic press does not allow reaction to entangle the popular masses of Italy with lies and drag them into war. It exposes the reactionary essence of domestic and foreign policy of ruling circles of Italy, unmasks plans of international imperialist reaction. At the same time, it tells the Italian people the truth about the life of the peace camp, about life in the Soviet Union, its peaceful construction, approaching the time of the advent of communism. The democratic press opposes the lying reactionary press, refutes its insinuations, slander, and distortion of facts. It is together with this an important weapon in the struggle for social progress of society. The Italian constitution solemnly proclaims: "Everyone has the right to free expression of their thoughts orally, in writing, and through other means of dissemination." Trampling on this provision of the constitution, reaction prepares a law against freedom of the press in which criticism of reactionary policy is qualified as an insult to the government. Communists showed that this places the democratic press in dependence on the arbitrariness of the police and that therefore mobilization of all democratic forces in defense of the progressive press is necessary.

The struggle of Italian communists for democratic rights of the people is inextricably linked with the struggle for peace and national independence. In his speech before the working people of Turin in September 1952, P. Togliatti said: "We are talking not only about making the regime fully democratic; we are talking about saving the country. It is necessary to save peace, this is the main thing!" (*«L'Unità»* of September 16, 1952, p. 3).

The suppression of democratic rights of the people and foreign policy conducted in the interests of foreign imperialist circles constitute a single line of Italian reaction. Such is the logical result of subordinating domestic reaction plans to plans of international imperialism. The communist newspaper *«L'Unità»* provides numerous facts illustrating this situation. Thus, for example, in connection with the arrival in Italy of General Ridgway, although a state of siege was not introduced in the country (in full contradiction with the constitution, which provides for the right of citizens to organize peaceful assemblies), assemblies in Udine dedicated to the memory of anti-fascist fighter Matteotti were banned; in Genoa, a rally of working people gathered to honor the memory of patriot-workers, employees, and technicians of the "San Giorgio" plant in Sestri, shot by fascists in 1944, was banned.

Reactionaries not by chance try to prove as if popular masses and their parties have no right to deal with foreign policy questions, that this area allegedly belongs entirely to the competence of the government, that consulting the people through a referendum is inapplicable here. This literally coincides with the words of Mussolini—"War is not declared

by referendum!" Naturally, all these assertions are in glaring contradiction with the constitution, and here with particular force manifests a tendency toward a coup d'état and monopolization of power. Foreign policy of Italian reaction is such that it completely denies the Italian constitution as a national one and advocates the so-called "European constitution," which American imperialists try to impose on Atlantic bloc countries—France, West Germany, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, and Italy.

Paragraph 41 of the Italian constitution provides for the right of control over the national economy only for the Italian state and only for "public purposes." The "Schuman Plan," as life showed, means subordination of the steel and coal industry of Italy to German monopolies working for war. It is well known to Italian ruling circles that the organization of a supranational coal and steel concern revives German militarism, and the inclusion of German divisions in the so-called "European Army" means a direct threat to the national independence of the Italian people.

Italian communists lead a decisive struggle in parliament and in the country against Italy's participation in the "European Defense Community," against the organization of the "European Army." P. Togliatti exposed and condemned reaction's attempts to remove democratic forces from participation in discussing foreign policy issues. Statements of reactionaries that foreign policy is not subject to discussion, that opposition has no right to express its active disagreement with government decisions in this area, communists qualify as a gross distortion of constitutional rights, as refusal from its

main norms. Communists showed that both the letter and spirit of the constitution grant the people and their parties this right, which forms the basis of the constitution born as a result of victory over the fascist regime, which brought Italy to ruin through its criminal foreign policy directed at protecting interests of foreign capital and betrayal of national interests.

Parliamentary speeches of Italian communists heading opposition on foreign policy issues contributed to the development in the country of a broad movement to create public opinion against rearming Germany and against attempts to fully subordinate Italian armed forces to interests and directives of a foreign state. This movement is the main reason compelling the government to withdraw the treaty on creating a "European Defense Community" from the agenda of the Chamber of Deputies.

Italian communists tirelessly emphasize the importance of the struggle for peace and national independence for the life and future of the Italian people. In Italy, said Emilio Sereni, Chairman of the Italian Peace Committee, "such conditions are created under which not only the Italian government conducts foreign policy, but armed forces and foreign officers begin themselves to directly manage everything happening in Italy. This means that the problem of national independence comes to the fore and the struggle for peace and national independence becomes identified, becomes one" (*«L'Unità»* of June 12, 1952, p. 6).

The struggle of Italian communists and the entire people for democratic, peace, and national independence expands and grows stronger. Italian communists are confident in final

victory; they know the conditions currently operating in favor of revolutionary and democratic parties fighting under the heel of bourgeois draconian laws; they clearly realize main tasks and goals facing them—to raise and carry forward the banner of democratic freedoms and national independence. They realize also that historical responsibility currently resting on revolutionary and democratic parties before the nation, the people.

Italian communists take the most active part in the movement of peace supporters in Italy, in the activities of the Italian Committee of the Peace Movement, in popularizing decisions of the Vienna Congress for Peace and the Budapest Appeal of the World Peace Council. They advocate broad development of trade and economic ties with all countries of the world, fight for friendship among peoples based on the great principle of proletarian internationalism, defend best national traditions, contribute in every way to the development of national culture, fighting against corrupting ideology of cosmopolitanism adopted by imperialist reaction.

Going in the vanguard of the steadily growing movement in defense of democracy, peace, and national independence, Italian communists expose the conspiracy of reactionary forces and plans of clerical reaction harmful to the life of the people, arming democratic forces of Italy with awareness of their own power. Vanguard of the working class of Italy—communists lead great work among peasant masses, heading their struggle for land. The Italian Communist Party achieved serious successes in work among peasant masses. Communists launched broad work among petty-bourgeois strata of urban

population. Under its banner, the party unites and leads behind it all democratic forces of the country. The outcome of the struggle of democratic forces of Italy against domestic and international reaction will depend on how united, organized, showing all their endurance, selflessness, and heroism these forces act, united in a broad single national front of defense of democracy, peace, and independence, on how monolithic first of all will be the ranks of the glorious working class of Italy, led by the Communist Party.

In the period of preparation for the elections of June 7, 1953, the Italian Communist Party appealed to the people with a call to fight for a government that would want and could achieve together with the people the preservation and consolidation of world peace, that would be capable of conducting an independent foreign policy, protecting national sovereignty from all encroachments by foreign imperialism. The Communist Party called for a struggle to change the tense domestic political situation created by reactionary policies of provocations and civil war, police arbitrariness, and repressions. To this policy, Italian communists oppose the demand to restore constitutional legality and national unity. In the economic field, the main task is the struggle for implementing social reforms provided for by the constitution (nationalization of large monopolistic industrial enterprises, land reform, free medical care for all in need, construction of cheap housing, etc.), development of trade relations with all countries.

With such a program, Italian communists campaigned in the election campaign. Their program, their call for further

consolidation of all democratic forces of Italy to save constitutional rights and freedoms, peace, and national independence penetrated into various social strata.

The results of the parliamentary elections that took place on **June 7–8, 1953**, showed that the policy pursued by Italian communists finds support among the broadest masses of the people. Democratic forces of Italy, led by the Italian Communist Party and fighting side by side with socialists, won a major victory. Hopes for carrying out a coup d'état and monopolization of power, which clericals associated with recent parliamentary elections, collapsed. Thereby a serious blow was dealt also to plans of international reaction regarding Italy. The threat of removing broad democratic masses of the people from participation in the political life of the country was disrupted—without which, as communists showed, neither a democratic regime, nor preservation of national sovereignty, nor struggle for peace and social progress is possible in Italy.

Elections showed that the cause of defending democracy in Italy is in reliable hands, and once again confirmed the correctness of the theoretical development of democracy development problems underlying the practical activities of Italian communists. Finally, elections showed how much the authority of the Italian Communist Party grew among broad popular masses, acting as the largest, consolidated, and strong democratic party of Italy, capable of exercising leadership over all life of the country. The Italian Communist Party points out to the people the only correct path of struggle for democracy and national independence, for peace and social progress.

4. THE MAIN ENGINE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES

F. V. KONSTANTINOV

I

The problem of the development of productive forces and relations of production, the question of their relationship, correspondences, contradictions, and conflicts between them arising and being resolved in the course of historical development, occupy a paramount place in historical materialism. Special attention is devoted to these questions in J. V. Stalin's brilliant new work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*.

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

As is well known, in contrast to idealism—which considers changes in social ideas and social consciousness to be the main and determining cause of the development of society—historical materialism sees the deepest cause of social development in the changes and development of social production. The mode of production of material life in society conditions the social, political, and intellectual life processes in general. "...The key to the study of the laws of the history of society," writes Comrade Stalin, "must not be sought in the minds of men, not in the views and ideas of society, but in the

mode of production practiced by society in any given historical period—in the economics of society" (*Problems of Leninism*, p. 591, 11th ed., 1952). The mode of production determines the structure of society, its character. A change in the mode of production causes a change in the entire social system, social views, political, legal, and other institutions.

Why, then, does a change in the mode of production itself occur? This change is always caused and conditioned by a change in the productive forces. "At a certain stage of their development," writes Marx in his famous preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, "the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is merely a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed".

Thus, the deepest economic foundation of social revolutions, including the socialist revolution, is the conflict of new productive forces with outdated, dying relations of production. Consequently, in the final analysis, the deepest source and cause of the development of society lies in the development of the productive forces.

What determines the development of the productive forces of society themselves? Where is the main source, the main engine of their development? Marx gave the answer to this question in the passage cited above from the preface to *A Contribution to*

the Critique of Political Economy, calling relations of production, during the period when they correspond to productive forces, the form of their development. Dying relations of production are called by Marx fetters, chains, hindering the development of productive forces. Here Marx also pointed out why production relations turn from a form of development of productive forces into their fetters.

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

The goal and driving motive of capitalist production is the production of surplus value, the accumulation of capital based on the ever-increasing exploitation of the working people. The means by which capital—its bearer, the bourgeoisie—achieved this goal in the period of the ascending line of capitalist development was the development of productive forces. This limited goal of production, arising from the nature of capitalist relations of production, came into contradiction with the development of productive forces. The movement of the capitalist mode of production represents the development and deepening of this contradiction, growing into an acute conflict between the productive forces and capitalist relations of production.

"The contradiction," writes Marx, "expressed in the most general form, consists in this: that the capitalist mode of production has a tendency toward absolute development of the productive forces, regardless of value and the surplus value contained in it, and also regardless of the social conditions under which capitalist production takes place; whereas, on the other hand, its goal is to preserve the existing capital value and to expand it to the utmost (i.e., an ever-accelerating increase of this value). The specific feature of the capitalist mode of production consists in using the existing capital value as a means for the greatest possible increase of this value. The methods by which it achieves this lead to a decrease in the rate of profit, to the devaluation of existing capital, and to the development of the productive forces of labor at the expense of already produced productive forces.

Capital and its self-expansion appear as the starting and ending point, the motive and purpose of production; production is merely production for capital and not vice versa: the means of production are not mere means for an ever-expanding process of life for the society of producers. The limits within which the preservation and self-expansion of the value of capital can alone take place—limits which rest upon the expropriation and impoverishment of the great mass of producers—these limits come continuously into conflict with the methods of production employed by capital to achieve its purpose, and which tend toward unlimited expansion of production, toward unconditional development of the social productive forces, which sets production as an end in itself. The means—unlimited development of the social productive forces—comes

into permanent conflict with the limited purpose—the expansion of the value of existing capital. Therefore, if the capitalist mode of production is a historical means for developing the material forces of production and creating the corresponding world market, it is at the same time a constant contradiction between its historical task and its corresponding social relations of production" (*Capital*, Vol. III, pp. 259–260, 1949).

In that period, when capitalist relations of production fully corresponded to the level and character of the productive forces, they contributed to their development. This development occurred under capitalism, as before—under slavery and feudalism—in a contradictory form. But in the initial period of capitalism's existence, this did not exclude the complete correspondence of capitalist relations of production to the level and growth of productive forces.

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

Marx in *Capital* exposed and demonstrated the dialectics of the development of productive forces and relations of production in capitalist society, scientifically substantiating the historical necessity of destroying capitalist relations of production and replacing them with socialist production relations corresponding to the character and social nature of modern productive forces. According to Marx, the key to the development of productive forces must be sought not outside

the mode of production, but in the mode of production itself, in existing relations of production, in their correspondence or non-correspondence to productive forces.

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

V. I. Lenin in his brilliant work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* showed that it was the transformation of pre-monopoly capitalism into monopoly capitalism that led to the decay of capitalism. The development of capitalism, with historical inevitability under the influence of the colossal concentration of production, led to the rule of monopolies, giving rise to a tendency to retard development and destroy productive forces. The deepening and extreme sharpening of the contradiction between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation subjects capitalist society to increasingly destructive periodic crises and economic catastrophes.

Dying capitalist relations of production—this is the main, decisive obstacle on the path of the development of productive forces. Therefore, it is necessary to destroy capitalist relations of production and replace them with socialist relations of production, thereby opening wide scope for the development of productive forces. This is what Lenin and Stalin teach, following Marx and Engels. They ideologically arm the working class and Marxist parties for the socialist revolution.

A different position was taken by revisionists, including G. V. Plekhanov. His reformism—both in theory and practice—caused by bourgeois influence, was bound up with a false understanding of the most important problems of historical materialism, in particular, with an incorrect explanation of the main source of the development of productive forces, accompanied by a abandonment of the open Marxist law of the compulsory correspondence of relations of production to the character of the productive forces.

In a number of his works, G. V. Plekhanov attempted in his own way to formulate and solve the question of the main source of the development of productive forces, and in doing so fell into a geographical bias.

In *Fundamental Problems of Marxism*, Plekhanov writes: "When we begin a materialist explanation of history, we first of all encounter... the question of where the real causes of the development of social relations lie. And we already know that 'the anatomy of civil society' is determined by its economics. But what determines the latter?" asks Plekhanov, and answers: "...The whole question of the development of economics boils down, therefore, to the causes that condition the development of the productive forces at the disposal of society. And in this latter form, it is solved primarily by pointing to the properties of the geographical environment... The properties of the geographical environment condition the development of productive forces, while the development of productive forces conditions the development of economic relations, and

following them, all other social relations" (*Works*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 203–204 and 205).

Plekhanov in this answer did not clarify the question of the source, the main engine of the development of productive forces, but merely entangled it.

Of course, it would be strange to deny a certain role of the geographical environment in the development of productive forces; it undoubtedly influences their development: a favorable geographical environment accelerates development, an unfavorable one slows it down. However, as J. V. Stalin emphasized in his work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, the geographical environment is relatively unchanging and constant if viewed independently of the changes introduced into society. How can a relatively constant quantity explain the change and development of productive forces? Is it not clear that under the conditions of one and the same geographical environment, productive forces can develop extremely slowly, as, for example, in tsarist Russia, or at a gigantic pace, as in the USSR in a socialist society?

Plekhanov's theory of the "geographical environment" cannot explain why the untold natural riches of the Urals, Siberia, and regions of Central Asia lay dormant under capitalism, whereas today they have been brought to light and placed at the service of socialist society. Plekhanov's un-Marxist viewpoint ideologically disarmed the working class, diverting it from the task of destroying capitalist relations of production that had become a brake on the development of productive forces. Today, when geographical theories are raised on the shield by the ideologists of reactionary imperialism, the harm of

Plekhanov's geographical explanation of the development of productive forces is especially obvious.

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

An attempt to find a general and main cause for the development of productive forces was also made by Karl Kautsky in his book *The Materialist Conception of History*. He saw this cause, like many bourgeois scholars, in the development of knowledge, in the development of science. It is understandable that the development of knowledge, especially in the field of natural sciences and technical disciplines, exerts an undeniable influence on the development of productive forces. But, firstly, the development of knowledge and science itself depends on the needs of production development; and secondly—most importantly in this connection—the possibility of utilizing scientific discoveries depends primarily on the mode of production, and even on the stage—ascending or

descending—that this mode of production is in. It is known that the bourgeoisie has turned from a revolutionary force in technical progress into a reactionary force today. This is evidenced, in particular, by numerous facts of patent freezing on technical discoveries in capitalist countries, especially the refusal to utilize one of the greatest discoveries of modern science—atomic energy—for peaceful purposes, and using it instead for the destruction of productive forces (the atomic bomb). Only in the USSR, under socialist conditions, has the foundation been laid for using atomic energy for peaceful purposes, to multiply and develop the productive forces of society.

According to US press data, the American automotive company General Motors utilizes only one percent of the patents for technical inventions in the field of automotive manufacturing it has bought up. The remaining patents are frozen in safes to keep them from falling into competitors' hands. Other capitalist monopolies, concerns, and trusts do the same.

Thus, a scientific discovery in technical science, mechanics, physics, or chemistry is merely a *possibility* for technical progress. But this possibility can either turn into reality or not, depending on relations of production, their character, nature, and the interests of the ruling class—the bearer of these production relations. Under modern capitalism, scientific thought and technical, inventive genius are directed by the bourgeoisie toward creating means to destroy productive forces, above all the most important productive force—the working people themselves.

V. I. Lenin wrote regarding the possibility of digging a tunnel under the English Channel and underground coal gasification that these and other discoveries and technical achievements open up vast opportunities for progress and the development of productive forces, but capitalism and the bourgeoisie stand in the way with their self-serving, reactionary goals. New productive forces, which helped the bourgeoisie defeat its mortal enemy—the feudal lord—are now directed not against the bourgeoisie itself, but against its production relations. Modern productive forces revolt against the capitalist mode of their utilization. Therefore, in our era, the bourgeoisie increasingly hinders the utilization of scientific and technical inventions for the development of productive forces. It encourages them only to the extent that they can secure maximum profits. In the name of this, it strives to unleash predatory imperialist wars and develop the war industry. For these purposes, the imperialist bourgeoisie spares neither strength nor resources, forcing the priests of science, an army of scientists, and inventors in capitalist countries to serve the god of war.

Thus, Kautsky's theory, like those of other modern idealist theorists who view science as the main engine of productive forces development, is false. The purpose of all these theories is to ideologically disarm the working class and Marxist parties, diverting them from their fundamental historical task of destroying capitalist relations of production and replacing them with socialist relations of production.

After Marx and Engels, only the great leaders of the working class, Lenin and Stalin, continued and continue the creative

development of historical materialism and Marxism as a whole, enriching it with new brilliant propositions and discoveries.

In his work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, J. V. Stalin, creatively developing the most important problems of historical materialism, gave a clear, profound explanation of the laws of development of productive forces and relations of production. Characterizing the three features of production, Comrade Stalin revealed in this work the internal logic of the development of social production, the development of productive forces and production relations.

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

One of the features of production, Comrade Stalin notes, is that its change and development always begin with changes and development of the productive forces, primarily with changes and development of instruments of production. Productive forces are the most mobile, revolutionary, and at the same time the determining element of any mode of production. First, the productive forces of society change and develop, and then, following these changes and in accordance with them, human relations of production change more or less rapidly. Relations of production, changing and developing in dependence on the development of productive forces, in turn exert a reverse

influence on the development of productive forces, accelerating or slowing down this development. Changes in production relations somewhat lag behind changes and development of productive forces. But this lagging cannot be too prolonged; otherwise, the unity of productive forces and production relations is disrupted, leading to a crisis in production and the destruction of productive forces.

"...However much relations of production may lag behind the development of productive forces," writes Comrade Stalin, "they must sooner or later come into correspondence with—and actually do come into correspondence with—the level of development of the productive forces and the character of the productive forces. Otherwise, we would have a radical disruption of the unity of productive forces and production relations in the production system, a breakdown of production as a whole, a crisis of production, and the destruction of productive forces" (*Problems of Leninism*, p. 592).

Comrade Stalin points out that only the correspondence between productive forces and relations of production ensures full scope for the development of productive forces. Today, the economic and social system of capitalism demonstrates a deep conflict between modern productive forces—which are social by their nature—and outdated capitalist relations of production based on private ownership of the means of production. Hence overproduction crises, economic catastrophes, wars, and the colossal destruction of productive forces, along with the decay of the entire capitalist system.

In contrast to capitalism, the socialist economic system in the USSR serves as an example of complete correspondence

between relations of production and the modern level and character of productive forces. Here public ownership of the means of production corresponds to the social character of production. This provides tremendous scope for the development of productive forces, the continuity of this development, and the absence of overproduction crises.

Comrade Stalin, in *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, gave a brief history of the development of social productive forces from stone axes and the bow of primitive humans to modern giant machines and machine systems powered by electricity. He showed how, with changes in productive forces, a revolutionary overthrow of old production relations took place as a result, replacing them with new ones corresponding to the level and character of the productive forces. Along with changes in modes of production, the incentives for labor, driving forces, and motives of production changed. In all antagonistic social formations, the development of productive forces was accompanied by brutal exploitation of the immediate producers—the working people. Therefore, the acute struggle between the exploited and the exploiters constitutes a paramount law of the development of all antagonistic societies.

Socialist society knows no exploitation of man by man. The development of productive forces here is accompanied by a steady rise in the material well-being of the working people and a continuous growth of their cultural and technical level. Characterizing the laws of production development in the USSR, Comrade Stalin writes: "Therefore, the productive forces here develop at an accelerated pace, since the

corresponding production relations give them full scope for such development" (*Problems of Leninism*, p. 597).

II

In his brilliant work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, J. V. Stalin revealed and refuted incorrect views on the relationship between productive forces and relations of production held among Soviet historians, economists, and philosophers. These views were connected with a false, idealist understanding of planning as the basic economic law of socialism, and a wrong understanding of the law of compulsory correspondence of relations of production to the character of productive forces.

In *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, J. V. Stalin further develops the Marxist theory of productive forces and production relations, defining relations of production with complete clarity as the main and decisive engine of the powerful development of productive forces, comprehensively substantiating and showing the action of the objective economic law of compulsory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces. Never before in Marxist literature have the essence, historical significance, and role of the economic law of compulsory correspondence of relations of production to the character of productive forces been revealed with such depth and comprehensiveness as in this new work of J. V. Stalin, based on the analysis of the development of modern decaying capitalism and the advancing economic development of socialist society.

The law of compulsory correspondence of relations of production to the level and character of productive forces was first discovered by K. Marx. He was the first to formulate the proposition on the necessity of correspondence between relations of production and the character of productive forces. In his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx points out that "in the social production of their life, men enter into definite necessary relations that are independent of their will—relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces".

In a letter to Annenkov, Marx, criticizing Proudhon, writes that great social conflicts arise "on the grounds of a conflict between already acquired productive forces of men and their social relations, which cease to correspond to these productive forces" (Works, Vol. V, p. 292).

J. V. Stalin pointed out the forgotten nature of the law of compulsory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces among some Marxists. Scientifically substantiating the essence of this law, J. V. Stalin emphasized with all his might its great significance in explaining the development of productive forces, the dialectics of the relationship between productive forces and relations of production, and its role in the origin of social revolutions, specifically the socialist revolution.

Comrade Stalin, analyzing the dialectics of the development of productive forces and relations of production in various social formations, particularly in socialist society, subjected simplistic, vulgarizing, Bogdanov-Bukharin interpretations of

this question to critique, along with idealist, voluntaristic explanations of the character of the economic laws of socialism.

Some comrades, writes J. V. Stalin, dazzled by the successes of Soviet power in forming and developing the socialist economy, lost sight of the operation of the economic law of compulsory correspondence of production relations to the character of the productive forces, thereby willy-nilly falling into idealism. The role of the Soviet state in the emergence and development of socialist society is indeed unprecedented. This special role is conditioned by the fact that it was called upon to destroy all exploitation of man by man and create a new socialist economy without having any ready-made rudiments of a socialist economy at hand.

"This task was undoubtedly difficult and complex, having no precedent," says Comrade Stalin. "Nevertheless, Soviet power accomplished this task with honor. But it accomplished it not because it allegedly destroyed existing economic laws and 'formed' new ones, but solely because it relied on the economic law of compulsory correspondence of relations of production to the character of the productive forces. The productive forces of our country, especially in industry, had a social character, but the form of ownership was private, capitalist. Relying on the economic law of compulsory correspondence of relations of production to the character of the productive forces, Soviet power socialized the means of production, made them the property of the whole people, and thereby destroyed the system of exploitation, creating socialist forms of economy. Had it not been for this law and had it not relied on it, Soviet power could

not have accomplished its task" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 7).

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

The colossal development of the productive forces of socialist society in industry and agriculture resulted from the liquidation of old, dying capitalist relations of production and their replacement with socialist relations corresponding to the character and level of modern productive forces. Old, capitalist relations of production held back and delayed the development of productive forces. New, socialist production relations created unprecedented, powerful new incentives and possibilities for the development of the productive forces of socialist society.

G. M. Malenkov, in his report to the 19th Party Congress, gave a profound scientific characterization of two opposite lines of economic development—on the one hand, the camp of socialism led by the USSR, and on the other, the camp of capitalism—citing the following illustrative figures. The volume of industrial output in the USSR in 1951 reached 1,266% relative to 1929, representing nearly a 13-fold increase. During the same period, industrial production in most capitalist countries stagnated around the 1929 level. In the US, industrial production doubled during these years, largely due to World

War II, from which US capitalist monopolies made astronomical profits, as well as through predatory wars in Korea, rearmament drives, and preparation for a new world war.

In the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, an unceasing, rapid development of industry and agriculture is taking place. In capitalist countries, there is decay of productive forces, industrial stagnation, and agricultural stagnation.

The figures below characterize the growth rates of industry in capitalist countries and in the socialist country.

In capitalist countries, there is a systematic decrease in industrial growth rates. Thus, average annual industrial output growth in capitalist countries was 6.3% from 1870 to 1890; 5.8% from 1890 to 1913; 3% from 1913 to 1929; and 0.4% from 1929 to 1937. In the USSR, average annual industrial growth in pre-war five-year plans reached 20.1%, and in post-war plans, it was higher still.

From a powerful engine for developing productive forces in the period of ascending capitalism, capitalist production relations have long since turned into their opposite, into fetters, restricting and braking the development of productive forces and condemning them to decay and destruction.

This manifests in a predatory attitude toward nature and land, in turning vast forests and fertile fields into barren deserts. It finds expression in the most brutal, barbaric struggle against population growth, in the destruction of working people by capital through starvation, war, and disease. This is reflected in

periodic overproduction crises and economic catastrophes, during which millions of tons of consumer goods are destroyed to maintain maximum capitalist profits, and enormous productive forces are destroyed, throwing society far backward in its development. The crisis of 1929–1933 cost the United States $300 billion in lost output—equal to the material cost of World War II (William Z. Foster, *The Decline of World Capitalism*, p. 13, 1951).

Chronic multi-million unemployment, chronic underutilization of production capacities, and the refusal of capitalist monopolies to utilize technical discoveries out of fear that their implementation will lead to price reductions and the devaluation of fixed capital—all this bears witness that capitalist production relations everywhere have long turned into fetters on the development of productive forces. This is also demonstrated by the terrible results of World Wars I and II, caused by the conflict between productive forces and capitalist relations of production, as well as the operation of the basic economic law of modern capitalism: tens of millions of victims, thousands of destroyed cities and villages. Capitalist relations of production turned not only into a brake on productive forces development, but into a destructive force. Production relations no longer correspond to the character of modern productive forces; they must and will be destroyed everywhere. This is dictated by urgent economic necessity. It guides all progressive social forces in their social, political, and intellectual activities.

In contrast to capitalism, socialist society with its socialist relations of production presents a picture of the most powerful development of productive forces history has ever known.

Carrying out the historical Stalinist plan for the socialist industrialization of the country over several five-year plans was possible only on the basis of socialist ownership of the means of production, on the basis of socialist relations of production —relations of cooperation and mutual aid among working people liberated from exploitation.

Socialist ownership of the means of production makes it possible for the first time in history to carry out a conscious, planned transformation of nature on a gigantic scale. Transforming the deserts and arid steppes of Central Asia into blooming, fertile regions; building powerful shipping and irrigation canals, reservoirs, and giant hydroelectric stations on the Volga, Dnieper, Amu Darya, and Angara; implementing a vast shelterbelt planting plan across vast areas—this entire great Stalinist plan for transforming nature became possible solely on the basis of socialist relations of production, on the basis of socialist ownership of the means of production under planned management of the national economy.

Carrying out such grandiose measures under private ownership of the means of production is impossible. This is evidenced by the sad fate of the St. Lawrence River hydro project in the US, sabotaged over two decades by capitalist monopolies led by the Morgan banking house. These monopolies, owning power plants and other energy sources, feared that a massive hydro plant on the St. Lawrence River would lower electricity prices and harm capitalist profits; thus, they killed the project, as they

did many other technically feasible projects that failed to meet the narrow, self-serving interests of the bourgeoisie.

Socialist production is subject to the action of the basic economic law of socialism, born of socialist production relations and expressing their essence: securing maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of society through the continuous growth and perfection of socialist production based on advanced technology—this is the most powerful engine of socialist production, the engine of the development of productive forces under socialism.

The role of socialist ownership and socialist production relations as the engine of technical progress was demonstrated by J. V. Stalin using the example of applying advanced agricultural technology in our country. "We all rejoice," writes Comrade Stalin, "at the colossal growth of agricultural production in our country, the growth of grain production, cotton, flax, sugar beets, etc. Where is the source of this growth? The source lies in modern technology, in the countless agricultural machines serving all these branches of production. The point here is not just technology in general, but that technology cannot stand still; it must constantly improve, old technology must be retired and replaced with new, and new with even newer. Without this, the progressive advance of our socialist agriculture, high yields, and an abundance of agricultural products are unthinkable. But what does it mean to retire hundreds of thousands of wheeled tractors and replace them with crawler tractors, replace tens of thousands of outdated combine harvesters with new ones, create new machines, say, for industrial crops? It means incurring billions

in expenses that can only pay off in 6–8 years. Can our collective farms bear these expenses, even if they are millionaires? No, they cannot, as they are in no position to assume billions in expenses that pay off only after 6–8 years. These expenses can only be borne by the state, for it alone can assume the losses from retiring old machines and replacing them with new ones, and it alone can sustain these losses for 6–8 years in order to recoup the expenditures after that period" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, pp. 90–91).

This example is a striking illustration of the superiority of socialist relations of production over capitalist ones. If our collective farms cannot afford to constantly renew expensive modern technology on their own, how much less can farmers in capitalist countries afford it?

Socialist relations of production manifest in new, historically unprecedented incentives and driving forces for production. One remarkable expression of this is socialist emulation—a powerful factor in the development of our society's productive forces.

Capitalism stifles, crushes, and suppresses the talents and gifts of the people, turning the worker into an appendage of the machine, its slave. Under capitalism, man is merely a means of production, a talking tool of labor that sets machines in motion —a source of profit for capital magnates.

Socialist production relations have opened wide scope for the flourishing of initiative, talent, and abilities among tens of millions of people. The entire public education system in our country is directed toward this end. Man and his abilities,

satisfying his growing material and cultural needs—under socialism, this is the direct goal of production. The more the socialist economic system flourishes, the greater the opportunities for the comprehensive physical and mental development of working people in the USSR.

Under the new Five-Year Plan, universal ten-year compulsory education is planned for implementation in major cities and industrial centers, and in the following five-year plan—across the entire country.

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

Socialist relations of production ensure the achievement of the great goal mapped out by Marx: "...along with the all-round development of the individual, the productive forces will also grow and all the springs of cooperative wealth flow more abundantly—only then... can society write on its banner: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!" (*Critique of the Gotha Programme*, p. 14, Gospolitizdat, 1945).

To ensure the development of productive forces necessary for implementing the great principle of communism, socialist society applies the principle of socialism: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work". This principle expresses socialist production relations. The principle of

socialism means work according to ability for all citizens, guaranteeing equal pay for equal work, eliminating unequal pay found in capitalist countries (especially the US), and ending pay disparities based on gender or age. Combatting petty-bourgeois equalization and maximizing personal material interest in work outcomes are ensured by the socialist distribution principle. This principle fosters the growth of socialist consciousness, socialist attitudes toward labor, and the expansion of socialist emulation.

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

Comrade Stalin, summarizing the laws governing productive forces development across social formations, including socialist society, writes: "...New relations of production are that main and decisive force which actually determines the further, powerful development of productive forces, and without which productive forces are doomed to stagnation, as is currently the case in capitalist countries".

No one can deny the colossal development of productive forces in our Soviet industry over the five-year plans. But this development would not have occurred had we not replaced old, capitalist production relations in October 1917 with new, socialist relations. Without this overthrow of production relations, our country's productive forces would stagnate just as they do today in capitalist countries (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, pp. 61–62).

The same applies to the development of productive forces in USSR agriculture, where growth has taken on colossal scope. In capitalist countries, agricultural productive forces languish.

What practical conclusion follows for advanced forces in capitalist society? To pave the way for the objective economic law of compulsory correspondence of relations of production to the character of modern productive forces, to destroy capitalist relations of production, and to replace them with socialist ones —just as was accomplished in the USSR and is successfully being carried out in the countries of people's democracy.

Reactionary forces in capitalist society furiously resist the solution of this historical task, interested in perpetuating capitalist production relations. Only advanced social forces can break this resistance. In Russia in 1917, such a force was the alliance of workers and peasants. Such an invincible force is forming today in capitalist countries under the leadership of communist and workers' parties.

Some comrades raise the question: how to explain that productive forces, which came into non-correspondence with capitalist relations of production in the middle of the 19th century (becoming a brake on development), nevertheless continued to develop—and in certain periods and individual countries, developed very rapidly, so that countries like Germany and the USA overtook once-advanced industrial England?

The conflict between productive forces and capitalist relations of production must be viewed dynamically. It did not immediately acquire the depth and severity that manifested

under imperialism, and especially now in the period of the general crisis of capitalism.

The power of Marx's genius and the strength of Marxism were shown in the fact that in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* and especially in *Capital*, when the non-correspondence of productive forces to capitalist relations of production was only beginning to reveal itself in the first overproduction crises, Marx was able to prophetically predict the inevitable sharpening of this contradiction into an acute conflict, prove the inevitability of capitalism's demise, and substantiate the historical task of replacing capitalist relations of production with socialist ones. The entire subsequent course of capitalism's development fully confirmed Marx's forecast and the reality of the task he set, responding to the needs of material life in society.

It must be borne in mind that not all countries entered the path of capitalist development simultaneously. While the first economic crisis broke out in England in 1825 (as the initial manifestation of the emerging conflict between productive forces and bourgeois relations of production), countries like Germany, Russia, Japan, and Italy were only entering the path of capitalist development. Naturally, the conflict between productive forces and capitalist production relations did not arise simultaneously across all countries.

In the era of imperialism, the law of uneven economic (and political) development of capitalism acquired decisive significance. The uneven development of productive forces allowed certain countries to rapidly leap ahead and overtake formerly leading capitalist nations. This was true of Germany

relative to England at the beginning of this century, and of the USA relative to a number of European capitalist countries. This possibility of rapid, leap-like development relied on a high level of technology and the ability of late-developing countries to adopt the latest technical achievements, whereas older capitalist countries were burdened with old equipment and outdated techniques.

The operation of the basic economic law of modern capitalism, the law of competition and anarchy of production, and the law of uneven economic development explain why the development of capitalism acquired a destructive and catastrophic character. In our era—the era of the general crisis of the capitalist system—the conflict between modern productive forces and capitalist production relations has taken on extreme severity and depth, as the single world market has split into two parallel markets, narrowing the sphere of action for capitalist relations of production and dooming productive forces in the capitalist world to stagnation.

The growing decay of capitalism and destruction of productive forces are evidenced by falling employment rates among the able-bodied population in industry and agriculture, along with the growth of people employed in non-productive spheres.

The progressive American economist Victor Perlo writes in *American Imperialism*: "By the 1920s, parasitism in American life reached significant proportions... An approximate idea of the scale of this trend is given by the declining share of the population employed in commodity production. For every 100 people engaged in commodity production in 1929, there were

74 engaged in other activities; in 1939—87, and in 1949—106" (p. 285).

Half the US population is employed in spheres serving parasitic classes, an enormous trade apparatus, inflated police and state apparatuses, fascist organizations, and organs of population suppression. These terrifying figures testify to the growing decay of capitalism. In the USSR, 70% of working people are employed in the sphere of material production.

The militarization of the economy in capitalist countries is one manifestation of the destructive impact of capitalist relations of production, a striking manifestation of decay and parasitism.

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

Militarism today has grown a hundredfold, not only in capitalist Europe, but especially in the USA, where 3/4 of the state budget is spent on war preparations, and merely 1% on public education and healthcare.

US imperialism, seeking a way out of its contradictions, destroys the economies of other capitalist countries. It forces mercenary pro-American governments to increase arms spending, intensifying the burden of militarism under which peoples groan.

The bourgeoisie today stands bankrupt, unable to ensure the development of productive forces. The operation of the basic economic law of modern capitalism has acquired an extremely

ruinous character for the peoples. This is proof that capitalist relations of production have outlived their era and act as a brake on productive forces.

Vulgarizers and simplifiers like Yaroshenko attribute an exclusively negative role to production relations, failing to see the positive, progressive role of new relations of production as the main engine of productive forces.

Criticizing this view, Comrade Stalin writes: "Incorrect. First, the role of production relations in history is not limited to being a brake that fetters the development of productive forces. When Marxists speak of the braking role of production relations, they have in mind not just any production relations, but old production relations that no longer correspond to the growth of productive forces and, consequently, retard their development. But besides old production relations, there exist, as is well known, new production relations that replace the old ones. Can it be said that the role of new production relations boils down to acting as a brake on productive forces? No, it cannot" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 61).

When the young, revolutionary bourgeoisie in bourgeois revolutions destroyed feudal relations and replaced them with new, capitalist ones, it thereby paved the way for powerful development of productive forces. In their time, bourgeois relations of production played a progressive role, even though they merely replaced feudal exploitation with no less brutal capitalist exploitation.

Only later, as a result of the development of productive forces and the lagging behind of production relations, did new,

progressive production relations turn into old, reactionary ones, acting as a brake on productive forces.

"Of course, new relations of production cannot remain new forever," teaches Comrade Stalin; "they begin to age and come into contradiction with the further development of productive forces; they begin to lose their role as the main engine of productive forces and turn into their fetters. Then, in place of such production relations that have become old, new production relations appear, whose role is to be the main engine for the further development of productive forces. This peculiar development of relations of production—from acting as a brake on productive forces to being their main forward engine, and from being the main engine to acting as a brake—constitutes one of the chief elements of Marxist materialist dialectics" (ibid., p. 62).

A simplistic understanding of the development of productive forces and relations of production in socialist society, resulting from forgetting materialist dialectics and conceding to metaphysical views, became widespread in our literature. An error of this nature was also made by the author of these lines in the book *Historical Materialism* and in the article "Against Dogmatism and Pedantry" published in the journal *Voprosy Filosofii*.

Qualifying the full correspondence of production relations to productive forces as a feature unique to socialist society (and alien to other formations) was incorrect. Comrade Stalin refuted this erroneous view, pointing out that "in the period following the bourgeois revolution, when the bourgeoisie destroyed feudal relations of production and established

bourgeois production relations, there were undoubtedly periods when bourgeois production relations fully corresponded to the character of the productive forces. Otherwise, capitalism could not have developed at the speed with which it developed after the bourgeois revolution" (ibid., pp. 50–51).

Our mistake in interpreting the full correspondence of socialist production relations to modern productive forces also lay in understanding full correspondence as an absolute—excluding contradictions between developing productive forces and socialist relations of production.

In *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, J. V. Stalin showed that contradictions arise in socialist society between rapidly developing productive forces and socialist relations of production. Production relations in socialist society lag behind the development of productive forces, coming into contradiction with them. But here, unlike in antagonistic formations, the correct policy of the Communist Party and the socialist state prevents these contradictions from turning into opposites and conflicts.

The Communist Party and the Soviet state, guiding the economic development of our country on the basis of the law of compulsory correspondence of production relations to productive forces, study economic processes and take timely measures to bring production relations into line with the growth of productive forces. So it was in the 1930s when, relying on the economic law of compulsory correspondence, our party set the task of replacing capitalist relations in

agriculture with socialist ones, leading the mass movement for collective farming.

At present, Comrade Stalin, in *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, analyzing conditions for the gradual transition from socialism to communism, established that collective-farm group property and commodity circulation—while successfully utilized by Soviet society to develop production—are beginning to retard the development of productive forces.

The transition to communism requires gradually raising collective-farm property to the level of public socialist property and transitioning from commodity circulation to product exchange between state industry and collective agriculture. Rudiments of such a transition are contained in the practice of commodity-exchange arrangements for agricultural products (cotton, flax, sugar beets, etc.). Gradually raising collective-farm property to the level of public ownership will allow the transition from two existing forms of socialist economy to a single, all-encompassing communist economy managed under a single state plan.

Under socialism, perfecting production relations by adapting them to the growing demands of productive forces is a primary condition for achieving the goals set by socialist society. This goal consists in securing maximum satisfaction of the growing material and cultural needs of society. The means to achieve this goal is the continuous growth and perfection of socialist production based on advanced technology. Discovered by the genius of Stalin, the basic economic law of socialism expresses the relationship of necessity between the goal of social

production and the means for achieving it under socialism. Utilizing this law, along with other objective laws of socialism, ensures the continuous advance of our society toward communism.

The production relations of socialist society, its forms of ownership, inter-group relations, and distribution forms generate a vital interest among all Soviet people in the development of social production.

The Soviet people are deeply interested in the operation of the objective law of compulsory correspondence of relations of production to the character of productive forces, as it ensures that production relations fulfill their role as the main engine of productive forces.

In the fundamental interests of the Soviet people, utilizing the objective law of planned (proportionate) development of the economy allows for scientific planning across the national economy to achieve maximum satisfaction of growing societal needs.

The Soviet people are vitally interested in fully utilizing the basic economic law of socialism, as it secures the powerful development of productive forces, the perfection of relations of production, and the further cultural growth of society and the realization of all three main preliminary conditions outlined by Comrade Stalin for the transition to communism. Achieving these conditions will transform labor into society's primary vital necessity and turn public property into the sacred, inviolable foundation of society. Without this fundamental change in attitudes toward labor and public property, the

transition to the communist principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" is impossible.

Comrade Stalin writes that our cadres must study deep economic processes, master economic laws, and skillfully utilize them in the interest of building communism. People are slaves to economic laws when they do not know them and act contrary to them; but having discovered and studied them, people become their masters. Acting in accordance with objective laws, we place them at the service of society. This is precisely how the great party of Lenin and Stalin acts regarding the law of compulsory correspondence, the basic economic law of socialism, and other objective laws of social development. Thanks to this, our party has the ability to direct the course of social events scientifically, guiding the development of socialist society toward communism.

The victory of socialist relations of production in our country served as the foundation upon which new driving forces of social development grew in the USSR. Memorable are the historic words of Comrade Stalin in the report to the 18th Party Congress:

"Whereas capitalist society is torn by irreconcilable contradictions between workers and capitalists, between peasants and landlords—which leads to internal instability—Soviet society, liberated from exploitation, knows no such contradictions and presents a picture of friendly cooperation among workers, peasants, and intellectuals. On the basis of this commonality, powerful driving forces developed, such as the moral-political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of the

peoples of the USSR, and Soviet patriotism" (*Problems of Leninism*, p. 629).

Even in socialist society, development occurs through overcoming contradictions by struggling for the new against the old. But in our country, there are no dying classes capable of organizing resistance to building a new life. On the side of the new stands the entire Soviet people led by the Communist Party. Herein lies the profound significance of the moral-political unity of Soviet society as a driving force for development.

Because moral-political unity exists under socialism, and because there are no reactionary classes resisting progress, Comrade Stalin points out that socialist society has the ability to timely bring lagging relations of production into line with the character of productive forces. Of course, under socialism, lagging, inert forces will exist that fail to understand the necessity of changing relations of production; but these forces can easily be overcome without letting matters reach a conflict (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 51).

In the struggle against the old, the Soviet people strengthen their moral-political unity. The old manifests not only in capitalist survivals within human consciousness, but also in hostile, wrecking, diversionary, and espionage actions by remnant anti-Soviet groups.

Our party and leaders Lenin and Stalin teach us, based on the experience of all revolutions, that the greater the successes of the revolution, the more acute the resistance of its enemies becomes. Anti-party theories about the "extinction" of class

struggle have nothing in common with building communism. We must not forget that capitalist encirclement still exists, and that enemies of the Soviet state persistently seek to send in their agents to utilize unstable elements in Soviet society for their dirty ends (G. Malenkov, *Report to the 19th Party Congress*, p. 86).

Soviet people must not for a moment lose sight of the fact that covert agents of capitalist encirclement inside our country have harmed and will continue to harm us. Striking evidence of this is the case of the murderer-doctors who sold out to American and British intelligence—despicable villains hiding behind the mask of physicians.

The vile actions of enemies remind us of the need for high political vigilance and an uncompromising struggle against all manifestations of carelessness, complacency, and gullibility, which provide cover for spies and saboteurs. Further strengthening the Soviet armed forces and intelligence organs is a paramount condition for securing new successes in building communism.

Thus, we see that old, dying capitalist relations of production have become a brake on the development of productive forces and the cause of their destruction. This necessitates replacing capitalist production relations with socialist ones corresponding to the character and level of modern productive forces.

Socialist production relations, victorious in the USSR and being established in the countries of people's democracy, have proven to be the main and decisive driving force for the powerful development of productive forces. The elimination of

exploitation and the triumph of socialist relations of production serve as the economic foundation for all driving forces in socialist society.

Steadfastly strengthening and perfecting relations of production and adapting them to growing productive forces is a key condition for our society's successful advance toward communism.

5. DRIVING FORCES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

I. V. MALYSHEV

Socialism, having triumphed in the Soviet country, has engendered high rates of social development unseen in history. Their source lies in the emancipated creative forces of the people, new laws, and driving forces of society's development.

Historical materialism teaches that the driving forces are the deepest causes of social development, setting in motion vast masses of people, social classes, and entire nations. These forces, acting over a long period, bring about historically lawful changes in social life. The study of the driving forces of social development leads to the cognition of the objective laws of history.

Historical materialism has proven that social development is causally conditioned, lawful, and subordinated to objective laws that exist independently of human consciousness and will. Social being determines social consciousness. Concretizing this general proposition of historical materialism, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Dialectics requires a full-scale study of a given social phenomenon in its development and the reduction of external, apparent aspects to the fundamental driving forces, to the development of productive forces and to the class struggle" (*Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 193–194).

Idealists, on the contrary, assert that the determining cause and driving force of social development are human consciousness and will, social ideas, and theories. This false, idealistic view

has its social-historical, class, and gnoseological roots. Since everything that impels people to activity passes through their heads and is reflected in their consciousness in the form of ideas and motives, the illusion is created that ideas, goals, or various impulses are the main, determining, initial, and ultimate causes and driving forces of history. This illusion is reinforced by the long historical development of the opposition between mental and physical labor, the oppression of physical labor workers in class-antagonistic formations by representatives of mental labor, and the self-serving interests of reactionary classes. In reality, as the classics of Marxism showed, the ultimate cause and determining driving force of all important historical events should be sought not in the ideas, aspirations, or desires of certain people, but "in changes in the mode of production and exchange, in the resulting division of society into various classes and in the struggle of these classes among themselves" (F. Engels, *On Historical Materialism*, p. 13, State Publishing House of Political Literature, 1939).

The main cause and decisive force in the system of conditions of the material life of society, determining the character of the entire social system and the development of society from one system to another, is the mode of obtaining the means of life—the mode of production of material goods. This determining force of social development gives rise to all its other driving forces.

It is precisely the development of productive forces, causing changes in the entire mode of production, that led at a certain stage to the replacement of the communal-gens form of property by private property in the means of production, to the

emergence of classes, class inequality, class struggle, and the state as an instrument of the ruling class. Since then, the class struggle between oppressors and oppressed, exploiters and exploited—occurring in all spheres of social life: economic, political, and ideological—becomes a regular feature and driving force of the history of antagonistic class societies. The ruling exploiting class strives to preserve obsolete relations of production that have ceased to correspond to the level of development of productive forces and have come into conflict with them. For this purpose, the exploiting class uses economic, political, and ideological means, and above all, state power. Therefore, the replacement of old relations of production with new ones, corresponding to the character and state of productive forces, can occur in an antagonistic society only through a fierce class struggle, through a social revolution, the violent overthrow of the old power, old production relations, and the establishment of a new power and new production relations, through the overthrow of the old superstructure that hinders social progress, and its replacement with a new superstructure that meets the needs of social development.

However, this historical necessity can pave its way only through the transformation of economic needs into conscious political demands, backed by large masses of people united by common interests, i.e., classes. Here, the active, organizing role of new, advanced ideas and new political institutions manifests itself most clearly. New ideas make it possible to realize the need for social development, organize and mobilize the masses to fight for their implementation; the masses unite into a new

political army, create a new, revolutionary power, and use it to forcefully abolish the old order in the realm of production relations and establish a new order that gives scope for the further development of the productive forces of society. "No social formation perishes before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed," emphasized Marx, "and new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society itself. Therefore, mankind always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve, since upon closer examination it will always be found that the task itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation" (*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, p. 8, State Publishing House of Political Literature, 1949).

Thus, considering the mode of production as the main cause and determining force of social development, historical materialism also shows the operation of derivative political and ideological driving forces arising from the mode of production —class struggle, state, ideology.

Each mode of production engenders only its intrinsic driving forces of social development. The economic, political, and ideological driving forces engendered by the socialist mode of production have as their material basis the economic system of socialist society.

The driving forces of socialist society fundamentally differ from the driving forces of the old, bourgeois society and all other antagonistic formations based on private property and exploitation of one part of society (the majority, the working

people) by another part (the minority, the exploiters). For capitalist society, an irreconcilable contradiction between the social character of production and private ownership of the instruments and means of production, private form of appropriation, is characteristic; hence anarchy of production, periodic crises of overproduction, unemployment, absolute and relative impoverishment of the working people, and class struggle.

Under the socialist mode of production, on the contrary, productive forces and relations of production are in complete conformity with each other. The words "complete conformity" should be understood to mean that under socialism things usually do not reach a conflict between relations of production and productive forces. Socialist society, in the person of its governing bodies, has the opportunity to timely bring lagging relations of production into line with the character of productive forces, since we have no obsolete classes capable of organizing resistance to this. And this complete conformity is a law of socialist society, the basis of its unhindered, accelerated development without class conflicts and clashes, without social upheavals and crises—a deep source of continuous planned growth of socialist production.

Production relations of socialist society—relations of comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance of people free from exploitation—become the main and decisive force in the powerful development of socialist production.

Our relations of production are the source of the emergence and development of all driving forces of Soviet society. The people of our country, prompted by a feeling of Soviet

patriotism, strong moral-political unity, and friendship of peoples, continuously drive forward the productive forces of the new society at unprecedented rates. At the same time, Soviet people, guided by the Communist Party, base their actions on the utilization of all the great advantages and opportunities of socialism, its objective laws, and on the use of such a specific and wonderful weapon for the new system as criticism and self-criticism.

In the countries of capital, the development of productive forces leads to the accumulation of wealth at one pole of society and to ruin and poverty at the other. "Rate of profit is the driving force of capitalist production; production occurs only to the extent that it can be carried out with profit" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 269, 1949). Developing this proposition of Marx, I. V. Stalin teaches that the basic economic law of modern capitalism is ensuring 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 other countries, especially backward ones, and finally, through wars and the militarization of the national economy used to ensure highest profits.

In a socialist society, the development of productive forces leads to a steady increase in the material well-being of the working people. Ensuring maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the whole society through continuous growth and improvement of socialist production based on higher technology is the basic

economic law of socialism. This law determines both the operation of all driving forces of Soviet society.

The driving forces of capitalist society, as well as of all preceding class-antagonistic formations, are based on opposing one part of society against another, on clashes between personal and social interests, and therefore they cannot fail to be contradictory, historically transient in nature. Objective economic needs of development, without being cognized, are reflected in human consciousness in a distorted form and pave their way in society spontaneously, through mutually contradictory aspirations and actions of people. "The desired," wrote Engels, "comes about only in rare cases; for the most part, goals set by people clash with each other and are either unattainable by their very nature, or due to insufficient means for their realization. Clashes of countless individual aspirations and actions bring about in the sphere of history a state completely analogous to that which prevails in unconsciously acting nature. Actions have a certain desired goal; but the results actually flowing from these actions are completely unwanted, or if at first they seem to correspond to the desired goal, they ultimately bring about consequences far from what was desired" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 371).

Private ownership of the instruments and means of production under capitalism engenders such driving forces as the pursuit of profit and competition. Greed for profit and competition prompt individual entrepreneurs to improve machinery and production technology, to a certain extent contributing to the development of productive forces. However, the capitalist is

interested in improving production only indirectly; he stands for new technology only when it promises maximum profits; he opposes new technology and even favors manual labor when he gets the opportunity to achieve highest profits through establishing monopoly prices and over-exploiting workers without introducing new machinery, which leads to the depreciation of capital already invested in production. The producers themselves, the working masses, are not interested under capitalism in improving production, for it leads not to easing labor, but to its intensification; new machinery displaces workers and condemns them to unemployment.

Private ownership of the means of production, spontaneous fluctuations in supply and demand on the capitalist market, and anarchy of production render its planning impossible. The capitalist state can also influence production only indirectly, for example, through tax policy or subsidy policy. In doing so, the state acts in the interests of large owners of the means of production, remaining in the hands of capitalists as their agent.

Development under capitalism breaks its way through the collision of many chaotic, sometimes directly opposite forces of society, whereas under socialism, development is composed of forces acting as a whole in one direction. That is why, despite the fact that the growth rate of production under capitalism was higher than in preceding formations, it is infinitely lower than the growth rate of production under socialism.

The most important feature of socialist society is also that which is engendered by socialist ownership of the means of production: the planned development of the national economy.

Planned management of the economy, based on the utilization of objective economic laws of socialism in the policy of the Soviet state, contributes to the accelerated development of the socialist economy. Annual and five-year plans of Soviet society are an approximate reflection of the requirements of the objective economic law of planned (proportional) development of the national economy.

Socialist relations of production give rise among working people to a new attitude toward labor as a matter of honor, glory, valor, and heroism, giving birth to nation-wide socialist emulation—a powerful driving force of the socialist economy. Socialist emulation, fundamentally and radically different from bourgeois competition, is based on comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance of people free from exploitation; it constantly pulls up laggards and develops the creative forces of the working masses, their initiative in the development of production, technology, and culture.

A powerful stimulus for the development of production is the fundamental principle of socialism: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work". The implementation of this principle awakens in working people the desire to increase labor productivity, master technology, and raise their cultural level. On the basis of the development of the socialist economy, the socio-political activity of the masses unfolds—the main creators of the new socialist, communist life, the creators of history. This creative activity of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, their decisive participation under the leadership of the party in state administration, is the main factor in the development of socialist society.

Naturally, under conditions of planned, progressive development of society, when tens and hundreds of millions of people rise to conscious, creative work, the role of the Communist Party as the leader and organizer of the working masses increases. The Communist Party is the guiding and organizing force in the development of Soviet socialist society and state. Not a single important political or organizational issue is resolved by Soviet or other mass organizations without guiding instructions from the party.

Mensheviks, Trotskyites, and other enemies of the working class tried to belittle and deny the leading role of the party in the struggle of the working class for the victory of socialism. The Communist Party crushed all these enemies of the people. In the fierce struggle against the enemies of Leninism, the steadfast unity of our party was forged, which is the most characteristic feature of its organization and activity.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Soviet people carried out industrialization of the country and collectivization of agriculture. During the Great Patriotic War, the Communist Party acted as the inspirer and organizer of the victory of the Soviet people over the German fascist invaders.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Soviet people are fulfilling a grand program of economic and cultural construction outlined by the 19th Party Congress. The 19th Congress of the CPSU defined the main tasks of the party at the present stage: to build a communist society through a gradual transition from socialism to communism, to continuously raise the material and cultural level of society, to educate party members in the spirit of internationalism, to

establish fraternal ties with the working people of all countries, and to thoroughly strengthen the active defense of the Soviet Motherland against aggressive actions of its enemies.

The new Party Rules raise even higher the guiding and directing role of the Communist Party in Soviet society and increase the responsibility of every party member for the great cause of building communism. Political leadership is the main thing in the activity of the Communist Party. The all-conquering power of our party's policy lies in the fact that in its activity it is guided by the most advanced theory—Marxism-Leninism—which correctly reflects the needs of the development of the material life of society. The strength and invincibility of the Communist Party lie in its inseparable connection with the masses.

The unity of the fraternal family of peoples of the USSR, trust in the Communist Party and the Soviet Government are the pledge of successful implementation of the great tasks of communist construction. The historic victories of the Soviet people demonstrate the triumph of the wise policy of the Communist Party, which expresses the vital interests of the working people of the Soviet country.

The Soviet socialist state and the Communist Party represent a superstructure over the socialist basis. The Soviet state, proceeding from the objective needs of Soviet society, exerts an immense influence on its progressive development.

Particularly great is the active, creative role of the Soviet socialist state in creating and strengthening the socialist basis, since it does not and cannot arise in ready-made form under

conditions of the bourgeois system, under the rule of the bourgeoisie. The socialist revolution begins with the seizure of political power by the working class. The working class uses political power to destroy capitalist relations of production and establish socialist relations of production. The socialist state relies in this process on the material, economic prerequisites of socialism created within capitalism, and above all on large-scale industry, which is transferred into nation-wide ownership.

The greatest creative role is played by the Soviet socialist state even after the building of the socialist basis, strengthening the new economic system, organizing and directing its planned development toward communism. The Soviet state is the main instrument for building socialism and communism. Carrying out its economic-organizational and cultural-educational function, the function of protecting and strengthening socialist property, and the function of defending the country against capitalist encirclement, the Soviet state acts as a powerful organizing force of Soviet society.

The socialist economy is directed by the socialist state in a planned manner, based on cognized objective economic laws. The socialist state can carry out planned management of the economy because key means of production are in its hands, and social ownership of the means of production imperatively demands planned management of the economy by society and the state.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government, setting the steady improvement of the material well-being of workers, collective farmers, and intelligentsia as the main goal of their domestic policy, display constant concern for the further

powerful development and improvement of industrial and agricultural production. The national income of the USSR is continuously growing. In order to satisfy the constantly growing needs of the Soviet people, the USSR Government in 1953 planned additional production of consumer goods amounting to 32 billion rubles. In 1953, workers, collective farmers, and employees will receive from the state budget 127 billion rubles more than they contribute to the budget from their personal incomes—more than two and a half times more than last year. The Soviet Government and the Communist Party are full of determination, based on a general advance in all agriculture and further organizational-economic strengthening of collective farms, to achieve within the next two to three years the creation in our country of an abundance of food for the population and raw materials for light industry.

By fostering the development of productive forces and relations of production of socialist society, the Soviet state organizes the building of the material and technical base of communism. On this basis, an abundance of material and spiritual goods necessary for the transition from socialism to communism is created; on this basis, the task set by the Communist Party—to make all workers and peasants cultured and educated—is resolved. In the process of communist construction, essential differences between city and countryside, between physical labor and mental labor workers are gradually erased, class boundaries between workers and peasants and between them and the intelligentsia are removed, labor turns into a prime necessity of life, into a habit, and remnants of capitalism in human consciousness are overcome.

* * *

In the transition period from capitalism to socialism, in the presence of exploiting classes and the antagonistic contradictions associated with their existence, during a fierce class struggle, the driving forces of socialist society could not fully unfold. They unfolded in full only under conditions of victorious socialism. This applies primarily to such driving forces as moral-political unity, friendship of peoples, and Soviet patriotism. The economic basis of these driving forces, which are inextricably linked with each other, is the socialist economic system and public ownership of the instruments and means of production; their political basis is the Soviet state system, and their ideological basis is Marxism-Leninism.

The moral-political unity of the whole society, of all the people, became possible due to the elimination of exploiting classes. This led to a radical change in the class structure of society, the social nature, and the moral-political character of the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, and all nationalities of the USSR.

The economic and political drawing together of workers and peasants conditioned their spiritual, ideological drawing together. Distrust of collective farmers toward urban dwellers, which still existed in the mid-1920s, disappeared as a result of the victory of socialism in the entire national economy. Socialist reorganization of the countryside, mechanization of agriculture based on the achievements of heavy industry, and the opportunity to build a prosperous and cultured life on this basis—all this brought the peasantry economically, politically, and spiritually closer to the socialist city, to the working class,

and created economic conditions for the growth of socialist consciousness among the peasantry.

The alliance of the working class and the peasantry became an invincible force. This alliance is the unshakable foundation of the power of Soviet society.

The Soviet people are united in their spiritual character, in the moral-political principles by which they are guided in their behavior, and in their ideology. Marxist-Leninist ideas, having taken hold of the consciousness of millions of Soviet people, have turned into a powerful material force that exerts a tremendous influence on the further development of socialist society. Moral-political unity, rallying workers, peasants, and intelligentsia into a monolithic collective force, accelerates the movement of Soviet society forward to communism, making the Soviet people an invincible bulwark of peace, socialism, and democracy worldwide.

The moral-political unity of the Soviet people grows and strengthens in the struggle of the new and growing against the old and dying out, in the struggle against remnants of private-property psychology and morality. Its highest expression—the moral-political unity of working people: workers, peasants, intelligentsia—was found in the fact that the entire Soviet people are united around a single party, which defends to the end the interests of workers and peasants.

In the course of revolutionary events in the USSR, the peoples of our country cast aside all bourgeois parties and made their choice in favor of the Communist Party—the only anti-landlord and anti-capitalist party. Soviet people fully support the

Communist Party, tested in battle, acting not in isolation, but in a close bloc with non-party members.

In the USSR, several parties cannot exist, since there are no hostile classes here. The existence of two or more parties is necessary and inevitable in an antagonistic society built on the exploitation of one part of society (the majority) by another part (the minority). Such a society develops in an irreconcilable struggle between antagonistic classes, expressed through various parties. In Soviet socialist society, the interests of workers and peasants are not hostile or contradictory. These common interests are protected and expressed by a single party, rallying the whole nation around itself into a single whole. Evidence of the powerful force of the moral-political unity of socialist society is the solid bloc of communists and non-party members that has developed in the USSR.

Capitalist society is torn apart not only by class contradictions, but also by national ones, for capitalism is based not only on the exploitation of one group of society by another, but also on national oppression. In contrast to capitalism, socialist society sets an example of great fraternal friendship among the peoples of the USSR, which has as its basis public ownership of the instruments and means of production. If private property and capital inevitably disunite people, fan national strife, and intensify national oppression, then collective property and joint labor for the good of society just as inevitably bring people together, undermine national strife, and eliminate national oppression. The existence of capitalism without national oppression is unthinkable. The existence of socialism is

unthinkable without the liberation of oppressed nations, without national freedom.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government established equality of working people of all nations of our Motherland, forged great friendship of peoples, and fostered cooperation among socialist nations that arose on the ruins of bourgeois nations as a result of the victory of socialism. The working class and its internationalist party stand at the head of socialist nations, binding them together and guiding them. Socialist nations are free from irreconcilable class contradictions that tear apart bourgeois nations, and are far more monolithic than any bourgeois nation. Standing guard over the friendship of peoples is the Soviet state and socialist legality. Equality of all citizens of the USSR in all spheres of economic, cultural, and socio-political life, regardless of their race or nationality, is an absolute law of socialist society. "Any direct or indirect restriction of rights, or, conversely, establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens depending on their race and nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness, or hatred and contempt—are punishable by law" (*Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR*, p. 26).

Strengthening the cooperation of the peoples of the USSR, the Communist Party crushed both Great-Power chauvinism and local nationalism. Of paramount importance was the realization of actual economic and cultural equality among the nations of the USSR, fraternal assistance from the great Russian people in developing the national statehood, economy, and culture of formerly backward borderlands. The Communist Party and the Soviet Government tirelessly cared and care for the industrial

development of formerly backward national regions and republics. If from 1913 to 1940 gross production of large-scale industry increased across our entire country by an average of 10.9 times, in Kazakhstan it grew over the same period by 22.2 times, in Armenia by 22.3 times, in Georgia by 26.4 times, in Kirghizia by 160 times, and in Tadzhikistan by 242 times. A vivid manifestation of the friendship of the peoples of the USSR and its powerful driving force in the development of Soviet society was the fraternal assistance of all peoples of our country in restoring the national economy of the western republics of the Soviet Union devastated by Hitlerite invaders, and fraternal assistance to the Turkmen people who suffered from the 1948 earthquake, etc.

The most important achievement of the Lenin-Stalin national policy is the growth of culture among the peoples of the Soviet Union—national in form, socialist in content—and the creation of national party and Soviet cadres of national intelligentsia from the native population. At present, national academies of sciences and state universities have been created in almost all Union republics. There is not a single Union or Autonomous republic that lacks higher educational institutions, and in republics like the Kazakh SSR or Uzbek SSR, where prior to the revolution over $^{9}/_{10}$ of the population were illiterate, the number of higher educational institutions now exceeds two dozen. In this matter, the great Russian people and the Russian working class rendered selfless assistance to other peoples of the USSR.

Friendship of the peoples of the USSR manifests itself in a wide variety of forms. Ural plants trained cadres to establish

the metallurgical industry in Kazakhstan. Ukrainian plants trained cadres for young Georgian metallurgy. Oil workers of Baku and Grozny helped master the oil fields of Bashkiria, and Ivanovo weavers created the textile industry in Uzbekistan.

Friendship of the peoples of the USSR as a driving force of socialist society clearly manifests itself in nation-wide socialist emulation among republics, which deeply reflects comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance in building a new life. For fourteen years now, for instance, socialist emulation has continued between collective farmers of the Moscow region's Ramensky district and the Kiev-Svyatoshinsky district of the Kiev region, Ukrainian SSR. Socialist emulation helps Russian and Ukrainian collective farmers successfully solve tasks for the further advance of socialist agriculture and serves as evidence of the unshakable friendship between Russian and Ukrainian peoples. Emulation among Tadzhikistan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Turkmenia, and Azerbaijan for high yields of cotton and other crops has turned into a powerful demonstration of friendship among the peoples of the USSR.

Scientists from fraternal republics work in close creative partnership, driven by a common desire to develop productive forces and socialist culture, thereby bringing closer the victory of communism. For example, on issues of prospecting and manufacturing building materials, a link was established between scientific workers of Bashkiria and Ukraine. The Power Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Azerbaijan SSR, based on experiments from institutes of the Academy of

Sciences of the Estonian SSR, is studying methods of burning Azerbaijani oil shale.

Books in the Soviet multinational state are published in **119 languages**. Works of the Ukrainian writer A. Korneichuk have been translated into **17 fraternal languages**, the Belarusian Yanka Kupala into **9 languages**, and the Uzbek Gafur Gulyam into **6 languages**. Georgians read verses by the Ukrainian poet Mikola Bazhan, while Ukrainians read the Georgian poet Georgy Leonidze.

Thus, in fraternal cooperation among the peoples of the USSR, a powerful development of productive forces, mutual enrichment, and flourishing of culture—national in form, socialist in content—takes place.

In the report speech to the 19th Congress on the work of the Central Committee, G. M. Malenkov emphasized that the strengthening of the moral-political unity of Soviet society and friendship among the peoples of our country is one of the main results confirming the correctness of our party's policy.

The heroic history of the country of socialism and its world-historic achievements served as the source of such a driving force of our society as Soviet patriotism.

Soviet patriotism is patriotism of a new, higher type.

In the Soviet country, sincere and ardent love of the people for the existing social and state system merges with love for native places, native hearth, and national culture. In antagonistic societies, on the other hand, the love of working people for the land on which they were born, for the language they speak, for

the surrounding nature, and for the material and spiritual culture of their people combines with burning hatred for the existing system that brings exploitation, social and national oppression, poverty, unemployment, and uncertainty about tomorrow.

In an antagonistic society, patriotism cannot become a constant driving force of development encompassing the whole people and the whole society, because private property constantly disunites people, giving rise to class inequality, exploitation, and social and national oppression, leading to a fierce struggle between antagonistic classes of society. The bourgeoisie, without hesitation, betrayed national interests whenever they came into conflict with its self-serving interests. This was the case in 1871, when Thiers and Bismarck jointly suppressed the Paris Commune; in 1917–1920, when Russian capitalists and landlords sold our country wholesale and retail to foreign capital just to preserve their class privileges and the opportunity to oppress the peasantry and working class; in 1939–1945, when the ruling exploiting classes of several Western European countries threw the national independence of their countries under Hitler's boot; this is happening before our eyes in Marshallized European countries, whose rulers abandon national sovereignty for dollar handouts in favor of Wall Street monopolists.

Capitalism inevitably engenders mutual distrust among nations. Exploiting classes are interested in every way in cultivating and fanning national strife, whereas the Soviet multinational socialist state unites all socialist nations and contributes to their

comprehensive communication and drawing together, cultivating mutual trust and friendship among peoples.

The Communist Party tirelessly educates all peoples of the USSR in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and Soviet patriotism. Soviet patriotism is based on fraternal cooperation among all nations of the Soviet country. In Soviet patriotism, national traditions of peoples organically combine with the common vital interests of working people of the Soviet Union. The behavior of Soviet people is determined by a noble sense of love for their socialist Motherland, concern for its power and prosperity, for they see in it the foundation and guarantee of their well-being and happiness. The community of economic, political, and spiritual interests unites all citizens of the socialist country, cultivating selfless love for the Motherland and concern for the good of the whole nation and state, turning patriotism into a constantly acting factor in the development of socialist society. Soviet patriotism combines national interests of socialist nations with the international interests of working people across the world. During the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet people not only defended their great Motherland, but also helped the peoples of Europe and Asia free themselves from fascist slavery. The victory of socialism in the USSR and the building of communism have immense world-historic significance, facilitating the liberation of all peoples from capitalism. Therefore, defense of the USSR—the socialist fatherland of the international proletariat—is the duty of every internationalist.

The Soviet Union is guided in its foreign policy by Marxist-Leninist ideology regarding the equality of all races and

nationalities. The foreign policy of the Soviet state is a policy of peace, friendship, and security for all peoples on Earth, big and small; it expresses the interests of all progressive humanity. With every passing day, the powerful movement of peace supporters grows and expands, headed by the great Soviet people. Soviet diplomacy decisively exposes and repels any encroachments on the national sovereignty of small nations by imperialist predators.

Boundless is the trust of working people in all countries toward the Soviet multinational state. Representatives of fraternal parties at the 19th Congress of the CPSU noted that the victory of socialism in the great Soviet country, as well as the establishment of a people's democratic system in several countries in Europe and Asia, marked the beginning of new relations between peoples, relations of cooperation and friendship among various countries of the socialist camp. Day in and day out, genuine friendship and cooperation among the peoples of the USSR, the great Chinese people, and working people of all people's democracies grow stronger. While the basis of relations between countries of the imperialist camp is a policy of dictate, deception, and mutual robbery and enslavement of peoples, the basis of cooperation among countries of the socialist camp is a genuine desire to help one another achieve common growth and advance.

Thus, moral-political unity, friendship of peoples, and Soviet patriotism grew and unfolded on a single economic, political, and ideological basis. They reflect the socialist economic system and are derivatives of it, which by no means implies that they exist only in human consciousness in the form of

feelings, ideas, and views. As moral-political unity of Soviet society, friendship of peoples, and Soviet patriotism express real relations among people, social groups, and nations in socialist society. They manifest themselves not only in political and spiritual life, but also in material life, in the selfless labor of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, who create all material and spiritual values of society.

The new (fifth) Five-Year Plan provides for a further powerful advance of the national economy of the USSR and ensures a significant growth in the material and cultural level of the people. Fulfillment of the fifth Five-Year Plan will be a major new step forward on the path of Soviet society's development from socialism to communism. This plan contributes to strengthening and expanding economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and people's democracies and establishing economic relations with all countries willing to develop trade on principles of equality and mutual benefit.

The successes of peaceful economic and cultural construction in the USSR become especially obvious against the background of the progressive decay of capitalist economics, which follows the path of militarizing the national economy, bringing astronomical profits to monopolies and ruin and poverty to multi-million working masses in cities and villages. If in 1951 industrial production in the USSR exceeded the 1929 level by almost 13 times, in the USA over the same period it increased by only two times, in England slightly more than 1.5 times, while in France for 25 years it has been hovering at the same level. These concise figures are clear evidence of the

infinite superiority of the socialist economic system over the capitalist system.

The grandiose tasks set before the Soviet people by the fifth Five-Year Plan require further strengthening and development of all driving forces of Soviet society, improving the work of all party, Soviet, trade-union, Komsomol, and economic organizations, and unfolding criticism and self-criticism from below to increase activity and creative initiative of the masses in building communism.

A vivid picture of the growth of driving forces in Soviet society, the growth of the builders of communism themselves —the main heroes and creators of history—is characterized by nation-wide socialist emulation, a powerful creative surge, and innovativeness of Soviet people inspired by the great goal of building communism. Our people have long been famous for their creative initiative, sharp wit, and inventiveness. But only under conditions of the socialist system did such a rapid burst of innovativeness, inventiveness, and production rationalization become possible. Suffice it to say that in 1952 alone, about 800 thousand inventions, technical improvements, and rationalization proposals were introduced in industry, construction, and transport. This powerful labor surge is stimulated by a firm conviction among Soviet workers, collective farmers, and employees—confirmed by the entire history of Soviet society—that the higher labor productivity and the lower product cost, the lower prices are for all products and goods, and consequently, the higher the living standards of working people.

The driving forces of Soviet society operate in all spheres of social life and activity of Soviet people, mutually supplementing and reinforcing one another. Moral-political unity contributes to the flourishing of friendship among the peoples of the USSR and Soviet patriotism, uniting not only workers, peasants, and intelligentsia of every socialist nation, but all nations of the USSR into one monolithic family. In turn, friendship among the peoples of the USSR and Soviet patriotism undoubtedly strengthen the moral-political unity of Soviet society. All these forces contribute to a powerful unfolding of nation-wide socialist emulation and find their vivid expression in it. Taken together, they strengthen the Soviet state, adding special weight and authority to Soviet public opinion. It is clear how important this is for combating remnants of capitalism in human consciousness, for the communist education of the masses, which is one of the decisive conditions for successful progress toward communism. Only by strengthening moral-political unity, friendship of peoples, and cultivating Soviet patriotism can one successfully overcome remnants of bourgeois nationalism, servility toward decaying bourgeois culture, and individualistic remnants. Overcoming remnants of capitalism accelerates the movement of Soviet society to communism.

* * *

Marxist dialectics teaches that the struggle between the old and the new, between the dying out and the nascent, is a general law of development. This law manifests itself in social development as well, but differently in each social formation. In conditions of antagonistic social formations, the struggle

between old and new and the transition from a lower to a higher stage occur in the form of class struggle. In socialist society, where there are no antagonistic classes, the struggle of the new against the old and obsolete takes place in the form of criticism and self-criticism. This special form of revealing and resolving contradictions expresses the conscious and organized nature of the struggle of the new and progressive against the old and obsolete—a struggle led by the Communist Party and the Soviet state with mass support from below.

With the help of criticism and self-criticism, the Communist Party exposes contradictions arising in socialist society, indicates ways to overcome them, ways to eliminate shortcomings in our work, and ways to transition social development to a new, higher stage. "If our country," noted I. V. Stalin in 1928, "is a country of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the dictatorship is led by one party, the party of communists, which does not share and cannot share power with other parties, is it not clear that we ourselves must expose and correct our mistakes; if we wish to move forward, is it not clear that there is no one else to expose and correct them. Is it not clear, comrades, that self-criticism must be one of the most serious forces driving our development forward?" (*Works*, Vol. 11, p. 29). Without self-criticism, stagnation, decay of the apparatus, growth of bureaucracy, and undermining of the creative initiative of the working class are inevitable. Criticism and self-criticism are a sign not of weakness, but of strength and vitality of the socialist system. Broadly unfolding criticism and self-criticism, the party and government are guided by the desire to raise socialist national economy even higher and

improve the living standards of the Soviet people to make our Motherland even stronger and more powerful.

The broader the building of communism unfolds, the broader the party develops criticism and self-criticism as a powerful tool for improving the work of social and state organizations, a tool for mobilizing and increasing the activity of the masses, for "the state is strong through the consciousness of the masses" (Lenin).

Criticism and self-criticism operate in close and inseparable connection with other driving forces of Soviet society, based on the undivided rule of the socialist economic system and unfolded socialist democracy, on the basis of established moral-political unity of Soviet society, friendship of peoples, and Soviet patriotism. Criticism and self-criticism are one of the main means of drawing all working people into the active construction of communist society. In all spheres of Soviet social life, starting from production and ending with higher spheres of spiritual life—science, literature, art—criticism and self-criticism operate, having as their goal the development of the socialist system. The most important form of criticism and self-criticism in science and culture is creative discussion. No science can develop without a clash of opinions and freedom of criticism. The report speech to the 19th Party Congress pointed out that only under condition of further unfolding criticism, creative discussions, and clash of opinions in scientific work can Soviet science occupy first place in world science.

Criticism and self-criticism are directed against everything that hinders the movement of Soviet society forward to communism, against remnants of capitalism in human

consciousness—private-property tendencies, an un-socialist attitude toward labor, toward socialist property—against remnants of bourgeois ideology and the baneful influence of decaying bourgeois culture. Criticism and self-criticism serve as a means of raising communist consciousness, educating people in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and friendship of peoples, thereby strengthening the moral-political unity and other driving forces of Soviet society. Contributing to the consolidation and development of everything advanced in socialist society, rallying the Soviet people around the Communist Party, criticism and self-criticism play an immense mobilizing and organizing role in building communism.

The Communist Party demands the development of self-criticism and criticism from below, exposing shortcomings in work and striving for their elimination, fighting against pompous well-being and intoxication with successes. Suppressing criticism is a grave evil. Anyone who smothers criticism, replacing it with pomp and praise, cannot remain in the ranks of the party. Broad, all-out unfolding of self-criticism and criticism from below contributes to eliminating shortcomings, unleashes the activity of working people, and develops in them a feeling of being masters of their country and responsibility for its fate. The fraternal peoples of the USSR are full of determination, under the leadership of the Communist Party, to achieve new successes in the struggle for the triumph of communism. Urgent measures developed by the Communist Party and Soviet Government for the further advance of industry and agriculture and improving the material

well-being of the people have evoked a massive political and production surge among Soviet people.

The driving forces of Soviet socialist society grow and strengthen in the process of the gradual transition from socialism to communism. They serve the cause of strengthening peace, democracy, and socialism worldwide, and further demonstrating the immense advantages and supreme superiority of socialism over capitalism.

6. Development of the Productive Forces of Agriculture Under Socialism

Academician V. S. NEMCHINOV

Under socialism, boundless scope opens up for the development of productive forces both in agriculture and in industry. The productive forces of agriculture develop thanks to the improvement of socialist relations of production, through the introduction into production of the achievements of science and technology. However, relations of production in agriculture under socialism differ in their degree of development from the relations of production dominant in industry. The conditions for applying the highest technology, the attitude of people and society toward objects and forces of nature in agriculture and in industry are also unequal.

Peculiarities in the development of the productive forces of agriculture exist under other modes of production as well. Although under socialism these features are less substantial in character than under capitalism, they are nevertheless so important that they cannot be overlooked either in the scientific analysis of the development of the national economy or in practical activity.

In our day, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government, in accordance with the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, are organizing a sharp advance in the production of consumer goods. To achieve this, a sharp advance in agriculture—which supplies the population with food and industry with raw materials—is also necessary.

Carrying out these measures proves possible on the basis of the enormous achievements of Soviet heavy industry, the further development of productive forces, and the improvement of relations of production in socialist agriculture, as well as the strengthening of economic ties between industry and agriculture.

The decrees of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the CC CPSU on measures for developing livestock raising, increasing the production of potatoes and vegetables, improving the work of machine-tractor stations, further developing Soviet trade, and increasing the production of consumer goods and food products and raising their quality are based on the cognition and application of the objective economic laws of socialism and stem from the fundamental tenets of Marxist-Leninist teachings on society.

I

Between Marxism-Leninism and bourgeois sociology and political economy, there is a fundamental difference in understanding the laws of social development. Bourgeois political economy and sociology are completely subordinated to the task of justifying capitalism. Dialectical and historical materialism and Marxist political economy are wholly subordinated to the task of revealing the objective laws of social development in the interests of the full utilization of these laws to ensure overall social progress, the radical improvement of the material and cultural condition of the people, and the victory of communism.

To whitewash capitalism, bourgeois scientists widely use the Malthusian "law" of population. According to Malthus, natural population growth occurs in a geometric progression, doubling every 25 years, whereas the means of subsistence, under the most favorable conditions of applying human labor, can grow only in an arithmetic progression. Malthus viewed his "law" as a universal law of nature and society, equally applicable at all times.

Marxism-Leninism rejects this allegedly universal "law" of population as a natural law of nature; each social formation—feudalism, capitalism, socialism—has its own law of population.

Malthus's assertion that the impoverishment of working people is the result of excessive population reproduction is false at its very core.

Of course, under certain stagnant conditions of societal development, the production of the means of subsistence does not grow even in arithmetic progression—as, for example, in Japan during the feudal period, in China under the rule of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, in the African colonies of imperialist powers, etc. However, the reasons for such a state of production and the poverty of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries are caused not by the notorious "law" of Malthus, but by the enslavement of these countries by imperialist predators and the plundering of the working masses by foreign monopolies and their own ruling classes.

Consistent Malthusians, like Vogt, Pendell, Cook, and Huxley, who defend the interests of capitalist monopolies and are, in

essence, enemies of humanity, propagate forced birth control as the primary measure in the fight against poverty and hunger, and advocate for the forced sterilization of "unfit and cheap people". They call for a new world war as the most radical means to bring the population of the globe into line with its allegedly limited resources.

The insane, cannibalistic ideas propagated by the Wall Street press evoke anger and contempt from all progressive humanity, which evaluates this propaganda as a vivid manifestation of the greed of monopoly capital, ready in pursuit of maximum profits to destroy half of the human race.

A somewhat different attitude toward the problem of the growth of means of subsistence and the problem of population growth is shown by the leaders of the Labour Party of England, who published in the second half of 1952 the pamphlet "Towards Abundance for All". The authors of the pamphlet claim that ensuring an annual growth in food production of 2% is an extremely difficult, almost impossible task; the solution to the global food problem is seen not in social and economic transformations, but in carrying out technical measures alone. At the same time, the authors of the pamphlet advocate the use of machines only in countries where there is a surplus of land compared to population size, while in "overpopulated" countries they recommend only measures such as using selected seeds, chemical fertilizers, pest and disease control agents, as well as water regime regulation. The implementation of these measures is tied by the authors of the pamphlet to financing by rich countries—that is, actually propagating the

American type of "aid"—the further enslavement of millions of working masses by monopoly capital.

The leaders of the Labourites draw their official optimism from the claim that the following "regularities" allegedly exist: 1) economic development and the raising of the living standard lead to a decrease in population growth, rather than to its increase; 2) population growth acquires a tendency to fall after industry absorbs approximately 1/3 of the country's population.

At the core of these propositions lies, on the one hand, the marginal theory of limited possibilities for the growth of production of the means of subsistence, and on the other hand, the conviction that solving the problem of abundance is possible only under conditions of falling population growth. However, the experience of the Soviet Union and the people's democracies refutes the existence of any constant tendency toward a reduction in population growth allegedly associated with the improvement of the material situation of the population and the industrialization of the country.

In the bourgeois press, many were eager to assert that the lag of certain branches of socialist agriculture revealed at the September Plenum of the CC CPSU allegedly proved that the Soviet Union had not escaped the action of the "law" of Malthus. The newspaper *The New York Times* even wrote that "the Soviets need Malthus just as much as Marx". The bourgeois press tried, understandably, to hide from world public opinion the true causes of the lag in certain branches of agriculture in the USSR.

Under conditions of socialism, the production of the means of subsistence grows faster than the population increases. At the same time, not only do the material and cultural needs of the people increase, but the ability of working people to satisfy these needs also increases on an ever-expanding scale. Effective demand among the population is steadily growing as a result of the policy of systematic price reductions carried out by the party and the Soviet government. The relationships between the production of consumer goods and the effective demand for these goods under conditions of socialism and under conditions of imperialism are directly opposite. Under capitalism, especially under the rule of monopolies, social production periodically runs into the narrow limits of national consumption and low effective demand of the population caused by absolute and relative impoverishment of the working people. Under conditions of capitalism, a completely unnatural situation is created in which huge "surpluses" of goods that find no buyer demand exist simultaneously with mass poverty and hunger on the other side.

Over the last 28 years, the production of means of production in the Soviet Union has grown 55 times, while the production of consumer goods over this period has increased 12 times. Trade turnover (in comparable prices) increased from 1926 to 1952 by almost 8 times. The physical mass of goods (calculated per capita) grew annually on average by 10.3%, which is almost 3 times faster than in Tsarist Russia. The marketable production of agriculture grew from 1926–1927 to 1952–1953: for grain—almost 4 times; for potatoes—more than 4 times; for milk—more than 3 times; and for meat—more

than 2 times. During this time, the urban population increased from 26 million people in 1926 to nearly 80 million in 1953.

Consequently, the marketable production of the USSR in basic agricultural products grew faster not only than in arithmetic progression, but even faster than in the notorious geometric progression of Malthus (which posits a doubling every 25 years), and faster than the Labourites considered possible with their 2% annual increase in food production.

Even more significant rates of growth in consumer goods production are provided for by the decree of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU. An increase in the production of consumer goods, taking real possibilities into account, is planned by 1956 compared to 1950 in the following amounts: leather footwear and cotton fabrics—by 1.7 times; animal butter and woolen fabrics—by 2 times; vegetable oil and fish—by 2.1 times; meat—by 2.4 times; refined sugar—by 2.6 times; canned goods of all types—by 2.9 times; cheese—by 3.3 times; silk fabrics—by 5.2 times.

As a result of progress in applying the achievements of science and technology, the production of consumer goods requires less and less socially necessary labor; in connection with this, the social value of consumer goods tends to fall. However, in pursuit of maximum profit, monopolists in countries where capital reigns not only strive to keep retail prices at their previous levels, but even drive them up.

On the contrary, in a socialist state where the law of planned (proportional) development of the national economy operates, the growth of labor productivity and the reduction of unit cost

are used for periodic reductions in retail prices at which consumers purchase necessary goods. This genuinely raises the living standard of working people and increases effective demand among the population.

Under conditions of monopoly domination, an alien, selfish goal is imposed on social production—the extraction of maximum profits by monopolies. Under conditions of socialism, social production retains the natural and normal goal of all material production—satisfying the needs of the population. Hence stems the opposite nature of relations between consumer goods production and popular consumption (effective demand) under capitalism and under socialism.

In socialist society, the continuously growing material and cultural needs of the population and the constant growth of its effective demand continually push social production forward. However, this could not automatically insure against imbalances in the development of production, particularly in the development of certain branches of agriculture—for example, livestock raising and the production of potatoes and vegetables. Therefore, the socialist state in a planned manner, relying on knowledge of the objective economic laws of socialism, takes the necessary measures in a timely way to eliminate the lag in individual branches of the economy.

II

Bourgeois science usually asserts that the possibilities of utilizing productive forces in crop cultivation and livestock raising are limited, and that this allegedly constitutes the cardinal feature of agriculture. The rapid increase in consumer

goods production is allegedly hindered by the notorious "law" of diminishing soil fertility, according to which the development of productive forces in agriculture is limited by the conservatism of the forces of nature. Ignoring the development of the mode of social production and technical progress, bourgeois science shifts the vices and limitations of capitalism onto nature. The true cause of stagnant processes in capitalist agriculture lies in the fact that it cannot develop at sufficiently rapid rates under conditions where, as a result of private land ownership, enormous funds in the form of mortgage payments, rent, and various semi-feudal obligations are permanently withdrawn from agriculture.

The volume of these uncompensated withdrawals from agricultural production in Tsarist Russia was expressed annually as almost 20 million tons of grain.

In Poland, during the period of landlord rule, rent payments for land and mortgage debt expenses absorbed about one-third of the cash income of the countryside. The agriculture of China (prior to the formation of the Chinese People's Republic), bound by feudal shackles, annually paid landowners sums equivalent to 30 million tons of grain. As a result, agriculture there could not develop. When the landless and small-land peasants of China received 47 million hectares of landlord land from their people's government and were freed from land rent payments to landlords, agricultural and food production in the country began to grow rapidly and steadily. In just three years of the existence of the people's democratic system in the country, grain production increased by 45%, sugar by 99%, and the cotton harvest in 1952 exceeded the maximum harvest of

the past by 1.5 times, while cattle livestock increased by 26% and sheep by 42%.

Despite such high growth rates, production in the Chinese People's Republic does not run into the narrow limits of popular consumption, since effective demand is growing faster than production.

The lag of crop cultivation behind industry under capitalist conditions is a consequence of historical and social causes. This lag is connected with the inflation of land rent, medieval privileges of the landlord class, and the dominance of private land ownership. Under capitalism, private ownership of land and the fragmentation of land plots impede the rational application of large-scale machine production in agriculture.

The liberation of land from the unbearable burden of rent payments and feudal duties, and the replacement of capitalist land ownership and land use with socialist ones, open up wide scope for the development of productive forces in agriculture. Consequently, there are no natural peculiarities of agricultural production that would limit the possibilities for its growth.

However, compared to industry, agricultural production possesses certain essential features. The primary and fundamental difference of crop cultivation from industry consists in the fact that "the economic process of reproduction, whatever its specific social character, is in this sphere always intertwined with a natural process of reproduction" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. II, p. 358). This natural process of reproduction is connected with the vital activity of plant and animal organisms and microorganisms. With their help, the matter of nature is

converted from geological turnover into biological turnover. In the labor process, the appropriation by society of mineral and biological elements of nature occurs on the basis of the rational use by humans of objects and forces of nature in the production process.

Therefore, in agricultural production, the process of developing productive forces has certain features. This, in turn, leads to a certain distinctiveness in the ripening of new relations of production in agriculture compared to industry. Thus, for example, capitalist relations of production arise first in industry, while feudal relations continue to dominate in agriculture; only later, as the capitalist mode of production matures, does a restructuring of agriculture along capitalist lines occur.

Under socialism, by virtue of historical conditions of agricultural development, somewhat different forms of socialist relations of production arise in this sphere than in industry. In agriculture, relations of production based on collective-farm/cooperative property are most widespread. However, relations of production based on nationwide state property are increasingly developing in agricultural production as well, in connection with the growing importance of machine-tractor stations and state farms, as well as a result of joint production of consumer goods with industry.

In agriculture during the period of socialism, collective farmers, MTS workers, and state farm workers, as well as workers and employees of other branches of the economy residing in rural areas, are allocated small plots of land to conduct personal subsidiary farming. Collective farmers,

workers, and employees under conditions of socialism enjoy the right of ownership—as defined by legislation—over residential housing, domestic animals, farm buildings, and small agricultural inventory. However, as the productive forces in agriculture develop, as land is improved as a means of labor, and as public livestock raising develops, the need for personal subsidiary plots will undoubtedly disappear. This will occur when public farming can fully satisfy the population's needs for agricultural products.

The process of labor both in agriculture and in industry is essentially characterized by the exchange of matter between nature and society. Man in the process of social production can only utilize the action of natural forces. The means and instruments of labor characterize the "embodied power of knowledge" and, being an element of productive forces, express society's relation to objects and forces of nature in the process of producing material goods.

The development of productive forces and the improvement of relations of production is a two-sided process characterizing the development of the mode of social production itself, which forms the economic foundation of human history.

Representatives of bourgeois economic thought, speaking of the action of the law of diminishing returns on successive expenditures of labor and capital in agriculture, commit an elementary error by ignoring the development of productive forces in crop cultivation and failing to account for the level of development of agricultural technology.

If unchanging technology sets relatively narrow limits for additional investments of labor and capital, even within these limits additional investment of labor and capital by no means always and necessarily will be accompanied by a decrease in the productivity of subsequent expenditures. Additional investment of labor and means of production always presupposes a change in technology and production methods to one degree or another. They are accompanied by the invention of new machines, the breeding of new plant varieties and animal breeds, the introduction of new systems of crop farming and livestock management, as well as the use of improved product transportation.

An essential feature of agricultural production lies in the somewhat different composition of means of production compared to industry. It is known that elements of productive forces are instruments of production (means of labor), through which material goods are produced, and people with their production experience and labor skills. Natural riches and objects of labor, such as raw materials, do not in themselves enter into the composition of productive forces, but as natural material filtered in the process of labor, they form the basis for the further progress of productive forces.

In industry, land is merely a general condition of production, while in the extractive industry, the subsoil of the earth is additionally an object of labor. In agriculture, land is not only a general condition of production and not only an object of labor, but also a means of labor. Land, as Marx points out, acts in crop cultivation itself as an instrument of production, and this circumstance determines that in crop cultivation, successive

expenditures of capital can be used productively, contrary to bourgeois "theories" of the falling productivity of successive expenditures of labor and capital. Land, as a means of labor in crop cultivation, has the feature that it constantly improves if worked properly, whereas, for example, machines wear out and deteriorate in the process of labor.

Another feature of land as a means of labor is that it can function in this capacity only under the condition of having other means of labor (agricultural inventory, machines, draft animals). Without a sufficiently high development of labor power, and without having additional means of labor at human disposal—even if primitive ones—land cannot function as a means of labor. K. Marx specially emphasized this specific feature of the functioning of land as a means of labor (see *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 186).

The role of land as a means of labor increases as agricultural technology improves. In this respect, the introduction into agriculture of machine technology for working the land for planting and harvesting operations is of particular importance. The circumstance that land as a means of labor presupposes the presence of other means of labor—specifically machines—determines that for the development of productive forces in agriculture, the industrialization of the national economy and the mechanization of various branches of agricultural production are of enormous importance. The industrialization of the country is an integral part of the progress of productive forces in agriculture.

The industrialization of the national economy ensures the mechanization of crop cultivation and livestock raising, and the

supply of agricultural production with compound feeds and mineral feed elements, as well as mineral fertilizers and diverse chemical agents both for combating pests and plant/animal diseases and for stimulating their growth and development.

Domestic animals as a means of labor also possess specific properties. Draft animals are used in agriculture as living engines. Breeding animals in cattle raising, pig farming, and sheep farming also function as a means of labor. However, other domestic animals—for example, young stock being raised and animals being fattened—are an object of labor, not a means of labor. Upon slaughter, domestic animals are transformed from a means of labor and object of labor into consumer goods. Milk obtained from a cow or sheep, and mare's milk (*koumiss*), are also consumer goods, while in processing in butter or cheese manufacturing, milk is an object of labor.

Depending on the species of animal, age, and sex, as well as depending on the method of utilization, domestic animals function in agriculture as a means of labor, as an object of labor, or as a consumer good. This key feature of livestock raising makes it the most complex branch of agriculture. The specific composition of the means of labor used in the process of material production in the field of crop cultivation and livestock raising affects the level of development of productive forces in agriculture.

Along with the further mechanization of agriculture, mastering technology presents agricultural workers under socialism with a task of huge importance: to master completely the specific means of labor in crop cultivation and livestock raising—such

as land and domestic animals. As this task is fulfilled, the productivity of animals and the yield of fields will grow, and soil fertility will increase.

Marxism views soil fertility not only as a natural property of land, but also as a social property of farming closely connected with the dominant mode of production. In particular, highly relative is the very concept of "unsuitable land". In the work *The Agrarian Program of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution*, V. I. Lenin pointed out that individual lands are unsuitable not so much "by virtue of natural properties of given lands or given borderlands, but as a consequence of *social* properties of farming in Russia proper, properties condemning technology to stagnation..." (*Works*, Vol. 13, p. 228). V. I. Lenin confirmed this thought using the example of the Taurida and Trans-Volga steppes: prior to the abolition of serfdom, they were considered unsuitable for cultivation, whereas in the 1880s they overtook the central black-earth regions in grain production.

With the replacement of one social mode of production by another, the character of people's relation to objects and forces of nature changes. Under the capitalist mode of production, under conditions of private ownership of land, where production is subordinated to the selfish goal of extracting maximum profits from a given land area, rational crop cultivation is impossible; in this case, it is based on narrow, one-sided specialization and monoculture, while the application of scientific and technological achievements is limited by the principle of capitalist profitability of production.

Under the socialist mode of production, the attitude of people toward objects and forces of nature—both in industry and in agriculture—changes substantially. Under conditions of socialism, man actively influences the objects and forces of nature and holds sway over them, relying on the latest achievements of science and technology and on the mighty forces of the new social system.

In the era of socialism, society's relationship to nature is formed on the basis of planned, creative influence of society upon nature. This new, "engineering" character of people's relationship to the objects and forces of nature is expressed above all in the widespread introduction into agricultural production of advanced machine technology. The main feature and advantage of the collective farm system lies precisely in the fact that it ensures the mechanization of agricultural production.

Under socialism, a diverse system of land-improvement measures also receives widespread application: irrigation construction, water supply, drainage, and forest reclamation measures. Mass application is gained by complex measures in the form of the ley farming system, which ensures imparting the necessary crumbly structure to the soil and includes in the system of cultivation the working not only of arable land, but also of meadows and pastures based on the use of a unified system of field and meadow-pasture crop rotations arranged with local topography taken into account.

All this leads to the flourishing of productive forces in agriculture and ensures the fulfillment of the main goal of socialist production—the satisfaction of the constantly growing

material and cultural needs of society. On the basis of the development of productive forces and the improvement of relations of production, a sharp advance in the production of consumer goods is ensured, and broad possibilities open up for creating an abundance of food and means of subsistence.

III

Essential differences between agricultural and industrial production during the period of socialism are gradually being erased, and agricultural production in its character is drawing closer to industrial production. This process takes place through various paths, in particularly through the development of the socialist application of machines in crop cultivation, the introduction of industrial methods of managing agriculture, and, most importantly, through the further improvement of collective-farm/cooperative relations of production. All this was manifested with particular clarity in connection with measures based on the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, adopted following the report of N. S. Khrushchev.

A significant part of consumer goods is created as a result of the combined productive activity of industry and agriculture, and only a small part of them is produced by industry alone (for example, metal products) or by agriculture alone (for example, fresh vegetables and fruits, whole milk). In industry, nationwide state ownership of the means of production dominates, whereas in agriculture, collective-farm/cooperative ownership plays a major role (alongside nationwide ownership of land, tractors, and agricultural machinery) over such means

of production as farm buildings, agricultural inventory, domestic animals, etc.

The overwhelming majority of consumer goods is therefore the result of joint work of two production sectors—state and collective farm. Collective farms produce agricultural raw materials, while state light and food industries process them. Such, for example, is the case with fabrics, for the production of which agriculture supplies cotton, flax, and wool; with footwear; and with food products such as sugar, baked bread, flour, animal and vegetable oil, tea, etc.

The joint work of industry and agriculture in producing consumer goods is based on peculiar economic relations between two main production sectors—state and collective-farm/cooperative.

Agricultural raw materials and food products enter industry for further processing from collective farms in significant quantities in the order of fulfillment by collective farms of firm obligations to the state, which have the force of law. Beginning in April 1940, these obligations were determined in the form of per-hectare delivery norms. A large and ever-growing portion of agricultural raw materials and food enters the state as natural payment for the work of MTS.

The fact that part of the agricultural products enters the state from collective farms in the order of state procurements, and another part in the order of state and cooperative purchases at higher prices, does not change the nature of economic ties between city and countryside, but ensures greater material incentive for collective farmers in increasing the productivity

of public collective farming. For its part, industry actively participates in agricultural production by supplying for its needs tractors, combines, various machines, spare parts, agricultural tools and inventory, mineral fertilizers, compound feeds, construction and repair materials, fuel, etc. From year to year, as the intensity of socialist agriculture increases, its orders for industrial products grow.

In accordance with the decision of the September Plenum, industry is obligated to supply agriculture in the period from 1954 to May 1, 1957, with no fewer than 500 thousand tractors (in 15-horsepower equivalent) and 250 thousand row-crop tractors. In addition, industry is obligated to deliver a huge quantity of diverse agricultural machines for complex mechanization not only of crop farming, but also of livestock raising. The capacity of plants for producing compound feeds is to be brought in 1954 to 2 million tons, and in 1956—up to 5 million tons per year. Production of mineral fertilizers (recalculated in standard units) in 1959 must reach 16.5–17.5 million tons, and in 1964—28–30 million tons per year. Industry has received an order for the expansion of spare parts production necessary for repairing tractors and other machines, as well as an order for creating at MTS an exchange stock of tractor and farm machinery units and components that would ensure machine repair under field conditions. For the next 2–3 years, industry receives a special order for rendering production assistance to machine-tractor stations (construction of repair shops, garages for tractors, sheds for combines, sheds and concrete pads for machines, residential houses, and dormitories), as well as a special assignment to render

assistance to collective farms in constructing greenhouses and hotbeds. The timber and paper industry received a large order for supplying in 1954–1956 pre-fabricated two-apartment and single-apartment wooden residential houses for MTS specialists.

State industry equips agriculture with first-class technology. Tractors and agricultural machines intended for work in collective farm fields are concentrated in state machine-tractor stations. Economic ties between state industry and collective farm production are realized in this case in the form of a productive alliance based on the participation of state means of production in collective farm production.

At present, 8,950 MTS serve 94 thousand collective farms in agriculture. Such an organization of the material-technical base of agricultural production made it possible to solve the problem of mechanizing the most important types of agricultural work and thereby ease the labor of collective farmers. Mechanization, in turn, leads to a continuous increase in labor productivity—the most important condition for the growth and improvement of collective farm production. The level of mechanization of work on collective farms reached in 1952: for plowing fallow land, plowing fall fields, and sowing cotton and sugar beets—96–98%; for sowing grain crops—87%; and for harvesting grain crops with combines—70%.

However, for a number of agricultural operations—especially in livestock raising, vegetable growing, and potato and feed production—the level of mechanization is clearly insufficient. To overcome this lag in the coming years, many diesel, crawler, and row-crop tractors and high-productivity machines

for cultivating and harvesting industrial and feed crops, potatoes, and vegetables, as well as machines for the complex mechanization of hay harvesting, silage crops, and the mechanization of all labor-intensive operations on livestock farms, will be delivered to MTS.

State machine-tractor stations have become a powerful industrial base for collective farm production. The socialist principle of applying machines in agriculture completely removes the limitations imposed by private land ownership and capitalist forms of farming, which held back the process of production development, and at the same time opens boundless perspectives for improving machine technology. For the first time in history, the system of machines in agriculture has ceased to be determined by the size of the cultivated land area belonging to one or another farm.

With the concentration of machine technology in state machine-tractor stations, collective farm production is not burdened with multi-billion expenditures connected with introducing new and more advanced machines. Thus, replacing wheeled tractors with crawler and diesel ones, introducing new models of combines, introducing cotton-harvesting machines and sugar-beet harvesting machines, and replacing trailed agricultural inventory with mounted tractor inventory—which required multi-billion expenditures—are carried out by the Soviet state through machine-tractor stations at the expense of the general state budget.

Possibilities for utilizing developing technology in socialist agriculture are of exceptional importance. This, in particular, is evidenced by the experience of enlarging collective farms.

In connection with the use of new, more advanced machine technology in agriculture, a certain disparity emerged between the working conditions of MTS tractor brigades and the field-crop brigades of small collective farms. The nationalization of land and its transfer to collective farms for permanent and free use, socialist land tenure, and the socialist principle of applying machines in agriculture opened up wide possibilities for the movement that began among small collective farms toward enlargement; as a result, instead of 254 thousand small artels, 94 thousand larger collective farms were created through amalgamation. This merger led to the strengthening of the collective farm system and helped eliminate the ripe contradictions between the powerful machine technology of MTS and the relatively small sizes of cultivated plots of the former collective farms. At present, machine-tractor stations have begun constructing permanent field camps for each tractor brigade, located on the same plot as the collective farm field-crop brigades, with field crop rotations taken into account.

The rich and complex technology of machine-tractor stations, requiring skilled working hands, led to the necessity of creating permanent, qualified cadres of MTS machine operators. Prior to the decision of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, collective farmers assigned for the period of field work as seasonal MTS workers worked on tractors. The labor of tractor drivers, as well as other collective farmers, was paid by workday units depending on the results of the agricultural year, but in addition, they were guaranteed a certain minimum payment for workday units in cash and in kind. Only combine operators and mechanics/drivers of certain large harvesting

machines were permanent MTS workers. At present, machine-operating cadres working in collective farm fields—brigadiers and assistant brigadiers of tractor brigades, tractor drivers, excavator operators and their assistants, record-keepers and fuel refillers, as well as combine operators, combine mechanics, cotton-picker drivers, flax-puller operators, and hemp-harvester operators—have been transferred to the permanent staff of MTS as permanent workers. Working with the rights of seasonal workers in MTS are trailer operators and operators of agricultural and earth-moving machines, and assistant combine operators. As a result of this measure, the army of permanent agricultural workers increased by 1.3 million people, and in the coming years will increase significantly.

Permanent and seasonal MTS workers represent a peculiar social figure in the countryside. Although permanent MTS workers work in collective farm fields using means of production that are in nationwide state ownership, their position in production differs somewhat from the position of workers in state enterprises—for example, state farms. The distinctiveness of the position of permanent and seasonal MTS workers consists in the fact that their labor is paid mainly as the labor of workers at state enterprises (enrollment in staff, monthly cash payments, established procedures for pensions and benefits, sick pay, and vacation pay), but with certain features analogous to the labor payment of collective farmers (crediting of workday units, distribution of in-kind payment and additional cash payment depending on the results of the agricultural year). This distinctiveness is determined by the

presence in agricultural production of two forms of ownership over the means of production—state and collective-farm/cooperative.

The presence of these two forms of ownership over means of production in agricultural production is reflected especially in the fact that in agriculture, two forms of socialist distribution according to labor exist. Distribution according to labor in agriculture is carried out both in the form of monetary wages and in the form of distributing money and in-kind goods by workday units among collective farmers.

Peculiarities of relations of production in agriculture in the era of socialism arise on the basis of the peculiar development of productive forces in agriculture and, in turn, exert an influence on the further development of agricultural productive forces.

This interaction of relations of production and productive forces is reflected in recent measures of the Communist Party and Soviet Government in the field of agriculture. On the basis of decisions of the September Plenum, substantial changes took place in the organization of agricultural management. As N. S. Khrushchev noted in his report at the Plenum, the need for district agricultural administrations is now disappearing. Management of agricultural production is now concentrated in machine-tractor stations, to which all agronomic, zootechnical, and veterinary staff of former district agricultural administrations, as well as all veterinary dispensaries and control-seed stations, are transferred. MTS concentrate not only production assistance to collective farms based on operating the large machine technology of MTS in collective

farm fields, but also all other types of production assistance based on introducing scientific achievements.

Consequently, agricultural production is drawing closer to industry in terms of management methods as well. These measures will make it possible to strengthen agronomic and zootechnical assistance to collective farms and widely deploy complex mechanization of all branches of collective farm production. Sending 100 thousand agricultural specialists to permanent work at MTS and collective farms will bring immeasurably greater benefit than the sporadic dispatch of temporary envoys, which was widely practiced until recently.

The September Plenum of the CC CPSU also adopted a number of decisions allowing party leadership to be brought closer to key sectors of agricultural production. For work at each MTS, a group of instructors is allocated, headed by one of the secretaries of the district party committee, who are called upon to render constant production, business, and organizational assistance to collective farms served by the MTS.

All these measures will undoubtedly ensure the further improvement of relations of production in agriculture and a sharp advance in the production of food and agricultural raw materials.

IV

The September Plenum revealed that one of the main reasons for the lag in branches of agriculture such as livestock raising and the production of potatoes and vegetables was the violation of the principle of material incentive of collective farmers in

the results of labor. Weak material incentive among collective farmers led to these branches being insufficiently provided with qualified labor power, labor discipline weakened, and the production experience and labor skills of collective farmers were not properly valued; in connection with this, the level of development of labor power—the main productive force—proved insufficient.

The previously existing system of procurements led to violations of the principle of firm per-hectare norms of state deliveries, as a result of which leading collective farms, by way of deliveries against future years and by way of overfulfilling plans, actually performed obligations to the state for lagging collective farms.

In connection with this, the Plenum of the CC CPSU outlined concrete measures that found expression in the decrees of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the CC CPSU on measures for further developing livestock raising and increasing the production of potatoes and vegetables. These decrees are aimed at raising the material incentive of collective farmers in the results of labor, for which norms of mandatory deliveries to state procurements were significantly reduced, a new unified system of agricultural product purchases was introduced, and procurement and purchase prices were set several times higher than previous prices.

Thus, for example, procurement prices for livestock and poultry delivered to the state in fulfillment of mandatory deliveries increased by more than 5.5 times; for potatoes—by 2.5 times; for milk and butter—by 2 times; and for vegetables—on average by 25–40%. Purchase prices increased: for milk

by 1.5 times, and for meat by 1.3 times. A new system was introduced for supplying goods in exchange for purchased products to collective farms with various manufactured goods (automobiles, construction materials, etc.), compound feeds, and mineral fertilizers. A system of advancing collective farms against purchase contracts was also introduced, providing for cash advances to collective farms concluding contracts for the sale of meat and milk on a quarterly basis. Cash incomes received from vegetable and potato growing in the amount of 25% are credited by Gosbank (upon request of collective farms) to a special current account. By decision of the general meeting of collective farmers, these funds can be issued as advances, with this advance not reducing the final distribution of cash income. Such advancing is of great fundamental importance and makes the size of labor payment per workday unit more tangible compared to the former system, where distribution per workday unit and the size of workday payment were established by the collective farm only once a year. Recently, many leading collective farms have been introducing monthly advance payments not only in cash, but also in kind (for example, the "Sickle and Hammer" collective farm, Leninsky District, Moscow Region). This testifies to the further improvement of relations of production on collective farms—specifically that side connected with income distribution. Reducing norms of mandatory deliveries for state procurements and raising procurement and purchase prices strengthen the material incentive of collective farmers and collective farms in the further advance of agriculture, and make it possible, in particular, to expand and strengthen the new,

progressive practice of quarterly or monthly advance payments for workday labor.

However, this alone does not determine the main path for developing collective farm production. The main measure ensuring a sharp advance in the production of livestock products, potatoes, and vegetables is a significant increase in the role of MTS in these branches of collective farm production, for along with the violation of the material incentive principle, the key cause of their lag was the weak level of mechanization in these branches.

The Communist Party and Soviet Government adopted an extensive plan to supply machine-tractor stations with row-crop tractors, special machines for planting and harvesting potatoes, vegetables, feed, and silage crops, machines for improving and clearing meadows and pastures, and to supply MTS with means for mechanizing main labor-intensive tasks on collective farm livestock farms. In particular, by 1955 the level of mechanization for grass mowing, raking, and cocking hay will be brought to 80%; hay stacking—to 65%; and ensiling feeds—to 75%. In work connected with the production of silage crops and feed roots (planting and inter-row cultivation), the level of mechanization will be brought to 95%. MTS operations for fundamental improvement of meadows and pastures will be significantly expanded.

Fulfilling these plans will make it possible to sharply increase mechanization in livestock raising and potato/vegetable production. Timely and high-quality execution of agricultural work will, in turn, increase the yields of collective farm fields and meadows.

Intensification of agriculture during the period of socialism cannot be defined solely by the indicator of increased labor expenditures or expenditures of means and objects of labor per unit of land area. This indicator characterizes only one—and moreover not the main—side of the process of increasing agricultural intensity. Socialist society is interested primarily in the results of additional investments of labor, means, and objects of labor. Developing the productivity and skills of crop cultivation and livestock raising is a specifically socialist form of agricultural intensification connected with the development of multi-branch farming on collective farms and with the comprehensive improvement of soil fertility.

In this respect, the indicator put forward by N. S. Khrushchev in his report at the September Plenum is characteristic: output of meat and milk per 100 hectares of land assigned to a collective farm (arable land, meadow, and pasture). This indicator presents great theoretical and practical interest, as it characterizes the level of development of labor power and means of labor such as land and domestic animals. Regarding perspectives for livestock raising, this level was defined by N. S. Khrushchev on average for the USSR as 260 centners of milk and 27 centners of meat per 100 hectares of arable land, hayfield, and pasture. This level is necessary to satisfy the population's dietary requirements according to scientifically grounded norms.

The task of economists, planners, and farm managers is to correctly differentiate these indicators by zones and regions of the country.

In the government decree on measures for further developing livestock raising, it was established that collective farms achieving in the preceding farm year a gross milk yield per 100 hectares of arable land, hayfield, and pasture of 150 centners of milk receive no assignment for further herd growth of cattle if the milk yield per cow reached no less than 2,500 kilograms. Such collective farms are set the national economic goal of only improving the herd, raising livestock productivity, and on this basis further growing output. The norm of livestock product deliveries on average for the USSR is set at 16 centners of milk and 4 centners of meat per 100 hectares of arable land, hayfield, and pasture.

In creating productive and skilled livestock raising, securing a firm feed base is of great importance. Measures pertaining to this set as their task a significant increase in the production not only of green, succulent, and coarse feeds, but also concentrated feeds. These measures provide for the further introduction of field grass cultivation, increasing the productivity of natural feed lands (meadows and pastures), introducing the green conveyor system, planting feed crops to obtain two harvests a year, introducing paddock grazing systems, etc. Special attention is paid to expanding plantings of silage crops (for example, sunflower and corn in the non-black-earth belt). Growing potatoes for livestock feed and increasing plantings of high-yielding feed grain crops—especially corn, the cultivation of which for feed purposes is the basis of livestock development in the USA—acquire important significance.

The development of livestock raising in the eastern regions of the USSR, in the non-black-earth belt of the European part of the USSR, and in the northern part of the black-earth belt depends in many respects on a significant expansion of potato plantings for feed purposes. In pig fattening, concentrated feeds (flour, bran, oil cake) can to a certain extent also be replaced by potatoes. Thus, for example, according to experimental data from the Institute of Livestock Raising of the AN BSSR, feed consumption per 100 kilograms of live weight gain in fattened pigs was as follows:

Type of Ration	**Concentrates**	**Potatoes**
	(in kilograms)	
Concentrated	495	229
Moderately concentrated	388	531
Low-concentration	319	689

If potatoes are converted to grain using a coefficient of 4 kilograms of potatoes = 1 kilogram of grain, then per 100 kilograms of live weight gain, approximately 520 kilograms of concentrated feed and potatoes are required[5].

[5] For other products, analogous concentrate consumption norms are approximately as follows: per 100 kilograms of beef (in live weight)—130–180 kilograms; per 100 kilograms of milk—35–40; per 100 eggs—about 30 kilograms of concentrated feeds. These ratios determine the enormous role

In our conditions, full utilization of pastures in the Caspian region, Kazakhstan, and Central Asia—where full year-round pasture utilization is possible for meat cattle raising—acquires enormous importance. The fund of such pastures in our country is very significant.

At the fifth session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, G. M. Malenkov, speaking of the urgent task to sharply raise within 2 –3 years the population's supply of consumer goods, put forward as a primary task increasing the population's supply of food and industrial goods, particularly meat and meat products, butter, fish, and fish products. N. S. Khrushchev at the September Plenum specially emphasized the need to improve nutrition through increased consumption of meat and milk.

One can distinguish several types of dietary rations depending on the share of animal protein in the ration:

Share of animal protein in dietary ration (in %)	**Annual per capita norm in kg**			
	Grain & food potatoes (in conversion to grain)	**Vegetables & fruits**	**Meat**	

of concentrates and feed potatoes (alongside green and succulent feeds) in producing meat, milk, and eggs—these most important products of the human dietary ration.

Share of animal protein in dietary ration (in %)	**Annual per capita norm in kg**			
20	240	65	30	
30	185	75	40	
40	160	90	65	
55	115	120	80	
60	105	200	90	

The main conclusions from this table are as follows: 1) the higher the share of meat and milk in the dietary ration, the lower the consumption of food grain and potatoes; 2) an increase in meat and milk consumption is accompanied by growth in vegetable and fruit consumption (excluding populations engaged in pastoral livestock raising); 3) an increase in popular consumption of meat and dairy products requires a significant increase in feed grain and feed potato consumption. While under the first type of ration with a predominance of plant protein, 1 kilogram of food grain and food potatoes requires potatoes requires only 0.6 kilograms of feed grain and potatoes, under a ration where animal protein

significantly predominates, this ratio increases 5 or even 7 times.

Bourgeois agricultural economics sometimes draws from such calculations the conclusion that humans and domestic animals are antagonists and that population growth leads to a relative decrease in livestock raising. In confirmation of this, they refer to religious customs limiting consumption of animal and dairy products on certain days, as well as prohibition of consuming, for example, pork among Muslims or beef among Hindus. These incorrect assertions are based on false Malthusian premises.

Improving the structure of nutrition through increased consumption of meat, milk, and eggs, although it very substantially alters the ratio between food and feed grain/potatoes, increases overall consumption only insignificantly. Thus, with an increase in meat consumption of 3 times and milk of more than 2 times, overall per capita consumption of both food and feed grain/potatoes increases overall from 390 kilograms (first type of ration) to 530 kilograms (fifth type of ration)—that is, by only 36%. Qualitative improvement in the structure of consumption is therefore reflected only insignificantly in total consumption of food and feed grain/potatoes, as it is accompanied by a significant reduction in consumption (by more than 2 to 3 times) of food grain and potatoes.

Under conditions of growth in agricultural productive forces and improvement of relations of production, there are no limitations not only for production growth of means of subsistence, but also for improving the structure of

consumption. However, agricultural science faces the responsible task of developing methods for replacing certain types of concentrated feeds with others (for example, feed grain with potatoes, oil cake, compound feed, hay meal, etc.). In doing so, a strict distinction must be drawn between product manufacturing having food value and feed value.

In decrees of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and CC CPSU on further agricultural development, very important measures are provided regarding economic relations between city and countryside, between industry and agriculture. In particular, these decrees provide for the sale to collective farms of concentrated feeds (oil cake, bran, compound feed) at the rate of 0.5 kilograms per each liter of milk sold under contract (in areas of industrial butter making) and 1 kilogram per each liter of whole milk delivered under deliveries to the capital and large cities. A system is introduced for collective farms to deliver livestock and poultry to the state in exchange for concentrated feeds at the rate of: 4 centners per 1 centner of live weight of cattle and sheep, and 5.5 centners per 1 centner of live weight of pigs and poultry. Simultaneously, a system was developed for full utilization of feed waste from distillery, sugar, and brewing plants and organizing fattening stations attached to them, and natural payment in meat and milk for MTS work connected with feed procurement mechanization and labor processes on collective farm farms was introduced.

Substantial changes are taking place in vegetable production as well. In collective farm vegetable growing, the level of mechanization is rising sharply, and a system of natural payment for corresponding MTS work is introduced. Of great

importance for collective farm vegetable growing is the new procedure for direct delivery to stores and public catering enterprises of hothouse-greenhouse vegetables, early open-ground greens, early potatoes, and fresh vegetables, with payment for delivered products at **retail prices (with a 25% discount)**.

All these measures improve economic ties between city and countryside in a number of agricultural branches.

In the interest of encouraging individual gardening on household plots, the principle of per-hectare land taxation is widespread, regardless of how the land plot was used—for planting potatoes, vegetables, or fruit/berry plantings.

***

Mobilizing the masses and their creative initiative to fulfill the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU is now the main, decisive thing.

Despicable enemies of the people—the contemptible outcast Beria and his criminal gang—with their villainous acts tried to disrupt measures of the party and government aimed at advancing lagging regions and branches of agriculture. Traitors and conspirators sought to undermine the alliance of workers and peasants and restore capitalism. The vile enemy was exposed and destroyed.

With tenfold energy, the Soviet people, led by the Communist Party and Soviet Government, have set about creating an abundance of consumer goods. The complex of measures carried out on the basis of the decisions of the September

Plenum will ensure a sharp advance in the material well-being of the people in the next two to three years.

7. On the Objective Character of the Laws of Development of Soviet Socialist Society

N. E. OVANDER (Kiev)

Among the questions of Marxist-Leninist theory that are of crucial importance for understanding the phenomena of our reality, one should highlight the question of the objective character of the laws of development of socialist society. This question acquired particularly vital importance because a certain part of our economists, philosophers, and historians made idealistic errors in this area.

Proceeding from the fact that socialist society is built through the conscious activity of the working masses, many comrades drew an incorrect conclusion, which came down to denying the objective character of the laws of development of socialist society. These comrades erroneously believed that conscious activity is incompatible with the existence of objective laws independent of human will and consciousness.

In connection with this, the assertion was widespread that, unlike the state in an antagonistic society, the Soviet socialist state is capable of "creating" economic laws, that "it can do anything," that "nothing is impossible for it." The Soviet state played and plays a huge role in the development of our socialist society, but this by no means means that it does not rely in its activities on the objective laws of historical development, that it is not a superstructure of society, or that it is capable of performing such "functions" as the destruction of

"old" laws, the "creation," "formation," or "transformation" of economic laws.

Striving in this way to emphasize the specific features of the development of socialist society, some comrades forgot that Marxism teaches us to view the development of society as a natural-historical process.

* * *

Communism arises as a result of the conscious creativity of millions of working people. But the creative activity of Soviet people leads to historical successes precisely because it relies on objective laws and is directed toward the realization of objectively necessary historical tasks. The purposeful activity of the masses under the leadership of the Soviet State and the Communist Party by no means implies freedom from objective laws.

The conscious activity of millions is an expression of their freedom only to the extent that it reflects the ability of man to cognize and utilize objective forces in his interests—the objective laws of development of nature and society. Freedom, from the point of view of Marxist-Leninist science, is based on recognized necessity. Marx wrote:

"Just as the savage must wrestle with Nature to satisfy his wants, to maintain and reproduce his life, so must civilized man, and he must do so in all social formations and under all possible modes of production.

With his development this realm of physical necessity expands as the result of his wants; but, at the same time, the forces of

production that satisfy these wants also increase. Freedom in this field can only consist in socialized man, the associated producers, rationally regulating their interchange with Nature, bringing it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it as by the blind forces of Nature; accomplishing it with the least expenditure of energy and under conditions most favorable to, and worthy of, their human nature. But it nonetheless still remains a realm of necessity. Beyond it begins that development of human energy which is an end in itself, the true realm of freedom, which, however, can blossom forth only with this realm of necessity as its basis" (*Capital*, Vol. III, p. 833. 1949).

From this statement of K. Marx, one should first of all single out the fundamental proposition of historical materialism, which states that both savage and civilized man, the man of primitive society and the man of socialist society, must produce, must satisfy their needs, maintain and reproduce their life. In all socio-economic formations, under all modes of production, man is obliged to obtain in the process of labor the necessary means of material existence. The labor process is a process taking place between man and nature. By acting on external nature and changing it, man changes the productive forces of society, changes his social relations and his own nature. Characterizing the process of development, Marx wrote that each specific historical form of the labor process further develops both the material foundations of this process and its social forms (see ibid., p. 897).

These propositions of K. Marx characterize the role of labor activity of people in all socio-economic formations.

Objectively necessary for all forms of social life, the process of labor is an eternal, natural condition of human life. It forms the basis of those objective processes, independent of human will, which ultimately determine social life, its development, and its nature at each given stage of historical development. This objective process, independent of human will, constitutes the foundation of the life and development of any society, including Soviet socialist society.

Social development is, above all, the development of production, its material basis, and its social form—the development of productive forces and relations of production.

Capitalism played a progressive role precisely because it significantly advanced the development of productive forces. Under capitalism, they acquired a social character and thus outgrew the framework of private-property, capitalist use. The production relations of capitalist society turned from forms of development into fetters, into a colossal obstacle to the further development of productive forces.

"The new productive forces have already outgrown the bourgeois form of their utilization by a whole head," wrote F. Engels. — "And this conflict between productive forces and the mode of production... exists in reality, objectively, outside us, independently of the will or conduct even of those people whose activity created it. Modern socialism is nothing but the reflection in thought of this actual conflict..." (*Anti-Dühring*, p. 252. 1950).

Capitalists, in the picturesque expression of F. Engels, resemble an engine driver who, having built up steam, drives

his locomotive toward ruin, because he is no longer able to open the safety valve to prevent the impending catastrophe that is inevitable for him.

The mighty productive forces developed in the womb of capitalism are called upon to be used by the working class in the conditions of a new, socialist society. Only it is in a position to give full effect to the law of obligatory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces. Only it, as the vanguard of the working people, together with all working people, can save society from ruin by organizing new social relations that eliminate once and for all the exploitation of man by man, creating relations of a socialist, and then a communist society. But even in this society, the necessity to produce remains—this eternal, natural condition of human life.

How, then, does the production of material wealth at the highest stage of societal development differ from production under conditions of class antagonisms and the exploitation of man by man?

Under conditions of an antagonistic society, people are slaves to forces alien to them, which shackle their productive forces and place them in a servile position. Only under socialism have people gained the opportunity to develop production in genuinely human conditions, without exploiters, without oppressors. As Marx predicted, "associated producers" in the land of socialism have begun to rationally regulate their interchange with nature, bringing it under their common control, and now produce on principles that do not enslave the

producers. If previously the need to produce acted as a blind force oppressing the worker, now, under socialism, the producer acts as a free master of the socialist society who has stepped off the old, exploitative path. Marx's foresight has come true in our socialist society, where production, while remaining an objective necessity, develops through the conscious utilization of objective economic laws, objective laws of social development.

The role of conscious human activity in the development of our society was vividly manifested in the policy of socialist industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture. The industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture, carried out on the initiative of the Communist Party and with the conscious support of the people, ensured the construction of the foundation of a socialist economy, turned our country from a backward, agrarian state into a powerful industrial socialist power capable of protecting itself from the dangers of capitalist encirclement.

However, this policy, like all the activities of our party, the Soviet state, and our entire people, achieved world-historical results only because it relied on the conscious utilization of the objective laws of social development. In its policy of industrialization of the country, the party and the people relied on the law stating that the basis of socialism can only be heavy industry, high technology, and that only large-scale industry can ensure the independence and defense capability of the country. Setting out on the path of collectivization of agriculture, we relied on the law of mandatory correspondence of productive forces and relations of production, which

required us to ensure the victory of socialist relations of production in the countryside as well.

Only based on what has been said can one correctly understand the role of conscious activity in the development of socialist society and criticize erroneous, idealistic positions according to which the conscious principle supposedly determines the development of our society.

In recent years, quite a few erroneous articles have appeared in our press, the authors of which either denied the objective character of the laws of development of socialist society or limited themselves to such an "acknowledgment" of them that did not prevent them from seeing in socialism only conscious activity.

Thus, for example, in the first volume of *Philosophical Notes* of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR for 1946, published under the editorship of Prof. G. S. Vasetsky and Prof. V. I. Svetlov, it was written: "As is known, all past socio-economic formations developed spontaneously, whereas our socialist formation was prepared by Marx and Engels long before its practical realization, and was created through an active and purposeful struggle for it" (p. 4).

Is it possible, keeping in mind the historical merits of Marx and Engels, to assume that they "prepared" the socialist formation? It is possible, of course, but under one condition: if we ignore or completely deny the objective laws of historical development. Undoubtedly, Marx and Engels, through their discovery of the laws of development of society, the laws of

development and decay of capitalism, contributed to the enlightenment and organization of those social forces that, in the course of the revolution, destroyed the production relations of capitalist society. But it does not follow from this that Marx and Engels "prepared" a new socio-economic formation as opposed to past formations that took shape spontaneously.

One of the serious errors in the interpretation of the development of Soviet socialist society was the identification of the spontaneous with the objective. Because of this, instead of a correct counterposition of the spontaneous to the conscious, an erroneous counterposition of the conscious to the objective was obtained.

According to the theory of historical materialism, the spontaneous manifestation of objective historical laws in the history of antagonistic society and the conscious utilization of objective laws of history in socialist society rest equally on the action of objective, necessary laws of social development independent of human will and consciousness. Meanwhile, some of our philosophers, economists, and historians, counterposing the spontaneous development of capitalist society to the conscious character of the development of society under socialism, interpreted this issue in a subjectivist, idealistic key. It turned out that objective laws of history acted as spontaneous forces in antagonistic society, whereas in our Soviet society, the conscious principle acts as opposed to objective forces. State laws, conscious leadership, and planning were interpreted by them as laws of development of our society, and they saw this as its specific feature. To admit that objective laws operate in our society meant, in their opinion, to

identify our society with an antagonistic one where blind, spontaneous forces reign supreme.

Thus, in a serious and detailed article by Prof. M. P. Kim, published in issue VI of *Scientific Notes* of the Academy of Social Sciences under the CC AUCP(b) (1949), we read the following: "Marxism established that the people are the creator of history. But in the past, the people made history unconsciously, objectively. Only in socialist society do the people create history consciously, intentionally" (p. 98). Here, conscious, intentional actions of Soviet people are erroneously counterposed to objective forces of historical development, as if conscious actions exclude the utilization of these very objective forces.

The collective of the Department of Dialectical and Historical Materialism of the Academy of Social Sciences did not avoid similar errors either. In the collection of articles *On the Development of Soviet Socialist Society*, published by the department in 1950, we meet a number of erroneous statements.

"The development of Soviet society from lower to higher," writes N. Dzhandildin, "occurs not outside the will and consciousness of people, but in an organized, conscious manner; it is carried out according to planned designs of the Soviet state, expressing the interests, aspirations, and will of millions of working masses" (p. 226. *Emphasis ours — N. O.*).

This statement, found alongside a correct understanding of processes characterizing the development of Soviet society, testifies to the fact that, proceeding from an incorrect

counterposition of the objective to the conscious, some comrades forgot about the objective character of the laws of development of socialist society, just as comrades Sanina and Venzher did, who claimed that "only thanks to the conscious action of Soviet people engaged in material production do the economic laws of socialism arise."

"Marxism holds..." emphasized I. V. Stalin, "...that the laws of political economy of socialism are a reflection in the minds of people of objective regularities existing outside us" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 84).

According to the formulations of comrades Kim and Dzhandildin, as well as Sanina and Venzher, it turns out that the conscious character of human creativity determines the objective laws of social development, whereas in reality, the conscious activity of people unfolds on the basis of using objective laws independent of human will and consciousness.

The collection of the Institute of Philosophy *Problems of Dialectical and Historical Materialism in the Work of I. V. Stalin "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics"* went through two editions, but it also contains erroneous propositions bordering on voluntarism.

In the article by G. E. Glezerman, we find the following assertion: "In conditions of the victory of the socialist system and the liquidation of the multi-tiered nature of the national economy, the economic development of the country is no longer a spontaneous process independent of the will of people. It is entirely subject to the guiding influence of a single national economic plan" (p. 201). Here economic development

as a development independent of human will is clearly denied, and the understanding of the role of a single national economic plan excludes the existence of an objective law of planned, proportional development of the national economy under socialism.

Under socialism, the laws of science merely reflect the objective process of development taking place independently of human will and consciousness.

Thus, the development of material production is an objective, natural-historical process. Social production is characterized by connections and regularities that are conditioned by the internal logic of production development. Social production under socialism is directed toward satisfying the needs of workers freed from exploitation. However, the need to produce, to produce in a certain way in accordance with the requirements of the basic economic law of socialism, the need to ensure proportional development of all branches of production, as well as the need to constantly maintain correspondence between productive forces and production relations, remains a sphere of objective, regular processes independent of human consciousness.

Taking these objective processes into account, skillfully utilizing the objective laws of historical development, the workers of socialist society direct the action of objective laws toward satisfying their needs.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the conscious activity of the masses, guided by the party of Communists, unfolds as a result of a correct reflection in consciousness of historical necessity,

objective laws, skillful utilization, and application. A correct reflection of the action of objective historical forces in the scientific theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin gives the masses, led by the Communist Party, an understanding of the goal and prospects of the struggle and construction.

Of course, the conscious character of all activity of the peoples of the USSR imparts completely different, qualitatively unique features to our society and is a great force accelerating the movement of Soviet society forward.

To understand the significance of the conscious character of the activity of Soviet people, guided by the Communist Party, means to understand what feedback effect consciousness of the workers of our society exerts on the objective course of development of Soviet society, and the correct utilization of objective laws of development by them.

Some authors, carried away by demonstrating the specific features of the development of Soviet society, substituted the question of the inverse influence of consciousness, the question of the role of consciousness in our development, with the question of the objective foundations, of the objective regularities of our development. They groundlessly included the conscious character of the creativity of the popular masses into the objective foundation of the life of our society. In reality, the successful activity of working people building socialism is explained by the fact that they rely on objective historical laws and skillfully use them.

Lenin wrote in his work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*: "Social being is *independent of the social consciousness of*

people. The fact that you live and conduct your business, beget children and produce products, exchange them, forms an objectively necessary chain of events, a chain of development, independent of your *social* consciousness, and never encompassed by it in its entirety. The highest task of humanity is to comprehend this objective logic of economic evolution (the evolution of social being) in its general and fundamental features, so that it may adapt to it its social consciousness and the consciousness of the advanced classes of all capitalist countries as clearly, sharply, and critically as possible" (*Works*, Vol. 14, p. 311).

Only by being guided by these Marxist-Leninist propositions can one correctly understand the objective logic of development of Soviet society, the objectively necessary chain of events in the movement of our society. Only proceeding from this can one correctly understand the great mobilizing, organizing, and transforming role of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

* * *

An incorrect, idealistic understanding of the role of the conscious principle in the development of Soviet society often finds expression in an incorrect interpretation of the question of the role of the Soviet state and the role of planning the national economy.

The economic policy of the party and state, relying on the operation of objective laws, represents the skillful utilization of these laws, the utilization of real possibilities that are transformed into reality.

However, one cannot consider that the economic policy of the party and state *is* the economic law of socialism. This policy is merely a result of reflection—a correct, scientific reflection of the operations of objective laws.

An incorrect understanding of the regularities of the development of Soviet socialist society often finds its expression in the fact that, by counterposing the spontaneous action of economic laws under capitalism to the conscious activity of Soviet people, this activity was erroneously interpreted as supposedly economic non-determined unconditioned by objective economic laws. It turned out that the conscious leadership of the party and state, the conscious activity of the masses, acted as primary in the development of Soviet society, and the economic laws of socialism as something secondary, derivative. The conscious, purposeful principle in the development of our society was counterposed to the objective character of the laws of socialist society and, in essence, denied it.

An erroneous understanding of socialist planning was clearly expressed in the article by Prof. V. V. Reikhardt "Socialism and the Character of Its Economic Laws," published in *Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta* (No. 3 for 1947). Socialist national economic planning is, according to Prof. Reikhardt, a specific economic law of socialist production (see p. 70).

I. V. Stalin exposed the fallacy of such views to the end.

Our five-year plans, the very planning of the national economy, cannot be regarded as objective economic laws. National economic planning by state bodies is a derivative moment, a

result of the reflection by these bodies of objective laws—the law of planned, proportional development of the national economy and the basic economic law of socialism.

The activity of the Soviet state is an example of the skillful utilization of objective laws. It is precisely because the Soviet state was able to put the action of objective forces, laws of social development, at the service of the interests of the working masses that the victory of socialism in the USSR was ensured.

An erroneous interpretation of national economic plans as objective laws of development of Soviet society gained fairly widespread distribution. This error is a consequence of misunderstanding the objective character of the laws of development of socialist society, a failure to understand that it is unacceptable to identify state laws created by people and having only legal force with objective laws of social development independent of human will and consciousness.

In another article by Prof. Reikhardt, "Soviet Society and Socialist Economy" (*Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta*, No. 11 for 1947, p. 35), the following thought is expressed: "As a recognized objective necessity expressed in state directive assignments, the plan is an economic law, and at the same time a law in the sense of a state-obligatory norm for the sphere of material production" (*Emphasis ours — N. O.*). Here are two errors: recognition of the plan as an economic law, and identification of an objective economic law with a legal one.

Exactly the same error is contained in the lecture of Comrade B. N. Stefanov, where it is directly stated: "Planning of the

national economy is a powerful economic lever of socialist society—the main economic law of the new mode of production" (*The State Plan — Unshakeable Law of Socialist Society*, p. 10. Leningrad, 1951).

In the collection *Problems of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy*, published by the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, we read in the article by F. F. Chernov: "The Plan of the Soviet state is a law of motion of our economy and directs the development of the entire social life of our country—both economic, political, and ideological" (p. 248).

It is impossible not to cite on this question the following statement by I. V. Stalin: "...Socialist national economy can only be conducted on the basis of the economic law of planned development of the national economy. This means that the law of planned development of the national economy gives our planning bodies the *opportunity* to correctly plan social production. But *opportunity* must not be confused with *actuality*. These are two different things. To turn this opportunity into actuality, one must study this economic law, one must master it, learn to apply it with full knowledge of the matter, and draw up plans that fully reflect the requirements of this law. It cannot be said that our annual and five-year plans fully reflect the requirements of this economic law" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, pp. 8–9).

New economic laws are not created by human will, but arise on the basis of new economic conditions. Thus historical materialism resolves the question of the objective character of the laws of social development, combining it with the

recognition of the objective character of the laws of development of socialist society. Only on the basis of these fundamental propositions of historical materialism can one comprehend the role of the conscious activity of the masses in the development of Soviet society.

* * *

The Great October Socialist Revolution placed the former forces of spontaneous development under the control of united producers who consciously utilize the objective laws of socialist society in their interests.

In this connection, it is necessary to dwell on the question of the objective character of contradictions in the development of Soviet society. Some comrades believed that these contradictions relate only to the sphere of struggle against remnants of capitalism in human consciousness. However, the struggle of the new against the old, the emerging against the dying, manifests itself not only in the struggle against remnants of capitalism. Comrade Stalin, in his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, exposed the historical contradictions between productive forces and production relations in the USSR and showed their objectively developing process.

The specific character of these contradictions reflects the profound, principled difference of our society from antagonistic societies, and underscores the huge role of leadership in the development of the country of socialism, in using the objective laws of social development.

Contradictions between our productive forces and our production relations exist and will exist, because the development of production relations cannot lag behind the development of productive forces. But "with a correct policy of the leading bodies," says I. V. Stalin, "these contradictions cannot turn into an opposition, and things cannot come to a conflict between production relations and productive forces..."

Therefore, the task of the leading bodies is to timely notice growing contradictions and take measures in time to overcome them by adapting production relations to the growth of productive forces (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, pp. 67, 68).

The existence of contradictions in our society between productive forces and production relations does not mean, of course, that the development of production relations goes beyond the framework of relations of friendly cooperation and socialist mutual assistance characteristic of socialism and communism. Development takes place within the framework of these relations; only the form in which these relations take shape and proceed changes.

At present, due to the need for widespread introduction of advanced technology into agriculture, it became necessary to enlarge the collective farms.

The most important task of the present moment is the strengthening of collective farms and the all-round development of commodity circulation. In the future, as I. V. Stalin showed, it will be necessary to exclude surpluses of collective farm production from the system of commodity

circulation and include them in the system of product exchange between state industry and collective farms. This will serve in due course as a decisive means for raising collective farm property to the level of public property.

Thus, in our society, the general historical law continues to operate, according to which productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary element of production. The steady and increasingly powerful development of productive forces will be the source of contradictions between productive forces and production relations of socialist society. The timely alteration of forms or certain aspects of production relations is aimed at preventing them from becoming a brake on the development of productive forces, ensuring they constantly retain their role as the main driver.

The strength of the policy of the Communist Party lies precisely in the fact that it correctly reflects the needs of the economic development of our society, timely notices and resolves new tasks and opportunities that arise in the course of its development.

Such stages of party policy as the Brest Peace, ensuring victory in the Civil War, the transition to the New Economic Policy, the policy of industrialization of the country, carrying out collectivization and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, the struggle for victory during the Great Patriotic War, post-war economic construction, and finally, scientifically grounded prospects and paths of transition to communism, formulated in the historical decisions of the 19th Party Congress—all these are remarkable examples of political leadership on the part of

our glorious Communist Party, armed with Marxist-Leninist science.

The significance of the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism consists in the fact that it gives the opportunity not only to correctly understand the past and present, but also to foresee the course of events, to discern not only how and where events are developing in the present, but also how and where they must develop in the future.

Acknowledgment of the objective character of the laws of development of socialist society by no means implies ignoring the possibility of their active, conscious utilization. On the contrary, it is precisely the acknowledgment of the objective character of historical laws that allows us to understand the full power, significance, and role of the activity of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, the role of advanced political ideas, and the role of Marxist-Leninist science in life and in the development of socialist society.

The world-historical victories in building socialism in the USSR, the successful movement of our country toward communism—all this is the result of the skillful utilization of the objective laws of society in the interests of society, the ability to "harness" them so that they serve the needs of millions of masses.

Man with his needs constitutes the goal of production in a socialist society. Under conditions of socialist society, working people can set certain goals and achieve them through the skillful utilization of objective historical forces, the laws of societal development. The vital interests of the members of

socialist society completely coincide with objective needs and possibilities of development of social production. The activity of the masses has led and will lead to the transformation of these possibilities into reality.

The continuous growth of the needs of the working people of our country can be satisfied only under the condition of further growth in labor productivity. Satisfying constantly growing needs is possible only under conditions of selfless labor, which is the duty of every member of society. The gradual transformation of labor into a primary life need will lead to unlimited freedom for the development of all multifaceted creative capacities of person in a communist society. This will be associated with an even more skillful and comprehensive utilization of the forces of nature. The necessity of scientific guidance over the utilization of the laws of development of society will not decrease, but will increase immensely.

The guiding and leading force in the development of our society is the Communist Party. "The teaching of Marx — Engels — Lenin — Stalin," said G. M. Malenkov in the report to the 19th Party Congress, "gives our party invincible strength, the ability to blaze new paths in history, to clearly see the goal of our forward movement, to achieve and consolidate victories faster and more firmly. Leninist-Stalinist ideas illuminate with a bright light of revolutionary theory the tasks and prospects of the struggle of the popular masses of all countries against imperialism, for peace, democracy, and socialism" (pp. 107–108).

The 19th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union demonstrated the immense importance of the scientific utilization of the laws of social development, which found brilliant reflection in Marxist-Leninist theory. Our party and foreign communist and democratic parties are guided in all their activities by this great theory, opening to all humanity the path to a bright future.

8. Discovery and Substantiation by Comrade Stalin of the Basic Economic Law of Socialism

A. M. RUMYANTSEV

One of the most important problems of political economy is the problem of the basic economic law of a given socio-economic formation. The very name "basic law" speaks to its place in the system of specific economic laws and its significance for studying the economy of a society.

The basic economic law is called basic precisely because, as Comrade Stalin teaches, it determines not just some single aspect or single process of social production, but all main aspects and all main processes of its development; consequently, it determines the essence of the economic system being studied. Only on the basis of understanding this law is it possible to comprehend and explain all the most important phenomena in the realm of a historically specific mode of production, the entire process of its development. Only on this basis can one reveal and demonstrate the specific economic laws inherent to the society under study in their mutual internal connection, and give a finished, coherent structure to the theoretical study of these economic relations.

Prior to the publication of Comrade Stalin's brilliant work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Soviet economists were unable to give a correct definition of the basic economic law of socialism, although the most important ideas

for such a definition—consistently developing Marxism—were already contained in the works of Comrade Stalin. The practice of socialist construction, carried out by the Soviet people under the wise leadership of our great Communist Party, essentially proceeded from taking into account the requirements of the basic economic law of socialism.

The most widespread error of a subjective-idealist character was the assertion by Comrades A. Leontiev, L. Gatovsky, and others that the basic economic law of socialism is national economic planning, determined by the will of the Soviet state. Contrary to the very concept of a basic economic law, there was also the assertion that in our society there could be several basic economic laws. In the anti-Marxist writings of N. Voznesensky, along with the so-called law of planning, the law of value was also included among the basic laws. A complete break with Marxism was also marked by the assertion of certain, if one may say so, economists of the Yaroshenko type, as if the basic economic law of socialism were the continuous growth and perfection of production.

To one degree or another, these and similar views were propagated on the pages of our leading theoretical journals, in many articles and reports of academic directors and staff members of institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, as well as by staff of higher educational institutions and other research institutions.

The existence of incorrect viewpoints on this and other political-economic questions of socialism and modern capitalism hindered the development of political economy, left loopholes for the penetration into our economic literature of

other views alien to Marxism, delayed the creation of the full-fledged, systematized Marxist textbook of political economy that we need. Such a state of affairs bore witness to the lagging behind of many economists and philosophers from life, which required a theoretical reflection and generalization of the practice of constructing socialism and the gradual transition to communism.

Comrade Stalin's new classic work raised Marxist economic theory to a new, incomparably higher stage of development, exposed voluntaristic, bourgeois distortions of Marxist political economy, and opened up the broadest vistas for its further development in inseparable connection with the tasks of the practice of communist construction.

In his brilliant work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, alongside other questions of the political economy of socialism and modern capitalism, Comrade Stalin resolved with exhaustive scientific depth and completeness the question of the basic economic law of socialism. Comrade Stalin gave a classic formulation of this law, discovered and comprehensively substantiated by him, the essential features and requirements of which, as Comrade Stalin points out, consist in securing "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 technique" (p. 40). At the same time, Comrade Stalin explained that neither the objective economic law of planned, proportional development of the national economy, nor its more or less correct reflection —planning—are the basic economic law of socialism, for they

cannot by themselves define the goal for the sake of whose realization the planned development of the national economy is carried out; and a law that does not define the goal of social production cannot be the basic law.

In his new work, Comrade Stalin exposed the un-Marxist essence of assertions that the basic economic law is continuous growth and perfection of production. This assertion, covering itself with illiterate arguments about the "primacy" of production over consumption, turns production from a means of achieving a goal into an end in itself. In such a conception, man with his needs disappears from view, and with the disappearance of the goal of socialist production, the last remnants of Marxism also disappear, leaving, as Comrade Stalin aptly remarked, something like the "primacy" of bourgeois ideology over Marxist ideology.

* * *

The discovery and substantiation by Comrade Stalin of the basic economic law of socialism rest upon the unshakable foundation of Marxism, representing a consistent Marxist disclosure of the essence inherent to socialist economic processes.

The classics of scientific communism, long before the emergence of the socialist mode of production, discovered in contemporary phenomena of production the real prerequisites of future society and, proceeding from this, scientifically outlined the general, main features characterizing socialism. Essential for socialism, as the classics of Marxism-Leninism

indicated, is **man with his needs**. This objectively stems from the very content of social production.

"...For life," wrote the founders of Marxism, "there are needed above all food and drink, housing, clothing and a few other things. Thus, the first historical act is the production of the means necessary to satisfy these needs, the production of material life itself. And indeed this is a historical act, a fundamental condition of all history, which (today as well as thousands of years ago) must be performed every day and every hour, merely in order to keep human beings alive" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. IV, p. 18).

Production, carried out in one social form or another, always represents a unity of direct production, distribution, exchange, and consumption. They, as K. Marx writes, form "parts of a whole, distinctions within a unity" (*Works*, Vol. XII, pt. 1, p. 189). Production cannot exist and does not exist without consumption. The consumption of products ultimately completes production and creates, through the growth of demand for products, an impetus for its further development. Production, being itself productive consumption of the means of production, gives products not only for personal, but also for productive consumption by people. It develops this consumption and determines the methods of consumption of products by people. Consequently, production does not exist for its own sake: its objective goal, internally inherent to it, is the satisfaction of human needs through the production of objects necessary for people for their personal consumption.

However, this objective goal of social production—independent of human will and internally inherent to it—does

not always manifest directly. Between production and consumption, as a necessary link in the chain, as a part of a whole, stands distribution, which is not only the distribution of products, but first and foremost the distribution of the means of production and, correspondingly to this distribution, the placement of members of society among the various branches of production, defining their place in the social process of production and the exchange of their activity. "Distribution of products," points out K. Marx, "is, obviously, only a result of this distribution, which is included within the production process itself and which determines the structure of production" (Vol. XII, pt. 1, p. 186).

In order to live, people must produce the material goods they need. They can produce them only if they have at their disposal the physical conditions of labor, that is, if they own the means of production. Only under such a distribution of the means of production, when the latter are in the common ownership of the people, does the satisfaction of human needs objectively emerge as the direct goal of social production.

Deprived of the means of production, people are deprived of the means of existence and fall into dependence on the people who have concentrated these means of production in their hands as private property. The physical conditions of labor turn into a power dominating over them, opposing labor as foreign property, the objective interests of which become diametrically opposed to the interests of labor, forced into subordination.

Under these conditions, the satisfaction of human needs—the direct goal of the development of social production—inevitably must disappear and does disappear. Instead, with the same

objective inevitability, a new direct goal arises, inherent to antagonistic formations—the accumulation of wealth, profit-making. The means for this is the exploitation of people deprived of the physical conditions of labor necessary for its realization, and therefore, deprived of the means of existence.

Capitalist distribution of the means of production, concentrating the physical conditions of labor in the hands of capitalists and depriving workers of them, sets as the direct goal and stimulus of the development of social production the preservation and increase of the wealth concentrated in their hands, obtained and being obtained through the exploitation of hired labor power. In this process, labor appears here not as a process of producing objects of consumption necessary to people, but as a means by which the wealth of capitalists is preserved and increased. Here, people do not employ the means of production; rather, the latter employ the workers. Production relations are materialized. Objectified labor, in the vivid expression of K. Marx, sucks living labor, turning the worker into a instrument of production. Therefore, the goal of social production becomes not use value, necessary to people to satisfy their needs, but value, self-expanding value, not a commodity, but surplus value or its transformed form—profit, which determines all the vital activity of capital.

"In the capitalist process of production," indicates K. Marx, "the labor process appears merely as a means, the process of expanding value or the production of surplus value—as the goal" (*Archive of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Vol. 2 (7), p. 57).

"The direct goal of capitalist production," points out K. Marx in another place, "is the production not of commodities, but of

surplus value, or profit in its developed form; not of a product, but of surplus product" (*Theories of Surplus Value*, Vol. II, pt. 2, p. 218).

Capital completely subordinates social production to this goal. In doing so, we are not speaking of profit in general, but of obtaining, with the minimum expenditure of capital, the maximum possible profit, but no less than the average rate, ensuring capital, if we speak of pre-monopoly capitalism, the possibility of expanded reproduction. The chase after the highest profit, or lucre, objectively required by the capitalist mode of production, acts as the conscious goal of the activity of every individual capitalist. "The goal of capitalist production always consists in creating maximum surplus value or maximum surplus product with a minimum of advanced capital..." (ibid.).

This objective goal of capitalist production, achieved by exploiting hired workers, is that essential, constant, durable (remaining) element in the phenomenon of the capitalist mode of production which reveals its unity and connection, interdependence and integrity, without which there is not and cannot be capitalism itself. In other words, this objective goal and the means of its achievement acted in their aggregate as the absolute, as K. Marx said, economic law of capitalism. "Production of surplus value or profit-making—such," he noted, "is the absolute law of this mode of production" (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 624).

Comrade Stalin, concretizing the Marxist law of surplus value and developing it further as applied to the conditions of monopoly capitalism, which requires for its existence the

securing of maximum profit, discovered the **basic economic law of modern capitalism**, consisting in securing 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 the highest profits.

There are no crimes against humanity and humaneness to which monopoly capitalism would not resort or does not resort to extract maximum profit. All conceivable methods of obtaining it are sought out, methods of exploiting working people are intensified, methods of squeezing out of them ever greater masses of surplus labor.

Under certain conditions, capitalists were forced to improve the technique of production, raising the productive force of social labor to a level capable, under conditions of social ownership of the means of production, of satisfying the needs of society. But in the hands of capitalists, technology serves, as is well known, only the purpose of intensifying the exploitation of workers and obtaining on this basis ever larger profits. "The progress of technology and science means in capitalist society," indicated V. I. Lenin, "progress in the art of squeezing out sweat" (*Works*, Vol. 18, p. 557). If new technology does not bring capitalists the highest profits, they come out against new technology, refraining from its application; in the development of technology, interruptions occur, capital turns even to hand labor.

The development of capitalist production, determined by the economic law inherent to it, occurs spontaneously, anarchically, planlessly. The main contradiction of capitalism —between the social character of production and private appropriation—deepens. Markets become overstocked with commodities that do not find solvent demand. The impoverished state of the broad working masses limits the boundaries of the market. In society, economic crises of overproduction periodically break out. Production that does not yield the necessary profit is curtailed; millions of workers are thrown overboard, deprived of even minimal means of subsistence. "The mass of applied productive labor... exists for capital as an interest only in so far as, thanks to it—or correspondingly to it—the amount of surplus labor grows (which creates surplus value, hence, profit—*A. R.*)... Since labor does not give this result, it is redundant and must be stopped" (K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus Value*, Vol. II, pt. 1, p. 218).

There arises such a crying contradiction in society, when with a huge need of the people for means of existence, with the material possibility of satisfying it, with available free hands and idle means of production, people cannot apply their hands to these means of production, cannot produce necessary products. And not infrequently, existing commodity stocks—in the presence of millions of starving people—are destroyed in the name of maintaining high prices. Capitalist ownership of the means of production, the interests of profit-making, stand between the working people and the means of production and prevent people from living and working. If capitalists could, as

Comrade Stalin points out, adapt production not to obtaining maximum profit, but turned profit to the improvement of: methods of exploitation, but adapted production and turned profit to securing and satisfying the material and cultural needs of the whole of society, then there would be no such crying phenomena. But then capitalism would not be capitalism (see V. I. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 12, pp. 244–245). Capitalism does not set and cannot set before itself such tasks as satisfying the needs of all members of society, for under capitalism "the worker exists for the needs of increasing existing values, instead of material wealth existing for the needs of the development of the worker" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 627).

The worker exists in capitalist society only as a means to produce profit, therefore the satisfaction of the worker's needs is necessary for capital only in so far as it ensures the fulfillment of the main task of the capitalist mode of production —the creation and extraction of profits. Therefore capital provides its wage slaves engaged in production only with such satisfaction of their needs needs as corresponds to the needs of capital in the production and reproduction of labor power as a means of producing profit, and does not provide at all for the needs of the unemployed, jobless portion of the working class. Capital needs a needy worker, forced to go to it into wage slavery. Capital needs an army of the unemployed, pressing upon those employed and ready, under threat of starvation, to work for capitalists on any terms.

Capitalism brings working people poverty, its systematic deepening as a necessary condition for the growth of capitalist wealth. This finds expression in the general law of capitalist

accumulation: in the accumulation of wealth at one, ever-shrinking pole of society—on the side of the exploiters—and the accumulation of poverty and the torment of labor at the other, continuously growing pole—on the side of the working masses.

But the modern social character of the production process requires new production relations, under which man with his needs can and must become, by all objective necessity, its direct goal. For this, in modern society all necessary material prerequisites have matured. "The possibility," F. Engels pointed out, "through social production—of securing to all members of society an existence not only fully sufficient and every day becoming richer, but also guaranteeing them the completely free development and exercise of their physical and mental faculties—this possibility is now **actually reached** for the first time" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 286).

Only capitalist appropriation prevents the realization of this possibility, necessary for ensuring the progressive development of society according to its social character of production. Capitalist production relations have become fetters for the further development of productive forces, ceasing to correspond to their character, condemning the latter to stagnation and destruction. People faced the necessity of changing the character of appropriation, bringing production relations into accordance with the character of productive forces, giving scope for their development, replacing the capitalist mode of production with a higher, socialist one. And this means creating in society a new mode of distribution of the

means of production and members of society according to various types of production, a mode defining and corresponding to the distribution of products. Appropriation corresponding to the social character of machine production is, as is known, the appropriation of the means of production in the form of social property, giving rise to comradeship cooperation and mutual assistance of people free from exploitation, and securing the satisfaction of the needs of all members of society.

However, the realization of this natural social necessity is met with desperate resistance from the dying social class—the bourgeoisie, which is increasingly deeply recognized by the progressive forces of society—the working class and the working masses following it. Concentrating in its hands economic and political power, the bourgeoisie with all its might strives to retain its dominion, not to permit the economic law of obligatory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces to clear its way in society. Inscribing into the annals of history, in the vivid expression of K. Marx, with a flaming tongue of fire and sword, the establishment of capitalist production relations and the subjugation of working people to capitalist labor discipline, capitalism by all means of deceit and violence forces the working masses to submit to the capitalist law of their robbery, the law of enriching the owners of the means of production—the capitalists.

Ideologists of capitalism, defending the interests of the dying forces of society, strive in every way to prevent the consolidation of the progressive forces of society interested in

utilizing the law of obligatory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces, and consequently, inherent to social ownership of the means of production, new specific economic laws. Ideologists of the imperialist bourgeoisie conceal the real reasons for the progressive impoverishment of the working masses in capitalist society and the paths to overcoming it. They proclaim poverty and the torments of labor in existing society a natural phenomenon or a decree of Providence. Relatively recently, Pope Pius XII again cynically blessed working people to submit to the law of capitalist slavery, condemning their "desire to exclude from life any kind of suffering," calling to "patiently endure life," to reconcile with "inevitable deprivations" brought by the capitalist economic system.

Modern academic lackeys of the bourgeoisie—Russells, Vogts, and others—following the famous obscurantist of the period of the bloom of capitalism, the priest Malthus, declared the working people themselves to be the culprits of poverty. They call working people to labor and abstinence, and the bourgeois state—to clearing the earth of the "excess" population, justifying and praising imperialist wars, bacteriological and other means of exterminating people.

Under conditions of the general crisis of capitalism, when the contradictions inherent to the capitalist system have sharpened to the extreme, when the successes of socialism in our country reveal with special depth the advantages of the socialist economic system over the capitalist one, exposing before the whole world the incurable ulcers of capitalism, ideologists of capitalism, various Keyneses, Harrods, Johnstons, Attlees, and

others, strive to gloss over these vices, proclaiming the transformation of capitalism into "democratic capitalism" or "democratic socialism". They assert that through strengthening the control of the bourgeois state over capitalist production it is possible to achieve full employment of the population, softening of property inequality, and deliverance of society from poverty. But it has long been known that capitalist production is not in the hands of the bourgeois state; on the contrary, the bourgeois state is in the hands of capital. So-called control of the bourgeois state is control of the financial oligarchy over state power, used by monopoly capital for its own selfish interests. It has also long been known that "not a single capitalist will ever and on any account agree to the full liquidation of unemployment, to the abolition of the reserve army of the unemployed, the purpose of which is—to press upon the labor market, to secure cheaper paid labor hands" ("Questions of Leninism", p. 600, 10th ed.).

The great teachings of Marxism-Leninism tore away all veils of secrecy surrounding the essence of the capitalist mode of production. It armed the working class and the remaining progressive forces of society following it for the struggle to overthrow the rule of capital, to bring the forms of appropriation of the means of production into accordance with the social character of productive forces.

Social appropriation of the means of production excludes profit-making as the goal and stimulus of the development of social production. Man with his needs becomes the goal and stimulus of social production, that is, direct and moreover maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and

cultural requirements of all society. In this lies the essence of the socialist mode of production. The task of maximum satisfaction of human vital requirements determines all sides and all processes of the development of socialism. Without this there is no socialism.

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

Comrade Stalin, citing the indication of K. Marx that the worker in capitalist production objectively acts as a means of production, and not as an end in itself and the goal of production, notes that these last words of K. Marx are remarkable "in the respect that they outline that main goal, that main task, which must be set before socialist production" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 77. *Emphasis mine.—A. R.*).

V. I. Lenin as early as 1895–1896, drafting a program for the Social-Democratic Party, pointed out that under socialism "all improvements in production must go to the benefit of the working people themselves" (*Works*, Vol. 2, p. 80). Speaking of the task of socialist production, V. I. Lenin in 1902 formulated it as the socialist organization of the production of products "at the expense of society, to ensure full well-being and free, well-rounded development of all its members" (*Works*, Vol. 6, p. 12).

In contrast to the anarchist interpretation of socialism, Comrade Stalin as early as 1906 showed that future socialist society will not know exploitation of man by man and will open broad scope for the rapid development of productive forces. J. V. Stalin revealed and consistently explained the content and objective character of the goal of socialist production. "As you see," wrote Comrade Stalin in the work *Anarchism or Socialism?*, "the main goal of future production is—the direct satisfaction of the needs of society, and not the production of commodities for sale for the sake of increasing the profits of capitalists" (*Works*, Vol. 1, p. 334).

This insight of the classics of Marxism-Leninism into the future is a great scientific feat. Scientific proof of the necessity and possibility of a truly human life for all people transformed the utopian dream of socialism into a real task, solved by progressive social forces led by the working class. In the understanding of this simple truth in all its grandeur lies the whole difficulty of Marxism and all its power. This thought was remarkably expressed by V. I. Lenin: "Only socialism will give the possibility to broadly spread and genuinely subordinate social production and distribution of products according to scientific considerations, regarding how to make the life of all working people most easy, affording them the possibility of well-being. Only socialism can realize this. And we know that it must realize this, and in the understanding of such a truth lies all the difficulty of Marxism and all its power" (*Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 375–376).

Relying on an unshakable scientific foundation, firmly confident in the historical necessity of building socialism and

in their capacities to accomplish this task, the working class of our country, led by the party of Lenin-Stalin, marched to the socialist revolution, to socialism, the goal and content of which is the satisfaction of human vital requirements. Socialism and the well-being of the people are inseparable from each other. If the proletariat were not able to accomplish this goal, then the proletarian revolution would have been useless, and therefore not needed. "There was no point in overthrowing capital in October 1917 and building socialism over a number of years," said Comrade Stalin, "if we do not achieve that people live here in plenty. Socialism means not poverty and deprivation, but the abolition of poverty and deprivation, the organization of a prosperous and cultured life for all members of society" (*Works*, Vol. 13, pp. 357–358).

* * *

The Great October Socialist Revolution laid the beginning for the realization of the objective requirement of the material life of society—bringing the forms of appropriation of the means of production into accordance with the social character of production. With the victory of the socialist revolution, new economic conditions arose in our country, radically different from capitalism; socialist production relations arose. Social ownership of the means of production captured above all the commanding heights of the economy. Thereby, following the destruction of the political rule of the bourgeoisie, the economic rule of monopoly capital was destroyed.

In the emerging socialist sector of the national economy there is not and cannot be exploitation of man by man, for in it there are no opposed property owners of the means of production

and a hired worker deprived of them. Correspondingly, the relations of people in the process of production appear here not as relations of exploitation, but as relations of comradeship cooperation and mutual assistance of workers free from exploitation, distributing the products of consumption according to the quantity and quality of labor given to society.

The objective goal of the emerging socialist production emerged directly as man with his needs. To this goal the Soviet state from the very beginning consciously subordinated all development of socialist production, which was the sole source of genuine well-being for the people. The replacement of private ownership of the means of production and circulation by social ownership and the introduction of planned organization of the social production process occurred, as was recorded by the program of the party adopted at the VIII Congress, "...to ensure the well-being and well-rounded development of all members of society" ("VKP(b) in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenums of the CC", Pt. 1, p. 282). On this objective basis, the relations of the socialist sector with the remaining, existing transitional sectors from capitalism to socialism in the national economy of the country were also determined.

Nationalization of large and medium industry, railways, banks, etc., the creation of socialist commanding heights of the national economy radically undermined the economic power of the Russian bourgeoisie as a whole. The extraction from its hands, for example, of such a major nerve of economic life of the capitalist world as modern banks are in it, left the bourgeoisie without a soul, as Comrade Stalin figuratively

expressed the significance of nationalizing banks. All economic activity of the capitalist elements that still remained at that time (and small-scale peasant economy) turned out to be in special, unprecedented conditions for them. It proceeded under the rule of the proletariat, in the presence of nationwide ownership of the most important means of production, capturing the commanding heights of the economy, within the limits of which relations between people were built not on production and extraction of profit.

The emerging socialist sector was by no means something like a "box" that peacefully rolls into the future along tracks parallel with other sectors of social life, without affecting them. Comrade Stalin exposed the existing currency in economic literature of the transition period from capitalism to socialism of the bourgeois "theory" of equilibrium, which advocated similar parallel coexistence and development of sectors ("boxes") of the national economy. He pointed out that the development of sectors (sectors) of the Soviet national economy goes not on parallel tracks, but on intersecting ones, "in the order of fierce class struggle, a struggle not for life, but to the death, a struggle on the principle "who will beat whom"" (*Works*, Vol. 12, p. 144).

Capitalist and small commodity sectors in the Soviet national economy began to act under the leading role of the socialist sector, developing in the interests of all working people and placing other sectors in certain boundaries.

Together with new economic conditions of social life, there arose specific economic laws inherent to them. As a result of radical changes in the economic conditions of the life of

society, and as a result of the disappearance in it of monopoly capital, the basic economic law of modern capitalism lost its force in our country. It left the economic stage and yielded its place to the basic economic law of socialism, defining in the final analysis all content and direction of the development of the country's national economy.

The special conditions of economic activity in which the capitalist elements and small commodity producers were placed by the victory of the socialist revolution determined also the special character of the action of economic laws inherent to small commodity and capitalist relations. On the basis of understanding active economic laws, the Soviet power, giving scope to the action of economic laws of socialism, restricted in the interests of constructing socialist society the sphere of action of the law of capitalist lucre. This led in the final analysis to the impossibility of expanded reproduction of capital in our country, and consequently, to the disappearance in the future of economic processes of a capitalist order in the Soviet national economy.

In the interests of socialism, the sphere of action of the law of value was also restricted. It lost its all-encompassing character, ceased to be the law governing the development of social economy. Its elemental destructive force was curbed, it began to "work" to the detriment of capitalism, to the benefit of socialism.

But although the dying social forces were deprived of power and economic dominance in the country, they, relying on certain economic positions still remaining behind them, on their organizational-production and administrative experience,

on international connections, by all means, including military ones, resisted the implementation in our country of the law of obligatory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces. Summarizing the difficulties of building socialism in the first period after the October Revolution, Comrade Stalin indicated: "...We had to build under fire. Imagine a mason who, building with one hand, defends with the other the house he is building" (*Works*, Vol. 4, p. 390). Capitalist elements resisted the development of new economic relations, the understanding of economic laws inherent to them and their application, striving to restore capitalism, to return lost economic and political dominance. "...Our work on the socialist reconstruction of the national economy," noted Comrade Stalin, "cutting economic ties of capitalism and turning upside down all forces of the old world, cannot but evoke desperate resistance on the part of these forces" (*Works*, Vol. 12, p. 302). In stubborn and sharp struggle, the working class led by the party of Lenin-Stalin overcame this furious, overt and covert resistance of dying social forces to the construction of socialism.

The victory of the socialist revolution and the emergence in the national economy of our country of socialist production relations immediately with all sharpness raised the question of comprehensive theoretical generalization of the practice of socialist construction, of the discovery, understanding, and utilization in the interests of society of specific economic laws of socialism, scientifically foreseen by the classics of Marxism-Leninism in general terms even before the emergence of these laws. The Party, scientifically generalizing the practice of

socialist construction, discovered and continues to discover objective economic laws inherent to socialism, tirelessly deepened and continues to deepen the knowledge of these laws, in order to genuinely master them, to place them under the control of society, to utilize them with full knowledge of the matter in the interests of the whole of society. On this path, our party, led by Lenin and Stalin, had to overcome no small difficulties of both a practical and theoretical order.

Truly titanic work was performed by the leaders of our party Lenin and Stalin in the struggle against all enemy encroachments on socialist construction and Marxist theory. This was heroic work, in the process of which they defended the construction of socialism and the purity of Marxism. Lenin and Stalin developed Marxist theory further as applied to the conditions of victorious proletarian revolution and socialist construction, revealed the deepest content of economic laws inherent to socialism. On this scientific basis, they began and developed the most difficult and complex task of reorganizing the economic life of tens of millions of people, which could not be accomplished without overcoming the petty-bourgeois element that predominated then in our ruined country, agrarian in its economic profile, which presented a particularly acute danger to young socialism.

The petty-bourgeois element resisted in every way the socialist transformation of the economy, considering production and distribution of products from time immemorial a purely private affair, not subject to direct care of society. "...We built not a bourgeois economy," indicated Comrade Stalin in 1920, "where everyone, pursuing his private interests, does not care

about the state as a whole, does not set himself the question of planned organization of the economy on a state scale. No, we built a socialist society. This means that the needs of the whole of society must be taken into account, the economy must be organized in a planned, conscious manner on an all-Russian scale. There is no doubt that this task is incomparably more complex and difficult" (*Works*, Vol. 4, p. 390).

Together with V. I. Lenin, Comrade Stalin exposed anarcho-syndicalist tendencies that appeared at the first stage of socialist construction in individual sectors of socialist industry. Anarcho-syndicalists denied, essentially, the very meaning of socialist production, its goal and means of achieving it—satisfaction of material and cultural requirements of the whole of society on an advanced industrial base, organized on an all-state scale.

Together with V. I. Lenin, Comrade Stalin substantiated the necessity of socialist industrialization of the country, the necessity of developing heavy industry producing means of production, as the material basis of socialism, and hence as a means of achieving the internal goal inherent to socialist economy. As early as in a letter to V. I. Lenin regarding the book "Plan for Electrification of Russia," Comrade Stalin, casting aside Trotskyite-Bukharinite attempts to disrupt socialist construction, evaluated the bold scientific proposals of the Leninist GOELRO plan as the only Marxist attempt "to provide under the Soviet superstructure of economically backward Russia a genuinely real and single possible under current conditions technical-production base" (*Works*, Vol. 5, p. 50).

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

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

Developing together with V. I. Lenin the new economic policy and developing it further, Comrade Stalin emphasized that the key to understanding NEP is understanding the necessity of such relations with the peasantry, such an economic form of union of workers and peasants, which secured for them their economic interests and thereby led to the victory of socialism in our whole national economy. "The point here is not," taught Comrade Stalin, "to coddle the peasant and in this see the directive of establishing correct relations with him, for you will not go far on coddling, but the point is to help the peasant transfer his economy onto a new technical base, onto the technical base of modern large-scale production, for in this lies the main path of deliverance of the peasantry from poverty.

And to transfer the economy of the country onto a new technical base is impossible without a fast tempo of development of our industry and, above all, production of means of production" (*Works*, Vol. 11, p. 256).

On the paths of NEP there occurred an improvement in the material and cultural position of workers and peasants, without which it was impossible to move forward in the field of constructing socialism. On the paths of NEP there occurred the accumulation of necessary prerequisites for a radical improvement in the material and cultural position of the main mass of the peasantry, that is, preparation for the organization in the countryside of a general, artel, cooperative labor on the basis of advanced agricultural science and technology.

Retention of the commanding heights of the economy in the hands of the Soviet state and their rapid development, realization of socialist industrialization secured the transition to a socialist path of the main mass of the peasantry, displacement and liquidation of capitalist elements in all branches of the national economy.

"...Only collective farms give peasants a way out of poverty and ignorance," said Comrade Stalin (*Works*, Vol. 12, p. 220). Only the socialist path of agricultural development, the path of collectivization, gave the possibility in the course of several years to cover the whole country with large collective farms possessing the capacity to apply new technology, utilize all agronomic achievements, and give the country more commodity output (J. Stalin, "Speech at Pre-election Meetings of Voters of the Stalin Electoral District of Moscow, December 11, 1937 and February 9, 1946", pp. 20, 1951).

On the initiative of Soviet power, with the support of the main masses of the peasantry in the country, continuous collectivization was implemented, on the basis of which the most numerous capitalist class—kulaks—was liquidated. Socialism won also in the countryside. Man with his requirements became the direct goal of production in agricultural economy. The sphere of action of the basic economic law of socialism expanded, the action of the law deepened and developed.

Comrade Stalin exposed all attempts to distort the Marxist understanding of the socialist requirement for satisfying human needs. In the process of struggle for transferring the countryside onto a socialist path of development, the Bukharinite slogan "enrich yourselves" was exposed and cast aside, the essence of which consisted in substituting the socialist requirement of satisfying the needs of working people as the goal of social production with the bourgeois requirement of gain. This slogan meant, as Comrade Stalin points out (Vol. 13, p. 359), essentially a call—*to restore capitalism*. In the process of struggle for building socialism in our country, Comrade Stalin exposed and routed Trotskyite, Bukharinite, and other bourgeois attempts to substitute the Marxist theoretical working out of questions of the Soviet economy with bourgeois working out with the goal of disrupting the discovery and knowledge of economic laws of socialism, and hence, their utilization in the interests of society.

The bourgeoisie and its academic agents and lackeys always sought to poison the consciousness of the masses, to slander socialism, to instill in the masses a bourgeois concept of

socialism. They used for this erroneous theories of utopian socialism propagating universal asceticism and egalitarianism; they picked up discrediting socialism and leading to the restoration of capitalism anarchist teachings; they did not bypass the absurdity of Dühring's radical egalitarian socialism, propagating equality of living conditions, tastes, etc. The negative influence of petty-bourgeois views manifested in the spread of egalitarian tendencies, the extreme expression of which were so-called production communes, organized in individual enterprises by "leftist dizzy-heads," as Comrade Stalin called them. In these communes, wages of skilled and unskilled workers were equalizingly redistributed.

The Party led by Comrade Stalin routed all these hostile, petty-bourgeois views on socialism and egalitarian attempts, defended the Marxist understanding of equality, meaning the abolition of classes, equal freedom of all members of society from exploitation, equal obligation to work according to ability, and equal right to receive under socialism according to labor, and under communism—according to needs. "To draw the conclusion from this," points out Comrade Stalin, "that socialism requires leveling, equalization, leveling of needs of members of society, leveling of their tastes and personal life, that according to the plan of Marxists everyone must walk in identical suits and eat one and the same dishes, in one and the same quantity—means to talk platitudes and slander Marxism" (*Works*, Vol. 13, p. 355).

The requirement of socialism is not the leveling of personal needs, not bringing them to a "subsistence minimum," as takes place in bourgeois society, where to a working person the

possibility is given merely to vegetate, and not to live. The point is not about receiving means of existence in a quantity sufficient from the viewpoint of the capitalist labor market for the production and reproduction of labor power of normal quality. Under socialism, the point is about securing **maximum satisfaction of all diverse, constantly growing needs of culturally developed working people**.

Disclosing the content of the socialist requirement for satisfying human needs, Comrade Stalin at the XVII Party Congress said: "It would be foolish to think that socialism can be built on the basis of poverty and deprivations, on the basis of reducing personal needs and lowering the level of people's life to the level of the life of the poor, who moreover themselves no longer want to remain poor and press upward to a prosperous life. Who needs such, if one may say so, socialism? This would be not socialism, but a caricature of socialism. Socialism can be built only on the basis of a rapid growth of productive forces of society, on the basis of an abundance of products and goods, on the basis of a prosperous life of working people, on the basis of a rapid growth of culture. For socialism, Marxist socialism, means not reduction of personal needs, but every kind of their expansion and growth, not limitation or refusal of satisfying these needs, but comprehensive and full satisfaction of all needs of culturally developed working people" (*Works*, Vol. 13, pp. 359–360).

To this requirement is subordinated all development of socialist production. This is the goal of socialist social production, daily implemented by it through systematic improvement of the material and cultural position of working people, an

improvement that began with the liberation of man from exploitation. Together with the growth of socialist production, the well-being of the people grows and expands, ever more fully satisfying the needs of working people.

Socialist production has as its objective goal, teaches Comrade Stalin, securing maximum satisfaction of precisely these growing material and cultural requirements of society. Therefore, in raising the level of well-being of the people, socialist society proceeds not from the past, but from its growing needs **in the present**, from requirements that **are subject to satisfaction**. "One cannot refer to that," points out Comrade Stalin, "that earlier housing was less than now, and that, in view of this, one can rest content with the achieved results. One cannot also refer to that, that earlier supply of workers was much worse than now, and that, in view of this, one can content oneself with the existing situation. Only rotten and through-and-through decayed people can comfort themselves with references to the past. One must proceed not from the past, but from growing requirements of workers in the present. One must understand that conditions of existence of workers have changed with us radically. The worker today is not what he was earlier. The current worker, our Soviet worker, wants to live with satisfaction of all his material and cultural needs both in terms of food supply, and in terms of housing, and in terms of securing cultural and all other needs. He has the right to this, and we are obligated to secure him these conditions. True, he does not suffer from unemployment with us, he is free from the yoke of capitalism, he is no longer a slave, but a master of his cause. But this is little. He requires

securing all his material and cultural requirements, and we are obligated to fulfill this requirement of his. Do not forget that we ourselves now come forward with certain requirements to the worker,—requiring from him labor discipline, intense work, competition, shock-work. Do not forget that the vast majority of workers accepted these requirements of Soviet power with great enthusiasm and perform them heroically. Do not be surprised, therefore, that, fulfilling the requirements of Soviet power, workers in their turn will require from it fulfillment of its obligations regarding further improvement of material and cultural position of workers" (*Works*, Vol. 13, pp. 59–60).

At the same time, this growth of requirements of members of society under socialism, as under communism, has nothing in common and cannot have anything in common with bourgeois squandering, with the merchant principle "whatever my left foot wants," with petty-bourgeois, philistine "eyed" attitude to "state property". Socialist society is alien to excesses of the parasitic bourgeoisie.

The source securing the systematic growth of well-being of the people is continuously growing and perfecting socialist production. As early as 1906, Comrade Stalin foresaw that socialism, opening scope for rapid development of productive forces, will secure on this basis full satisfaction of all needs of working people. Summarizing the practice of socialist construction, Comrade Stalin untiringly emphasized this unbreakable interconnection between the goal of socialist production and the means of its achievement. The unity of the

one and the other embodies the basic economic law of socialism.

Comrade Stalin noted at the XVI Party Congress that the basis of growth of material well-being and cultural level of working people in our country is the growth of socialist national income. Speaking of conditions of a prosperous life of collective farmers (which applies to all working people), Comrade Stalin indicated that such a condition is honest labor in the collective farm, correct utilization of machines, livestock, correct cultivation of land, protection of collective farm property. "Socialism requires not idle living," teaches Comrade Stalin, "but that all people work honestly, work not for others, not for the rich and exploiters, but for themselves, for society" (*Works*, Vol. 13, p. 249).

Soviet people, working for themselves, for their people, produce ever more necessary means of production and means of existence for socialist society. The aggregate social product produced per year society distributes in such a way as to secure as a result of this a systematic growth of well-being of the people [6].

---

[6] In some articles on the basic economic law of socialism, authors (C. Sobol, Popelyukhov) inaccurately disclose the content of the goal of socialist production. Speaking of distribution in socialist society of the aggregate social product, they, in essence, do not disclose that distribution of the social product goes in the final analysis only in the name of satisfying human needs, that setting aside a part of the aggregate social product to satisfy requirements of production is **not an end in itself**, but a means of achieving the goal. In view of this error, an incorrect representation arises, as if socialist production has not one, but two goals, from which one is production for production...—a stance exposed by Comrade Stalin as harmful, anti-Marxist.

For this it is necessary, first of all, to set aside from the aggregate social product a part going to replace the expended means of production in the process of production, without which continuous development of production is generally impossible. For this it is necessary, secondly, to set aside a part of the aggregate social product for further expansion of production, without which it is impossible to produce an additional quantity of material and cultural goods in accordance with expanding requirements of society. For this it is necessary, thirdly, to set aside a part for satisfying various social needs (expenditures for administration, for cultural and everyday needs, social security, etc.). The remaining part of the aggregate social product socialist society distributes directly among its members.

This last part of the aggregate social product, together with the second and third parts of it, constitutes the national income of the country, which is the main basis of growth of well-being of the people. In socialist society, all 100% of national income belongs to society. Of these, about 75% society expends on satisfying personal material and cultural needs of working people, and the remainder—on social needs and expansion of production.

Every part of the aggregate social product, regardless of whether it goes to satisfy personal or production needs of working people, directly or indirectly, as K. Marx indicated, goes to the benefit of members of socialist society, serving the task of securing maximum satisfaction of their growing requirements.

Obviously, the more people are involved by society in production and the higher the productivity of their labor, the larger in its volume is the aggregate social product, the larger in its volume are those parts into which it is divided, and, consequently, the fuller is the satisfaction of diverse requirements of people. Labor productivity growth, outstripping the growth of wages and pay according to work-days, secures expansion of production, growth of social wealth. On this basis, Soviet society implements a systematic raising of the material and cultural level of working people, maximum satisfaction of their growing requirements.

Socialist society, arising from the womb of capitalism, retains by force of this for a certain time so-called birthmarks of the old society. This cannot fail to exert an influence on the implementation of the goal of socialist production. "...One cannot think," indicated V. I. Lenin, "that having overthrown capitalism, people immediately learn to work for society without any norms of right, for economic prerequisites of such a change capitalism *does not give immediately*" (*Works*, Vol. 25, p. 439).

In socialist society, subordination of man to the inherited division of labor still remains, essentially binding him to one or another profession for his whole life. Here there still remain at first the opposition, and later, with overcoming it, essential distinctions between town and country, between mental and physical labor. Labor to a significant degree remains still only a means for life, becoming only as socialism develops to a greater degree the first vital need of people. Productive forces, having received with the victory of the socialist revolution

scope for their development, only now approach that level when all sources of collective wealth pour forth in a full stream, as K. Marx noted, creating a high abundance in the country necessary for distribution of products according to needs.

Under these conditions, characteristic for socialism as the first phase of new, communist society, maximum satisfaction of growing requirements of people can be realized only through consistent implementation of the socialist principle of distribution according to labor. "Marx and Lenin say," teaches J. V. Stalin, "that the difference between skilled labor and unskilled labor will exist even under socialism, even after the destruction of classes, that only under communism must this difference disappear, in view of which "wages" even under socialism must be issued according to labor, and not according to needs" (*Works*, Vol. 13, p. 57).

Obviously, the higher the labor activity of a member of socialist society, the fuller his personal requirements are satisfied. The higher the labor activity and labor productivity of Soviet people, the larger is social wealth and lower are prices on consumer items, the higher are real incomes of working people and fuller satisfaction of requirements of everyone.

Socialist production by its internal nature at all stages of its development was subordinated to the task of securing maximum satisfaction of constantly growing material and cultural requirements of working people. It is incorrect to demarcate material and cultural requirements of people, establishing a sequence in their satisfaction. This is refuted by all practice of socialist construction. It is sufficient to recall the

unprecedented in history scope and growth of cultural-educational and educational work in our country, deployed immediately after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, transfer to working people of the housing fund belonging prior to this to the bourgeoisie, growth of housing construction, liquidation of urban slums, growth of population nobility and liquidation of unemployment and poverty, growth of funds and real content of wages, etc., to be convinced that growth of material and cultural level of working people's life proceeded and proceeds in Soviet society in an inseparable unity. However, certain authors, for example, P. Mstislavsky (see his article in No. 1 of the journal "Novy Mir" for 1953), in their articles on the basic economic law of socialism devise contrived scales of priority in satisfying at first material, then cultural requirements of Soviet people, vulgarizing the Marxist understanding of the goal of social production under socialism and its implementation.

Satisfaction of material and cultural requirements of its members socialist society implements mainly through Soviet trade. Soviet trade is a necessary form of distribution and exchange of products in socialist society. It is that link in the system of socialist national economy without which its development is impossible. Indeed, in society a situation is possible when there is available output of industrial and agricultural production, growth of requirements increasing demand on the part of the population for this output, and with all this the commodity does not reach the consumer. In this case "economic life," says Comrade Stalin, "not only cannot be

beating with a key, but on the contrary—will be upset and disorganized to the foundation" (*Works*, Vol. 13, p. 340).

Soviet trade, being trade of a special kind, without capitalists and speculators, binds into a single whole requirements of Soviet consumers to production and supply of socialist production to consumers. Soviet trade, realizing production of socialist enterprises, takes into account growing demand and requirements of the consumer and brings them to the knowledge of production. Well-organized cultural Soviet trade promotes the best realization of growing real incomes of working people, improvement of material well-being of Soviet people.

The goal of socialist production—direct satisfaction of human requirements—is a powerful constant engine of development of socialist production. On the basis of growth of requirements (purchasing power), the Soviet people present to socialist production ever new and new requirements. Steady growth of demand for products of industry and agriculture creates an objectively growing base of socialist production. "...Our industry," indicated Comrade Stalin, "can develop and strengthen only in so far as our internal market develops and expands, the capacity of this market, mass demand for industrial commodities. And by what is expansion of internal market, strengthening of its capacity determined? It is determined, among other things, by systematic lowering of prices on industrial commodities..." (*Works*, Vol. 9, pp. 194–195). Lowering of prices, increasing the capacity of the internal market, exerts a stimulating influence on the perfection of socialist production. Solvent demand outstrips the growth of

socialist production and presents to it ever new and new requirements, pushing it to continuous expansion and perfection.

But this does not mean that satisfying constantly growing material and cultural requirements of Soviet people requires development of production primarily of consumer goods. V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin showed that the key to development of production of consumer goods is development of heavy socialist industry. Heavy industry secures economic independence of the country; it gives means of production that allow reconstructing the whole national economy, placing under it a new technical base. Development of machine-building is the basis of growth of technical equipment of labor, consequently, growth of its productivity in all branches of the national economy, and means, in branches producing consumer goods—secures in the final analysis an abundance in the country of personal consumption items.

Comrade Stalin, working out questions of industrialization of our country, repeatedly emphasized that the point is above all about socialist heavy industry with its heart—machine-building. Heavy industry serves as the basis for implementing the goal of the socialist mode of production. Comrade Stalin routed hostile attempts to substitute the steel foundation securing maximum satisfaction of material and cultural requirements of society with a "calico" foundation. Enemies, notes Comrade Stalin, said: "What do we need your industrialization and collectivization, machines, metallurgy, tractors, combines, automobiles for? You would better give more manufactures, buy better more raw materials for

production of consumer goods and give more to the population of all those small things that brighten human life. Creation of industry with our backwardness, and moreover a first-class industry—is a dangerous dream".

Exposing these bourgeois-capitalist, treacherous views, Comrade Stalin indicated: "Of course, we could with 3 billion rubles of currency, obtained through the hardest economy and spent on the creation of our industry,—we could turn them to import of raw materials and intensification of production of items of broad consumption. This is also a kind of "plan". But with such a "plan" we would have neither metallurgy, nor machine-building, nor tractors and automobiles, nor aviation and tanks. We would find ourselves disarmed before external enemies. We would undermine the bases of socialism in our country. We would find ourselves in captivity to the bourgeoisie, internal and external" ("Questions of Leninism", p. 488, 11th ed. *Emphasis mine.—A. R.*).

On the basis of continuous growth and perfection of socialist production, on the basis of new technology, with priority, primary development and perfection of heavy industry, the working class of our country solved and solves the task of securing maximum satisfaction of growing requirements of the Soviet people. Namely expanded reproduction of means of production, securing expanded socialist reproduction as a whole, gives the possibility of continuous expansion of production of consumer items, and consequently, satisfaction of growing requirements of the population.

Solution of this main task pushes the development of socialist production forward, conditions its continuous growth and

perfection. Growing solvent demand of the population requires not only an increase in the quantity of production of consumer products, but also cheapening them and improving their quality. All branches of the national economy present continuously intensifying demand for new machines, instruments, and apparatuses, require perfection of production processes, their electrification and automatization, mechanization of labor, etc. All branches of socialist economy broadly consume products of heavy industry (including and above all heavy industry itself), securing both its expansion and perfection.

In dialectical interaction of the goal of socialist production and means of its realization lies the source of steady surge of socialist national economy and strengthening of economic power of our motherland.

Disclosing the connection and interaction of the goal of socialist production and means securing realization of this goal, it is necessary also to emphasize that systematic raising of the material and cultural level of the people's life is a condition for continuous, steady growth of production, its rationalization, growth of technology, guarantees crisis-free development of the economy.

Continuously growing and perfecting socialist production on the basis of higher technology not only does not create a threat of overproduction, but requires for securing smooth development the creation of certain reserves. And the Soviet state, as a thrifty master, specially creates in all branches of the national economy state reserves. These reserves are necessary to cover shortages that may arise for various reasons in one or

another sector of our huge economy. Presence of reserves secures smooth movement of all socialist economy, and means, smooth satisfaction of all requirements of society.

This harmonious relationship between production and consumption, between the first and second subdivisions of social production, is determined by the basic economic law of socialism, which for the realization of its tasks requires planned, proportional development of the national economy, without which continuous growth and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher technology is impossible.

In its turn, the law of planned, proportional development of the national economy does not exist and cannot exist without the presence of the basic economic law of socialism defining the task of socialist management. The basic economic law of socialism gives full scope to the action of the law of planned development and other economic laws of socialism, defining the task corresponding to the essence of the socialist mode of production.

The action of the basic economic law of socialism is an inexhaustible source of systematic growth of labor creative activity of working people, a powerful stimulus of well-rounded development of personality in socialist society.

"Under capitalism," points out Comrade Stalin, "labor has a private, personal character. Worked out more, receive more and live for yourself, as you know. Nobody knows you and wants to know. You work for capitalists, you enrich them? And how else? For them to enrich you? For you and for yours, to enrich exploiters. You do not agree with this,—go into the

ranks of the unemployed and vegetate as you know,—we will find others, more compliant. Therefore labor of people is not highly valued under capitalism" ("Questions of Leninism", pp. 499–500).

Under socialism, together with unemployment disappeared uncertainty of working people in tomorrow. With liquidation of exploitation disappeared forced labor with its private, personal, disuniting people character. Social ownership of the means of production united all workers of socialist society in a single field of socialist labor. Here every person works not abandoned, not alone, not for a capitalist, but together, in full view of all, works for himself, for the Soviet people. Therefore labor of every worker in socialist society is not a private, personal affair, but a social affair, and the worker himself, by characterization of Comrade Stalin, is a kind of public figure. There grows a sense of social duty, a sense of responsibility before society for the quality of one's labor.

Socialism shatters the shameful view on labor as a shameful, heavy burden, as a despicable occupation, a view engendered by exploitative system, where freedom from labor for exploiters is the most desirable "cause".

"...Under Soviet order," notes Comrade Stalin, "a worker looks at the factory no longer as a prison, but as something near and dear for his cause, in the development and in the improvement of which he is vitally interested. Hardly is it necessary to prove that this new attitude of workers to the factory, to enterprise, this feeling of closeness of workers to enterprise is the greatest engine of all our industry" (*Works*, Vol. 10, p. 120).

Industrial and agricultural socialist enterprises in which Soviet people work are equipped with the most advanced modern technology. In Soviet conditions, technology not only raises labor productivity, but also lightens, in contrast to capitalist application of technology, the labor of the worker. As labor mechanization and production automatization proceed, working people are more and more liberated from heavy and harmful to health production operations.

For the development of technically highly-equipped production, deep mastering by workers of production technology is necessary. V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin repeatedly pointed to the huge significance of this cause for the development of socialism. "Technology without people who have mastered technology—is dead," points out Comrade Stalin.—"Technology led by people who have mastered technology can and must give wonders" ("Questions of Leninism", p. 490). And this requires systematic raising of cultural-technical level of both ordinary and supervisory cadres of production, raising labor of the worker to the level of engineering-technical labor, and labor of collective farmers—to the level of agrotechnical labor. Development of socialist production requires further raising of general educational level of the population. All this in aggregate leads to liquidation of essential distinctions between mental and physical labor, between town and country.

New attitude of workers and peasants to production as to their near and dear cause, accelerating development of production, especially vividly manifested in socialist competition, which from simplest forms—communist subbotniks, which were, in

evaluation of V. I. Lenin, "first sprouts of communism,"—grew into a movement of millions, into an all-nation movement for continuous growth and perfection of socialist production, for a surge of economic power of the USSR.

Theory and practice of scientific socialism overturned and smashed to dust the view spread by the bourgeoisie and its lackeys that a radical improvement of material position of working people leads to lowering of their working capacity. Such an assertion with full candor was expressed by a well-known petty-bourgeois economist Sismondi. "At that time as wealth is produced by his labor (that is, labor of the worker—*A. R.*),—wrote Sismondi,—this same wealth would make him less capable of labor if he began to enjoy it himself" (J. C. L. Sismondi "New Principles of Political Economy", Vol. 1, pp. 183–184, 1936).

Construction of socialism showed that improvement of material and cultural position of working people leads to an unprecedented in history development of their labor activity, on the basis of which a completely new attitude of people to labor is cultivated, as to a matter of honor, a matter of glory, a matter of valor and heroism. Together with growth of material and cultural level of Soviet people, labor productivity rapidly grows in our country, catching up with and overtaking in this respect the main capitalist countries. As V. I. Lenin, Comrade Stalin repeatedly emphasized the significance of high labor productivity for the victory and development of socialism. "Why can, must, and necessarily will socialism defeat the capitalist system of economy?" asked Comrade Stalin. And answered: "Because it can give higher standards of labor,

higher labor productivity than the capitalist system of economy. Because it can give society more products and can make society richer than the capitalist system of economy" ("Questions of Leninism", p. 491).

Comrade Stalin pointed out to us also main paths of solving this task. This is first of all the path of systematic improvement of material position of working people, the path of strengthening comradeship labor discipline, the path of organizing socialist competition and shock-work. All this on the basis of improving technology and rational organization of labor. Stakhanovite movement, as the highest stage of socialist competition, arose precisely on the basis of a radical improvement of material well-being of the Soviet people. "Life has become better, comrades," said Comrade Stalin.—"Life has become joyful. And when life is joyful, work goes well. From here high output norms. From here heroes and heroines of labor. In this lies first of all the root of the Stakhanovite movement" ("Questions of Leninism", p. 499). The Soviet state, emphasizing social significance of creative labor, introduced awarding advanced workers of labor with orders and medals, established for them honorary labor titles, topped with the highest title of Hero of Socialist Labor.

Continuous surge of well-being of Soviet people, confidence of theirs in tomorrow secure rapid growth of population of the Soviet Union. This growth leaves far behind itself population growth of any capitalist country. There is disclosed the corresponding socialist law of population, according to which any population growth finds for itself a place in life.

Comrade Stalin in his works disclosed that all sides and all processes of socialist production are determined by requirements of the basic economic law of socialism. These requirements are the basis of development of socialist society. Not for nothing Comrade Stalin along with internal conditions of development of Soviet system points first of all to internal conditions, to the necessity of constant satisfaction of growing material and cultural requirements of Soviet people. "...Soviet system and dictatorship of the proletariat,—says Comrade Stalin,—can develop only under condition of steady surge of material and cultural state of working class, under condition of steady improvement of position of all working people of the Soviet country" (*Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 96–97).

Basic economic law of socialism determines all multifaceted activity of the Party and Soviet state, securing rapid growth of socialist production both in town and in countryside. Sufficient to say that in the USSR over 35 years, despite huge losses inflicted on our national economy by World War II, industrial production grew 39 times. Industrial production, for example, in the USA, enriched moreover in the war, grew over these same years in total by 2.6 times, wherein necessary to note that this growth was achieved mainly due to war production.

Soviet state, guided by the basic economic law, secured continuous growth of number of workers and employees. At the end of 1952, number of workers and employees constituted already 41.7 million people, exceeding 1913 level by more than 25 million. In the capitalist world today there are numbered about 45 million unemployed and semi-unemployed. Unemployment in our country, as is known, since 1930 does

not exist and in trace. With us disappeared poverty in countryside and firm confidence of all Soviet people in tomorrow is secured. "You will ask—where went 20–30 million of hungry poor? They passed into collective farms, settled there and successfully build their prosperous life" (J. Stalin "Speech at Conference of Advanced Combine-Drivers", p. 9. 1935).

Steadily grows national income of our country. Fund and real content of wages of workers and employees increases, as well as incomes of collective farms and collective farmers, network of Soviet trade expands. Only for the period from 1940 to 1951 national income of the USSR grew by 83%. Real incomes of workers and employees calculated per one working person in 1951 were higher than in 1940 by approximately, as indicated in his report at the XIX Party Congress by Comrade Malenkov, 57%, and real incomes of peasants calculated per one working person were higher by approximately 60%. In the capitalist world real wages steadily fall. In the USA over last 5 years it fell by 17%. At the same time colossal profits of monopoly magnates of capital grew.

On the basis of known and applied by socialist society basic economic law of socialism there occurs steady raising of general educational level of the population, growth of production qualification of working people, growth of cultural and everyday institutions, housing construction, growth of funds of state social insurance and security, etc. Number of students in the USSR increased over last 10 years by almost 8 million people and constitutes at present 57 million. By 2.2 times increased in comparison with pre-war time quantity of

specialists with higher and secondary education working in national economy. Only for post-war years built in the country 23,500 schools, over 155 million square meters of housing space. In rural localities built over 3.8 million housing units. In 1951 working people of town and country received at the expense of social insurance and security 125 billion rubles, which is more than 3 times higher than data of 1940. In all this manifested action of basic economic law of socialism, realization of its requirements.

Goal of activity of the party and Soviet state fully expressed Comrade Stalin in his soulful words, noting that for members of CC, members of government there is no other life than life for our great cause, than life for struggle for general well-being of the people, for joy for all working people, for million masses.

Summarizing experience of socialist construction, Comrade Stalin directed our attention to the great goal of socialist production. Still on the threshold of victory of socialism in whole national economy Comrade Stalin revealed essential features of socialist system of economy.

"Soviet system of economy means,—indicates Comrade Stalin at XVI Party Congress,—that:

1. power of class of capitalists and landlords is overthrown and replaced by power of working class and laboring peasantry;
2. tools and means of production, land, factories, plants, etc., are taken away from capitalists and transferred to ownership of working class and laboring masses of peasantry;

3. development of production is subordinated not to principle of competition and securing capitalist profit, but to principle of planned guidance and systematic surge of material and cultural level of working people;
4. distribution of national income occurs not in interests of enriching exploitative classes and their numerous parasitic retinue, but in interests of systematic raising of material position of workers and peasants and expansion of socialist production in town and country;
5. systematic improvement of material position of working people and continuous growth of their requirements (purchasing power), being constantly growing source of expanding production, guarantees working people from crises of overproduction, growth of unemployment and poverty;
6. working class and laboring peasantry are masters of country, working not for capitalists, but for their laboring people" (*Works*, Vol. 12, pp. 320–321).

In this generalization Comrade Stalin gave us deepest scientific characterization of socialist system of economy, revealed and systematized inherent to it economic laws governing production and distribution of material goods under socialism. He showed those ties and interdependence of parts of socialist production, which reveal unity and integrity of socialism: he revealed main, primary goal—task of social production under socialism and means of its achievement, which constitutes essence of basic economic law of socialism.

Maximum satisfaction of material and cultural requirements of whole society is secured by continuous growth and perfection

of socialist production on the basis of higher technology. Goal of social production requires continuous growth of production. As a whole all these requirements of basic economic law secure continuous surge of labor productivity, rapid development of science and technology. Realized goal calls high population growth, finest capital, by characterization of Comrade Stalin, which society possesses. Basic economic law of socialism secures development and strengthening of comradeship cooperation and mutual assistance of people free from exploitation, raises sense of responsibility and pride of people for their labor. Basic economic law of socialism determines creation and accumulation of all conditions of gradual transition from socialism to communism.

* * *

Majestic task of gradual transition from socialism to communism objectively put forward by development of material life of our society. And precisely because this task stood before us as direct task of our days, special significance acquires theoretical reflection of paths into future, disclosure of sprouts of future in present. Penetration into future can be successful only on the basis of scientific generalization of past and present. All this defines significance of new brilliant work of Comrade Stalin *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, in which resolved all main questions of political economy of socialism, in which comprehensively scientifically substantiated, revealed and with ultimate clarity formulated basic economic law of socialism.

Basic economic law of socialism discovered and substantiated by great Stalin in sharpest struggle with overt and covert

enemies of socialism, with carriers of petty-bourgeois leveling, sectarian understanding of socialism as poverty, with revivers of kulak slogan of Bukharinites "enrich yourselves," with all attempts to disrupt construction of socialism and prevent utilization in interests of society of objective economic laws of socialism.

Being greatest contribution into treasure-house of Marxist-Leninist theory, new brilliant work of Comrade Stalin serves as guide to action.

Securing our victorious movement forward, to communism, Comrade Stalin exposed hindering this movement, fraught with great dangers for society remnants of defeated by the party un-Marxist, subjective-idealist, voluntaristic viewpoints, Bogdanovite-Bukharinite views on laws of political economy of socialism. He armed us with knowledge of these laws and their main link—basic economic law of socialism, mobilizing and organizing all our forces and capacities for conscious and active struggle for gradual transition of society from socialism to communism.

Soviet people led by their brilliant leader and teacher Comrade Stalin blazes reliable path for all humanity into its beautiful future—communism.

9. ON THE COEXISTENCE OF THE TWO SYSTEMS—CAPITALIST AND SOCIALIST

I. A. SELEZNEV

The powerful worldwide movement to prevent a third world war, to preserve a durable and lasting peace, which has unfolded for the first time in human history, is a general democratic movement. It encompasses the working class, the peasantry, the petty and middle bourgeoisie. People of the most diverse political views and religious convictions, adherents and defenders of various social systems, take part in the modern movement of peace supporters. Despite the heterogeneous social composition of the peace supporters, this movement represents a tremendous force united by a single goal and will. Peace supporters set for themselves a completely definite, limited task: to prevent a third world war and to preserve the existing peace.

Peace supporters believe—and this is one of the principles of this movement—that peace can be preserved on the basis of the coexistence of capitalism and communism. For this, it is necessary only to force the existing governments of capitalist countries to pursue a policy of cooperation with socialist countries; and if these governments will not do this, then they should be replaced by governments of a bloc of democratic parties. Thus, the modern movement for peace does not aim at the overthrow of the capitalist system, this source of aggressive wars, and therefore it bears not a socialist, but a democratic character.

“The modern peace movement,” teaches J. V. Stalin, “aims to rally the popular masses to the struggle for the preservation of peace, for preventing a new world war. Consequently, it does not pursue the goals of overthrowing capitalism and establishing socialism—it is limited to the democratic goals of the struggle for the preservation of peace” (J. V. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 36. Gospolitizdat. 1952).

Communists are the most active and selfless fighters for a democratic peace, for preventing a third world war. Proceeding from the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, they believe that all wars will become impossible only with the liquidation of capitalism and the victory of communism throughout the world, that a lasting peace is impossible until a society based on private ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of man by man is liquidated.

However, Communists know how in every given historical period of society's development to see its specific features and, on the basis of a scientific analysis of these features, to build their policy, strategy, and tactics. It is known that wars are a general regularity of antagonistic society, but in different periods of the development of class society, the manifestation of this historical regularity has its own characteristics. In the era of imperialism, when a worldwide system of capitalist economy was formed and a close interdependence between countries was established, wars between capitalist states take on a global character. At the same time, the resistance of the broad masses of the people to imperialist wars is constantly growing. Imperialism is the era of proletarian revolutions,

leading to the falling away, one after another, of capitalist countries from the system of imperialism and their joining the growing and strengthening camp of socialist states.

Under current conditions, such a situation has developed in the international arena that the world has turned out to be split into two opposite camps: the imperialist camp, in which imperialism, by virtue of the economic laws of its development, inevitably generates wars, in connection with which there exists the danger of a new world war; and the socialist camp, in which the possibility of wars is fundamentally excluded, for it does not stem from the essence of the socialist system of economy and the action of its economic laws. Socialist states, vitally interested in peace, resolutely fight against the danger of a third world war prepared by the states of the imperialist camp headed by the USA.

Taking into account all the features of the current situation, Communists believe that under present conditions the possibility of preventing a new world war has been created. The movement of peace supporters is one of the powerful factors contributing to the prevention of a new world war.

"The achievement of this goal," said G. M. Malenkov, "would be, under present historical conditions, a huge victory for democracy and peace" (G. M. Malenkov, *Report to the XIX Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 25. Gospolitizdat. 1952).

Slanderers against Communists from the camp of warmongers (Acheson, D. Dulles, Taft, Fuller, and others) and their Right-

Socialist lackeys try to "prove" that from the worldview of Communists there allegedly follows a denial of the possibility of peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism, that the USSR allegedly does not strive for "peaceful coexistence" with capitalist countries. By this slander, the imperialists try to justify their aggressive policy aimed at unleashing a third world war. They want to mislead world public opinion by spreading foul fables that the threat of war allegedly comes from the socialist states.

The founders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, gave Communists a powerful ideological weapon in the struggle against imperialist slanderers. Having deeply scientifically substantiated a new theory of socialist revolution, they proved the necessity and possibility of the coexistence of capitalism and communism over a more or less prolonged historical period.

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin on the Inevitability of a Period of Coexistence of Capitalism and Communism

The tendency toward the expansion and strengthening of global economic, political, and cultural ties between peoples in the progressive development of human society represents a historical regularity. The history of the development of modes of production and the history of the development of exchange associated with it show that over many centuries an unswerving objective process of growth of large-scale production and expansion of worldwide economic, political, and cultural ties between the peoples of the whole world took place. This objective process developed and continues to

develop independently of the will and desire of people "Growth of exchange, growth of large-scale production," wrote V. I. Lenin, "—these are the main tendencies observed over centuries absolutely throughout the world" (*Works*, Vol. 22, p. 91).

The development of economic, political, cultural, and other ties between peoples took on the broadest character in the era of capitalism.

At the highest stage of capitalism—in the era of imperialism—international economic, political, national, cultural, and other ties expanded even further. A global system of capitalist economy was formed, where the economic and political dependence of one country on another acquired a universal character. This progressive in its objective content process of internationalization of production and exchange, which led to economic convergence and the gradual unification of vast territories into a single all-encompassing world economic market, was carried out not on the basis of voluntary and equal unification of peoples, but on the basis of robbery, violence, war, and brutal, savage suppression of less developed peoples. The imperialist method of "economic unification" of territories and peoples, carried out by the bourgeoisie, inevitably led to attempts by the most powerful powers to win monopoly economic and political dominance. But these attempts usually ended in collapse.

Only the advanced and most revolutionary class of modern society—the proletariat—is capable in practice of solving the progressive task of organizing a single world economy on the

basis of voluntariness and equality of peoples, because it solves this task by creating a society on the principles of friendly cooperation and socialist mutual assistance of people free from exploitation. Only a socialist revolution and its victory on a world scale will give the opportunity to realize the complete unification of peoples in a single world economy. The victory of socialism on a world scale will finally destroy the fragmentation of humanity and any isolation of nations.

It is impossible to establish a single and all-encompassing system of world socialist economy by a single act. In the era of pre-monopoly capitalism, Marx and Engels believed that the socialist revolution must take place in all or most civilized countries simultaneously. For their time, this theory was the only correct one. If the socialist revolution had won in all or most civilized countries, the process of forming a single world system of communist economy would have occurred more or less simultaneously. But in the new historical era associated with the transition of capitalism to the stage of imperialism, it turned out that the socialist revolution cannot win in all countries or in most countries simultaneously. V. I. Lenin, on the basis of a deep analysis of the features of the development of capitalism in the imperialist era, came to the conclusion that it is possible to break through the imperialist front by the proletariat initially in one individual country; that the victory of socialism in one country is possible, and the impossibility of such a victory in all or most civilized countries simultaneously, owing to the uneven development of capitalism in these countries and, consequently, the uneven maturation of the proletarian revolution in them.

Proceeding from this, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin believed that the formation of a single world system of socialist economy is a prolonged process of development of the world socialist revolution, a process of gradual and steady falling away, one after another, of capitalist countries from the world system of capitalist economy and their joining the growing and strengthening socialist economic system. In the process of forming a single world system of communist economy, a more or less prolonged period of coexistence of the capitalism leaving the historical arena and the growing, strengthening communism is inevitable.

Historical experience has confirmed the correctness of the Leninist-Stalinist theory of socialist revolution. In the course of the development of the world socialist revolution, an entire camp of socialist states was formed, uniting more than a third of the population of the globe. Socialist states exist alongside capitalist states.

The main regularities in the relations between socialist countries and capitalist countries were uncovered by V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin. Lenin and Stalin showed that with regard to socialist countries, two tendencies are possible on the part of capitalist states: a tendency toward armed struggle against socialist states and a tendency toward peaceful coexistence with them over a more or less prolonged period.

Lenin and Stalin foresaw that the victory of the socialist revolution in one country would cause furious hatred and enmity of the international bourgeoisie toward the world's first proletarian state, that the international bourgeoisie would make repeated attempts to rush at the proletarian state and strangle it.

Lenin warned the proletariat about this as early as 1916 in his famous article "The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution," in which he pointed out that the victory of the proletarian revolution in one country must cause "not only friction, but a direct striving of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the victorious proletariat of the socialist state. In these cases, a war on our part would be legitimate and just" (*Works*, Vol. 23, p. 67).

Comrade Stalin, developing V. I. Lenin's propositions on the regularity of the coexistence of capitalism and communism, repeatedly warned the Soviet people about the danger of intervention by imperialist states against the Soviet Union. "We do not live on an island," said J. V. Stalin in 1926. "We live in a capitalist encirclement. That circumstance—that we are building socialism and revolutionizing by this very fact the workers of capitalist countries—cannot fail to cause hatred and enmity on the part of the entire capitalist world. To think that the capitalist world can look indifferently at our successes on the economic front, successes revolutionizing the working class of the whole world—means to fall into an illusion" (*Works*, Vol. 8, pp. 262–263).

In 1934, Comrade Stalin, noting facts of hostile actions of imperialists toward the USSR, set before the Soviet people the task "to take all measures to guard our country against surprises and to be ready for its defense against attack" (*Works*, Vol. 13, p. 305).

The entire period of the world socialist revolution, which began in October 1917, is filled with a fierce struggle between the old, dying world of capitalism and the new, growing and

thriving world of socialism. Imperialists repeatedly tried to strangle the Soviet socialist state, organized interventionist campaigns, staged various provocations and blockades, but each time these campaigns of the imperialists were broken against the insurmountable fortitude of the peoples who had won freedom and learned the joy of liberated labor.

One of the attempts to crush the country of socialism was undertaken by international imperialists in 1941 through Hitlerite Germany. But the Soviet Union smashed the enemies, grew even stronger, and the capitalist system as a whole suffered a severe defeat, which led to a weakening of the imperialist front, to an even greater sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism, and to a tremendous strengthening of the camp of socialism and democracy.

American imperialists, who now head all reactionary forces, are preparing a new world war against the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and the European people's democratic states. They are creating military bases, cobbling together aggressive military blocs of socialist and democratic countries, organizing subversive, espionage, and sabotage activities against them, and sending their agents—especially into communist and workers' parties. To conduct this criminal activity, the ruling circles of the USA allocated 100 million dollars in October 1951. But it would not hurt the gentlemen imperialists to remember the lessons of history and take into account the facts of the past.

“And these facts,” notes Comrade G. M. Malenkov, “speak to the fact that as a result of the First World War, Russia fell away from the system of capitalism, while as a result of the Second

World War, an entire series of countries in Europe and Asia fell away from the system of capitalism. There is every reason to believe that a third world war will cause the collapse of the world capitalist system" (*Report to the XIX Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 33).

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin repeatedly pointed out that relations between countries of socialism and countries of capitalism cannot be limited only to their mutual struggle. It would be incorrect and deeply erroneous to suppose that capitalism and communism, being antipodes, two mutually opposed and mutually exclusive sides, must continuously be in a state of bloody struggle with one another. Only inveterate enemies of peace, warmongers, or vulgarizers and Talmudists who do not understand the essence of Marxist-Leninist theory can reason in this way.

Comrade Stalin teaches that despite the fact that the contradiction between capitalism and socialism is stronger than the contradictions between capitalist countries (theoretically this is beyond any doubt), nevertheless, it is wrong to think that capitalist countries can easily unite into a solid coalition and act against socialist countries. Practically, it is difficult for them to achieve this for three reasons: first, because the desire to drown one's competitors in the struggle for markets turns out practically stronger than the contradictions between the camp of capitalism and the camp of socialism; second, capitalists understand that a war against the USSR is more dangerous for the fates of capitalism than a war among themselves, for in such a war it is a question not of the predominance of one group of powers over another group, but of the existence of

capitalism itself as a system of economy; third, imperialists, despite the widespread noise about the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, themselves do not believe in its aggressiveness, as they take into account the peaceful policy of the USSR and know that the Soviet Union itself will not attack capitalist countries. The history of the Second World War shows that it began not with a war against the USSR, but with a war among capitalist countries.

Marxism-Leninism holds that the contradiction that arose at a certain stage of human development between dying capitalism and growing communism does not necessarily have to be resolved by armed struggle between them. The force capable of overthrowing capitalism and establishing communism in every country is the proletariat. Attempts by imperialists to accuse the Soviet Union and the people's democracies of wanting to attack capitalist countries and establish a communist regime in them are slanderous fabrications. The collapse of capitalism and the victory of communism are equally inevitable. But this will happen not through the export of revolution, but on the basis of further development and revolutionary resolution of internal contradictions inherent in capitalism.

The Soviet government, the Communist Party, in conducting their internal and external policies, have never been oriented toward deciding the fate of world capitalism by an armed action of the Soviet Union against capitalist countries.

The necessity of peaceful coexistence between capitalism and communism is dictated by objective economic conditions. This necessity consists in general worldwide economic relations formed on the basis of the international division of labor.

After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the economic ties of capitalism as a single world economic system turned out to be undermined to a significant degree. The imperialists of the USA, England, France, Japan, and other countries, with animal hatred, began a predatory war against revolutionary Russia in order to overthrow Soviet power and restore capitalism. They refused to trade with the USSR and embarked on the path of an economic blockade. But all attempts of the imperialists to strangle the young Soviet republic were thwarted by the invincible fortitude of the liberated peoples of Russia, who, having defeated the interveners, began building a socialist society.

As historical experience showed, the mere desire of imperialists proved insufficient to achieve their counter-revolutionary goals. The internal economic position of capitalist countries imperatively demanded the establishment of trade and economic relations with Soviet Russia. Namely "the economic position of those who blockaded us," V. I. Lenin said, "proved to be vulnerable. There is a force greater than the desire, will, and decision of any of the hostile governments or classes; this force is general economic worldwide relations, which compel them to enter upon this path of intercourse with us" (*Works*, Vol. 33, p. 129).

The necessity of establishing trade, economic, and political ties between the Soviet state and capitalist countries was mutual.

The point is that no country can exist in absolute isolation from other countries. This applies not only to states with a homogeneous economic system, but also to states with different economic systems. Among them, the state of the

proletarian dictatorship cannot exist in absolute isolation from surrounding national economies. One way or another, it must have certain economic ties with capitalist states.

The Socialist Republic, V. I. Lenin said in 1921, “cannot exist without world ties, and under current conditions must bind its existence with capitalist relations” (*Works*, Vol. 32, p. 293).

Comrade Stalin pointed out:

“To depict a socialist economy as absolutely self-contained and absolutely independent of surrounding national economies means to assert nonsense. Can it be asserted that a socialist state will not have any export and import, will not import missing goods into the country and export its products in connection with this? No, it cannot be asserted. And what are export and import? They are an expression of the dependence of countries upon each other. They are an expression of economic interdependence” (*Works*, Vol. 9, p. 132).

Of course, our party never strived to make foreign trade ties the basis of the country's development. On the contrary, Comrade Stalin repeatedly called upon the Soviet people to accelerate the pace of industrialization of the country in order to free ourselves from foreign economic dependence, so as not to be on the leash of world imperialists. But having built socialism, the Soviet Union did not refuse to continue trade and economic ties with capitalist countries. Possibilities for export and import expanded significantly, since we can now export abroad machines, machine tools, equipment, which we so sharply needed in the first period of the existence of Soviet power and

which are now so necessary to backward and underdeveloped countries.

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin considered possible the coexistence of the Soviet Republic over a more or less prolonged period of time in an encirclement of hostile states. They repeatedly expressed the idea of the possibility of peaceful cooperation of the USSR with capitalist countries, and the establishment of all-around ties for such cooperation was a constant concern of Lenin and Stalin.

“For the first time the idea of the cooperation of two systems,” notes J. V. Stalin, “was expressed by Lenin. Lenin is our teacher, and we, Soviet people, are pupils of Lenin. We have never departed and will not depart from Lenin's instructions” (newspaper *Pravda* of May 8, 1947). Relying on these instructions of Lenin, J. V. Stalin teaches: “The basis of our relations with capitalist countries consists in permitting the coexistence of two opposite systems. Practice has fully justified it” (*Works*, Vol. 10, p. 289).

In the post-war years, Comrade Stalin repeatedly declared the readiness of the Soviet Union for cooperation with capitalist countries on the basis of peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism. In April 1952, answering questions from a group of editors of American newspapers, Comrade Stalin said:

“The peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism is fully possible given a mutual desire to cooperate, readiness to fulfill obligations assumed, and observance of the principle of equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states” (newspaper *Pravda* of April 2, 1952).

In December 1952, to a question from diplomatic correspondent of the *New York Times* James Reston, whether the USSR and the USA could live at peace in the coming years, Comrade Stalin replied:

"I continue to believe that war between the United States of America and the Soviet Union cannot be considered inevitable, that our countries can as before live in peace" (newspaper *Pravda* of December 26, 1952).

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin on the Real Basis of Peaceful Coexistence and Cooperation Between Capitalism and Communism

Lenin and Stalin teach that the real basis for organizing economic cooperation between the Soviet state and capitalist countries is export and import. The historically established international division of labor fully ensures, other conditions being equal, mutual benefit to trading parties both from the camp of capitalism and from the camp of socialism.

The structure of export and import of socialist states is determined by the specific historical stage of development of these states, the level of development of their productive forces, and the needs of socialist construction.

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin repeatedly declared the desire of the socialist state to organize trade and economic cooperation with all countries on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, and at various stages of the development of the Soviet state put forward concrete, real bases for economic agreements of the USSR with capitalist countries.

"Export and import," J. V. Stalin said in 1927, "are the most suitable ground for such agreements. We need equipment, raw materials (for example, cotton), semi-finished products (for metal, etc.) and capitalists need a market for these goods. Here is ground for agreement for you. Capitalists need oil, timber, grain products, and we need to sell these goods. Here is ground for agreement for you. We need credits; capitalists need high interest on these credits. Here is ground for agreement for you along the line of credit, moreover it is known that Soviet organs are the most punctual payers on credits" (*Works*, Vol. 10, p. 123).

With the victory of socialism in the USSR, possibilities for trade and economic relations with capitalist countries grew even further. These possibilities are especially great at the present time. The whole world knows that the Soviet Union emerged from the Second World War even stronger and reinforced in economic and political respects. Despite the great destruction caused by the fascist occupation of a number of Soviet regions and districts, the Soviet country in post-war years not only healed the wounds inflicted by the war, but moved far ahead. In 1952, the pre-war level of industrial production in the Soviet Union was exceeded by more than two and a quarter times.

The rapid rise of the Soviet economy in the post-war period created favorable conditions for expanding trade and economic ties of the Soviet Union with other countries. In the first post-war years, international trade and economic ties of the USSR with capitalist countries developed successfully; however, in the last 4–5 years they have sharply reduced. The reason for

this reduction lies in the fact that the United States of America intentionally embarked on the path of curtailing international trade with the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy.

The ruling circles of West European countries, under pressure from the US government, also took the path of curtailing and terminating trade and economic relations with the USSR and countries of people's democracy, although this is not in the interests of the economic life of these countries, but in the interests of American monopolies, which fear the rapid restoration of the economy of West European countries, for this can lead to the appearance of new competitors on the world market. The USA, resorting to the help of the "Marshall Plan," strives to completely disrupt and bring to ruin many branches of industry in such countries as England, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and others.

This fact testifies that "American imperialism acts not only as an international exploiter and enslaver of peoples, but also as a force disorganizing the economy of the remaining capitalist countries. Utilizing the weakening of its competitors, monopoly capital of the USA after the war seized a significant share of the world capitalist market. It destroys historically established multilateral economic ties between capitalist countries, replacing them with its unilateral ties with the USA" (G. Malenkov, *Report to the XIX Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 12).

The "Marshall Plan" pursues another goal: to isolate the countries of the socialist camp from the world economic

market, to retard industrial development in these countries, and to force them into bondage to American imperialism.

As a result of such discriminatory policy of the USA, international economic ties turned out to be broken, and world trade fell into decline.

The policy of the USA and other capitalist countries in relation to the USSR and countries of people's democracy negatively affected primarily the economy of the capitalist countries themselves. It led to an even greater disruption of the economic life of these countries, to an even greater sharpening of the general crisis of the entire capitalist system, to the breakdown of the single world market and the formation of a new world market.

"The economic result of the existence of two opposite camps," points out J. V. Stalin, "was that the single all-encompassing world market collapsed, as a result of which we now have two parallel world markets, also opposing each other" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, pp. 30–31).

These two world markets are developing in opposite directions. The world economic market of the socialist camp does not know difficulties of sales, since its capacity is constantly increasing owing to crisis-free development of the economy. This ensures an increase in rates of production in the countries entering this camp. For the period from 1948 to 1952, trade turnover between democratic countries grew by more than three times and continues to expand. "It can be said with confidence," points out J. V. Stalin, "that with such rates of development of industry, it will soon come to the point that

these countries will not only not need the import of goods from capitalist countries, but will themselves feel the need to send abroad surplus goods of their own production" (ibid., p. 31).

The world imperialist market, not connected with the USSR and countries of people's democracy, turned out to be constricted as a result of a sharp reduction in the spheres of application of forces of the main capitalist countries (USA, England, France) to world resources. It experiences difficulties of sales owing to interruptions and crises of production, owing to unemployment and impoverishment of the masses, owing to detachment from democratic countries.

The policy of blockade of democratic countries, pursued by the United States of America, England, and France, led not to a worsening of the position of democratic countries, as the ruling circles of the United States of America calculated, but to the strengthening of the new world democratic market. By this blockade, the imperialists dealt a serious blow to their own export and intensified the contradictions between the production capacities of their industry and the possibilities of selling its products. All this could not fail to lead to growing difficulties and contradictions of capitalism, to a deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system. Attempts by the USA to cover these difficulties with the war in Korea, the arms race, and militarization of industry not only failed to weaken these difficulties and liquidate contradictions, but intensified them even more and led to disastrous consequences: to a sharp weakening of the entire financial system of capitalist countries, to a one-sided military development of their economy, to a growth of a new deep economic crisis, to a sharp

deterioration in the living conditions of the popular masses, to the destruction of the peaceful economy of England, France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Norway, and other capitalist countries.

Broad popular masses and business circles of capitalist countries are seriously alarmed by these difficulties and are seeking a way out of the dead end that has developed. The International Economic Conference held in Moscow in April 1952 pointed a way out of the economic difficulty in which the capitalist world found itself in connection with the breakdown of the single all-encompassing world market. The way out consists in restoring all-around trade and economic ties between capitalist countries and countries of the socialist camp, in restoring a single international market. For this, it is necessary to put an end to the policy of economic blockade, to the policy of dictation and economic enslavement of other countries, to put an end to the frantic arms race, and to military adventures against freedom-loving peoples, which are currently practiced by the governments of the USA and other imperialist countries.

Can modern rulers of the USA, England, and France, representing parties of extreme reaction and war, do this? This depends on many circumstances, among which pressure on these governments from below by all democratic and progressive forces plays a paramount role. Post-war experience shows that modern imperialist rulers of the USA, England, and France do not want to go along this path. Such a path is within the power only of democratic governments representing the

working class, peasantry, petty and middle national bourgeoisie.

As for the position of the Soviet Union on this issue, it was repeatedly and again confirmed by the XIX Party Congress.

"The Soviet Union," said Comrade G. M. Malenkov, "has always stood and now stands for the development of trade and cooperation with other countries, regardless of differences in social systems. The Party will continue to pursue this policy in the future on the basis of mutual benefit" (*Report to the XIX Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, pp. 31–32).

Of great importance for the peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism are political agreements that create favorable conditions for the development of all-around trade, economic, and cultural ties between states of different systems. As historical experience shows, political agreements on non-aggression, disarmament, and reduction of standing armies, neutrality, mutual assistance against aggressive states, as well as on military cooperation for joint struggle against an aggressor, etc., can be concluded between states of different systems.

"We are pursuing a policy of peace," Comrade Stalin said in 1927, "and we are ready to sign non-aggression pacts with bourgeois states. We are pursuing a policy of peace and we are ready to go to an agreement regarding disarmament, up to the complete destruction of standing armies, about which we declared to the whole world back at the Genoa Conference.

Here is ground for agreement along diplomatic lines for you" (*Works*, Vol. 10, p. 123).

The Soviet Union goes with great willingness to the conclusion of such political agreements, as they contribute to maintaining peace throughout the world, and this constitutes the main content of Soviet foreign policy.

After the end of the Second World War, in connection with the growing danger of a new world war being prepared by aggressive forces of the United States of America, the Soviet Union repeatedly proposed to the governments of the USA, England, France, and other capitalist countries to conclude agreements aimed at weakening tension in international relations, maintaining peace and security, and eliminating the danger of a new world war.

Besides the perspective of war, which warmongers are trying to impose on peoples, another perspective exists—the perspective of preserving peace among peoples. This perspective demands the prohibition of war propaganda in accordance with the UN Resolution, the prohibition of atomic and bacteriological weapons, a consistent reduction of the armed forces of the five great powers, the conclusion of a Peace Pact between the powers, expansion of trade between countries, restoration of a single international market, and other measures in the spirit of strengthening peace.

The implementation of these measures will strengthen peace, deliver peoples from fear of the threat of war, stop the unheard-of expenditure of material resources on armaments and

preparation for a destructive war, and give the opportunity to turn them to the benefit of peoples.

The Soviet Union stands for the implementation of these measures, for the perspective of peace among peoples (*G. Malenkov, Report to the XIX Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 33).

But the peace-loving proposals of the Soviet Union run into opposition from imperialist circles of the USA, England, and France, and are rejected by them. This once again confirms Comrade Stalin's words that imperialists need not agreement and cooperation, but talk about agreement and cooperation. The policy of agreements with the Soviet Union undermines the aggressive designs of the imperialist bourgeoisie, renders unnecessary the arms race, which brings colossal profits to capitalist monopolies.

Conditions for Peaceful Coexistence of States of Two Systems

The Soviet Union builds its trade, economic, and political relations with capitalist countries on the basis of new principles, organically stemming from the economic basis of socialism, from the inner nature of socialist social and state structure.

As the economic basis of socialism is fundamentally opposed to the economic basis of capitalist society, so the principles and bases of foreign policy of socialist states have a fundamental difference from the foreign policy of capitalist states.

Comrade Stalin teaches that the basic economic law determines not any single aspect of production, but all main aspects of this production, its essence. The main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism were brilliantly formulated by J. V. Stalin: "Securing maximum capitalist profit by means of exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of the majority of the population of a given country, by means of enslavement and systematic robbery of peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and finally, by means of war and militarization of the national economy used to secure maximum profits" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 38).

The basic economic law of modern capitalism determines such an aspect of the activity of the bourgeois state as relations with surrounding states, its foreign policy. The foreign policy of capitalist states is characterized by the striving to seize all new sales markets and sources of raw materials, to enslave and rob peoples of other countries, and to conduct systematic wars for the redivision of the world.

Comrade G. M. Malenkov, characterizing the historical significance of J. V. Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, and in particular the significance of the basic economic law of modern capitalism formulated by Comrade Stalin, said: "This law reveals and explains crying contradictions of capitalism, reveals causes and roots of aggressive predatory policy of capitalist states. The action of this law leads to a deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, to the inevitable growth and explosion of all contradictions of

capitalist society" (*Report to the XIX Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 104).

In the foreign policy of socialist states, the main thing is the striving for peace, friendship, and cooperation among peoples on the basis of equality and mutual assistance. This inevitably stems from the basic economic law of socialism, essential features of which, as Comrade Stalin teaches, are "securing maximum satisfaction of constantly growing material and cultural needs of the whole society through continuous growth and improvement of socialist production on the basis of higher technology" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 40).

Full conformity of relations of production to the character of productive forces in socialist society creates the possibility of ever more all-around satisfaction of constantly growing material and cultural needs of society and further development of social production. Skilful and rational use of internal resources and possibilities of socialist production, ever broader application of higher domestic technology, fully ensure the fulfillment of such a tremendous task. In view of this, a socialist state does not need foreign expansion, in conquests of foreign lands and peoples. On the contrary, to develop production at rapid rates, the Soviet state is vitally interested in preserving a durable and lasting peace. Wars imposed on us by world imperialists only hindered the great cause of building a happy life for our people.

The peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union organically stems also from the special character of the Soviet state structure.

Implementing the principle of equality of nations and friendship of peoples within a multinational state, the Soviet Union in the sphere of international relations pursues a policy of defending equality of rights of large and small states, a policy of peace and democratic cooperation among all peoples. Proletarian internationalism and equality of nations are the basis of the policy of the socialist state in international relations.

Thus, from the inner nature of socialist society, from the character of production relations of socialism, from the basic economic law of socialism, it follows that the relations of the Soviet state toward peoples of foreign countries are based on peace, friendship, and cooperation, that the basis of foreign policy of the USSR consists in the idea of peace, struggle against aggressive wars prepared by world imperialism.

Imperialists declare that in view of the fundamental opposition of principles of foreign policy of states of the two systems, it is impossible to establish peaceful relations between them, as well as economic, political, and cultural cooperation. By this "argument" American-English imperialist circles try to justify their anti-popular policy aimed at breaking any cooperation with the Soviet Union, at fanning war hysteria, and preparing a new world war, and to justify their unwillingness to enter into an agreement with the Soviet Union. But this argument is completely untenable.

Comrade Stalin, in his talk with Republican Party figure USA Harold Stassen in April 1947, showed the complete untenability of such "arguments" and gave a deep

substantiation of the possibility of cooperation between the economic systems of the USSR and USA in peacetime.

"They (economic systems of USSR and USA—*I. S.*), undoubtedly, can cooperate with each other," said J. V. Stalin. "Differences between them have no fundamental significance, as long as it is a question of cooperation. Economic systems in Germany and USA are identical, nevertheless war broke out between them. Economic systems of the USA and USSR are different, but they did not fight with each other, but cooperated during the war. If two different systems could cooperate during the war, why can they not cooperate in peacetime? Of course, it is understood that if there is a desire to cooperate, cooperation is fully possible under different economic systems. But if there is no desire to cooperate, then even under identical economic systems states and people can quarrel" (Record of conversation of Comrade J. V. Stalin with Republican Party figure USA Harold Stassen on April 9, 1947. Newspaper *Pravda* of May 8, 1947).

In maintaining universal peace and security, in preserving national independence of states, and in other issues of international relations, peoples of all countries are interested, regardless of what social system they belong to. On the basis of community of interests in resolving international problems between states of different systems, actions of great international importance arise. The history of international relations of the last twenty years knows numerous facts of such actions.

In the period of the emergence of the focus of aggression in Europe, when Hitlerite Germany created a threat to national

independence of European states, treaties of mutual assistance against an aggressor were concluded between the USSR and France, and also between the USSR and Czechoslovakia in 1935. When militarist Japan prepared a war in the Far East for the purpose of subjugating the peoples of Asia, an agreement on mutual assistance was concluded in 1936 between the USSR and the Mongolian People's Republic. In 1937, a non-aggression pact was concluded between the USSR and China. Somewhat earlier, in 1934, the USSR entered the League of Nations for the purpose of combining efforts of nations and states to organize a collective rebuff to fascist aggressors. Precisely in the years of the emergence of two foci of war were normal diplomatic relations established between the two largest world powers—the USSR and USA.

In the period when Hitlerite Germany and imperialist Japan unleashed the Second World War and practically embarked on the realization of their insane plans for subjugating all peoples of the world, efforts of peoples and states with different social systems united into an anti-fascist coalition. Sufficiently durable economic, political, and military cooperation was created between the USSR, USA, Great Britain, and peoples of other countries.

Are there in modern conditions important international problems that could serve as a basis for close cooperation between states of the socialist camp and capitalist countries? Yes, such problems exist.

A characteristic feature of the current international situation is the increased aggressiveness of American imperialism, which set as its goal by means of unleashing a new war to win world

domination. This now constitutes the basis of all policy of the American imperialist top leadership.

Covering themselves with the flag of "anti-communism" and posing as "defenders of freedom," American imperialism in fact step by step subjugates and robs old, long-established bourgeois states and their colonies, strives to subjugate all freedom-loving peoples, to turn them into slaves of American billionaires and millionaires.

The aggressiveness of American imperialism is manifested now in various practical actions, starting with open military adventure against the Korean people, creation of military bases around the USSR, remilitarization of West Germany and Japan, and ending with fascistization not only of the USA, but also of other countries. American armed forces, occupying along with defeated countries also their "allies" in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc (England, France, Italy, Holland, and other countries), perform the role of a world gendarme.

American monopoly capital dislocated the economy of remaining capitalist countries and created unheard-of difficulties for the economic development of these countries. Only people suffering from political blindness or caught in the nets of anti-communist propaganda do not see the danger threatening all humanity in connection with the growing aggressive activity of American imperialism.

Rulings circles of England, France, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and other capitalist countries must remember the lessons of the recent past, when Hitlerite Germany, covering itself with the flag of "anti-communism," step by step weakened the vigilance

of European peoples and governments, and then brought down on them the whole power of its war machine with the aim of subjugating all peoples and turning them into slaves of German princes and barons.

The bourgeoisie, standing now at power in these countries, is incapable of soberly assessing reality. It long ago threw overboard the banner of national independence and national sovereignty and sells rights and independence of its nations for dollars. But what the modern bourgeoisie is incapable of, healthy forces of these countries are capable of—patriotic forces represented by popular masses, headed by communist and democratic parties.

Now no longer only communist parties of capitalist countries, but all sober and progressive figures in European and other capitalist countries clearly realize consequences of the adventurist policy of American dictators and begin to speak out against war. "And there is reason to suppose that in countries condemned to the role of obedient pawns of American dictators, genuine peace-loving democratic forces will be found that will conduct their independent, peaceful policy and find a way out of that dead end into which American dictators drove them. Embarking on this new path, European and other countries will meet full understanding from all peace-loving countries" (*G. Malenkov, Report to the XIX Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 24).

Thus, the struggle against the danger of a new world war prepared by the United States of America, the struggle for saving peoples from a slavish fate prepared for them by American billionaires and millionaires, must unite efforts of

governments and peoples of states of different systems to maintain peace and international cooperation on the basis of peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism.

The Peoples' Congress in Defense of Peace in Vienna expressed the will and striving of millions of fighters for peace. Addressing directly the governments of imperialist states conducting military operations against peoples and intensifying the arms race to unleash a new world war, the Congress declared: "Enough destroying cities and countries, enough accumulating lethal weapons, enough preaching hatred and calling for war! Time to embark on the path of negotiations, time to agree!"

The will of hundreds of millions of fighters for peace, speaking out against the danger of a third world war, for stopping the arms race, for reducing military expenditures and raising the living standards of workers, must be directed at compelling ruling circles of capitalist countries to go for businesslike cooperation with countries of the socialist camp.

As for the Soviet Union, it not only places no obstacles on the path of establishing businesslike cooperation with all countries, but also takes practical steps in the cause of realizing such cooperation. In post-war years, the Soviet government submitted a whole series of well-known concrete proposals for achieving agreement and cooperation with capitalist countries.

"The position of the USSR in relation to the USA, England, France, and other bourgeois states is clear, and about this position it was repeatedly declared from our side. The USSR is even now ready for cooperation with these states, having in

mind observance of peaceful international norms and securing a lasting and durable peace" (*G. Malenkov, Report to the XIX Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 30).

Consequently, on the part of the Soviet Union there are no obstacles to organizing international cooperation.

It is completely obvious that for international cooperation there exist all necessary objective conditions and possibilities; nevertheless, this cooperation has not been established so far. The reason for such a situation consists in the fact that for cooperation, besides objective conditions, subjective conditions are needed as well.

One of the main reasons preventing the establishment of international cooperation is the unwillingness of ruling circles of the USA, England, France, and some other capitalist countries to realize such cooperation.

Exposing American-English warmongers frustrating peaceful cooperation, Comrade Stalin pointed out in 1948:

"Warmongers, striving to unleash a new war, fear most of all agreements and cooperation with the USSR, for a policy of agreements with the USSR undermines positions of warmongers and renders groundless the aggressive policy of these gentlemen" (newspaper *Pravda* of October 29, 1948).

Comrade Stalin teaches that a real condition for peaceful coexistence of states of two systems is readiness to fulfill obligations assumed. Bourgeois governments are not averse sometimes to chatter about peace and international cooperation,

to come out with empty and contentless declarations, like the joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the USA in July 1951, slandering the Soviet Union in unwillingness to cooperate; but when concretely raised is the question of signing this or that agreement, of establishing businesslike cooperation between states, these governments find various "reasons" to evade concluding agreements. Even if bourgeois governments sometimes sign such agreements, they do not want to fulfill obligations assumed, turning the agreement into empty pieces of paper. So acted ruling circles of the USA, refusing to fulfill obligations assumed arising from decisions of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences of leaders of three powers of the anti-Hitler coalition.

One of the conditions for peaceful coexistence of two systems, as Comrade Stalin points out, is observance of the principle of equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states. This condition is decisive in concluding agreements between states. Relations between capitalist states are based not on the principle of equality, but on the principle of dominance and subordination. The United States of America holds in countries of the Atlantic alliance not only its military advisers, but also its armed forces; and American diplomats shamelessly order the activity of prime ministers of some European countries and dictate to them whom of progressive figures to arrest and with what weapon to shoot a peaceful demonstration.

The Soviet Union refuses such, with permission to say, "cooperation". The Soviet Union goes only for equal

cooperation with states, regardless of their size and influence in the world arena.

"Many do not believe," says J. V. Stalin, "that an equal relationship between a large and small nation can exist. But we, Soviet people, believe that such relationships can and must exist" (Speech at the dinner in honor of the Finnish government delegation on April 7, 1948. Journal *Bolshevik* No. 7 for 1948, p. 2).

The Soviet Union resolutely opposes interference in internal affairs of any state and permits no one to interfere in its internal affairs. A vivid embodiment of democratic principles of international cooperation is the new type of international relations that formed between the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy.

Comrade Stalin emphasized that the USSR, China, and European people's democratic countries "economically closed together and established close economic cooperation and mutual assistance.

At the base of this cooperation lies a sincere desire to help each other and achieve general economic rise. As a result, we have high rates of industrial development in these countries" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 31).

Mutual relations between the USSR and countries of people's democracy are based on the granite foundation of proletarian internationalism, on fraternal mutual assistance of peoples of these states in building socialism and communism. Cooperation of peoples of the socialist camp has as its goal joint struggle

against aggressive forces of imperialism, against all forms of national oppression, for peace, democracy, and socialism.

Conditions for peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism and their all-around cooperation on democratic principles fully correspond to the interests not only of peoples of the socialist camp, but also to the interests of peoples of the whole world.

Comrade Stalin in his speech at the XIX Party Congress noted that the activity of our Party in the struggle for a bright future of peoples, in the struggle against war, for preserving peace won trust and warm support from all peace-loving peoples abroad.

"The feature of this support," says Comrade Stalin, "consists in the fact that any support of peace-loving strivings of our Party from any fraternal party means at the same time support of its own people in its struggle for preserving peace... This feature of mutual support is explained by the fact that the interests of our Party not only do not contradict, but, on the contrary, merge with the interests of peace-loving peoples. As for the Soviet Union, its interests are generally inseparable from the cause of peace in the whole world".

Guided by Leninist-Stalinist teaching on coexistence of capitalism and communism, the Communist Party and Soviet government pursue a policy of international cooperation and development of businesslike ties with all countries on the basis of mutual benefit, a policy of peaceful competition of economic systems.

At the same time, the Soviet Union understands that the threat of war from aggressive American aggressors has not been liquidated. In conditions of weakening their positions, inveterate warmongers can go for any adventure. Constant, unslumbering vigilance of peace-loving peoples is needed. Eyes and hopes of all people of the world are turned to the great socialist power—the Soviet Union, the bulwark of peace, democracy, and socialism, which is a powerful barrier on the path of realizing insane plans of warmongers. To justify hopes of peoples of the whole world, it is necessary to tirelessly strengthen the active defense of the Soviet state and raise our readiness to crushingly rebuff any aggressors.

10. THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING CLASS OF CAPITALIST COUNTRIES AT THE PRESENT STAGE

A. I. SOBOLEV

Modern humanity lives in a great era when the historical transition from the old, exploiting world to a world of freedom and prosperity is being realized.

At the head of the democratic forces fighting against all forms of reaction, for democratic freedoms and national independence, for socialism, stand communist parties, which have raised high the banner of progress and are confidently carrying it forward, pointing all the oppressed and enslaved people toward a bright future.

Carrying out the leadership of the liberation movement, communist parties proceed from the needs of economic development, from recognized objective laws, take into account and generalize the concrete historical conditions of the struggle, and on this basis determine the political line and tactics of their activities.

Lately, especially in the post-war years, the conditions of the struggle of communist parties have changed significantly: the correlation of forces has radically shifted in favor of socialism, against capitalism, imperialist contradictions have further intensified, and the process of decay of the capitalist economy has deepened, weakening the political positions of the bourgeoisie.

The change in the historical conditions of the activities of communist parties brings forward many very important questions concerning the policy and tactics of the parties, the organization and education of the working people. All these new questions of the liberation movement are creatively generalized and analyzed in the program documents and decisions of communist parties. Of outstanding importance for understanding the fundamental issues of the modern world liberation movement and the perspectives of international development is J. V. Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* and his speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU. In his speech, J. V. Stalin gave a vivid and comprehensive analysis of the present stage of the liberation struggle of the working class, generalized the gigantic experience accumulated by the labor movement, and enriched the theory of socialist revolution.

I

In their works, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin convincingly showed that the transition of capitalism to its final, imperialist stage means an extreme exacerbation of all contradictions of capitalist society, a widespread acceleration of the maturation of objective and subjective factors of revolution. Imperialism, V. I. Lenin teaches, is the eve of the socialist revolution.

The process of capitalism growing into imperialism was accompanied by the involvement of all national territories and national economies into the sphere of international economic relations.

A world imperialist system of economy was formed, which determined such a alignment of class forces in the capitalist camp where the general front of imperialism is opposed by the general front of the liberation movement, uniting all democratic, progressive forces—from the proletarian movement in capitalistically developed countries to the national liberation struggle in colonies and semi-colonies.

The modern world liberation movement represents a single, continuously developing process directed against reaction, against imperialist oppression, and ultimately against capitalism. However, the character of the development of the liberation struggle in various countries changes significantly depending on the level of socio-economic development, the balance of class forces, etc.

As evidenced by the program documents of the communist parties of capitalistically developed countries, the main, strategic task of the working class of these countries is the destruction of the reactionary, anti-national regime, the creation of a genuinely democratic system that secures the victory of socialism.

The fundamental tasks of the communist parties of capitalistically developed countries are concretely formulated in the program of the Communist Party of Great Britain, *The British Road to Socialism*, which points out that the main goal of the English working class—the construction of socialism—determines the ways and means of achieving this goal. In the program of the English Communist Party, a creative Marxist-Leninist solution is given to the most important issues of the struggle of the working class of capitalist countries as applied

to the conditions of England, and the ways ensuring the victory of socialism are defined.

Different tasks in the liberation struggle face the working class and all working people of colonial and semi-colonial countries. Program documents and statements of the Marxist-Leninist parties of these countries testify that at the present stage of struggle, the working class of colonies and semi-colonies is striving to solve general democratic tasks: the elimination of imperialist oppression and the achievement of national independence, the destruction of feudalism, the elimination of reaction, and the establishment of a democratic system that secures a progressive path of development. In other words, the working class of colonies, semi-colonies, and economically backward countries faces, as its primary tasks, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution; at the present stage of struggle, the working class of these countries does not set as its goal the construction of socialism.

The policy of the communist parties of colonies, semi-colonies, and backward countries found vivid expression in the program of the Communist Party of India. The program of the Indian Communist Party gives an example of the creative application of Marxism-Leninism to the solution of fundamental issues of the struggle of the peoples of India for national independence and democratic freedoms.

The implementation of general democratic measures is a necessary stage in the development of the liberation struggle of the working class of colonies and semi-colonies, an indispensable condition for the further progressive development of these countries. However, it is quite natural

that the resolution of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal tasks is not an end in itself; the elimination of the imperialist yoke and feudal remnants clears the ground for a new stage of historical development, opens the path for the transition in the future to carrying out socialist measures.

In the imperialist camp, there are also countries with a more or less significant level of capitalism development, but with a large volume of general democratic tasks. Such countries include, for example, Japan. As is known, in Japan feudal remnants in the economy and politics are extremely strong. After the war, Japan fell into bondage to American imperialists, lost its freedom and independence, lost elementary human rights, as a result of which the general democratic tasks of the Japanese working class have increased significantly. In accordance with this, the Communist Party of Japan in its program determines that at the present time the main task of the working class and all progressive forces of the country is the implementation of a national liberation, democratic revolution, called upon to eliminate reactionary orders and establish a democratic system.

Such are the great liberation tasks facing the working class of capitalist countries and requiring their solution. In his historic speech at the 19th Party Congress, J. V. Stalin noted that under modern conditions it is easier for the working class of these countries to carry out liberation tasks than it was in their time for the working class of Russia, that the communists of these countries do not experience such difficulties as Russian communists experienced.

J. V. Stalin showed that at present very important international, economic, and political factors are at work, facilitating for the working class of those countries where the bourgeoisie still rules the realization of its historical goals. First, said J. V. Stalin, communist parties of capitalist countries "have before their eyes such examples of struggle and successes as exist in the Soviet Union and the people's democratic countries" (p. 10). The great victories of the Soviet people, the achievements of the working people of the people's democracies have significantly altered the international situation, the historical conditions of the struggle of the working class of capitalist countries for freedom.

In his work *The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists*, J. V. Stalin, pointing out that the October Revolution was solitary, emphasized that a future revolution in any country would find itself in a more favorable position, as it would have support in the form of the Soviet Union. Characterizing the international significance of the socialist revolution, J. V. Stalin in his speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU said: "After the seizure of power by our party in 1917 and after the party took real measures to eliminate capitalist and landlord oppression, representatives of fraternal parties, admiring the courage and successes of our party, conferred upon it the title of 'Shock Brigade' of the world revolutionary and labor movement. By this they expressed the hope that the successes of the 'Shock Brigade' would ease the position of peoples languishing under the yoke of capitalism" (pp. 8–9).

Led by the Communist Party, the Soviet people honorably fulfill the noble historical role of the "Shock Brigade" of the

world liberation movement. The Soviet people consistently observe the principles of socialist internationalism, organically combining national, patriotic tasks with international obligations. J. V. Stalin showed that the "national" and international tasks of the proletariat of the USSR merge into one common task of liberating the proletarians of all countries from capitalism, that the interests of building socialism in our country fully and completely merge with the interests of the revolutionary movement of all countries into one common interest of the victory of the socialist revolution in all countries (*Works*, Vol. 9, p. 27).

Having accomplished the October Socialist Revolution, the working class of Russia fulfilled great patriotic tasks—saved the country from the threat of enslavement, liberated the peoples of Russia from the brutal yoke of reaction, opened the path for creating a new life, and thereby honorably fulfilled its international duty—broke the chain of imperialism, opened the era of proletarian revolutions throughout the world, created a powerful stronghold of the world revolutionary movement.

The construction of socialism in the USSR meant a great historical victory victory of the working class over the bourgeoisie, a major defeat for world capitalism. At the same time, the Soviet people, being the first to tread the hitherto untrodden path of social transformations along which all the peoples of the world must travel, performed the honorable work of a pioneer of socialist construction, proving in practice the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

Admiring the achievements of the Soviet people, communists of all countries of the world declared: the path traveled by the

USSR is the only correct path for all humanity; the experience of the USSR is a guiding star for all countries and peoples.

With honor, the Soviet people fulfilled their role as the "Shock Brigade" of the world liberation movement during the years of World War II, when German fascist and Japanese imperialist aggressors enslaved most of the peoples of Europe and Asia and sought to enslave all the peoples of the world. Soviet people, in fierce single combat, smashed the German and Japanese fascist invaders, saved the peoples of Europe and Asia, the peoples of the whole world from the threat of fascist slavery, saved world civilization.

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War consolidated the forces of democracy and socialism in the world arena, further shook and weakened the positions of capitalism. As a result of World War II, a new phase in the development of world socialism began.

At present, the Soviet people, under the leadership of the CPSU, are confidently building communism, even further strengthening the camp of democracy and socialism.

Consistently fulfilling the honorable role of vanguard of the world liberation movement, the Soviet people have emerged as the leading force of humanity, as the leading force in the struggle of peoples for peace, democracy, and socialism.

American imperialists obnoxiously strive to play a leading role in the world arena. A multi-thousand army of American reactionary writers, scientists, journalists, and politicians of all stripes shouts about the superiority of the "American way of life". The ruling circles of the USA try to impose their

dominance, stopping at no means, up to direct military aggression. However, not a single nation wants to live "American style," knowing that this brings it onerous bondage, robbery, and the horrors of war. Everywhere American imperialists have managed to extend their paw, the demand resounds: "Americans, go home!"

Working people of all countries are becoming increasingly imbued with the awareness that only the path along which the Country of Soviets travels leads to liberation from exploitation and ruin, from crises and wars. Hundreds of millions of people on the globe want to live Soviet style, learning from the USSR how to build a new life.

The great achievements of the Soviet people, the strengthening of the forces of socialism in the world arena—the whole course of the international liberation movement in the post-October period of world history—testifies that the CPSU has fully justified the trust of the working people of the whole world, successfully fulfilling the honorable role of advanced force in the revolutionary struggle of the proletarians of all countries against reaction.

"Of course," said Comrade Stalin, "it was very difficult to fulfill this honorable role as long as the 'Shock Brigade' was one and only and had to fulfill this leading role almost in solitude. But that was the case. Now it is a completely different matter. Now, when from China and Korea to Czechoslovakia and Hungary new 'Shock Brigades' have appeared in the form of people's democratic countries—now it has become easier for our party to fight, and work has gone more merrily" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, p. 9).

Fulfilling the honorable role of "Shock Brigades," the communist and workers' parties of the people's democracies are achieving continuous political and economic strengthening of the people's democratic system. As a result of the correct policy of the communists in the people's democracies, the alliance of the working class with the peasantry is strengthening, the leading role of the working class in this alliance is growing; with each year, the firm and heartfelt friendship with the Soviet Union becomes stronger; the authority and influence of communist and workers' parties grow steadily; the love of working people for these parties deepens; one after another, the schemes of imperialists fail, who attempt to weaken the system of people's democracy from within, to carry out with the help of their agents a counter-revolutionary coup, to restore reactionary orders; numerous hostile groups are exposed and neutralized, which, on the assignment of bourgeois intelligence services, conducted and attempt to conduct treacherous, subversive, espionage work.

Simultaneously, a rapid growth of the national economy of these countries is taking place. European countries of people's democracy, having taken the path of socialist construction, are carrying out socialist industrialization and have achieved high rates of economic development. In 1951, the pre-war level of industrial production was exceeded 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, in Albania—by more than 5 times. In 1952, industrial production exceeded the level of 1951 in Poland by 20%, in Czechoslovakia—by 18%, in Hungary—by 24%, in Romania

—by 23%, in Bulgaria—by 18%. In the European countries of people's democracy, the production of coal and metal, machinery, and electric power is steadily growing, etc.

Outstanding successes have been achieved by the Chinese people, who created a durable, continuously developing people's democratic state. The victory of the Chinese revolution led not only to the falling away from the imperialist camp of a large state, but also dealt a blow of tremendous force to the entire colonial system of imperialism, bringing to life a new phase in the development of the national liberation struggle.

At present, the Communist Party of China is successfully completing the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, strengthening the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, strengthening friendship with the Soviet people, deploying ideological work among the population, developing and strengthening in every way the economic power of its country, and achieving improvements in the material position and cultural level of the working people.

An invaluable contribution to the common cause of the liberation struggle is being made by the Korean people, heroically fighting against American aggressors. Significant results have been achieved by the people of Vietnam, striking formidable blows against French colonizers.

Consistently observing and defending the principle of socialist internationalism, the people's democratic countries have closely rallied around the Soviet Union, forming a powerful camp of democracy and socialism. This radically alters the

alignment of class forces in the world arena, creating new historical conditions for the struggle of the working class of capitalist countries.

Between the "Shock Brigades" of the international labor movement and the working class of capitalist countries, friendly relations of mutual assistance and support have developed, based on the unity of patriotic tasks and international duties of the working class, on the principle of socialist internationalism.

In his speech at the 19th Party Congress, J. V. Stalin pointed out that the CPSU, having achieved outstanding successes and created a powerful socialist state, needs the sympathy and support of the working class of other countries, revealing the characteristics of this support.

"The peculiarity of this support," said Comrade Stalin, "consists in the fact that any support for the peace-loving aspirations of our party by any fraternal party means, at the same time, support for its own people in their struggle for the preservation of peace. When in 1918–1919, during the armed attack of the British bourgeoisie on the Soviet Union, British workers organized a struggle against war under the slogan 'Hands Off Russia,' this was support—support primarily for the struggle of their own people for peace, and then support for the Soviet Union. When Comrade Thorez or Comrade Togliatti declare that their peoples will not fight against the peoples of the Soviet Union, this is support—support primarily for the workers and peasants of France and Italy fighting for peace, and then support for the peace-loving aspirations of the Soviet Union" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, pp. 6–7). This

feature of the labor movement is conditioned by the fact that the interests of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as the vanguard of the international labor movement are united with the interests of all freedom-loving peoples.

The immense successes achieved by the USSR, the prospects of communist construction outlined by the 19th Party Congress, the outstanding achievements of the countries of people's democracy—all this increases the malice of the bourgeoisie, which has not yet lost hope of eliminating socialism and restoring capitalism.

Lenin and Stalin proved the possibility of the peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist systems. The Soviet government consistently pursues a peace-loving foreign policy. But the imperialist sharks fear peace, striving to unleash war against the countries of the camp of democracy and socialism.

For these purposes, the ruling circles of capitalist countries, especially the USA, continuously expand the arms race, intensely forge military blocs, increase armed forces, expand the network of military bases, conduct political and ideological preparation for war against the USSR and the people's democratic countries, and send their agents to conduct subversive work.

The elimination of exploiting classes in the USSR destroyed any hopes of the international bourgeoisie to find social support inside our country. However, we still retain remnants of shattered bourgeois classes, living carriers of hostile views, hidden enemies of the Soviet system. Among these hostile

elements, among bourgeois nationalists, the capitalist encirclement seeks agents for itself.

To defend the gains of socialism and ensure the building of a communist society, it is necessary to strengthen the international ties of the Soviet people, strengthen the power of the Soviet state, the Soviet armed forces, and Soviet intelligence, and conduct an uncompromising struggle against all manifestations of bourgeois ideology.

The interests of the world liberation movement demand a ruthless struggle against any forms of bourgeois nationalism, this poisonous weapon of imperialist reaction. Preaching bourgeois nationalism, covered up by the banner of defending national interests, imperialists strive to split the progressive movement and thereby gain the opportunity to defeat individual links of democracy one by one.

Exposing the reactionary essence of bourgeois nationalism, fighting against it, communists hold high the banner of socialist internationalism.

The powerful force of socialist internationalism lies in the fact that it rallies the peoples of the world into a single army of active fighters for peace, democracy, and socialism, strengthens and expands the general front against imperialism imperialism, multiplies tenfold the forces of democracy and socialism, and ensures their victory over the forces of reaction.

II

Inestimable theoretical significance for determining the policy and tactics of communist and workers' parties in capitalist

countries is possessed by Stalinist propositions developing Marxist teaching on the objective character of laws of social development, on the intensification of the conflict between productive forces and production relations under imperialism, the discovery of the basic economic law of modern capitalism, and the substantiation of the deepening general crisis of capitalism.

Having discovered and formulated the basic economic law of modern capitalism, J. V. Stalin gave the communist parties of capitalist countries a powerful ideological weapon. Knowledge of the basic economic law of modern capitalism helps to deeply understand and explain the contradictions of imperialism, the main trends of internal and external policy, the alignment of classes in capitalist countries. Knowledge of this law is necessary for the correct determination of the political line and tactics of the struggle of communist parties.

In his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, J. V. Stalin showed that modern monopolistic capitalism requires obtaining maximum profits, without which it is impossible to carry out expanded reproduction. The pursuit of maximum profit, characteristic of modern capitalism, exerts a destructive influence on the capitalist economy and exacerbates all contradictions of imperialism.

In pursuit of maximum profit, monopolists intensify the robbery of the majority of the population of a given country, condemning working people to extreme poverty, ruthlessly exploit and oppress the peoples of other countries, especially backward ones, carry out the militarization of the economy, reducing thereby even further the living standard of popular

masses, and organize bloody wars that bring death to tens of millions of people and monstrous calamities to all nations.

American imperialists show particular ingenuity in exploiting workers, introducing the most "perfected" methods of wringing sweat out of workers. American monopolies have created a large number of systems for intensifying the labor of workers —"speed-up" systems. "For the entrepreneur," says the American brochure *Economic Crisis and Cold War*, "this is another form of reducing wages. For the worker, it is often death". As a result of various forms of "speed-up," the number of accidents grows, labor intensity rises at the expense of workers' health, which leads to premature aging of workers and to the growth of unemployment. In the USA, it has been calculated that every five-percent increase in labor intensity through "speed-up" increases the army of unemployed by 3 million people.

In the USA and other countries, the rate of exploitation is continuously growing. According to official American data, in the USA, for example, in 1950 the rate of exploitation was 373%. According to calculations, an American worker works for himself only 21% of working time; about 16% goes to pay administrative personnel, and the remaining 63% of working time the US worker spends on enriching a small handful of monopolists. At present, the exploitation of American workers has increased even further. Increasingly brutal becomes the exploitation of the working class in England, France, Italy, and other capitalist countries.

The intensification of worker exploitation in the sphere of production is accompanied by an attack on their living standard

in the sphere of circulation. Prices for mass consumption goods are continuously growing, while wages are frozen by government laws. Having established monopoly prices for consumer goods, gas, electricity, etc., imperialists on "legal" grounds rob the worker, taking away part of his wages. After World War II, the living standard of the working class in all capitalist countries dropped sharply. Wages of a significant portion of workers are below the cost of labor power. The working class in the countries of capital is impoverished relatively and absolutely.

In the post-war period, in connection with the falling away of new countries from the system of imperialism, in connection with the economic successes of the camp of democracy and socialism, conditions for monopolists to obtain maximum profits have deteriorated severely. In pursuit of maximum profits, monopolists in a number of countries are increasingly affecting the interests of the "labor aristocracy," cutting funds for its bribery, and this objectively means narrowing the social base of the agency of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement—right-wing social democrats, creating more favorable prerequisites for eliminating the split in the labor movement, for carrying out the tactics of a united front. This is also facilitated by the exposed treacherous policy of the leaders of right-wing social democrats, turned now into paid agents of American imperialism. The narrowing of the social base of opportunism in the labor movement is one of the vivid indicators of the weakening of the bourgeoisie, the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

The intensification of exploitation evokes resistance from the working class, which leads an increasingly active struggle against monopolies, for the satisfaction of its interests. The activation of the labor movement is expressed primarily in the growth of strikes. For example, in the USA in 1947 there were 3,693 strikes with 2,170 thousand participants; in 1948—3,419 strikes with 1,960 thousand participants; corresponding figures for 1949—3,606 and 3,030 thousand, 1950—4,843 and 2,410 thousand, 1951—3,910 and 2,220 thousand, 1952—4,950 and 3,500 thousand participants. The growth of the organized strike movement is noted in other capitalist countries as well, testifying to the exacerbation of contradictions between labor and capital, to the activation of the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie.

Pursuing their goal—extracting maximum profit—monopolists rob and ruin the broad masses of working peasants. This is achieved through oppressive forms of lease, usurious credit, monstrous taxes, with the help of non-equivalent exchange, etc. Monopolists set high prices for industrial goods sold to peasants and dictate low prices for agricultural products. Penetrating the countryside, monopolies use feudal remnants to intensify robbery, take under their wing landlords, and together with them exploit working peasants.

In an exceptionally difficult situation are the peasants of "Marshallized" countries—Italy, France, Western Germany. The peasantry of these countries experiences a triple yoke: local monopolists, landlords, and American financial capital.

In Italy, 40 thousand landlords own 10 million hectares of land, 2.5 million peasant farms—only 6 million hectares, and 2.5

million peasants have no land at all. Italian peasants eke out a miserable existence under the yoke of landlords and monopolies. A rapid process of peasant ruin is noted in France as well.

In all capitalist countries of Europe, the number of rural proletarians is growing.

The working class of capitalist countries actively and consistently comes out in defense of the interests of working peasantry, helping it defend its rights in the struggle against monopolies and landlords. Italian peasants lead a stubborn struggle for their rights in close alliance with the working class under the leadership of communists. In 1947, 600 thousand agricultural workers in Northern Italy achieved improvements in labor conditions. A major strike, embracing 2 million farmhands and agricultural workers, was conducted in Italy in the spring of 1949. As a result of stubborn struggle, the strikers achieved victory. On the initiative of communists, poor peasants of Sicily, Sardinia, Palermo, Calabria, etc., despite the threat of prison confinement, occupy vacant lands. As a result of prolonged struggle, Italian sharecroppers and small tenants achieved an increase in their share of the harvest. The struggle of Italian peasants for their rights is led by communists, whose authority among peasants grows year by year. The peasant movement in Italy becomes increasingly organized and rallied.

Under the leadership of communists, the French peasantry actively fights against monopolistic capital. The French Communist Party put forward a broad, effective agrarian program reflecting fundamental demands of the peasantry. Communists lead the struggle of peasants against excessive

taxes, against requisitions, and are originators of creating "peasant defense committees" and holding various peasant congresses. French peasants take an active part in the struggle for peace and the movement of peace supporters.

In a difficult situation are working farmers, especially in the USA. Agricultural production in the USA is completely subordinated to monopolies, which with wolfish greed choke and rob farmers. Monopolies dictate to the farmer everything: sown area sizes, types of cultivated crops, harvesting time and method, product prices, etc.

Speaking about the situation of working farmers in the USA, one of them, Hale, reported: "We are called independent landowners—farmers... In reality, we are simply farmhands of the bank that paid for the farm, farmhands of the company supplying us. The only difference is that a farmhand can change masters... I cannot leave my bank, to which I am obligated to pay off a debt for another 26 years. And so that the bank itself does not evict me, I must work, work, work. The bank doesn't even need an overseer over me; I am driven by these regular installment payments".

In the USA, something akin to serf dependence of peasants on monopolies is forming. As the American economist Edward testifies, "a farmer engaged in growing vegetables is reduced to a position strongly resembling serfdom. He receives loans from buyers and middlemen, and for this, not only pays them enormous interest (up to 30–40), but is obliged to sell his harvest when and where it suits the creditor, and at the price set by him".

As a result of the ruthless yoke of monopolies, a rapid process of ruin of farmer households is taking place in the USA. In the period from 1945 to 1950, 713 thousand farmer households were completely ruined and "disappeared" in this country. Farmers' incomes are continuously dropping.

Under conditions of monopoly dominance in agricultural production, the content of the peasant question changes. While in countries where feudal remnants are strong, in colonies and semi-colonies, the task of the working class consists in protecting peasants primarily from the yoke of landlords, and the alliance of the working class is formed on the basis of struggle against feudalism, in capitalistically developed countries the historical duty of the working class toward peasants consists in protecting them from enslavement by monopolistic capital and, on this basis, achieving an alliance with them.

The experience of the peasant movement in a number of capitalist countries testifies that the peasantry is becoming an increasingly active reserve of the working class in its struggle against reaction.

In pursuit of maximum profit, the reactionary bourgeoisie ruins the urban petty bourgeoisie and continuously reduces the living standard of broad strata of the intelligentsia. The working class considers it its duty to defend the interests of artisans, handicraft workers, and intelligentsia from the yoke of monopolistic capital.

A major feature of the economic life of capitalist countries at present is the militarization of the national economy. The

militarization of the economy exposes most fully the incurable sores of capitalism, expresses in concentrated form its organic defects, and most vividly reveals the rottenness of the capitalist system, its doom.

Monopolists unleash an arms race, which provides a temporary, one-sided revival of industry and allows monopolists to obtain huge profits through additional robbery of working people. However, militarization not only fails to cure capitalism, but exacerbates its disease. As a result of the arms race, unproductive military consumption sharply increases, vast material values are frozen in the form of military-strategic stockpiles, personal consumption simultaneously shrinks, working people's poverty grows, their purchasing power drops, which inevitably leads to the onset of an economic crisis. The militarization of the national economy is a means for monopolists to enrich themselves, a method of pumping funds from working people's pockets into the safes of arms manufacturers.

For the robbery of working people and securing maximum profits, monopolists fully utilize the state apparatus, which is an instrument of oppression and enslavement of popular masses. Bourgeois governments, obedient to plutocrats and executing their will, continuously increase taxes for financing military orders. Thus, in the USA, state taxes on the population in 1952 increased compared to 1937/38 by more than 12 times. In the capitalist countries of Europe, where taxes were already quite high, in 1952 they increased even further. In England, taxes grew over the same period by 2 times, in France—by 2.6

times, in Italy—by 1.5 times. Taxes fall as a heavy burden on the shoulders of working people.

In the interests of monopolists, bourgeois governments carry out "price regulation," conduct a policy of "blocking," "freezing" wages, i.e., preserve the old wage level for workers and employees under conditions of rapidly rising living costs. In reality, this means a reduction in real wages.

As a result of increased exploitation of the working class, robbery of farmers by monopolists and landlords, inflation, tax growth, and high living costs, relative and absolute impoverishment of broad strata of the population of capitalist countries takes place, which causes an important regrouping of class forces for the working class. The impoverished majority of the population—working peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie, intelligentsia—hates the monopolistic bourgeoisie, and by the logic of economic life is led to the necessity of social changes, inevitably gravitating toward the working class as the most consistent fighter against all forms of oppression.

All these facts testify that under modern historical conditions, as a result of increased economic oppression by the monopolistic bourgeoisie, an objective opportunity has been created to win over the majority of the population to the side of the working class.

In accordance with this, communist and workers' parties of capitalist countries put forward the idea of winning over the majority of the population to their side. This idea found vivid expression in the program of the British Communist Party, which states: "The most important condition for establishing

such a people's power is the creation of a broad people's coalition or alliance of all strata of working people: the organized working class, all workers of physical and mental labor, members of free professions and technical intelligentsia, all lower and middle strata of the population in cities and farmers in rural areas".

An active struggle for rallying the majority of the population around the working class is led by the communist parties of France, Italy, Western Germany, and other capitalist countries. Winning over the majority of the population to the side of the working class is an important means for the earliest achievement of victory over reaction.

In its struggle for solving great liberation tasks, the working class of capitalist countries possesses important reserves generated by the actions of the basic economic law of modern capitalism and growing as the general crisis of capitalism deepens.

The importance of such a reserve as the national liberation movement in colonies and semi-colonies is continuously growing.

Striving to secure maximum profit, the imperialist bourgeoisie increases the exploitation and robbery of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries. Hundreds of millions of people in Africa, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, the Near and Middle East, and Latin America, creating colossal wealth, are reduced to extreme poverty and doomed to lack of culture and

semi-starvation; many millions of people in colonies and semi-colonies die annually of starvation.

Enslaved peoples do not wish to put up with their situation and are rising in struggle against foreign oppression and feudal remnants, striking powerful blows against the deep rear of imperialism.

The exacerbation of contradictions between monopolies and colonies, which finds its expression in the continuous expansion of the national liberation movement embracing a vast territory from North Africa to Indonesia and the Philippines, reduces the maneuvering capabilities of imperialism, shatters and weakens its foundations, deepens the general crisis of capitalism, and brings closer its doom.

A serious reserve of the working class of the capitalist camp in its struggle against reaction, for democracy, for a genuinely progressive path of development is the continuously growing contradictions between imperialist states, the intensification of struggle for colonies, sales markets, raw material sources, etc.

After World War II, when the pursuit of maximum profit intensified, while the sphere of capitalist exploitation and the sphere of dominance of major capitalist countries over world resources shrank, the action of the law of uneven development of capitalist countries became more formidable, acquiring a character more catastrophic for capitalism.

The exacerbation of struggle between imperialist predators for sales markets and raw material sources, stemming from this growing conflict between imperialist states fraught with threats of military clashes, weakens capitalism from within,

representing an important reserve for the working class in its courageous struggle for the realization of its historical tasks.

Thus, as a result of the operation of the basic economic law of modern capitalism, as a result of the increased non-correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces, the process of decay of the capitalist system of economy has deepened, and the contradictions of imperialism have further intensified. All this weakens capitalism and facilitates the resolution of the tasks of the liberation movement.

III

The deepening conflict between productive forces and capitalist production relations, the growth of the general crisis of capitalism, the intensification of imperialist contradictions—all this, as already noted, radically alters the political situation in the countries of capital, leads to the weakening of the positions of the bourgeoisie, intensifies its reaction, and weakens the connection of the bourgeoisie with the people.

"...The bourgeoisie itself—the main enemy of the liberation movement—," says J. V. Stalin, "has become different, has changed seriously, has become more reactionary, has lost connection with the people, and thereby has weakened itself" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, p. 11).

In the period when the bourgeoisie, in accordance with the requirements of the law of obligatory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces, fought against medieval orders and destroyed the economic structure of feudal society, it acted as a progressive class.

Later, when non-correspondence of capitalist production relations to the character of productive forces manifested itself and began to affect increasingly, when the working class entered the arena of independent political struggle, the bourgeoisie forgot its slogans of freedom, equality, and fraternity, and began transitioning to reactionary positions.

Back in 1916, V. I. Lenin pointed out that "in foreign policy, as well as in domestic policy, imperialism strives equally toward violations of democracy, toward reaction. In this sense, it is indisputable that imperialism is the 'negation' *of democracy in general, of all democracy...*" (*Works*, Vol. 23, p. 31).

Now, when the forces of democracy and socialism have grown and matured, when the economic and political positions of the bourgeoisie weaken year by year, the bourgeoisie has become even more reactionary.

"Previously," said J. V. Stalin, "the bourgeoisie allowed itself to play the liberal, defended bourgeois-democratic freedoms, and thereby created popularity for itself among the people. Now not a trace of liberalism remains. There is no longer the so-called 'freedom of the individual'—rights of the individual are recognized now only for those who have capital, while all other citizens are considered raw human material suitable only for exploitation. Trampled is the principle of equal rights of people and nations; it has been replaced by the principle of full rights for the exploiting minority and lack of rights for the exploited majority of citizens" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, pp. 11–12).

At present, the bourgeoisie, using the most base and brutal methods of suppressing popular masses, has taken the path of fascistizing all spheres of social life.

Processes of political life fascistization are observed in all capitalist countries, but they have reached their greatest depth in the USA.

Issued by Truman and currently in effect, the executive order on "loyalty checks" means the establishment of police control even over people's thoughts. The Taft-Hartley Act is entirely directed against the working class. Under this act, trade unions fall under government control, and the right to conduct a strike struggle against monopolies is reduced to zero, for the government can ban strikes, arrest and imprison leaders of the strike movement, etc. Passed by the American parliament, the McCarran Act, granting police authorities the right to arrest and hold in prison without investigation or trial any person unacceptable to the government, actually means the "legal" introduction of fascism in the USA.

And if to all this one adds the activities of the American gestapo—the Federal Bureau of Investigation,—the work of the "Un-American Activities Committee," the terror of the Ku Klux Klan and other fascist organizations, it becomes completely clear that the anti-democratic campaign in the USA has taken on gigantic proportions, that fascism is marching across the country in all its hideousness.

But American monopolists do not limit themselves to anti-democratic measures inside the state: they act as a gendarme in the world arena, choke freedom in other countries, and

everywhere inspire and support obsolete, reactionary, decaying forces.

Under the dictation of Wall Street billionaires, an anti-democratic conspiracy was hatched by the Italian and French bourgeoisie. The Italian bourgeoisie dreams of fascist methods of rule and strives with all its strength to destroy democratic freedoms. This goal is served by the reactionary law passed by parliament, stating that a party receiving 50% of votes plus one vote gets 65% of mandates. This goal is served by draft laws directed against freedom of the press, and other anti-democratic measures of the Italian government.

Ever more openly manifests the reactionary essence of the French bourgeoisie, which persistently strives to establish a fascist dictatorship. In the name of this, it conducts a vicious campaign against communists, and with the help of a swindling electoral law artificially achieved a reduction of people's representatives in parliament. In the name of this, it tries to crush labor organizations, persecutes fighters for peace, throws into prison the best representatives of the people, while worse enemies of the French people—Pétainists and other traitors who served Hitler—occupy important state posts.

Reactionary regimes have been created in Western Germany and Japan; reaction is intensifying in England. Fascist terror rages in Greece, Yugoslavia, and Spain.

These and many other facts testify that the bourgeoisie, powerless to govern through bourgeois-democratic institutions, takes the path of open arbitrariness, fascist-police suppression of popular masses.

The anti-democratic conspiracy of the bourgeoisie affects the vital interests of broad strata of the population of capitalist countries: the working class, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie, and intelligentsia. In all capitalist countries, resistance to police methods of governance grows, and ever newer groups of people from the most diverse strata of the population join the struggle for the preservation of democratic freedoms.

"The strategy of struggle for freedom," stated Palmiro Togliatti, "consists in the fact that, defending the principles of democracy, we meet and can go in agreement with huge masses of people who do not belong to the working class, but realize that their life and their well-being are inseparable from the existence and respect of democratic freedoms".

For the struggle for democracy to be successful, it must be led. It is quite understandable that the leaders of this struggle cannot be bourgeois parties, nor can they be agents of the bourgeoisie—right-wing social democrats, who have stained themselves with hideous reprisals against peoples and are the gravediggers of democratic freedoms.

At present, there is only one class capable of uniting the majority of the population around the banner of democratic freedoms, leading the struggle of the people for democracy—the working class. Only communist and democratic parties are capable of raising the banner of democratic freedoms thrown overboard by the bourgeoisie, rallying around this banner all working people and carrying it forward.

"I think," pointed out J. V. Stalin, "that this banner will have to be raised by you, representatives of communist and democratic

parties, and carried forward if you want to rally around yourselves the majority of the people. There is no one else to raise it" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, p. 12).

In all capitalist countries, communists lead an active, heroic struggle for democracy, for the preservation and expansion of freedoms won by peoples. The Communist Party of the USA persistently exposes to the American people the reactionary nature of the policy of ruling circles. Italian communists have raised broad strata of the population to defend the constitution. A courageous struggle in defense of democracy is led by the communists of France. If in one or another capitalist country remnants of democratic freedoms still exist, they have been preserved not thanks to the bourgeoisie, but despite it; they have been preserved because on guard of democracy stand the working class and its vanguard detachment—communists.

The reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie narrows the social base of its rule, undermines its connection with the population, reduces its maneuvering capabilities, and prevents it from using democratic slogans for demagogic purposes. This is also facilitated by the policy of betraying national interests carried out by the political bourgeoisie.

In the period of formation of bourgeois nations and development of capitalism along an ascending line, the bourgeoisie, guided by interests of protecting the domestic market, obnoxiously shouted about patriotism, speculated on ideas of defending the motherland, and defended rights and independence of the nation. The falsity of patriotic declarations of the bourgeoisie was felt already then, and during the period

of the Paris Commune its treacherous behavior manifested itself quite clearly.

Subsequently, facts of national betrayal by the bourgeoisie became more frequent, although it tried as far as possible to mask them, demagogically beating its chest in love for the motherland and using national slogans to deceive popular masses.

A completely different matter now. The continuously weakening bourgeoisie, frightened by the growth of forces of democracy and socialism, has openly trampled the principle of national sovereignty and openly and cynically trades national interests.

"Previously," said J. V. Stalin, "the bourgeoisie was considered the head of the nation; it defended the rights and independence of the nation, placing them 'above all'. Now not a trace of the 'national principle' remains. Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, p. 12).

Observance of the principle of national sovereignty, being a serious obstacle to the enslavement by American imperialists of other countries, reduces the opportunity to rob and exploit other peoples. Therefore, ideologists of Wall Street launched a campaign against national sovereignty, claiming that it is allegedly obsolete.

The bourgeoisie of France, England, Italy, Belgium, Western Germany, Japan, and other capitalist countries, conducting severe competitive struggle for sales markets among themselves and especially with the US bourgeoisie, frightened

by its own people, threw itself into the arms of American imperialists, committed monstrous national betrayal, refused independent domestic and foreign policy, and doomed national culture to Americanization.

A glaring act of national betrayal was the adoption by the Western European bourgeoisie of the notorious Marshall Plan. In exchange for handouts under this plan, American imperialists obtained the right to intervene in the economic life of Marshallized countries and control their internal and external policies.

After some time, ruling circles of the USA, dreaming of binding Marshallized countries even tighter to their chariot, proposed concluding under the pretext of defending Western Europe the so-called North Atlantic Pact, to which the bourgeoisie of England, France, Italy, Benelux, and a number of other countries hastily agreed. The North Atlantic Pact significantly restricted the national sovereignty of Marshallized countries, placing them in even greater dependence on the USA. All major command posts in the aggressive North Atlantic alliance belong to Americans. Practically, the American General Staff has the ability to dispose of the armed forces of all its satellites, introduce American troops into any country participating in this pact, etc. The Minister of National Defense of France, René Pleven, openly admitted: "We agreed that our troops would be under the command of a senior foreign commander; we agreed that foreign troops would be constantly located on our territory".

Relying on corresponding articles of the pact, ruling circles of the USA sent their troops to England, occupying significant

territories in France, Italy, Denmark, Holland, etc. US troops seize large land plots, warehouse premises, and residential houses in Western Europe, disposing of things in these countries as if in their own colonies. The press of capitalist countries is full of all sorts of reports on atrocities of American soldiers enjoying extraterritoriality rights.

A monstrous betrayal of national interests is the signing by the governments of France, Western Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg of the agreement on creating the so-called European Army. This agreement legalizes the revival of the German Wehrmacht, which represents a direct threat to France, Belgium, and other countries. Its implementation will mean the elimination of national armies, the loss of government control in these countries over their own armed forces, as the question of service terms, unit strengths, military expenditures, officer training, commander appointments, deployment of armed forces, etc., will all be decided not by governments, nor parliaments, but by the "European Commissariat". This commissariat can send, for example, German troops to France, send German militarists to Belgian military schools, etc.

A hideous act of national betrayal was committed by the German bourgeoisie, which signed the Bonn Agreement, consolidating the American occupation regime in Western Germany. Into deep calamity threw its country the ruling clique of Japan. The San Francisco Treaty and administrative agreement in essence mean the consolidation in Japan of a colonial regime. In such a position Japan has never been before.

By order of ruling US circles, the bourgeoisie of capitalist countries, to the detriment of its national interests, significantly reduced trade with the USSR and people's democratic countries. Conducted on demand of American emissaries, the militarization of capitalist countries shatters their economy and bears an anti-national character.

The enslaving and ruining influence of the USA is especially strongly felt in the realm of culture, which has undergone intense Americanization. Cinema screens of capitalist countries, with official government consent, display American gangster films in their majority. National cinematic art leads a miserable existence. American books, newspapers, and journals in a broad stream flooded all capitalist countries, displacing national products. American influence becomes predominant in the spiritual life of capitalist countries, which causes serious dissatisfaction among the national intelligentsia.

Historical facts testify that national betrayal has become the standard behavior of the bourgeoisie, which is not only incapable of defending national sovereignty, but openly and cynically trades it, dooming its countries to the miserable role of satellites of American imperialism.

To justify its betrayal, the bourgeoisie began to widely disseminate reactionary theories about the obsolescence of national sovereignty, deploying propaganda for cosmopolitanism.

The question of national independence worries broad strata of the population of capitalist countries: working class, peasantry,

urban petty bourgeoisie, main mass of intelligentsia. Anti-American sentiments grow rapidly, and ever newer people from various social strata join the active struggle against the American yoke.

In modern historical conditions, the national question has acquired such significance as it never had in all world history, for such developed capitalist countries as England, Western Germany, France, Japan, Belgium, etc. have lost national independence and fallen into bondage to American imperialism, with many of them having never faced such a problem before. The struggle for national independence is an important task of the entire world liberation movement.

To gain national independence, a political leading force is needed that would unite the efforts of all strata of the population, rally patriotic masses around the goal of gaining freedom. It is quite clear that the bourgeoisie and its parties cannot defend national independence. Nor can the struggle for national freedom be led by right-wing social democrats, as they are agents not only of the local bourgeoisie, but also paid lackeys of American imperialism.

At present, there is only one class that can head the struggle of broad strata of the population against foreign enslavers—the working class. Only communist and democratic parties are capable of raising the banner of national independence thrown overboard by the bourgeoisie, rallying all patriots around this banner, solving the national question, and securing freedom and independence for the country.

"There is no doubt," said J. V. Stalin, "that this banner will have to be raised by you, representatives of communist and democratic parties, and carried forward if you want to be patriots of your country, if you want to become the leading force of the nation. There is no one else to raise it" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, pp. 12–13).

Communist parties of capitalist countries realize the importance of this vital patriotic task and courageously fight for its realization.

Fulfilling their role as defenders of the motherland, active fighters for national sovereignty, communists act with dignity and honor. They have raised high and hold high the banner of national independence, rallying around it all patriotic elements.

Communists of France, Italy, Western Germany strive for the liquidation of the Bonn Agreement and the agreement on creating a European army, demand rejection of the pro-American political course, advocate independent internal and foreign policies, and expose the treacherous behavior of the bourgeoisie.

Courageously fighting against foreign imperialist oppression are the communists of England, Holland, Belgium, Japan, and other capitalist countries.

In the program of the British Communist Party, it is stated: "The Communist Party fights for national independence and the true national interests of the British people and all peoples of the British Empire".

Enormous tasks in gaining national independence face the working class of colonies and semi-colonies. The comprador bourgeoisie of these countries, infringed upon by foreign imperialists and interested in gaining national sovereignty, can take and takes a more or less active part in the struggle for the liberation of the country from foreign yoke, but its behavior is contradictory. Fearing popular masses, it is inclined toward compromises, toward agreements with oppressors. The bourgeoisie of colonies and semi-colonies is incapable of raising popular masses to fight against imperialist oppression, cannot secure national independence.

The only class capable of uniting all patriotic, anti-imperialist forces of colonies and semi-colonies around the national banner and achieving national freedom is the working class.

Standing at the head of the national liberation movement, communists of Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, India, and other colonial countries gave this movement a militant, purposeful character, organization, and firmness. American imperialists attempted through various backroom methods to undermine the leading role of communists in the national liberation movement in order to eliminate the movement itself. They wanted to impose on enslaved peoples Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai, Chiang Kai-shek, but the peoples turned away with anger and indignation from these corrupt bloody puppets and united even closer around communists. History teaches that communists and national freedom are inseparable from each other.

Communists in all countries have earned well-deserved glory as true patriots, courageous and steadfast defenders of national

interests, most consistent fighters for the flourishing of the nation.

The struggle for democratic freedoms and national independence is inextricably linked with the struggle against instigators of a new world war, against imperialist aggressors. To save the cause of peace, broad masses of people across all countries of the globe have risen, unfolding an invincible movement of peace supporters. In this movement, which is the most massive movement in human history, various classes and social strata take part: the working class and significant bourgeois circles, peasantry and intelligentsia, artisans and merchants. For peace fight communists and liberals, Catholics and Muslims, white and black peoples.

Communists, always and everywhere defending the interests of popular masses, consider the struggle for peace as the most important, most urgent task of the present moment. They propose concrete measures for eliminating existing conflicts, reducing armaments, peacefully settling all disputed issues, and seeking the replacement of aggressive governments with governments ready to defend the cause of peace. At the same time, communists clearly realize that completely eliminating wars while imperialism exists is impossible; to eliminate the inevitability of wars, imperialism must be destroyed. But this is not included in the tasks of the modern movement for peace.

The consistent and persistent struggle of communist and workers' parties for world peace expands their authority, strengthens ties with popular masses. Ruling circles of capitalist countries persecute the movement of peace supporters in every way, and this convinces popular masses

even further of the reactionaries' aggressiveness. Therefore, objectively, the movement of peace supporters rallies and organizes popular masses, serving as a great school of education and training through personal experience, through practical struggle.

Analysis of the current historical situation shows that before the working class of all countries of the capitalist camp stand very important general democratic tasks: defense and expansion of democratic freedoms, securing and consolidating national independence, defending the cause of peace throughout the world. The working class and its vanguard—communists—attach enormous importance to solving these tasks.

The struggle against monopoly capital, which ruins the majority of the population of a given country, intensifies exploitation of working people, acts as the bitterest enemy of democratic freedoms, traitor to national interests, and enemy of peace, creates objective economic and political conditions for winning over the majority of the population to the side of the working class. The great achievements of the Soviet Union and people's democracies, the shift in the balance of power in favor of socialism against capitalism, create favorable international conditions for solving this task.

In the struggle for solving general democratic tasks, the political army of the liberation movement is created, educated, and tempered, called upon to play a decisive role in winning a bright future for peoples.

J. V. Stalin, on the basis of a deep analysis of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism, scientifically generalized the experience of the communist movement of recent years. Developing the Leninist proposition on bringing masses to revolution, he formulated a brilliant idea on the possibility of winning over the majority of the population to the side of communists, indicated ways to solve this historical task.

J. V. Stalin's brilliant idea on winning over the majority of the population to the side of the working class is an important contribution to the treasure house of Marxism-Leninism, enriches the theory of socialist revolution, and poses anew the question of allies of the working class. It deals a powerful blow to sectarianism, which still manifests itself in some parties. Sectarianism by its nature is an adventurist policy, based on fear of mass work, disbelief in the creative forces of the people, and disbelief in the revolutionary capabilities of allies of the working class and its ability to unite popular masses.

Guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, communists of capitalist countries determined the forms and methods of winning over the majority of the population to their side, persistently striving to create a single general national front of all democratic, progressive forces.

Serious results in this question have been achieved by Italian communists. The implementation of the policy of a united front allowed the Communists of Italy to isolate right-wing social democrats and establish close relations with the Socialist Party of Italy, headed by Comrade Nenni, thereby practically solving the task of uniting the majority of the working class of the country under the banner of struggle for a better future.

Consistently defending the interests of all working people, the cause of democracy, national independence, Italian communists steadily expand their influence among the peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie, and intelligentsia, weakening the political base of the bourgeoisie. In elections to local government organs in 1951 and 1952, the ruling clerical party led by De Gasperi lost over 4 million votes, while communists together with socialists gained a significant number of votes. "We are approaching," noted Togliatti, "the winning of the majority of the population".

Successfully fighting for the masses is the Communist Party of France, which put forward the idea of creating a single national front to save the country from ruin, from loss of national independence, from fascism and military adventures. Broad strata of the French population take an active part in the struggle for strengthening and expanding democratic freedoms, for national independence, for peace.

Tense struggle for the masses is underway in England, Western Germany, Belgium, the USA, and other countries.

Standing at the head of the people's struggle for the preservation and expansion of democratic freedoms, for national independence, communists have the opportunity to win over the majority of the population to their side and lead popular masses directly along the road to victory over the forces of reaction.

Consequently, as J. V. Stalin points out, there is every reason to count on the success and victory of fraternal parties in the countries of capital.

The consistent defense by communists of popular interests continuously strengthens and expands their authority. All advanced humanity sees in them saviors of democracy, ardent patriots, courageous guardians of national independence, selfless fighters for a bright future. The growth of influence and authority of communists is an historical regularity. The leading role of communist parties in the liberation movement is the guarantee of its success.

11. THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING CLASS OF CAPITALIST COUNTRIES AT THE PRESENT STAGE

A. I. SOBOLEV

Modern humanity lives in a great era when the historical transition from the old, exploiting world to a world of freedom and prosperity is being realized.

At the head of the democratic forces fighting against all forms of reaction, for democratic freedoms and national independence, for socialism, stand communist parties, which have raised high the banner of progress and are confidently carrying it forward, pointing all the oppressed and enslaved people toward a bright future.

Carrying out the leadership of the liberation movement, communist parties proceed from the needs of economic development, from recognized objective laws, take into account and generalize the concrete historical conditions of the struggle, and on this basis determine the political line and tactics of their activities.

Lately, especially in the post-war years, the conditions of the struggle of communist parties have changed significantly: the correlation of forces has radically shifted in favor of socialism, against capitalism, imperialist contradictions have further intensified, and the process of decay of the capitalist economy has deepened, weakening the political positions of the bourgeoisie.

The change in the historical conditions of the activities of communist parties brings forward many very important questions concerning the policy and tactics of the parties, the organization and education of the working people. All these new questions of the liberation movement are creatively generalized and analyzed in the program documents and decisions of communist parties. Of outstanding importance for understanding the fundamental issues of the modern world liberation movement and the perspectives of international development is J. V. Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* and his speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU. In his speech, J. V. Stalin gave a vivid and comprehensive analysis of the present stage of the liberation struggle of the working class, generalized the gigantic experience accumulated by the labor movement, and enriched the theory of socialist revolution.

I

In their works, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin convincingly showed that the transition of capitalism to its final, imperialist stage means an extreme exacerbation of all contradictions of capitalist society, a widespread acceleration of the maturation of objective and subjective factors of revolution. Imperialism, V. I. Lenin teaches, is the eve of the socialist revolution.

The process of capitalism growing into imperialism was accompanied by the involvement of all national territories and national economies into the sphere of international economic relations.

A world imperialist system of economy was formed, which determined such a alignment of class forces in the capitalist camp where the general front of imperialism is opposed by the general front of the liberation movement, uniting all democratic, progressive forces—from the proletarian movement in capitalistically developed countries to the national liberation struggle in colonies and semi-colonies.

The modern world liberation movement represents a single, continuously developing process directed against reaction, against imperialist oppression, and ultimately against capitalism. However, the character of the development of the liberation struggle in various countries changes significantly depending on the level of socio-economic development, the balance of class forces, etc.

As evidenced by the program documents of the communist parties of capitalistically developed countries, the main, strategic task of the working class of these countries is the destruction of the reactionary, anti-national regime, the creation of a genuinely democratic system that secures the victory of socialism.

The fundamental tasks of the communist parties of capitalistically developed countries are concretely formulated in the program of the Communist Party of Great Britain, *The British Road to Socialism*, which points out that the main goal of the English working class—the construction of socialism—determines the ways and means of achieving this goal. In the program of the English Communist Party, a creative Marxist-Leninist solution is given to the most important issues of the struggle of the working class of capitalist countries as applied

to the conditions of England, and the ways ensuring the victory of socialism are defined.

Different tasks in the liberation struggle face the working class and all working people of colonial and semi-colonial countries. Program documents and statements of the Marxist-Leninist parties of these countries testify that at the present stage of struggle, the working class of colonies and semi-colonies is striving to solve general democratic tasks: the elimination of imperialist oppression and the achievement of national independence, the destruction of feudalism, the elimination of reaction, and the establishment of a democratic system that secures a progressive path of development. In other words, the working class of colonies, semi-colonies, and economically backward countries faces, as its primary tasks, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution; at the present stage of struggle, the working class of these countries does not set as its goal the construction of socialism.

The policy of the communist parties of colonies, semi-colonies, and backward countries found vivid expression in the program of the Communist Party of India. The program of the Indian Communist Party gives an example of the creative application of Marxism-Leninism to the solution of fundamental issues of the struggle of the peoples of India for national independence and democratic freedoms.

The implementation of general democratic measures is a necessary stage in the development of the liberation struggle of the working class of colonies and semi-colonies, an indispensable condition for the further progressive development of these countries. However, it is quite natural

that the resolution of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal tasks is not an end in itself; the elimination of the imperialist yoke and feudal remnants clears the ground for a new stage of historical development, opens the path for the transition in the future to carrying out socialist measures.

In the imperialist camp, there are also countries with a more or less significant level of capitalism development, but with a large volume of general democratic tasks. Such countries include, for example, Japan. As is known, in Japan feudal remnants in the economy and politics are extremely strong. After the war, Japan fell into bondage to American imperialists, lost its freedom and independence, lost elementary human rights, as a result of which the general democratic tasks of the Japanese working class have increased significantly. In accordance with this, the Communist Party of Japan in its program determines that at the present time the main task of the working class and all progressive forces of the country is the implementation of a national liberation, democratic revolution, called upon to eliminate reactionary orders and establish a democratic system.

Such are the great liberation tasks facing the working class of capitalist countries and requiring their solution. In his historic speech at the 19th Party Congress, J. V. Stalin noted that under modern conditions it is easier for the working class of these countries to carry out liberation tasks than it was in their time for the working class of Russia, that the communists of these countries do not experience such difficulties as Russian communists experienced.

J. V. Stalin showed that at present very important international, economic, and political factors are at work, facilitating for the working class of those countries where the bourgeoisie still rules the realization of its historical goals. First, said J. V. Stalin, communist parties of capitalist countries "have before their eyes such examples of struggle and successes as exist in the Soviet Union and the people's democratic countries" (p. 10). The great victories of the Soviet people, the achievements of the working people of the people's democracies have significantly altered the international situation, the historical conditions of the struggle of the working class of capitalist countries for freedom.

In his work *The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists*, J. V. Stalin, pointing out that the October Revolution was solitary, emphasized that a future revolution in any country would find itself in a more favorable position, as it would have support in the form of the Soviet Union. Characterizing the international significance of the socialist revolution, J. V. Stalin in his speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU said: "After the seizure of power by our party in 1917 and after the party took real measures to eliminate capitalist and landlord oppression, representatives of fraternal parties, admiring the courage and successes of our party, conferred upon it the title of 'Shock Brigade' of the world revolutionary and labor movement. By this they expressed the hope that the successes of the 'Shock Brigade' would ease the position of peoples languishing under the yoke of capitalism" (pp. 8–9).

Led by the Communist Party, the Soviet people honorably fulfill the noble historical role of the "Shock Brigade" of the

world liberation movement. The Soviet people consistently observe the principles of socialist internationalism, organically combining national, patriotic tasks with international obligations. J. V. Stalin showed that the "national" and international tasks of the proletariat of the USSR merge into one common task of liberating the proletarians of all countries from capitalism, that the interests of building socialism in our country fully and completely merge with the interests of the revolutionary movement of all countries into one common interest of the victory of the socialist revolution in all countries (*Works*, Vol. 9, p. 27).

Having accomplished the October Socialist Revolution, the working class of Russia fulfilled great patriotic tasks—saved the country from the threat of enslavement, liberated the peoples of Russia from the brutal yoke of reaction, opened the path for creating a new life, and thereby honorably fulfilled its international duty—broke the chain of imperialism, opened the era of proletarian revolutions throughout the world, created a powerful stronghold of the world revolutionary movement.

The construction of socialism in the USSR meant a great historical victory victory of the working class over the bourgeoisie, a major defeat for world capitalism. At the same time, the Soviet people, being the first to tread the hitherto untrodden path of social transformations along which all the peoples of the world must travel, performed the honorable work of a pioneer of socialist construction, proving in practice the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

Admiring the achievements of the Soviet people, communists of all countries of the world declared: the path traveled by the

USSR is the only correct path for all humanity; the experience of the USSR is a guiding star for all countries and peoples.

With honor, the Soviet people fulfilled their role as the "Shock Brigade" of the world liberation movement during the years of World War II, when German fascist and Japanese imperialist aggressors enslaved most of the peoples of Europe and Asia and sought to enslave all the peoples of the world. Soviet people, in fierce single combat, smashed the German and Japanese fascist invaders, saved the peoples of Europe and Asia, the peoples of the whole world from the threat of fascist slavery, saved world civilization.

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War consolidated the forces of democracy and socialism in the world arena, further shook and weakened the positions of capitalism. As a result of World War II, a new phase in the development of world socialism began.

At present, the Soviet people, under the leadership of the CPSU, are confidently building communism, even further strengthening the camp of democracy and socialism.

Consistently fulfilling the honorable role of vanguard of the world liberation movement, the Soviet people have emerged as the leading force of humanity, as the leading force in the struggle of peoples for peace, democracy, and socialism.

American imperialists obnoxiously strive to play a leading role in the world arena. A multi-thousand army of American reactionary writers, scientists, journalists, and politicians of all stripes shouts about the superiority of the "American way of life". The ruling circles of the USA try to impose their

dominance, stopping at no means, up to direct military aggression. However, not a single nation wants to live "American style," knowing that this brings it onerous bondage, robbery, and the horrors of war. Everywhere American imperialists have managed to extend their paw, the demand resounds: "Americans, go home!"

Working people of all countries are becoming increasingly imbued with the awareness that only the path along which the Country of Soviets travels leads to liberation from exploitation and ruin, from crises and wars. Hundreds of millions of people on the globe want to live Soviet style, learning from the USSR how to build a new life.

The great achievements of the Soviet people, the strengthening of the forces of socialism in the world arena—the whole course of the international liberation movement in the post-October period of world history—testifies that the CPSU has fully justified the trust of the working people of the whole world, successfully fulfilling the honorable role of advanced force in the revolutionary struggle of the proletarians of all countries against reaction.

"Of course," said Comrade Stalin, "it was very difficult to fulfill this honorable role as long as the 'Shock Brigade' was one and only and had to fulfill this leading role almost in solitude. But that was the case. Now it is a completely different matter. Now, when from China and Korea to Czechoslovakia and Hungary new 'Shock Brigades' have appeared in the form of people's democratic countries—now it has become easier for our party to fight, and work has gone more merrily" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, p. 9).

Fulfilling the honorable role of "Shock Brigades," the communist and workers' parties of the people's democracies are achieving continuous political and economic strengthening of the people's democratic system. As a result of the correct policy of the communists in the people's democracies, the alliance of the working class with the peasantry is strengthening, the leading role of the working class in this alliance is growing; with each year, the firm and heartfelt friendship with the Soviet Union becomes stronger; the authority and influence of communist and workers' parties grow steadily; the love of working people for these parties deepens; one after another, the schemes of imperialists fail, who attempt to weaken the system of people's democracy from within, to carry out with the help of their agents a counter-revolutionary coup, to restore reactionary orders; numerous hostile groups are exposed and neutralized, which, on the assignment of bourgeois intelligence services, conducted and attempt to conduct treacherous, subversive, espionage work.

Simultaneously, a rapid growth of the national economy of these countries is taking place. European countries of people's democracy, having taken the path of socialist construction, are carrying out socialist industrialization and have achieved high rates of economic development. In 1951, the pre-war level of industrial production was exceeded 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, in Albania—by more than 5 times. In 1952, industrial production exceeded the level of 1951 in Poland by 20%, in Czechoslovakia—by 18%, in Hungary—by 24%, in Romania

—by 23%, in Bulgaria—by 18%. In the European countries of people's democracy, the production of coal and metal, machinery, and electric power is steadily growing, etc.

Outstanding successes have been achieved by the Chinese people, who created a durable, continuously developing people's democratic state. The victory of the Chinese revolution led not only to the falling away from the imperialist camp of a large state, but also dealt a blow of tremendous force to the entire colonial system of imperialism, bringing to life a new phase in the development of the national liberation struggle.

At present, the Communist Party of China is successfully completing the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, strengthening the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, strengthening friendship with the Soviet people, deploying ideological work among the population, developing and strengthening in every way the economic power of its country, and achieving improvements in the material position and cultural level of the working people.

An invaluable contribution to the common cause of the liberation struggle is being made by the Korean people, heroically fighting against American aggressors. Significant results have been achieved by the people of Vietnam, striking formidable blows against French colonizers.

Consistently observing and defending the principle of socialist internationalism, the people's democratic countries have closely rallied around the Soviet Union, forming a powerful camp of democracy and socialism. This radically alters the

alignment of class forces in the world arena, creating new historical conditions for the struggle of the working class of capitalist countries.

Between the "Shock Brigades" of the international labor movement and the working class of capitalist countries, friendly relations of mutual assistance and support have developed, based on the unity of patriotic tasks and international duties of the working class, on the principle of socialist internationalism.

In his speech at the 19th Party Congress, J. V. Stalin pointed out that the CPSU, having achieved outstanding successes and created a powerful socialist state, needs the sympathy and support of the working class of other countries, revealing the characteristics of this support.

"The peculiarity of this support," said Comrade Stalin, "consists in the fact that any support for the peace-loving aspirations of our party by any fraternal party means, at the same time, support for its own people in their struggle for the preservation of peace. When in 1918–1919, during the armed attack of the British bourgeoisie on the Soviet Union, British workers organized a struggle against war under the slogan 'Hands Off Russia,' this was support—support primarily for the struggle of their own people for peace, and then support for the Soviet Union. When Comrade Thorez or Comrade Togliatti declare that their peoples will not fight against the peoples of the Soviet Union, this is support—support primarily for the workers and peasants of France and Italy fighting for peace, and then support for the peace-loving aspirations of the Soviet Union" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, pp. 6–7). This

feature of the labor movement is conditioned by the fact that the interests of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as the vanguard of the international labor movement are united with the interests of all freedom-loving peoples.

The immense successes achieved by the USSR, the prospects of communist construction outlined by the 19th Party Congress, the outstanding achievements of the countries of people's democracy—all this increases the malice of the bourgeoisie, which has not yet lost hope of eliminating socialism and restoring capitalism.

Lenin and Stalin proved the possibility of the peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist systems. The Soviet government consistently pursues a peace-loving foreign policy. But the imperialist sharks fear peace, striving to unleash war against the countries of the camp of democracy and socialism.

For these purposes, the ruling circles of capitalist countries, especially the USA, continuously expand the arms race, intensely forge military blocs, increase armed forces, expand the network of military bases, conduct political and ideological preparation for war against the USSR and the people's democratic countries, and send their agents to conduct subversive work.

The elimination of exploiting classes in the USSR destroyed any hopes of the international bourgeoisie to find social support inside our country. However, we still retain remnants of shattered bourgeois classes, living carriers of hostile views, hidden enemies of the Soviet system. Among these hostile

elements, among bourgeois nationalists, the capitalist encirclement seeks agents for itself.

To defend the gains of socialism and ensure the building of a communist society, it is necessary to strengthen the international ties of the Soviet people, strengthen the power of the Soviet state, the Soviet armed forces, and Soviet intelligence, and conduct an uncompromising struggle against all manifestations of bourgeois ideology.

The interests of the world liberation movement demand a ruthless struggle against any forms of bourgeois nationalism, this poisonous weapon of imperialist reaction. Preaching bourgeois nationalism, covered up by the banner of defending national interests, imperialists strive to split the progressive movement and thereby gain the opportunity to defeat individual links of democracy one by one.

Exposing the reactionary essence of bourgeois nationalism, fighting against it, communists hold high the banner of socialist internationalism.

The powerful force of socialist internationalism lies in the fact that it rallies the peoples of the world into a single army of active fighters for peace, democracy, and socialism, strengthens and expands the general front against imperialism imperialism, multiplies tenfold the forces of democracy and socialism, and ensures their victory over the forces of reaction.

II

Inestimable theoretical significance for determining the policy and tactics of communist and workers' parties in capitalist

countries is possessed by Stalinist propositions developing Marxist teaching on the objective character of laws of social development, on the intensification of the conflict between productive forces and production relations under imperialism, the discovery of the basic economic law of modern capitalism, and the substantiation of the deepening general crisis of capitalism.

Having discovered and formulated the basic economic law of modern capitalism, J. V. Stalin gave the communist parties of capitalist countries a powerful ideological weapon. Knowledge of the basic economic law of modern capitalism helps to deeply understand and explain the contradictions of imperialism, the main trends of internal and external policy, the alignment of classes in capitalist countries. Knowledge of this law is necessary for the correct determination of the political line and tactics of the struggle of communist parties.

In his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, J. V. Stalin showed that modern monopolistic capitalism requires obtaining maximum profits, without which it is impossible to carry out expanded reproduction. The pursuit of maximum profit, characteristic of modern capitalism, exerts a destructive influence on the capitalist economy and exacerbates all contradictions of imperialism.

In pursuit of maximum profit, monopolists intensify the robbery of the majority of the population of a given country, condemning working people to extreme poverty, ruthlessly exploit and oppress the peoples of other countries, especially backward ones, carry out the militarization of the economy, reducing thereby even further the living standard of popular

masses, and organize bloody wars that bring death to tens of millions of people and monstrous calamities to all nations.

American imperialists show particular ingenuity in exploiting workers, introducing the most "perfected" methods of wringing sweat out of workers. American monopolies have created a large number of systems for intensifying the labor of workers —"speed-up" systems. "For the entrepreneur," says the American brochure *Economic Crisis and Cold War*, "this is another form of reducing wages. For the worker, it is often death". As a result of various forms of "speed-up," the number of accidents grows, labor intensity rises at the expense of workers' health, which leads to premature aging of workers and to the growth of unemployment. In the USA, it has been calculated that every five-percent increase in labor intensity through "speed-up" increases the army of unemployed by 3 million people.

In the USA and other countries, the rate of exploitation is continuously growing. According to official American data, in the USA, for example, in 1950 the rate of exploitation was 373%. According to calculations, an American worker works for himself only 21% of working time; about 16% goes to pay administrative personnel, and the remaining 63% of working time the US worker spends on enriching a small handful of monopolists. At present, the exploitation of American workers has increased even further. Increasingly brutal becomes the exploitation of the working class in England, France, Italy, and other capitalist countries.

The intensification of worker exploitation in the sphere of production is accompanied by an attack on their living standard

in the sphere of circulation. Prices for mass consumption goods are continuously growing, while wages are frozen by government laws. Having established monopoly prices for consumer goods, gas, electricity, etc., imperialists on "legal" grounds rob the worker, taking away part of his wages. After World War II, the living standard of the working class in all capitalist countries dropped sharply. Wages of a significant portion of workers are below the cost of labor power. The working class in the countries of capital is impoverished relatively and absolutely.

In the post-war period, in connection with the falling away of new countries from the system of imperialism, in connection with the economic successes of the camp of democracy and socialism, conditions for monopolists to obtain maximum profits have deteriorated severely. In pursuit of maximum profits, monopolists in a number of countries are increasingly affecting the interests of the "labor aristocracy," cutting funds for its bribery, and this objectively means narrowing the social base of the agency of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement—right-wing social democrats, creating more favorable prerequisites for eliminating the split in the labor movement, for carrying out the tactics of a united front. This is also facilitated by the exposed treacherous policy of the leaders of right-wing social democrats, turned now into paid agents of American imperialism. The narrowing of the social base of opportunism in the labor movement is one of the vivid indicators of the weakening of the bourgeoisie, the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

The intensification of exploitation evokes resistance from the working class, which leads an increasingly active struggle against monopolies, for the satisfaction of its interests. The activation of the labor movement is expressed primarily in the growth of strikes. For example, in the USA in 1947 there were 3,693 strikes with 2,170 thousand participants; in 1948—3,419 strikes with 1,960 thousand participants; corresponding figures for 1949—3,606 and 3,030 thousand, 1950—4,843 and 2,410 thousand, 1951—3,910 and 2,220 thousand, 1952—4,950 and 3,500 thousand participants. The growth of the organized strike movement is noted in other capitalist countries as well, testifying to the exacerbation of contradictions between labor and capital, to the activation of the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie.

Pursuing their goal—extracting maximum profit—monopolists rob and ruin the broad masses of working peasants. This is achieved through oppressive forms of lease, usurious credit, monstrous taxes, with the help of non-equivalent exchange, etc. Monopolists set high prices for industrial goods sold to peasants and dictate low prices for agricultural products. Penetrating the countryside, monopolies use feudal remnants to intensify robbery, take under their wing landlords, and together with them exploit working peasants.

In an exceptionally difficult situation are the peasants of "Marshallized" countries—Italy, France, Western Germany. The peasantry of these countries experiences a triple yoke: local monopolists, landlords, and American financial capital.

In Italy, 40 thousand landlords own 10 million hectares of land, 2.5 million peasant farms—only 6 million hectares, and 2.5

million peasants have no land at all. Italian peasants eke out a miserable existence under the yoke of landlords and monopolies. A rapid process of peasant ruin is noted in France as well.

In all capitalist countries of Europe, the number of rural proletarians is growing.

The working class of capitalist countries actively and consistently comes out in defense of the interests of working peasantry, helping it defend its rights in the struggle against monopolies and landlords. Italian peasants lead a stubborn struggle for their rights in close alliance with the working class under the leadership of communists. In 1947, 600 thousand agricultural workers in Northern Italy achieved improvements in labor conditions. A major strike, embracing 2 million farmhands and agricultural workers, was conducted in Italy in the spring of 1949. As a result of stubborn struggle, the strikers achieved victory. On the initiative of communists, poor peasants of Sicily, Sardinia, Palermo, Calabria, etc., despite the threat of prison confinement, occupy vacant lands. As a result of prolonged struggle, Italian sharecroppers and small tenants achieved an increase in their share of the harvest. The struggle of Italian peasants for their rights is led by communists, whose authority among peasants grows year by year. The peasant movement in Italy becomes increasingly organized and rallied.

Under the leadership of communists, the French peasantry actively fights against monopolistic capital. The French Communist Party put forward a broad, effective agrarian program reflecting fundamental demands of the peasantry. Communists lead the struggle of peasants against excessive

taxes, against requisitions, and are originators of creating "peasant defense committees" and holding various peasant congresses. French peasants take an active part in the struggle for peace and the movement of peace supporters.

In a difficult situation are working farmers, especially in the USA. Agricultural production in the USA is completely subordinated to monopolies, which with wolfish greed choke and rob farmers. Monopolies dictate to the farmer everything: sown area sizes, types of cultivated crops, harvesting time and method, product prices, etc.

Speaking about the situation of working farmers in the USA, one of them, Hale, reported: "We are called independent landowners—farmers... In reality, we are simply farmhands of the bank that paid for the farm, farmhands of the company supplying us. The only difference is that a farmhand can change masters... I cannot leave my bank, to which I am obligated to pay off a debt for another 26 years. And so that the bank itself does not evict me, I must work, work, work. The bank doesn't even need an overseer over me; I am driven by these regular installment payments".

In the USA, something akin to serf dependence of peasants on monopolies is forming. As the American economist Edward testifies, "a farmer engaged in growing vegetables is reduced to a position strongly resembling serfdom. He receives loans from buyers and middlemen, and for this, not only pays them enormous interest (up to 30–40), but is obliged to sell his harvest when and where it suits the creditor, and at the price set by him".

As a result of the ruthless yoke of monopolies, a rapid process of ruin of farmer households is taking place in the USA. In the period from 1945 to 1950, 713 thousand farmer households were completely ruined and "disappeared" in this country. Farmers' incomes are continuously dropping.

Under conditions of monopoly dominance in agricultural production, the content of the peasant question changes. While in countries where feudal remnants are strong, in colonies and semi-colonies, the task of the working class consists in protecting peasants primarily from the yoke of landlords, and the alliance of the working class is formed on the basis of struggle against feudalism, in capitalistically developed countries the historical duty of the working class toward peasants consists in protecting them from enslavement by monopolistic capital and, on this basis, achieving an alliance with them.

The experience of the peasant movement in a number of capitalist countries testifies that the peasantry is becoming an increasingly active reserve of the working class in its struggle against reaction.

In pursuit of maximum profit, the reactionary bourgeoisie ruins the urban petty bourgeoisie and continuously reduces the living standard of broad strata of the intelligentsia. The working class considers it its duty to defend the interests of artisans, handicraft workers, and intelligentsia from the yoke of monopolistic capital.

A major feature of the economic life of capitalist countries at present is the militarization of the national economy. The

militarization of the economy exposes most fully the incurable sores of capitalism, expresses in concentrated form its organic defects, and most vividly reveals the rottenness of the capitalist system, its doom.

Monopolists unleash an arms race, which provides a temporary, one-sided revival of industry and allows monopolists to obtain huge profits through additional robbery of working people. However, militarization not only fails to cure capitalism, but exacerbates its disease. As a result of the arms race, unproductive military consumption sharply increases, vast material values are frozen in the form of military-strategic stockpiles, personal consumption simultaneously shrinks, working people's poverty grows, their purchasing power drops, which inevitably leads to the onset of an economic crisis. The militarization of the national economy is a means for monopolists to enrich themselves, a method of pumping funds from working people's pockets into the safes of arms manufacturers.

For the robbery of working people and securing maximum profits, monopolists fully utilize the state apparatus, which is an instrument of oppression and enslavement of popular masses. Bourgeois governments, obedient to plutocrats and executing their will, continuously increase taxes for financing military orders. Thus, in the USA, state taxes on the population in 1952 increased compared to 1937/38 by more than 12 times. In the capitalist countries of Europe, where taxes were already quite high, in 1952 they increased even further. In England, taxes grew over the same period by 2 times, in France—by 2.6

times, in Italy—by 1.5 times. Taxes fall as a heavy burden on the shoulders of working people.

In the interests of monopolists, bourgeois governments carry out "price regulation," conduct a policy of "blocking," "freezing" wages, i.e., preserve the old wage level for workers and employees under conditions of rapidly rising living costs. In reality, this means a reduction in real wages.

As a result of increased exploitation of the working class, robbery of farmers by monopolists and landlords, inflation, tax growth, and high living costs, relative and absolute impoverishment of broad strata of the population of capitalist countries takes place, which causes an important regrouping of class forces for the working class. The impoverished majority of the population—working peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie, intelligentsia—hates the monopolistic bourgeoisie, and by the logic of economic life is led to the necessity of social changes, inevitably gravitating toward the working class as the most consistent fighter against all forms of oppression.

All these facts testify that under modern historical conditions, as a result of increased economic oppression by the monopolistic bourgeoisie, an objective opportunity has been created to win over the majority of the population to the side of the working class.

In accordance with this, communist and workers' parties of capitalist countries put forward the idea of winning over the majority of the population to their side. This idea found vivid expression in the program of the British Communist Party, which states: "The most important condition for establishing

such a people's power is the creation of a broad people's coalition or alliance of all strata of working people: the organized working class, all workers of physical and mental labor, members of free professions and technical intelligentsia, all lower and middle strata of the population in cities and farmers in rural areas".

An active struggle for rallying the majority of the population around the working class is led by the communist parties of France, Italy, Western Germany, and other capitalist countries. Winning over the majority of the population to the side of the working class is an important means for the earliest achievement of victory over reaction.

In its struggle for solving great liberation tasks, the working class of capitalist countries possesses important reserves generated by the actions of the basic economic law of modern capitalism and growing as the general crisis of capitalism deepens.

The importance of such a reserve as the national liberation movement in colonies and semi-colonies is continuously growing.

Striving to secure maximum profit, the imperialist bourgeoisie increases the exploitation and robbery of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries. Hundreds of millions of people in Africa, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, the Near and Middle East, and Latin America, creating colossal wealth, are reduced to extreme poverty and doomed to lack of culture and

semi-starvation; many millions of people in colonies and semi-colonies die annually of starvation.

Enslaved peoples do not wish to put up with their situation and are rising in struggle against foreign oppression and feudal remnants, striking powerful blows against the deep rear of imperialism.

The exacerbation of contradictions between monopolies and colonies, which finds its expression in the continuous expansion of the national liberation movement embracing a vast territory from North Africa to Indonesia and the Philippines, reduces the maneuvering capabilities of imperialism, shatters and weakens its foundations, deepens the general crisis of capitalism, and brings closer its doom.

A serious reserve of the working class of the capitalist camp in its struggle against reaction, for democracy, for a genuinely progressive path of development is the continuously growing contradictions between imperialist states, the intensification of struggle for colonies, sales markets, raw material sources, etc.

After World War II, when the pursuit of maximum profit intensified, while the sphere of capitalist exploitation and the sphere of dominance of major capitalist countries over world resources shrank, the action of the law of uneven development of capitalist countries became more formidable, acquiring a character more catastrophic for capitalism.

The exacerbation of struggle between imperialist predators for sales markets and raw material sources, stemming from this growing conflict between imperialist states fraught with threats of military clashes, weakens capitalism from within,

representing an important reserve for the working class in its courageous struggle for the realization of its historical tasks.

Thus, as a result of the operation of the basic economic law of modern capitalism, as a result of the increased non-correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces, the process of decay of the capitalist system of economy has deepened, and the contradictions of imperialism have further intensified. All this weakens capitalism and facilitates the resolution of the tasks of the liberation movement.

III

The deepening conflict between productive forces and capitalist production relations, the growth of the general crisis of capitalism, the intensification of imperialist contradictions—all this, as already noted, radically alters the political situation in the countries of capital, leads to the weakening of the positions of the bourgeoisie, intensifies its reaction, and weakens the connection of the bourgeoisie with the people.

"...The bourgeoisie itself—the main enemy of the liberation movement—," says J. V. Stalin, "has become different, has changed seriously, has become more reactionary, has lost connection with the people, and thereby has weakened itself" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, p. 11).

In the period when the bourgeoisie, in accordance with the requirements of the law of obligatory correspondence of production relations to the character of productive forces, fought against medieval orders and destroyed the economic structure of feudal society, it acted as a progressive class.

Later, when non-correspondence of capitalist production relations to the character of productive forces manifested itself and began to affect increasingly, when the working class entered the arena of independent political struggle, the bourgeoisie forgot its slogans of freedom, equality, and fraternity, and began transitioning to reactionary positions.

Back in 1916, V. I. Lenin pointed out that "in foreign policy, as well as in domestic policy, imperialism strives equally toward violations of democracy, toward reaction. In this sense, it is indisputable that imperialism is the 'negation' *of democracy in general, of all democracy...*" (*Works*, Vol. 23, p. 31).

Now, when the forces of democracy and socialism have grown and matured, when the economic and political positions of the bourgeoisie weaken year by year, the bourgeoisie has become even more reactionary.

"Previously," said J. V. Stalin, "the bourgeoisie allowed itself to play the liberal, defended bourgeois-democratic freedoms, and thereby created popularity for itself among the people. Now not a trace of liberalism remains. There is no longer the so-called 'freedom of the individual'—rights of the individual are recognized now only for those who have capital, while all other citizens are considered raw human material suitable only for exploitation. Trampled is the principle of equal rights of people and nations; it has been replaced by the principle of full rights for the exploiting minority and lack of rights for the exploited majority of citizens" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, pp. 11–12).

At present, the bourgeoisie, using the most base and brutal methods of suppressing popular masses, has taken the path of fascistizing all spheres of social life.

Processes of political life fascistization are observed in all capitalist countries, but they have reached their greatest depth in the USA.

Issued by Truman and currently in effect, the executive order on "loyalty checks" means the establishment of police control even over people's thoughts. The Taft-Hartley Act is entirely directed against the working class. Under this act, trade unions fall under government control, and the right to conduct a strike struggle against monopolies is reduced to zero, for the government can ban strikes, arrest and imprison leaders of the strike movement, etc. Passed by the American parliament, the McCarran Act, granting police authorities the right to arrest and hold in prison without investigation or trial any person unacceptable to the government, actually means the "legal" introduction of fascism in the USA.

And if to all this one adds the activities of the American gestapo—the Federal Bureau of Investigation,—the work of the "Un-American Activities Committee," the terror of the Ku Klux Klan and other fascist organizations, it becomes completely clear that the anti-democratic campaign in the USA has taken on gigantic proportions, that fascism is marching across the country in all its hideousness.

But American monopolists do not limit themselves to anti-democratic measures inside the state: they act as a gendarme in the world arena, choke freedom in other countries, and

everywhere inspire and support obsolete, reactionary, decaying forces.

Under the dictation of Wall Street billionaires, an anti-democratic conspiracy was hatched by the Italian and French bourgeoisie. The Italian bourgeoisie dreams of fascist methods of rule and strives with all its strength to destroy democratic freedoms. This goal is served by the reactionary law passed by parliament, stating that a party receiving 50% of votes plus one vote gets 65% of mandates. This goal is served by draft laws directed against freedom of the press, and other anti-democratic measures of the Italian government.

Ever more openly manifests the reactionary essence of the French bourgeoisie, which persistently strives to establish a fascist dictatorship. In the name of this, it conducts a vicious campaign against communists, and with the help of a swindling electoral law artificially achieved a reduction of people's representatives in parliament. In the name of this, it tries to crush labor organizations, persecutes fighters for peace, throws into prison the best representatives of the people, while worse enemies of the French people—Pétainists and other traitors who served Hitler—occupy important state posts.

Reactionary regimes have been created in Western Germany and Japan; reaction is intensifying in England. Fascist terror rages in Greece, Yugoslavia, and Spain.

These and many other facts testify that the bourgeoisie, powerless to govern through bourgeois-democratic institutions, takes the path of open arbitrariness, fascist-police suppression of popular masses.

The anti-democratic conspiracy of the bourgeoisie affects the vital interests of broad strata of the population of capitalist countries: the working class, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie, and intelligentsia. In all capitalist countries, resistance to police methods of governance grows, and ever newer groups of people from the most diverse strata of the population join the struggle for the preservation of democratic freedoms.

"The strategy of struggle for freedom," stated Palmiro Togliatti, "consists in the fact that, defending the principles of democracy, we meet and can go in agreement with huge masses of people who do not belong to the working class, but realize that their life and their well-being are inseparable from the existence and respect of democratic freedoms".

For the struggle for democracy to be successful, it must be led. It is quite understandable that the leaders of this struggle cannot be bourgeois parties, nor can they be agents of the bourgeoisie—right-wing social democrats, who have stained themselves with hideous reprisals against peoples and are the gravediggers of democratic freedoms.

At present, there is only one class capable of uniting the majority of the population around the banner of democratic freedoms, leading the struggle of the people for democracy—the working class. Only communist and democratic parties are capable of raising the banner of democratic freedoms thrown overboard by the bourgeoisie, rallying around this banner all working people and carrying it forward.

"I think," pointed out J. V. Stalin, "that this banner will have to be raised by you, representatives of communist and democratic

parties, and carried forward if you want to rally around yourselves the majority of the people. There is no one else to raise it" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, p. 12).

In all capitalist countries, communists lead an active, heroic struggle for democracy, for the preservation and expansion of freedoms won by peoples. The Communist Party of the USA persistently exposes to the American people the reactionary nature of the policy of ruling circles. Italian communists have raised broad strata of the population to defend the constitution. A courageous struggle in defense of democracy is led by the communists of France. If in one or another capitalist country remnants of democratic freedoms still exist, they have been preserved not thanks to the bourgeoisie, but despite it; they have been preserved because on guard of democracy stand the working class and its vanguard detachment—communists.

The reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie narrows the social base of its rule, undermines its connection with the population, reduces its maneuvering capabilities, and prevents it from using democratic slogans for demagogic purposes. This is also facilitated by the policy of betraying national interests carried out by the political bourgeoisie.

In the period of formation of bourgeois nations and development of capitalism along an ascending line, the bourgeoisie, guided by interests of protecting the domestic market, obnoxiously shouted about patriotism, speculated on ideas of defending the motherland, and defended rights and independence of the nation. The falsity of patriotic declarations of the bourgeoisie was felt already then, and during the period

of the Paris Commune its treacherous behavior manifested itself quite clearly.

Subsequently, facts of national betrayal by the bourgeoisie became more frequent, although it tried as far as possible to mask them, demagogically beating its chest in love for the motherland and using national slogans to deceive popular masses.

A completely different matter now. The continuously weakening bourgeoisie, frightened by the growth of forces of democracy and socialism, has openly trampled the principle of national sovereignty and openly and cynically trades national interests.

"Previously," said J. V. Stalin, "the bourgeoisie was considered the head of the nation; it defended the rights and independence of the nation, placing them 'above all'. Now not a trace of the 'national principle' remains. Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, p. 12).

Observance of the principle of national sovereignty, being a serious obstacle to the enslavement by American imperialists of other countries, reduces the opportunity to rob and exploit other peoples. Therefore, ideologists of Wall Street launched a campaign against national sovereignty, claiming that it is allegedly obsolete.

The bourgeoisie of France, England, Italy, Belgium, Western Germany, Japan, and other capitalist countries, conducting severe competitive struggle for sales markets among themselves and especially with the US bourgeoisie, frightened

by its own people, threw itself into the arms of American imperialists, committed monstrous national betrayal, refused independent domestic and foreign policy, and doomed national culture to Americanization.

A glaring act of national betrayal was the adoption by the Western European bourgeoisie of the notorious Marshall Plan. In exchange for handouts under this plan, American imperialists obtained the right to intervene in the economic life of Marshallized countries and control their internal and external policies.

After some time, ruling circles of the USA, dreaming of binding Marshallized countries even tighter to their chariot, proposed concluding under the pretext of defending Western Europe the so-called North Atlantic Pact, to which the bourgeoisie of England, France, Italy, Benelux, and a number of other countries hastily agreed. The North Atlantic Pact significantly restricted the national sovereignty of Marshallized countries, placing them in even greater dependence on the USA. All major command posts in the aggressive North Atlantic alliance belong to Americans. Practically, the American General Staff has the ability to dispose of the armed forces of all its satellites, introduce American troops into any country participating in this pact, etc. The Minister of National Defense of France, René Pleven, openly admitted: "We agreed that our troops would be under the command of a senior foreign commander; we agreed that foreign troops would be constantly located on our territory".

Relying on corresponding articles of the pact, ruling circles of the USA sent their troops to England, occupying significant

territories in France, Italy, Denmark, Holland, etc. US troops seize large land plots, warehouse premises, and residential houses in Western Europe, disposing of things in these countries as if in their own colonies. The press of capitalist countries is full of all sorts of reports on atrocities of American soldiers enjoying extraterritoriality rights.

A monstrous betrayal of national interests is the signing by the governments of France, Western Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg of the agreement on creating the so-called European Army. This agreement legalizes the revival of the German Wehrmacht, which represents a direct threat to France, Belgium, and other countries. Its implementation will mean the elimination of national armies, the loss of government control in these countries over their own armed forces, as the question of service terms, unit strengths, military expenditures, officer training, commander appointments, deployment of armed forces, etc., will all be decided not by governments, nor parliaments, but by the "European Commissariat". This commissariat can send, for example, German troops to France, send German militarists to Belgian military schools, etc.

A hideous act of national betrayal was committed by the German bourgeoisie, which signed the Bonn Agreement, consolidating the American occupation regime in Western Germany. Into deep calamity threw its country the ruling clique of Japan. The San Francisco Treaty and administrative agreement in essence mean the consolidation in Japan of a colonial regime. In such a position Japan has never been before.

By order of ruling US circles, the bourgeoisie of capitalist countries, to the detriment of its national interests, significantly reduced trade with the USSR and people's democratic countries. Conducted on demand of American emissaries, the militarization of capitalist countries shatters their economy and bears an anti-national character.

The enslaving and ruining influence of the USA is especially strongly felt in the realm of culture, which has undergone intense Americanization. Cinema screens of capitalist countries, with official government consent, display American gangster films in their majority. National cinematic art leads a miserable existence. American books, newspapers, and journals in a broad stream flooded all capitalist countries, displacing national products. American influence becomes predominant in the spiritual life of capitalist countries, which causes serious dissatisfaction among the national intelligentsia.

Historical facts testify that national betrayal has become the standard behavior of the bourgeoisie, which is not only incapable of defending national sovereignty, but openly and cynically trades it, dooming its countries to the miserable role of satellites of American imperialism.

To justify its betrayal, the bourgeoisie began to widely disseminate reactionary theories about the obsolescence of national sovereignty, deploying propaganda for cosmopolitanism.

The question of national independence worries broad strata of the population of capitalist countries: working class, peasantry,

urban petty bourgeoisie, main mass of intelligentsia. Anti-American sentiments grow rapidly, and ever newer people from various social strata join the active struggle against the American yoke.

In modern historical conditions, the national question has acquired such significance as it never had in all world history, for such developed capitalist countries as England, Western Germany, France, Japan, Belgium, etc. have lost national independence and fallen into bondage to American imperialism, with many of them having never faced such a problem before. The struggle for national independence is an important task of the entire world liberation movement.

To gain national independence, a political leading force is needed that would unite the efforts of all strata of the population, rally patriotic masses around the goal of gaining freedom. It is quite clear that the bourgeoisie and its parties cannot defend national independence. Nor can the struggle for national freedom be led by right-wing social democrats, as they are agents not only of the local bourgeoisie, but also paid lackeys of American imperialism.

At present, there is only one class that can head the struggle of broad strata of the population against foreign enslavers—the working class. Only communist and democratic parties are capable of raising the banner of national independence thrown overboard by the bourgeoisie, rallying all patriots around this banner, solving the national question, and securing freedom and independence for the country.

"There is no doubt," said J. V. Stalin, "that this banner will have to be raised by you, representatives of communist and democratic parties, and carried forward if you want to be patriots of your country, if you want to become the leading force of the nation. There is no one else to raise it" (*Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, pp. 12–13).

Communist parties of capitalist countries realize the importance of this vital patriotic task and courageously fight for its realization.

Fulfilling their role as defenders of the motherland, active fighters for national sovereignty, communists act with dignity and honor. They have raised high and hold high the banner of national independence, rallying around it all patriotic elements.

Communists of France, Italy, Western Germany strive for the liquidation of the Bonn Agreement and the agreement on creating a European army, demand rejection of the pro-American political course, advocate independent internal and foreign policies, and expose the treacherous behavior of the bourgeoisie.

Courageously fighting against foreign imperialist oppression are the communists of England, Holland, Belgium, Japan, and other capitalist countries.

In the program of the British Communist Party, it is stated: "The Communist Party fights for national independence and the true national interests of the British people and all peoples of the British Empire".

Enormous tasks in gaining national independence face the working class of colonies and semi-colonies. The comprador bourgeoisie of these countries, infringed upon by foreign imperialists and interested in gaining national sovereignty, can take and takes a more or less active part in the struggle for the liberation of the country from foreign yoke, but its behavior is contradictory. Fearing popular masses, it is inclined toward compromises, toward agreements with oppressors. The bourgeoisie of colonies and semi-colonies is incapable of raising popular masses to fight against imperialist oppression, cannot secure national independence.

The only class capable of uniting all patriotic, anti-imperialist forces of colonies and semi-colonies around the national banner and achieving national freedom is the working class.

Standing at the head of the national liberation movement, communists of Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, India, and other colonial countries gave this movement a militant, purposeful character, organization, and firmness. American imperialists attempted through various backroom methods to undermine the leading role of communists in the national liberation movement in order to eliminate the movement itself. They wanted to impose on enslaved peoples Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai, Chiang Kai-shek, but the peoples turned away with anger and indignation from these corrupt bloody puppets and united even closer around communists. History teaches that communists and national freedom are inseparable from each other.

Communists in all countries have earned well-deserved glory as true patriots, courageous and steadfast defenders of national

interests, most consistent fighters for the flourishing of the nation.

The struggle for democratic freedoms and national independence is inextricably linked with the struggle against instigators of a new world war, against imperialist aggressors. To save the cause of peace, broad masses of people across all countries of the globe have risen, unfolding an invincible movement of peace supporters. In this movement, which is the most massive movement in human history, various classes and social strata take part: the working class and significant bourgeois circles, peasantry and intelligentsia, artisans and merchants. For peace fight communists and liberals, Catholics and Muslims, white and black peoples.

Communists, always and everywhere defending the interests of popular masses, consider the struggle for peace as the most important, most urgent task of the present moment. They propose concrete measures for eliminating existing conflicts, reducing armaments, peacefully settling all disputed issues, and seeking the replacement of aggressive governments with governments ready to defend the cause of peace. At the same time, communists clearly realize that completely eliminating wars while imperialism exists is impossible; to eliminate the inevitability of wars, imperialism must be destroyed. But this is not included in the tasks of the modern movement for peace.

The consistent and persistent struggle of communist and workers' parties for world peace expands their authority, strengthens ties with popular masses. Ruling circles of capitalist countries persecute the movement of peace supporters in every way, and this convinces popular masses

even further of the reactionaries' aggressiveness. Therefore, objectively, the movement of peace supporters rallies and organizes popular masses, serving as a great school of education and training through personal experience, through practical struggle.

Analysis of the current historical situation shows that before the working class of all countries of the capitalist camp stand very important general democratic tasks: defense and expansion of democratic freedoms, securing and consolidating national independence, defending the cause of peace throughout the world. The working class and its vanguard—communists—attach enormous importance to solving these tasks.

The struggle against monopoly capital, which ruins the majority of the population of a given country, intensifies exploitation of working people, acts as the bitterest enemy of democratic freedoms, traitor to national interests, and enemy of peace, creates objective economic and political conditions for winning over the majority of the population to the side of the working class. The great achievements of the Soviet Union and people's democracies, the shift in the balance of power in favor of socialism against capitalism, create favorable international conditions for solving this task.

In the struggle for solving general democratic tasks, the political army of the liberation movement is created, educated, and tempered, called upon to play a decisive role in winning a bright future for peoples.

J. V. Stalin, on the basis of a deep analysis of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism, scientifically generalized the experience of the communist movement of recent years. Developing the Leninist proposition on bringing masses to revolution, he formulated a brilliant idea on the possibility of winning over the majority of the population to the side of communists, indicated ways to solve this historical task.

J. V. Stalin's brilliant idea on winning over the majority of the population to the side of the working class is an important contribution to the treasure house of Marxism-Leninism, enriches the theory of socialist revolution, and poses anew the question of allies of the working class. It deals a powerful blow to sectarianism, which still manifests itself in some parties. Sectarianism by its nature is an adventurist policy, based on fear of mass work, disbelief in the creative forces of the people, and disbelief in the revolutionary capabilities of allies of the working class and its ability to unite popular masses.

Guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, communists of capitalist countries determined the forms and methods of winning over the majority of the population to their side, persistently striving to create a single general national front of all democratic, progressive forces.

Serious results in this question have been achieved by Italian communists. The implementation of the policy of a united front allowed the Communists of Italy to isolate right-wing social democrats and establish close relations with the Socialist Party of Italy, headed by Comrade Nenni, thereby practically solving the task of uniting the majority of the working class of the country under the banner of struggle for a better future.

Consistently defending the interests of all working people, the cause of democracy, national independence, Italian communists steadily expand their influence among the peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie, and intelligentsia, weakening the political base of the bourgeoisie. In elections to local government organs in 1951 and 1952, the ruling clerical party led by De Gasperi lost over 4 million votes, while communists together with socialists gained a significant number of votes. "We are approaching," noted Togliatti, "the winning of the majority of the population".

Successfully fighting for the masses is the Communist Party of France, which put forward the idea of creating a single national front to save the country from ruin, from loss of national independence, from fascism and military adventures. Broad strata of the French population take an active part in the struggle for strengthening and expanding democratic freedoms, for national independence, for peace.

Tense struggle for the masses is underway in England, Western Germany, Belgium, the USA, and other countries.

Standing at the head of the people's struggle for the preservation and expansion of democratic freedoms, for national independence, communists have the opportunity to win over the majority of the population to their side and lead popular masses directly along the road to victory over the forces of reaction.

Consequently, as J. V. Stalin points out, there is every reason to count on the success and victory of fraternal parties in the countries of capital.

The consistent defense by communists of popular interests continuously strengthens and expands their authority. All advanced humanity sees in them saviors of democracy, ardent patriots, courageous guardians of national independence, selfless fighters for a bright future. The growth of influence and authority of communists is an historical regularity. The leading role of communist parties in the liberation movement is the guarantee of its success.

12. On the Question of the Relationship Between Logic and Grammar

D. P. GORSKY, N. G. KOMLEV

1. Formulation of the Question

The question of the relationship between logic and grammar is of great importance not only for linguistics and for logic, but also for the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism, since the solution to this question represents a concretization of one of the most important problems of the theory of knowledge, namely the problem of the unity of language and thought.

The question of the relationship between language and thought is studied by various sciences: linguistics, logic, physiology of higher nervous activity, psychology, anthropology. All these sciences confirm the thesis of dialectical materialism that thought and language are in an inseparable connection, that there is no thought without language and no language without thought. The study of the question of the relationship between logic and grammar also shows that between logical and grammatical categories, between language and thought, there exists a dialectical unity.

The correct solution to this question acquires urgent importance for the struggle against modern reactionary bourgeois philosophy, representatives of which invent a multitude of idealistic "theories", "concepts", and "attitudes" based on a false interpretation of this problem. The essence of

such "theories" and "attitudes" consists in claiming that ordinary, historically evolved languages allegedly do not fulfill their purpose—to be a means of communication between people and a means of expressing thought. Perverting the facts, ideologists of the imperialist bourgeoisie try to prove that language on the grammatical structure side is illogical, and on the side of its vocabulary is ambiguous, since the meanings of words expressing general concepts are allegedly established by people arbitrarily. From this they draw far-reaching reactionary political conclusions. Representatives of semantic philosophy strive to explain all political and diplomatic disagreements in society, the class struggle occurring between antagonistic classes of capitalist society, by the alleged imperfection of language, which allegedly hinders mutual understanding between struggling sides. Thus, for example, the semanticist Chase claims that "endless political and economic disagreements arose and develop because of bad language" (St. Chase, "The Tyranny of Words", 1943, p. 14).

The reactionary class meaning of such "attitudes" of modern semanticists is completely obvious: by explaining all the vices of capitalist society by their invented imperfection of our language, representatives of semantic philosophy strive to perpetuate the capitalist order, to present the class struggle in society as something accidental, non-lawlike, easily removable. They make the destruction of the contradictions of capitalist society dependent on a radical reform of language, which should supposedly eliminate the ambiguity of language and its illogicality.

In order to substantiate the possibility of implementing such a language reform, positivists attempt to "prove" that the laws of language are completely arbitrary, that they do not have an objectively necessary character and are established allegedly by the will and desire of people.

The ideal of a language deprived of ambiguity and illogicality, according to modern positivists, is the language of mathematical logic. It must be noted immediately that the "language" of formulas used in mathematics, chemistry, and mathematical logic is not language in the ordinary sense of the word, but merely an auxiliary tool that has an extremely narrow area of application and exists, moreover, only on the basis of spoken language.

Speculating on individual facts of the absence of a one-to-one expression of logical categories in grammar, modern positivists shout about the inability of language to express the logic of human thought, that words encountered in language allow contradictory interpretations.

We shall try to show that in language as a whole, the system of grammatical categories always corresponds to the system of logical categories. When we consider individual grammatical phenomena in their isolation, we become convinced that in some cases between grammatical and logical categories there is a one-to-one correspondence, while in other cases such a correspondence does not exist[7]. But even if between individual

[7] By a one-to-one correspondence of grammatical categories to logical ones, we understand such a relationship between grammatical means and logical categories

grammatical and logical categories there is no one-to-one correspondence, this does not mean the absence of any correspondence between them, since under all circumstances specific logical categories (concepts) are assigned to (and in this sense correspond to) grammatical tools. The absence of a one-to-one correspondence between the specified categories not only does not prevent the expression of our thoughts and mutual understanding, but, on the contrary, testifies to the extraordinary flexibility of our language as a means of communication between people, as a means of expressing our thoughts.

***

The question of the relationship between logic and grammar is posed by linguists and logicians usually on several different planes. This difference in the formulation of the question is determined primarily by the difference in the understanding by linguists and logicians of logical categories. Linguists assign to logical categories a different and much broader scope of concepts than logicians. They include among logical categories the entire set of concepts (categories) fixed in language behind these or those grammatical meanings (cases, tenses, numbers, etc.) and grammatical means of expression. With such an approach to the question, the list of logical categories includes a wide variety of concepts reflecting the qualities of objects and phenomena of material reality and relationships between

---

(concepts), when a given grammatical tool serves to express one single logical category. In the context of a word and a sentence, they are always in a one-to-one correspondence with the thought expressed in them, since they themselves always express a specific thought.

them, as well as relationships between the knowing subject and the object of knowledge. Such are concepts of spatial and temporal relationships of objects and phenomena of reality, fixed, for example, by various prepositions and cases, concepts of singularity and multiplicity, fixed by grammatical meanings of singular and plural numbers, concepts of the completion of an action relative to a particular temporal coordinate, fixed by grammatical meanings of verb tenses, concepts of modality and mood, concepts of instantaneousness and duration of an action, etc.

Comparing logical and grammatical categories in the course of the historical development of language, we discover the mutual conditionality of the logical and the grammatical. Comparing languages of peoples standing at a low stage of social development with languages of peoples standing at a higher stage of social development, researching the grammatical forms of these languages, it is easy to discover the evolution of the grammatical structure of language toward its enrichment with increasingly abstract categories. These abstractions allow for a more adequate, deep, and comprehensive expression of new social relations that arise in the process of historical development, constantly enriching human experience and knowledge, and human's new relationships to the surrounding environment.

Thus, it is known, for example, that languages of peoples standing at a relatively low stage of social development have special grammatical means for expressing very concrete relations between objects of the surrounding reality (spatial, temporal, etc.).

On one of the Pacific islands with a Papuan population, Kiwai Island, in the local language there is a large number of verbal prefixes designed to express and indicate how many subjects are currently acting and to how many objects their action extends.

Thus, for example, the prefix

rudo indicates an action of two on many in the past tense,

rumo indicates an action of many on many in the past tense,

durdo indicates an action of two on many in the present tense,

durumo indicates an action of many on many in the present tense

and so on.

An analogous picture takes place in many other languages of tribes standing at a low stage of social development. Thus, the system of verb endings in the Ngameba language (New South Wales) precisely expresses when exactly an action occurred, will occur, or will repeat. For example:

I will grind (future imperfective aspect)

in the morning,

all day,

in the evening,

at night,

anew, etc.

It is also known that the Aleut verb allows more than 400 modifications (tenses, moods, persons), not counting additional tenses formed with auxiliary verbs.

All this multitude of concrete relations finds its reflection in the grammatical structure of language. Concepts of these relations were fixed to corresponding grammatical meanings (just as, for example, in the Russian language, the main meaning for the instrumental case was fixed as the meaning of an instrument or means by which an action is performed) and had corresponding grammatical means for their expression.

In the course of the development of human knowledge of the reality surrounding them, in the course of the complication of human production practice, in the course of an ever deeper penetration into the essence of things and the enrichment of human knowledge, all concepts became increasingly abstract and grammatical meanings changed, as well as the concepts fixed behind them and the corresponding grammatical means. As evidence of these sciences regarding the historical development of languages shows, this process proceeded along the line of replacing more concrete concepts fixed behind grammatical meanings and grammatical means with more abstract ones, as well as along the line of significant simplification and reduction of the number of grammatical means corresponding to these concepts.

The question of the relationship between logical and grammatical categories is posed in linguistics as follows: Do there exist within a given language one-to-one relationships between these or those logical categories and grammatical means of expressing them? How to explain the fact that in many cases between logical and grammatical categories there is no one-to-one correspondence, that they do not cover each other? And indeed, frequently in language, to express one and the same concept (logical category) fixed behind a particular grammatical meaning, there exist several grammatical means of expression and, conversely, the same grammatical means sometimes act as carriers of various grammatical meanings and corresponding logical categories.

Thus, for example, the category of possession in the German language, just as in Russian, is expressed by the genitive case *Goethes Buch*. But this same relationship can also be expressed with the help of other means, in this case with the help of a preposition: *das Buch von Goethe* (the book of Goethe).

A similar phenomenon exists in the English language: *the book of mother* and *the mother's book*.

In the German language, the category of the future tense can be expressed on the verb both in the future form and in the present tense form: *ich werde gehen*, *ich gehe*, *ich will gehen* (I will go).

Conversely, in the French language, the present tense is sometimes expressed using means specific to the future tense: *il sera à Paris à l'heure qu'il est* (and this literally means: "he will be in Paris now", i.e., "he must be in Paris now").

In the Polish language, the sentence *"He reads more, therefore he understands more"* can be expressed in at least eight ways using only various conjunctions of consequence that are completely identical from a logical point of view:

Więcej czyta, więcej też rozumie.

Więcej czyta, dlatego więcej rozumie.

Więcej czyta, zatem więcej rozumie.

Więcej czyta, więc więcej rozumie.

Więcej czyta, przeto więcej rozumie.

Więcej czyta, przez to więcej rozumie.

Więcej czyta, to też więcej rozumie.

Więcej czyta, tedy więcej rozumie.

Logic establishes between two parts of this sentence a single connection—consequential. In language, however, this connection can be expressed by various means. The various ways of expressing one and the same thought, as we saw in the example from the Polish language, are usually determined by stylistic considerations.

Such a formulation of the question of the relationship between logical and grammatical categories is of essential importance

for grammar, since it explains the difficulties encountered by a linguist when classifying various grammatical phenomena. The point is that almost never within a single language is it possible to classify its grammatical phenomena according to one and the same basis: either logical or grammatical. Thus, nouns in the Russian language, when compiling descriptive grammars, are divided into three types, conditionally called declensions, according to a grammatical feature, that is, according to endings, with the vast majority of cases characterizing their gender in the nominative singular. Along with this, to the feminine declension belong—as cannot be done otherwise—some words clearly not of feminine gender (*мужчина* [man], *судья* [judge], etc.). But the main classification of conjunctions is carried out according to a logical feature, according to the semantic content borne by the corresponding conjunctions.

Very often into one group one has to place grammatical phenomena with a single grammatical feature which are, however, logically unrelated, and into a group of phenomena characterized by a single logical content, one has to place phenomena that have nothing in common from the point of view of grammatical features.

Comparing the system of grammatical means of expression corresponding to specific grammatical meanings in various languages with the system of logical categories fixed behind these meanings, we become convinced of the flexibility of languages, of their ability to express the entire set of logical categories reflecting relations of reality. This testifies to the fact that the system of grammatical means of a given language

as a whole always **corresponds** to the system of logical categories fixed in the language behind grammatical categories.

Comparing a sentence and a judgment, a word and a concept, we clarify the unity of these categories of language and logic. We establish, on the one hand, that a judgment is always expressed in the form of a grammatical sentence, but that, on the other hand, not every sentence expresses a judgment (for example, interrogative and imperative sentences do not represent judgments).

A true representation of the relationship between logic and grammar can only be obtained if all the specified moments in the formulation of this problem are taken into account. If we consider the question of whether there is a one-to-one relationship between grammatical categories and their means of expression in isolation from all other moments associated with the formulation of this problem, namely in isolation from the historical consideration of language, in isolation from considering language as a holistic system, then one can arrive at incorrect conclusions about the relationship between logic and grammar, namely to the conclusion that there is no mutual conditionality between them. This is how modern bourgeois linguists and philosophers act, trying to sever logic and grammar, language and thought, denying the objective character of the laws of language and logic.

A typical example of such a metaphysical, one-sided approach to the question of the relationship between logical and grammatical categories can be the formulation of this question in the book on logic and grammar by Ch. Serrus, "Logical-Grammatical Parallelism" (Ch. Serrus «Le parallélisme logico-

gramatical», Paris, 1933). Ch. Serrus approaches the analysis of the relationship between logic and grammar from a positivist position, and consequently, metaphysically.

Trying to trace the parallelism of logical and grammatical categories, the correspondence of grammatical means of expressing logical categories to categories of the grammatical structure of language to the logical structure of thought, Ch. Serrus considers linguistic facts in isolation from each other, distracts from the historical development of language and thought, from considering the system of language as a whole. And he arrives at the conclusion that there is no correspondence, no connection between logic and grammar. "The expectation that grammar corresponds to forms of thought since the development of scientific methodology is an illusion," writes Ch. Serrus in the mentioned work, understanding by scientific methodology the methodology of semantic analysis of modern positivism.

"On the one hand," he further asserts, "science does not find its reflection in grammatical meanings, since language is organically not connected with the expression of our ideas. On the other hand, language, being a material tool, cannot follow the progress of science, since in that case it would have to constantly change not only in relation to words, but also on the side of grammar" (p. 385).

The attitude of Ch. Serrus on the question of the relationship between logic and grammar, language and thought is typical for modern positivism. This false attitude in its essence generates numerous reactionary attempts of modern positivists to create, instead of currently existing national historically

formed spoken languages, an artificial language in which allegedly a one-to-one correspondence between logic and grammar should be achieved.

****

The scientific solution to the question of the relationship between logic and grammar consists in recognizing that between logic and grammar there is an inseparable dialectical interconnection determined by the unity of language and thought.

Language is a necessary condition for the formation of thought, and therefore, whatever thoughts arise and whenever they arise, as I. V. Stalin notes, they always exist on the basis of language. Thoughts can arise and exist only on the basis of language material, on the basis of linguistic terms and phrases; bare thoughts, without language, without a linguistic "material shell", do not exist. Fixing the successes of cognitive activity, language makes possible the exchange of thoughts in human society.

The inseparable connection between logic and grammar manifests itself in that: 1) grammatical categories do not exist in isolation from logical categories, including cases where between grammatical and logical categories there is a one-to-one correspondence, and cases where it does not exist; 2) the system of grammatical categories of a language as a whole fully corresponds to the system of logical categories, giving us the opportunity to express all the most complex relations of objects of reality.

The connection of language and thought, the unity of logical and grammatical categories of language and thought determine the presence of common features in logic and grammar. This manifests itself both in the nature of the laws formulated by these sciences and in the general method of formulating these laws.

First of all, it is necessary to note that the laws of logic and grammar carry an **objective character**. The objective character of the laws of these sciences, despite the fact that they find their realization in the thought and speech of each social individual, consists in that these laws do not depend on the will and desire of people. This is due to the fact that the laws of logic are a reflection of certain relations between objects and phenomena of material reality, and the laws of grammar are a reflection of laws formed in the system of a given language in the process of its historical development.

The specific features of the laws of these sciences are thus determined by the features of the subjects of their study, which have an objective character.

The common character of the laws of the science of logic and the laws of grammar manifests itself in the **breadth of the sphere of their application**. The laws of logic are applied by us everywhere, regardless of the concrete content of the subject of our thought. This means that the laws of logic are observed regardless of what we think about. And indeed, whatever science we take, all proofs and reasonings in these sciences are constructed in accordance with the laws of logic.

Similarly, the laws of grammar of a particular language have an extremely broad area of application. The laws of grammar are observed by us everywhere, regardless of what we talk about. Whatever the concrete content of a thought, whatever the subject of conversation, all people who command a given language do not violate (in its main and defining part) the laws of grammar of that language. In this, the laws of logic and grammar differ significantly from the laws of special sciences (not counting mathematics), which have force and are applied only in a strictly defined area.

The common character of the laws of the science of logic and grammar manifests itself also in the **general method of their formulation by abstraction from the particular and concrete**.

The laws of logic are formulated not in application to a particular concrete thought, but to thoughts of the most varied concrete content having one and the same logical form. Thus, as a rule, the conversion of particular affirmative judgments in logic is formulated not in application to an individual concrete judgment, for example, regarding the judgment *"some Stakhanovites are order-bearers"* or the judgment *"some metals are liquid"*, but immediately in relation to all judgments of the most varied concrete content having the logical form *"some **S** are **P**"*. This rule of logic can be expressed as follows: "If a true judgment has the form 'some **S** are **P**', then the judgment 'some **P** are **S**' will also be true." This means that in any true particular affirmative judgment one can swap the subject (**S**) and predicate (**P**) and again obtain a true judgment.

The laws of grammar are also formulated not in application to these or those concrete words and sentences, but immediately to all words and sentences having one and the same grammatical form representing a unity of grammatical meaning and grammatical method of expression. Thus, the rules of declension of nouns are formulated not in relation to individual words, but in relation to whole groups of words of varying lexical meaning belonging to a specific gender and having simultaneously specific endings (grammatical method of expression).

"A distinctive feature of grammar," says I. V. Stalin, "consists in that it gives rules for changing language, having in mind not concrete words, but words in general without any concreteness; it gives rules for constructing sentences, having in mind not any concrete sentences, say, a concrete subject, concrete predicate, etc., but sentences in general, regardless of the concrete form of a particular sentence.

Consequently, abstracting from the particular and concrete, both in words and in sentences, grammar takes the general that lies at the foundation of word changes and combinations of words in sentences, and builds from it grammatical rules, grammatical laws" ("Marxism and Problems of Linguistics", p. 24. 1950).

When formulating the laws of special sciences, we also abstract from the particular and concrete and isolate general, essential, and necessary connections between objects and phenomena of the world around us. For example, formulating the law of universal gravitation, or Coulomb's law, or Ohm's law, we reveal constant essential and general relations between these or

those phenomena and write down this dependence usually in the form of a mathematical formula. Thus, Ohm's law, stating that the current strength in a circuit is directly proportional to voltage and inversely proportional to resistance (**I = V* R**), is formulated not for some specific conductors, but for conductors having the most varied qualitative and quantitative characteristics (for example, different material, length, cross-section, etc.), not for a specific voltage, but for voltages of the most varied indicators.

But abstraction from the particular and concrete in these cases carries a different **character**. Here we do not rise to such a high degree of abstraction as in formulating the laws of logic and grammar, which is conditioned by the objective character of the laws themselves. This finds its expression in the fact that the laws of physics, chemistry, astronomy, biology, history, and other sciences have a strictly defined, limited area of application. For example, the laws of astronomy apply only to celestial bodies, their relationships, their origin, and development, but do not extend to biological, chemical, historical, and similar phenomena. The laws of logic and grammar apply to any concrete content, have force for all sciences. We think according to the same laws of logic, use the same laws of grammar of a particular language, no matter what field of science we deal with.

At the same time, the laws of the science of logic and the laws of grammar have a number of **specific features** determined by the features of logical and grammatical phenomena, that is, the features of phenomena belonging to the field of our thought, as generalized and mediated reflection of reality in the human

head, on the one hand, and features of language, as a means of realization and expression of our thoughts, on the other. Thus, in formulating laws in relation to judgments and to those forms of thought which include judgments, and namely to inferences, the main requirement is their provability, their truth. Formulating the laws of grammar in relation to these or those words or sentences, it is not at all necessary for us to know whether the thought expressed by them is true or false, since both a true and a false thought must be expressed in accordance with all the rules of language. In order to formulate these or those rules of grammar in relation to words and sentences, it is sufficient to understand the meaning and sense of the utterance.

2. Logical Categories and Means of Their Expression in Language

For logicians, a somewhat different formulation of the question of the relationship between logic and grammar is essential. This is connected with the fact that into the concept of logical categories they include different concepts from those that linguists associate with this expression. Among logical categories in the science of logic are included concepts of logical consequence, contradiction, logical form of thought, concepts of logical properties of relations, concepts of logical connection between the subject and predicate of a simple judgment, concepts of logical connection between individual judgments within another, more complex judgment, etc., that is, those concepts that play an essential role for obtaining truth in an indirect way in the course of inference and proof, which are essential for formulating the rules of various logical operations.

These concepts find their expression in language, and therefore naturally the question arises: Is a given linguistic, grammatical form always a indicator of a specific logical category? For example, the question arises: Is the pronoun "all", standing before the subject in a simple judgment, that is, in a judgment of the type "all birds are vertebrates", always a indicator of the fact that this judgment carries a universal character (universal affirmative or universal negative)? An analogous problem we solve when we determine whether the conjunction "if... then" always expresses the logical connection of ground and consequence, and so on.

In other words, it is important to establish whether there is a one-to-one correspondence between grammatical means and logical categories. Just as the problem of establishing the relationship between logical and grammatical categories in the formulation interesting to grammar can be correctly understood only taking into account the historical development of language and thought, in connection with considering the system of language as a whole, so in the formulation of this problem by logicians these aspects must also not be ignored.

One of the most important tasks of logic is the study of those rules according to which from some true, proven propositions one can obtain other true propositions. In other words, one of the most important tasks of logic is the study of inferences and proofs.

In all sciences and in the practice of everyday thought, we constantly resort in the course of inference and proof to obtaining some true propositions from others, that is, "to obtaining truth in an indirect way." A striking example of

obtaining new truths in such a way can be the proof of any geometric theorem. Relying on axioms, postulates, and other proven propositions, we derive from these propositions according to the rules of logic (according to the rules of inference) new proven true propositions (theorems).

An example of the rules of logic used in deriving some true propositions from others can be the rules of syllogism (simple, categorical, conditional, etc.). Thus, the rule of the *Barbara* mood can be formulated as follows: "If the true premises have the form 'All **M** are **P**' and 'All **S** are **M**', then the true conclusion must have the form 'All **S** are **P**'."

This rule holds for true premises of the most varied concrete content provided that the premises have the specified logical form. And indeed, from the true premises "All Heroes of the Soviet Union are order-bearers" and "This man is a Hero of the Soviet Union", according to the rule of the *Barbara* mood, we can obtain the true conclusion "This man is an order-bearer".

From premises of a different concrete content, we can also according to this rule obtain a corresponding conclusion (if the premises have the same logical form). For example, from the premises "All whales are mammals", "All dolphins are whales" follows the conclusion "All dolphins are mammals".

This means that these or those rules of inference are formulated in application to true premises of the most varied content provided that they have a specific logical form. From here it becomes clear what a huge role for formulating these or those rules of logic is acquired by the logical form of premises, which always represent judgments.

By the **logical form of thought** is understood the method of connecting parts of its concrete content. In application to judgments, in the form of which premises of inferences always appear, this will mean the following: The logical form of simple attributive categorical judgments will be the form of connection between the subject of the judgment (**S**) and its predicate (**P**). Thus, the form of the judgment "All capitalists are exploiters" can be expressed in the form of the formula "All **S** are **P**".

In ordinary verbal expression, this will mean the following: to each of the objects forming the class of the subject (**S**), belongs the feature indicated in the predicate (**P**). Naturally, of judgments having the form "All **S** are **P**", there is an uncountably large number. Judgments having such a form are called in logic universal affirmative judgments. Simple judgments can also have other logical forms: for example, "Some **S** are **P**", "Some **S** are not **P**", "No **S** is **P**". In logic, judgments having such logical forms carry, respectively, the name of particular affirmative, particular negative, and universal negative.

Complex judgments are formed in the majority of cases as a result of joining simple judgments by means of logical conjunctions "if then", "or", "and", etc. If we are interested in the form of connection of simple judgments within a more complex judgment, but are not interested in the structure of the simple judgments entering into the complex ones, then the logical form of such a complex judgment, such as "If iron is heated, then it expands", can be depicted in the form of the

formula "If **A**, then **B**", where **A** denotes the first judgment (iron is heated), and B denotes the second judgment (it expands).

Judgments possessing the form "If **A**, then **B**" carry in logic the name of conditional. It goes without saying that there exists a huge set of judgments concrete in content possessing this logical form.

As was already indicated above, the identification of logical forms of judgments is necessary for formulating rules of inference applied not to individual judgments concrete in content, but immediately to a huge mass of judgments having this or that logical form.

Logical form cannot be expressed otherwise than by linguistic means. In expressions of logical forms of these or those judgments (for example, "All **S** are **P**", "Some **S** are **P**", "If **A**, then **B**", etc.), we can discover two kinds of elements. First of all, we discover in them the signs **S** and **P**, **A** and **B**, and so on. In each concrete judgment having, for example, the logical form "All **S** are **P**" or "If **A**, then **B**", **S** and **P**, **A** and **B**, respectively, are replaced by the most varied concepts or judgments according to content. Thus, in the judgment concrete in content "All metals are electrically conductive", in place of **S** we have the concept "metals", in place of **P**—the concept "electrically conductive". In another judgment "If a given animal is a mammal, then it is a vertebrate", in place of the sign A stands the concrete judgment "a given animal is a mammal", and in place of the sign B stands the judgment "it is a vertebrate".

Thus, in judgments concrete in content, the signs **S** and **P**, **A** and **B** are always replaced by these or those thoughts concrete in content. These signs, encountered in expressions of logical forms, are called **logical variables**. Other elements in such expressions encountered in all judgments concrete in content having a given logical form are: "All", "is (are)", "If... then". Such elements in the composition of logical forms carry the name of **"logical constants"**. They are precisely formal indicators of the presence in these or those thoughts of a particular logical content, the presence in them of a particular logical form.

In logic, therefore, the question arises: Is it always possible to judge the logical nature of a given thought, its logical form, by the presence in sentences of words expressing "logical constants"? Are there not such cases when different logical content of a thought is expressed in one and the same words? Is, for example, the conjunction "if... then" in a sentence always expressing a conditional judgment, and the adverb "therefore"—the presence of logical consequence?

Analyzing this question, we shall try to show that logical categories and the means of their expression in language (that is, the logical and the grammatical) are in an inseparable connection, which manifests itself in that: 1) logical categories do not exist in isolation, outside their grammatical formatting; 2) the system of grammatical categories in language as a whole always corresponds to the system of logical categories, allowing us to express all the most complex logical relationships regardless of whether there is a one-to-one correspondence between them or not.

Let us consider first of all those cases when grammatical means of expression in language **always** can serve as indicators of a specific logical content of a thought, when between them **there exists a one-to-one correspondence**. We shall try to show that in a number of cases means of grammatical linguistic expression can serve as exact indicators of the logical content of a thought, and thereby refute the statement of Ch. Serrus made by him in the book "Logical-Grammatical Parallelism" that between logic and grammar there never exists a one-to-one correspondence. Proceeding from a false statement, Ch. Serrus arrived at the denial of any connection between logic and grammar. We shall show that in many cases grammatical categories are in a one-to-one correspondence with logical ones. (The question will be studied by us on examples taken from the Russian language.)

It is known what an essential role general judgments (universal affirmative and universal negative) play in logic. Indicators of the universal affirmative character of simple categorical judgments can be the pronouns "all", "every", "each" standing before the subject of the corresponding sentence, if before the predicate of this sentence does not stand the particle "not". And indeed, any declarative grammatical simple sentence, where before the subject stand the above-mentioned pronouns, expresses a universal affirmative judgment. Thus, the sentences *"All modern reactionary bourgeois philosophers defend the interests of capitalism"*, *"Every noun expresses a concept"*, *"Every member of the CPSU is obliged to observe the party rules"* express universal affirmative judgments.

Analogously, an indicator of the fact that a declarative grammatical sentence expresses a universal negative judgment can be, for example, words and word combinations "no", "not a single", "nobody". Thus, grammatical sentences: *"No threat is frightening to Soviet people"*, *"Not a single ruminant animal has tusks"*, *"Nobody knows the solution to Fermat's last theorem"*—express universal negative judgments.

In language there are also indicators of singular judgments. If, for example, before the subject of a declarative sentence stand the words "this", "that", "given", "specified", and so on, then in these cases sentences express singular judgments. For example, such sentences as *"This river is the largest in Europe"*, *"That man was the country's boxing champion in 1952"*, *"The specified book was not in the library"* express singular judgments.

The words "this", "that", "given", "specified", etc. only in the case can be indicators of the fact that declarative sentences express singular judgments if these words are placed in the singular number. If they stand in the plural, then they express not singular, but general judgments. Thus, the sentence *"These cities are located beyond the Arctic Circle"* expresses a general judgment. This same remark applies to the word "all". If the word "all" is used in the singular number (*весь*, *вся*, *всё* [all/whole]), then in this case the grammatical sentence will express a singular judgment (for example, *"The whole city was decorated with flags"*). As for the words "every", "each", "not a single", "no", in whatever number they are used, they will always express general judgments.

In language there exist not only indicators characterizing logical forms of judgments, but also indicators of individual logical operations and inferences. Thus, the presence in a sentence of the word combination "it is untrue that..." means always the negation of the judgment that follows these words. This means that the judgment following the words "it is untrue that..." is false and that the judgment contradicting the given one will be true. Thus, for example, the sentence *"It is untrue that all metals oxidize"* means that the judgment "All metals oxidize" is false and that the judgment contradicting it, *"Some metals do not oxidize"*, will be true.

The presence in a complex sentence or in a whole system of sentences of words and word combinations "therefore", "hence (from this) it follows", "hence (from this) it flows", "this proves that", etc. means that a particular complex sentence or system of sentences expresses a single inference, where the initial premises substantiate the resulting conclusion (consequence).

For example, the following complex judgment represents an inference, where from premises (explicitly expressed and implied, which, however, are not difficult to identify taking into account the context) with unyielding necessity follows a series of conclusions:

"If nature, matter, the material world is primary, and consciousness, thought—secondary, derivative, if the material world represents objective reality existing independently of the consciousness of people, and consciousness is a reflection of this objective reality, then ***from this it follows*** *that the material life of society, its being, is also primary, and its spiritual life—*

secondary, derivative, that the material life of society is objective reality existing independently of the will of people, and the spiritual life of society is a reflection of this objective reality, a reflection of being" (I. Stalin "Problems of Leninism", p. 545, 11th ed. Emphasis ours.—*D. G. and N. K.*).

In language there exist not only indicators of logical forms of judgments, these or those logical operations, but also indicators allowing us in some cases to determine the truth or falsity of a thought expressed in the form of a grammatical sentence. Thus, a declarative grammatical sentence always expresses a true judgment if in the sentence in the presence of one subject (grammatical subject) there are two predicates, before each of which stand components of the paired conjunction "either... or", "either... or" and moreover before one of the predicates there is the particle "not". The conjunctions "either" can be absent before the first predicate; the second predicate with negation can be replaced by the word "not".

Thus, the following sentences express true judgments: *"This person is either in Moscow or not in Moscow"*. (In spoken speech usually the second time the predicate is not repeated, but is replaced by the word "not": *"This person is either in Moscow or not"*, *"He is guilty or not guilty (or not)"*, etc.)

In other languages in spoken speech the second predicate is absent and only the negation is preserved: *Dieser Mensch befindet sich entweder in Moskau oder nicht* (German language). *Ten człowiek albo się znajduje w Moskwie albo nie* (Polish language).

In language there exist also indicators allowing us to determine in complex sentences expressing contracted forms of simple categorical syllogisms where one of the premises is omitted (enthymeme), which specific premise is omitted—major or minor. Thus, if sentences are connected by the conjunctions "since", "because", "for" and a number of other causal conjunctions, this means that in the enthymeme expressed in the form of a complex causal sentence, the major premise is omitted. For example, the sentence *"He is not a Marxist, since he denies the dictatorship of the proletariat"* expresses an enthymeme in which the major premise is omitted.

It is easy to discover this by restoring this enthymeme into a full syllogism, which will look as follows. Major premise: "Not a single person denying the dictatorship of the proletariat is a Marxist" (this premise was not expressed in explicit form, but was only implied). Minor premise: "This man denies the dictatorship of the proletariat". Conclusion: "This man is not a Marxist".

If simple sentences in the composition of a complex sentence are connected by the adverbs "therefore", "because" and express in this case an enthymeme, then this means that in the enthymeme the minor premise is omitted. For example: *"All Komsomol members are obliged to fight for strengthening production discipline, therefore Ivanov is also obliged to fight for strengthening production discipline"*. In this enthymeme the minor premise is omitted: *"Ivanov is a Komsomol member"*.

In a number of cases we encounter such grammatical indicators that always give the opportunity to judge complex logical relations between the subject and predicate. Thus, the word

"only", standing before the subject of a sentence expressing a universal affirmative judgment, means not only that the feature reflected in the predicate belongs to all objects entering into the scope of the concept of the subject, but also that it does not belong to any other objects.

In the sentence *"Only even numbers are divisible without remainder by two"* a judgment is expressed in which not only the predicate ("divisible without remainder by two") is inherent to all objects entering into the scope of the concept of the subject (that is, to all even numbers), but in which it is also asserted that there exist no other numbers, except even ones, that would divide by two. This means that the classes of objects entering into the scope of the subject and into the scope of the predicate coincide with each other (even numbers and numbers divisible without remainder by two—are one and the same numbers).

Let us note also that purely linguistic facts are fully sufficient to determine whether a sentence expresses a judgment or not. According to a widespread opinion, interrogative and imperative sentences do not express judgments, since to them evaluation from the point of view of truth or falsity is inapplicable; they do not contain assertions or denials of anything about anything. Such sentences as *"What time is it now?"*, *"Bring a glass of water!"*, *"O, if only I were now at Home!"*, do not express judgments.

If we exclude this kind of sentences from the composition of all existing sentences, then we are left with sentences representing utterances of something about something. This exclusion of sentences not expressing judgments can be

performed relying on grammatical indicators, intonation, word order, etc. Only sentences-utterances contain judgments. Moreover, the truth or falsity of some such judgments is clear without context. For example, the sentence *"Everything in the world around us is in mutual connection and mutual conditionality"* expresses a true judgment. In other cases, the truth or falsity of judgments expressed in sentences-utterances can be determined only in context. For example, the truth or falsity of the judgment *"He is ill"* can be judged only when it is known about whom specifically speech is being made, to what time our utterance is referred, and so on.

Thus, as a result of analyzing speech from the point of view of its linguistic characteristics, we can isolate a circle of sentences-utterances representing either true or false judgments.

In connection with considering the question of the one-to-one correspondence of logical categories, grammar is very important to stop on one more essential question. The point is that the exact indicator of a particular fully specific logical characteristic of a thought may be not one single grammatical indicator. We have already encountered this fact and saw that, for example, a sign of the universality of an affirmative judgment is not one single word standing before the subject of a declarative simple sentence, but a whole group of words, namely the pronouns "all", "every", "each". The presence of logical consequence is expressed in language not by some single word, but by a whole series of words and word combinations, for example: "therefore", "hence (from this) it follows", "hence (from this) it flows", etc.

In connection with this fact, the following question arises: why in language arises a multitude of words and word combinations that are indicators of one and the same logical content? Are not any words and word combinations in language having the same logical sense superfluous? Let us consider this question on the example of some Russian language conjunctions.

In logic, the conjunctions "and", "or" (divisive and non-divisive), "if... then" play a very essential role. With the help of these conjunctions from simple judgments complex ones are formed. Thus, connecting with the conjunction "and" two simple judgments: *"He arrived in Moscow"*, *"He entered the Lomonosov Moscow State University"*—into one judgment, we will obtain a new complex judgment: *"He arrived in Moscow and (he) entered the Lomonosov Moscow State University"*.

The truth of this new complex conjunctive judgment depends on the truth of the simple judgments entering into it. For this kind of judgments logic establishes the following rule: a conjunctive complex judgment is true when both judgments entering into it are true, and false in all other cases; it is false if at least one of the simple judgments entering into its composition is false.

For disjunctive complex judgments formed from simple judgments with the help of the conjunction "or", taken in a non-divisive sense, a different rule is formulated. A disjunctive judgment is true if at least one of the simple judgments is true; it is false in only one case—in the case when all judgments composing it are false.

In language there occur complex sentences formed with the help of conjunctions "and", "but", "although", etc. Analysis shows that all these conjunctions in their logical nature are equivalent, although grammatically they express different semantic connections: "and"—connects, "but"—opposes, "although"—expresses concession. This means that complex sentences formed from simple sentences by means of the specified conjunctions express a complex judgment that is true only in the case when all simple judgments entering into its composition are true.

Let us consider now a series of sentences formed with the help of the specified conjunctions: *"I went to the university, and my companion went there too"* (1), *"I went to the university, but my companion went there too"* (2), *"I went to the university, although my companion went there too"* (3).

These sentences express true judgments only in the case when each of the simple judgments expressed by simple sentences is necessarily true. It is sufficient to tell a lie in one of the two sentences connected by the conjunctions "and", "but", "although", and the sentence as a whole will express a false judgment. This is understandable. In all these complex judgments the coexistence of two facts or situations is asserted, it is asserted that both of these facts or situations reported in simple sentences take place.

In complex sentences with the conjunction "and" this fact appears most prominently: in it it is asserted directly that the facts reported in each of the simple sentences take place (*"I went to the university, and my companion went there too"*). If in one of these sentences a lie is reported (the situation does not

take place, although its presence is asserted in the judgment), then the entire judgment as a whole will be false, since its meaning as a whole consists in asserting that both situations reported in the sentences take place.

Despite the adversative character of the conjunction "but", the judgment expressed by a complex adversative sentence (*"I went to the university, but my companion went there too"*), asserts that both situations reported in the simple judgments take place. The same can be repeated about the judgment expressed in the form of a complex concessive sentence with the conjunction "although".

By no means all judgments expressed in the form of complex sentences assert the presence of specific situations reported in simple sentences. Thus, for example, in the judgment *"This student is lazy or he is incapable"*, expressed in the form of a complex disjunctive sentence (the conjunction "or" here has a non-divisive sense), it is asserted that at least one of the situations reported in simple sentences takes place. Therefore, the given judgment is true when at least one of the situations reported in simple sentences takes place. Consequently, the given judgment is true when at least one of the simple judgments is true.

Thus, the judgments (1), (2), and (3) cited above are equivalent in the logical sense. Then the question arises: why in one case did we use the conjunction "and", in another the conjunction "but", and in the third "although"?

This is due to the fact that conjunctions in each of the sentences cited above carry an additional semantic load, from which logic

abstracts. This additional semantic load of the conjunctions "but" and "although" in comparison with the conjunction "and" consists in the following. By the conjunction "but" instead of the conjunction "and" we in language use in those cases when we want to emphasize contrast, demarcation, and even opposition of the considered situations. The conjunction "but" instead of the conjunction "and" is used in the cited sentence (2), obviously, in such a context from which it follows that my companion was not supposed to go to the university, once I went there. By the conjunction "although" instead of the conjunction "and" we use in those cases when the contrast, opposition of situations expressed in sentences, reaches such dimensions that it causes surprise in us. Obviously, the use of the conjunction "certainly" instead of "and" would make sense in such a context from which it would follow that I usually do not go to the university or was not going to go there at all, once my companion went there. Examples analogous to the one considered by us could be cited in huge numbers.

Thus, despite the fact that in language there occurs a whole series of grammatical categories that are indicators of one and the same logical content (logical categories), nevertheless they are not useless in language. On the contrary, they are very important, as they carry an additional semantic load, from which the science of logic usually abstracts.

Language could not be a full-fledged means of communication between people if we ignored this additional semantic load. And therefore the reactionary attempts of representatives of semantic idealism striving to create a "universal language", where a one-to-one correspondence of logical and grammatical

categories would be established, mean essentially the liquidation of language as a means of full-fledged communication between people and therefore are in advance doomed to failure.

Thus, we have illustrated the presence of a one-to-one correspondence between logical and grammatical categories. We have shown that in language there exist grammatical categories that are always indicators of a specific logical content (logical categories). Therefore, it is not accidental that in identifying laws and rules of logic such a large role was played by the analysis of language, namely grammar. About this testifies the history of logic. Aristotle, by right considered the father of the science of logic, often arrived at the identification of logical laws as a result of analyzing corresponding grammatical forms. It is sufficient to indicate that Aristotle arrived at identifying the essence of judgment as a result of analyzing various sentences.

Analyzing sentences, Aristotle showed that some of them do not express judgments (for example, prayer), that judgments are only those utterances expressing either truth or falsity. "Not every speech," writes Aristotle, "is an utterance, but only that which possesses the capacity to express truth and falsity. This belongs not to every speech; for example, prayer is speech, but it is neither true nor false. Other (speeches) are left without attention, since their consideration belongs to the field of rhetoric and poetics; utterance constitutes the subject of the present investigation" ("On Interpretation" Aristotle 4, 4-5).

In connection with Aristotle's understanding of judgment, the premises of syllogism were defined by him as **speech**

(*emphasis ours.—D. G. and N. K.*) asserting or denying something about something ("First Analytics" 1, **24 a10-24 a21**). Inference in "Topics" Aristotle defines as such speech (logos), in which, if given certain propositions, from them follows by necessity something else than these propositions. Aristotle's table of categories also extremely resembles the classification of parts of speech, which testifies to the fact that in identifying the main logical and philosophical categories a large role was played by the analysis of linguistic forms.

Having clarified that in language there exist grammatical categories that are always indicators of a specific logical content, we shall show now on a series of examples that various logical categories are expressed in language by the very same grammatical means. This will be proof that in a number of cases grammatical categories are not indicators of a specific logical content.

First of all let us consider the concept of connection between the subject and predicate of a simple judgment (**is** P), which in the Russian language is usually expressed by the words "is", "appears" or by a dash sign (-).

Let us take the following sentences:

"K. Marx (is) the author of 'Capital'" **(1)**

"4 (is) an even number" **(2)**

"This metal (is) electrically conductive" **(3)**

Let us note that the copula "is", as a rule, in the Russian language in ordinary speech is omitted. Therefore we enclosed it in parentheses. In other languages, for example, in German and Polish, the verb "is" in analogous cases exists.

Although the copula[8] "is" in the specified three sentences in the Russian language is usually omitted, in logical analysis we nevertheless express the relation revealed by us between the subject and predicate of the sentence with the help of the word "is".

The copula "is" in all three cases expresses different logical content (categories).

In sentence **(1)** the grammatical copula "is" expresses the relation of identity between the subject and predicate of the sentence, stating the fact that the subject and predicate have one and the same scope (they reflect and fix one and the same person—K. Marx).

In sentence **(2)** "is" expresses a different relation, namely the relation of belonging of an element of a class to a specific class of objects, namely that the individual number 4 belongs to the class of even numbers.

In sentence **(3)** "is" expresses an attributive relation (the relation of belonging of a specific feature to an object about which speech is being made).

---

[8] The grammatical copula "is" performs in a sentence a double function: 1) connects the predicate with the subject; 2) expresses grammatical meanings of mood, tense, number, and person in nominal predicates.

Relations expressed by the verb "is" in all the cited sentences have essential significance for logic. It is especially important to distinguish the meaning of "is" in sentences **(2)** and **(3)**. The distinction of relations expressed by the word "is" in these cases is essential for the theory of inferences. Therefore these relations have to be identified and designated each in a special way so that their confusion does not occur.

The same can be said about a series of conjunctions that have different logical content, but, nevertheless, are expressed in language identically. Let us consider the following complex sentences with the conjunction "if... then".

"If the basis changes and is liquidated, then following it the superstructure changes and is liquidated" **(1)**.

"If a month ago he was not among the advanced workers, then in this month he overtook everyone, achieving the highest production indicators" **(2)**.

"If his son could not stand firm in the face of severe trials, then this is not his fault" **(3)**.

In these sentences the conjunction "if... then" expresses different logical content. In judgment **(1)** the conjunction "if... then" means a conditional connection. The second judgment ("following it the superstructure changes and is liquidated") is made dependent on the first ("the basis changes and is liquidated"). In this judgment it is asserted that if the first judgment is fulfilled ("the basis changes and is liquidated"), then the second cannot fail to be fulfilled ("following it the

superstructure changes and is liquidated"). This means that if the first judgment is true, the second cannot be false.

In the complex sentence **(2)** a conditional connection between two simple sentences is not expressed. In this judgment two facts are opposed: what the person was a month ago, and what he became now. It would not be difficult to show that in its logical content the conjunction "if... then" in this judgment is equivalent to the conjunction "and", which, as we showed earlier, can be replaced by the conjunction "but" equivalent to it in the logical relation. And indeed, in sentence **(2)** we without any detriment to the meaning can replace the conjunction "if... then" by the conjunction "but" (*"A month ago he was not among the advanced workers, but in this month he overtook everyone, achieving high production indicators"*).

In the complex sentence **(3)** the conjunction "if... then" also does not express a conditional connection between simple sentences. In this complex judgment precisely the conditional connection between the first simple judgment and the second is denied, namely it is denied that a person can be blamed for the fact that his son could not stand firm in the face of severe trials.

Let us consider now the divisive conjunction "or". Let us analyze the following disjunctive sentences:

"He is now at home or went to the theater" **(1)**.

"He felt bad or was busy" **(2)**.

The conjunction "or" in these sentences has different logical sense. In judgment **(1)** it is asserted that only one of the two

facts fixed in each of the simple sentences connected by the conjunction "or" takes place, that both of these facts ("to be at home" and "to go to the theater") cannot exist simultaneously. Therefore the given complex judgment **(1)** as a whole is true if one of the judgments composing it is true, and the other false. In judgment **(2)** the conjunction "or" has a different logical sense. In this judgment it is asserted that not only can take place one of the facts fixed in simple sentences, but that they can take place both together (for example, a person could not come to visit because he simultaneously felt bad and was busy). Therefore the complex judgment **(2)** will be as a whole true not only in the case when one of the judgments composing it is true, but also in the case when both of these judgments are true.

One could cite a larger number of facts testifying that grammatical categories often cannot be indicators of a specific logical content; the very same grammatical categories in different contexts have different logical content. Does this mean that the presence in language of such facts prevents the exchange of thoughts between people? Not at all.

If we consider the system of a particular language as a whole as the only full-fledged means of exchanging thoughts between people, as a tool and result of reflecting reality, in which the successes of human cognitive activity are fixed, then we can state that its grammatical categories always superbly express the logical content of thought, and consequently, in this sense **correspond** to logical categories.

In this connection it is necessary to note especially the following two circumstances:

1. Grammatical categories (such as the conjunctions "if... then", "or", etc.) do not exist in living speech in isolation, in separation from other words. In speech all grammatical categories are woven into the living fabric of linguistic context. In view of the fact that language is the main means of communication, a means of exchanging thoughts between people, every word used in our speech is always interconnected with other words, since they have as their purpose either to communicate something to someone, or to object to someone in something, or to express a request to someone for something, etc. Sometimes, true, in speech individual words are also used, but they are always connected with a specific situation (for example, "Fire!", "It is dawning", etc.). A word without situation or context is dead.

2. Words, existing in mutual connection with other words, being used in context, are not empty symbols deprived of any content, of any meaning (speech here is mainly about notional vocabulary). In words the successes of human cognitive activity are fixed, and therefore individual sound complexes (or their systems) possess a specific meaning. They express concepts, our knowledge about objects of the world around us and simultaneously denote these objects. Being used in context, serving as a

> means of exchanging thoughts between people, they give us the opportunity not only to understand what speech is about, but also to express our knowledge about the subject of our thought.

In connection with the solution to the question posed by us, this means the following: various words in language that play a special role for expressing logical content (such as conjunctions, words like "all", "some", "only", etc.), not only are not used in isolation, not only are they connected with other words of our speech, they are not only referred to a specific group of objects, but also express concepts about them. This gives us the opportunity to understand the logical nature of grammatical means used in speech.

Modern positivists are sharply expressed metaphysicians. They in a harmonious chorus declare the uselessness of language, its inability to express the logical content of thought. Moreover, in their "arguments" they ignore considering language as the most important means of communication between people, as a means of fixing and expressing our concrete knowledge about the world around us. Their usual way of reasoning is as follows. They declare that, for example, the expression *"if **A**, then **B**"* does not have a specific logical content, since this conjunction does not possess a one-to-one logical meaning. Having considered a whole series of analogous examples, they assert that ordinary languages are illogical and therefore must be replaced by a new language in which a one-to-one correspondence of logic and grammar would be achieved.

Such a "method" of logical-grammatical analysis is completely untenable. Indeed, the expression *"if **A**, then **B**"* does not give us an idea about the logical content of this expression. But expressions similar to the expression *"if **A**, then **B**"* are not facts of living spoken language. The point is that in living spoken language notional words referring to many objects not only denote a specific circle of objects, but also **express our knowledge about them**[9]. In the given expression the symbols **A** and **B** only denote all possible sets of concrete sentences that can be placed in place of the variable signs **A** and **B**, but **do not express concepts about these sentences**.

We use formulas in science similar to expressions *"if **A**, then **B**"*, but these expressions are not facts of spoken language serving as the only full-fledged means of exchanging thoughts between people, but merely auxiliary linguistic means similar to the "language" of formulas in chemistry, mathematics, and other exact sciences. From here becomes obvious the untenability of positivist criticism of the illogicality of ordinary languages.

Considering the same grammatical categories, similar to the conjunction "if... then" in concrete sentences (otherwise in the exchange of thoughts they are not used), we without difficulty discover their logical sense. Sentences used in living speech are always filled with concrete content. The concrete content of thought determines its logical form. And however this logical

---

[9] Emphasizing the word "many", we exclude from consideration proper names, which denote objects, but do not express concepts about them if the objects (persons) denoted by them are unknown to us.

form was expressed in language, we can always determine it by the content of those thoughts expressed by means of language. Thus, if the sentence *"People are mortal"* is given, then to determine the logical content of this sentence it is not at all necessary that this same thought be expressed in the form of the sentence *"All people are mortal"*. Knowing the content of what speech is about, we without analysis of grammatical means can determine its logical form, its logical content. Analogously, in whatever sense the conjunction "if... then" was used in our speech, we, understanding this speech, can always determine the logical content of the connection expressed by this conjunction.

Therefore, the absence in a number of cases of a one-to-one correspondence between logical and grammatical categories under no circumstances can be interpreted as a fact proving the non-correspondence of logic and grammar. Within the framework of a particular language, grammatical categories as a whole are always capable of expressing the logical content of our thoughts, always correspond to logical categories. Moreover, the presence in language of grammatical categories having in different contexts different logical content testifies to the flexibility of language, allowing us with the help of a limited number of grammatical categories to convey a varied logical sense.

It is necessary to note that in auxiliary languages (means) of science, for example, in the "language" of mathematical and logical calculi, considered by semanticists as models in which allegedly full one-to-one correspondence of the logical and

grammatical is achieved, in fact the specified correspondence does not exist.

In this connection it is necessary to note the following two circumstances:

Since the specified auxiliary means exist only on the basis of spoken, historically formed languages, this means that they to a certain extent share all their features, including that in them there is no complete one-to-one correspondence of logical and grammatical categories.

- In the course of operating with auxiliary means we constantly have to change the meanings of signs introduced by us. For example, solving the equation $\mathbf{a\ x^n + b\ x^{(n-1)} + \ldots = 0}$ and determining **x**, we consider **x** as a variable, and coefficients **a, b, c** as fixed constants. Desiring to determine coefficients for precisely fixed values of **x**, we change the sense of signs introduced by us and begin to consider **x** as a fixed constant, and coefficients **a, b, c** as variables. Analogously change meanings of logical connectives, meanings of indicators of logical operations in logical calculi when we use their apparatus for solving various problems.

The task itself of achieving a complete one-to-one correspondence between logical categories and means of their expression in language is posed in mathematical logic not with

the goal of turning it into a language that should replace currently existing national spoken languages, but with the goal of developing logical theory itself in connection with developing the theory of mathematical proof.

Thus, we have shown that between logic and grammar there exists an inseparable dialectical interconnection; they do not exist without each other. Regardless of whether there is a one-to-one correspondence in language between grammatical and logical categories or not, the system of grammatical categories of a particular language as a whole always corresponds to the system of logical categories of our thought and adequately expresses the logical content of our thoughts. This means that any concrete word or word combination, any concrete sentence or system of sentences, taken in context, always adequately, in a one-to-one manner expresses a specific logical content. This unity of logic and grammar is not accidental; it is conditioned by the unity and inseparable connection of language and thought.

13. SCIENCE IS AN ENEMY OF CHANCE

N. V. PILIPENKO (Yaroslavl)

Nature and society are not a random accumulation of objects and phenomena, not a realm of chaos and divine arbitrariness, but a process subject to strict necessity and regularity. This by no means signifies that science rejects objective chance in nature and society or ignores chance. On the contrary, chances not only exist, but also exert one influence or another on the development of nature and society. K. Marx noted that "history would be of a very mystical nature if 'accidents' played no role" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 264. 1947).

In letters to K. Schmidt and H. Starkenburg, F. Engels also pointed out that, since people make their history not guided by a single will or according to a single plan, economic necessity cuts its path through an infinite multitude of chances.

If science ignored chance, it would be unable to fully and comprehensively study the phenomena of the material world, since chance and necessity are in an inseparable regular connection with one another.

By necessity, dialectical materialism understands that which expresses the general, typical, stable, fundamental, essential internal connection in the phenomena of nature and society, which occurs under given conditions and in a given connection of phenomena of the material world with inevitable necessity. Therefore, the necessary under given conditions and in a given connection of phenomena must steadfastly take place and occur in precisely this way, and not otherwise.

By chance, dialectical materialism understands that which expresses not the general, typical, necessary, essential in phenomena, not their fundamental properties, but the external, superficial, untypical, unstable, which does not follow with internal necessity and inevitability from given conditions, from a given connection of phenomena of nature and society. Therefore, the accidental under given conditions and in a given connection of phenomena of nature and society may take place and may be absent, may occur in one way, or may occur in another.

Dialectical materialism has scientifically substantiated that all development of nature and social life occurs according to objective laws independent of the will and consciousness of human beings. People can discover these objective regularities, know them, and, relying upon them, utilize them in the interests of society. Denying the objective character of the laws of development of the material world leads to a rejection of the materialist understanding of the laws of development of nature and social life, and to a transition to positions of subjective idealism.

To what would the denial of objective regularities lead? "This would lead to us ending up in the realm of chaos and chance; we would find ourselves in a slavish dependence on these chances, we would deprive ourselves of the opportunity not only to understand, but simply to navigate this chaos of chances" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 85).

By discovering and studying the objective regularities of the development of the material world, people formulate the laws of science, which represent copies, images, and photographs of the objective laws of material reality. The laws of science have an objective character, since they reflect objective processes taking place in nature and society independently of the will and consciousness of people. Scientific knowledge of the laws of nature and society, verified by experience and practice, is reliable and represents objective truth.

The task of science lies in discovering deep-seated processes behind external, superficial connections of phenomena, finding necessity behind chance, and revealing the objective regularity of phenomena and processes, without the recognition and study of which it cannot exist and develop. Science can only truly be science when it comprehends the phenomena of nature and society in their necessity and in their regularities.

Relying on chance and "hoping for luck" leads to the liquidation of science, to the study of only the external, superficial, and singular, rather than the cognition of the core, necessary connection of phenomena and the discovery of laws, knowledge of which is the basis of purposeful practical human activity.

Science opposes objective chance not as a form of manifestation and supplement to necessity, but against the recognition of chaos and the dominance of chances in the development of nature and society, against replacing necessity and regularity with chance.

The proposition *science is an enemy of chance* is understood by dialectical materialism in the sense that science should not orient itself towards lucky chances or base its conclusions on them; rather, it is obliged to proceed from the cognition of objective regularities of nature and society and base its conclusions on the study of these regularities. Only the cognition and study of the phenomena of nature and society in their necessity allow science to uncover the essence of phenomena and the objective laws of their development.

Only such science, oriented towards the study of the laws of nature and society, can serve as a guide in cognition and in the practical transformation of the world. A science that ignores the laws of nature and society and relies on a fortunate concurrence of circumstances, gives the possibility of a favorable course of events, etc., resembles crude, blind empiricism and quackery.

Genuine science must foresee the course of processes and events in nature and society and their results. Foresight is inextricably linked with the recognition that nature and society are subject to their own laws, and that these laws are correctly reflected in the human mind. Scientific foresight gives practice a clear perspective, confidence, and orientation in achieving goals. Only on the basis of known laws of nature and society is it possible to foresee and thereby consciously and systematically outline the transformation of the material world in a direction needed by humans, subjecting the destructive forces of nature to human control. Basing oneself on chances means raising insurmountable obstacles on the path of scientific knowledge. Only the enemies of science, adherents of

idealism, extol chance in every way and drive regularity out of the realm of science, thereby defending obscurantist views. Thus, "physical" idealists, fulfilling the order of the ruling classes, strive to prove that micro-processes are allegedly inherent with indeterminism, that the motion of micro-particles is governed not by necessary connections, but by random ones, and that electrons possess "free will," and so forth.

Bourgeois scientists also explain the development of the Solar System through chance. According to the hypothesis of the English idealist physicist Jeans, as a result of a random approach of the Sun to a passing star, a stream of matter was allegedly pulled out of the Sun under the influence of this star, which, breaking into parts, formed the planets.

The extolling of chance is also characteristic of pseudo-scientific biology. In the view of Weismannist-Morganists, life arose on Earth purely by chance in the form of a gene molecule, as if lying at the base of all living things. Changes in organisms are also allegedly brought about on the basis of chance. Chance reigns supreme over everything.

The viewpoint of the dominance of chance is also defended by bourgeois sociologists. In the book *Problems of a Changing Social Order*, Gillet and Reinhart write: "What we have achieved is the result of thousands of random achievements and individual interferences. Future history can follow the same path" (Gillet and Reinhart, *Problems of Changing Social Order*, 1942, p. 388).

Bourgeois scientists pursue a goal: to distract science from the study of objective regularities and turn it onto the path of

indeterminism and mysticism, transforming it into a pillar of religion and obscurantism, an instrument for protecting existing capitalist orders.

The problem considered in this article is presented on the material of natural science.

****

The history of natural science bears witness to the fact that science in its development has always rejected reliance on "pure" chances and the explanation of natural phenomena through chances. "We must firmly remember," says T. D. Lysenko, "that *science is an enemy of chance*. Therefore, the transformer of nature Ivan Vladimirovich Michurin put forward the slogan: 'We cannot wait for favors (i.e., lucky chances—*T. L.*) from nature; to take them from her is our task'" (T. D. Lysenko, *Agrobiology*, p. 579. Selkhozgiz, 1952).

A particularly significant role in banishing chances from physics, chemistry, and biology, and converting these sciences into precise sciences, was played by such fundamental laws of nature as the law of conservation and transformation of energy, the periodic law of chemical elements discovered by D. I. Mendeleev, the theory of the chemical structure of organic substances by A. M. Butlerov, and the law of unity of the organism and external conditions of existence.

Prior to the discovery of the law of conservation and transformation of energy, physical phenomena were explained through "chances". After the discovery of this law, physics, relying on it, began to provide a scientific explanation for natural phenomena. Indeed, in the late 17th and first half of the

18th century, natural science, following Newton's path, explained all physico-chemical processes through mechanical motion. At the same time, the energetic basis of industry was mechanical motion (energy of water, wind, and muscular energy of animals and humans). But at the end of the 18th century, large machine industry, mining, and metallurgical industries emerged, and chemical technology and thermal engineering began to develop rapidly. Explaining chemical and thermal forms of motion of matter through mechanical motion, without deviating from science, was no longer possible.

Therefore, to explain the nature of various forms of moving matter, physicists of that time began to allow arbitrariness in interpreting natural phenomena; they invented various imponderable fluids ("fluids"), incomprehensible internal "forces," etc. For example, major chemical reactions were explained by the presence of phlogiston, i.e., a special kind of combustible substance or carrier of combustibility; metals were viewed as complex bodies consisting of calx and phlogiston. The cause of heat was attributed to a special imponderable thermal fluid—caloric. Hence, heating a colder body with a hotter body was explained by the transfer of caloric from the first body to the second.

The cause of light was explained by the presence of a special "luminous" matter. Similarly, electricity was viewed either as the result of the presence of an electrical fluid in substances or as the presence of electrical repulsive/attractive contact forces, etc.

F. Engels criticized Newtonians for resorting to imaginary "forces" and substances to explain all incomprehensible natural

phenomena. Empiricists of that time, Engels writes, "thought they explained unexplained phenomena by substituting some force—gravitational force, buoyant force, electrical contact force, etc.—or, where that didn't fit, some unknown substance: light matter, heat matter, electrical matter, etc." (*Anti-Dühring*, p. 11. Note. 1950).

Newtonian natural science, although it played a certain role in accumulating facts, was on the whole incapable of bringing these facts into a necessary connection inherent in their internal regularity, or of explaining them.

In the middle of the 18th century, the great Russian scientist M. V. Lomonosov led a decisive struggle to banish imponderable fluids—"fluids"—and "forces" from science. In developing a holistic picture of the world, he clearly formulates and places at the foundation of his research the law of conservation of matter and motion as a universal law of nature.

From the standpoint of the law of conservation of matter and motion, Lomonosov approaches the explanation of such natural phenomena as heat, combustion chemistry, electricity, light, etc. In contrast to Newtonians who explained the cause of heat by a thermal substance—caloric, Lomonosov developed a molecular-kinetic interpretation of heat, seeing the cause of it in the internal motion of matter, in the "rotary" (rotational) motion of "insensitive particles" (atoms and molecules) of which natural bodies consist.

M. V. Lomonosov saw in motion (and friction) of the smallest particles of matter not only the cause of heat, but also of electricity and light. Thus, he viewed electricity as the result of

interaction between different types of ether and various types of ordinary matter (substance). "Electrical force is an action caused by light friction in bodies accessible to our senses; it consists of repulsive and attractive forces..." (M. V. Lomonosov, *Selected Philosophical Works*, p. 270. 1950). M. V. Lomonosov believed that electrical force propagates through the rotational motion of the ether. Denying the existence of a special light matter, Lomonosov saw the cause of light in wave (vibrational) motion of the ether.

All this shows that while M. V. Lomonosov did not yet contrast light, heat, electricity, and chemistry as qualitatively distinct forms of motion of matter, but treated them as varieties of mechanical motion, he nevertheless gave these natural phenomena a materialist explanation based on the study of the regularities of moving matter.

M. V. Lomonosov held that various natural phenomena are driven by various forms of motion of material particles (vibrational, rotational, translational). Moreover, M. V. Lomonosov was already outlining the correct approach to interpreting the transition of mechanical motion into heat. He saw the cause of this transition in friction and impact. M. V. Lomonosov expressed insights into the connection between heat and electricity, electricity and chemistry. In the future, the brilliant discoveries of M. V. Lomonosov were enriched by all the new achievements of natural science.

In the years 1836–1837, Russian scientist B. S. Jacobi proved through electroplating the connection between electricity and chemistry.

In 1840, our compatriot G. I. Hess, studying heat evolution during salt exchange reactions in aqueous solutions, as well as in neutralization reactions, discovered the law of constant heat summation in reactions, which is essentially nothing other than a chemical expression of the law of conservation of energy, given for the first time in an experimentally substantiated form.

In 1842–1845, J. R. Mayer and in 1847 Helmholtz experimentally proved the transformation of heat into mechanical energy and mechanical energy into heat. A short time later, Favre and Silbermann proved the conversion of chemical energy into electricity and vice versa.

As a result of all these achievements of science, it was conclusively proven that all the countless forces acting in nature, which until then had appeared mysterious and unexplainable—mechanical force, heat, radiation (light and radiant heat), electricity, magnetism, chemical force of combination and decomposition—are special forms of existence of one and the same energy; that is, of motion, and under given conditions they mutually transform into one another without any loss whatsoever.

"Thanks to this," F. Engels notes, "the various physical forces —these, so to speak, immutable 'species' of physics—were transformed into differently differentiated and mutually convertible forms of motion of matter according to specific laws. Science eliminated the randomness of the presence of such-and-such an amount of physical forces, for their mutual connection and conversions into one another were proven" (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 10. 1962).

F. Engels and V. I. Lenin called the law of conservation and transformation of energy the establishment of the main tenets of materialism.

If the discovery of the law of conservation and transformation of energy helped eliminate from physics the concept of random and mystical "forces" and turn physics into an exact science, the discovery in 1869 by D. I. Mendeleev of the periodic law of chemical elements contributed in equal measure to banishing chance from the realm of chemistry.

Prior to the periodic law, elements and their properties were studied separately in chemistry, without seeing a regular connection between them. Each element with its properties seemed a random manifestation of matter. As for the discovery of as-yet unknown elements, prior to the periodic law this matter was not placed on a scientific footing at all. The discovery of new elements was purely a matter of chance.

Thus, Scheele in 1774, striving to solve the mystery of fire, unexpectedly discovered that burning phosphorus (and later other substances) in closed vessels leads to a $1/5$ decrease in air volume. These experiments led Scheele to conclude that ordinary air is not an element, as people previously thought, but a complex substance, "a mixture of two gases, which he called 'fire air' and 'vitiated air.'" A few years later, Lavoisier proved that "fire air" is oxygen, and "vitiated air" is nitrogen.

Equally by chance, Davy in 1807 isolated the metals sodium and potassium from what were considered simple elements—sodium and potassium oxides—using electrical current. Then, a

year later, Davy discovered a group of alkaline earth metals—magnesium, calcium, strontium, and barium using the same method. With the help of spectral analysis discovered by Bunsen and Kirchhoff (1860), rubidium, cesium, thallium, and indium were discovered.

Speaking about how chance reigned in the discovery of elements, D. I. Mendeleev wrote: "Prior to the periodic law, simple bodies represented merely fragmentary, random phenomena of nature: there was no reason to expect any new ones, and those newly found were complete, unexpected novelties in their properties" (*Selected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 359. 1934).

In order to banish chance from the discovery of elements—and thus free chemistry from chance and turn it into an exact science—it was necessary to discover a law reflecting the diverse properties of chemical elements within a single unified system. This task was accomplished by D. I. Mendeleev. His discovered periodic law became the law of inorganic nature that helped unite and harmonize various parts of chemical knowledge and build chemistry as a science.

Mendeleev himself gave the following formulation of the periodic law he discovered: "...*If all elements are arranged in order according to the magnitude of their atomic weight, a periodic repetition of properties is obtained. This is expressed in the law of periodicity: the properties of simple bodies, as well as the forms and properties of compounds of elements, are in a periodic dependence on (or, expressed algebraically, form a periodic function of) the magnitude of the atomic weights of*

the elements" (*Principles of Chemistry*, Vol. 11, pp. 80–81. 1947).

With the establishment of the periodic law, which demonstrated the universal connection and interdependence of elements, the discovery of new elements was placed on a scientific footing; scientists began to study regular connections and relationships between elements, thereby banishing chance from their discovery.

Pointing out the significance of the periodic law in banishing chance from chemistry, especially regarding the discovery of new, as-yet unknown elements, D. I. Mendeleev said that prior to the periodic law "we had no way to predict the properties of unknown elements, nor could we judge the absence or presence of certain ones. The discovery of elements was a matter of single-instance observation. And only blind chance and the exceptional insight and attentiveness of great minds led to the discovery of new elements... The law of periodicity opens a new path in this latter respect" (D. I. Mendeleev, *New Materials on the History of the Discovery of the Periodic Law*, p. 59. 1950).

The periodic law enabled Mendeleev to predict the existence and properties of a number of elements and directed the minds of scientists toward the discovery of new elements. Proceeding from the periodic law, Mendeleev discovered that his system (table) contained several unoccupied places—for instance, in columns under aluminum, boron, and silicon. Since according to his law there should be no random gaps, but rather qualitative changes in chemical elements must occur regularly depending on atomic weights, Mendeleev assumed that empty

cells were explained by elements corresponding to them (eka-aluminum, eka-boron, eka-silicon) existing in nature, but not yet discovered. Guided by this law, Mendeleev predicted the atomic weight and key properties of the presumed elements and their compounds. Regarding eka-aluminum, he made a very bold assumption, noting that this metal would possess greater volatility than aluminum, and therefore could be discovered by spectral analysis.

Mendeleev's foresight was brilliantly confirmed. In 1875, Lecoq de Boisbaudran discovered a new element—gallium—in zinc blende using spectral analysis, which corresponded to eka-aluminum. In 1879–1880, Lars Fredrik Nilson discovered scandium and showed that it possessed the properties predicted by Mendeleev for eka-boron. In 1886, Clemens Winkler discovered the element germanium, the properties of which coincided with the described Mendeleevian properties of eka-silicon.

Engels gave a high evaluation of D. I. Mendeleev's predictions based on the periodic law. He wrote that although Mendeleev unconsciously applied the law of transformation of quantity into quality, with his discovery he "accomplished a scientific feat that can boldly be placed alongside Leverrier's discovery, who calculated the orbit of an as-yet unknown planet—Neptune" (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 43).

The discovery of inert gases convinced scientists even more that the key to discovering new chemical elements is the periodic law. Thus, in 1895, W. Ramsay discovered helium by heating the mineral cleveite. A year earlier, he together with Rayleigh found argon in the air. These new elements, which

turned out to be non-reactive, valenceless, and monatomic in terms of chemical properties, had to be placed somewhere in Mendeleev's system. It was obvious that helium should be placed between hydrogen and lithium. Therefore, Ramsay suggested introducing a new group into the system, with which Mendeleev later agreed—the zero group. With the introduction of the new group, each period in the system was completed with a corresponding inert gas. When Ramsay placed these two elements in Mendeleev's table, he saw that one unoccupied cell remained between them and two empty cells below argon. "Following the example of our teacher Mendeleev," writes Ramsay, "I described, as far as possible, the expected properties and predicted relations of that gaseous element that should fill the place between helium and argon" (*Noble and Radioactive Gases*, Vol. 11. Kazan, 1909). And indeed, later Ramsay isolated neon, krypton, and xenon from liquid air, which filled the empty cells in the system of elements. The properties of neon turned out to be exactly as Ramsay had predicted earlier.

With the discovery of radioactivity, which served as the starting point for creating the theory of atomic structure, and the discovery of the electron and X-rays, it was proven that an element's position in Mendeleev's table is determined not by atomic weight, but by the set of chemical properties of the atom, namely its nuclear charge, which coincides with the atomic number and corresponds to its electronic configuration. Moseley in 1914 derived this number (atomic number) experimentally. It turned out to be nothing other than the square root of the frequency of characteristic lines in X-ray

spectra. But Mendeleev, without knowing about the atomic nucleus, actually used it in his derivations and predictions, as well as in the final arrangement of his table precisely by atomic number, i.e., position (cell) of the element in the system.

A deeper interpretation of the periodic law was of paramount importance in discovering new elements. Let us provide just one example with the discovery of hafnium.

Since the atomic numbers of two adjacent elements in Mendeleev's system differ by unity, it became clear that between the rare-earth element lutetium (atomic number 71) and the next element, tantalum (atomic number 73), there must be one more element. Where to look for this element with atomic number 72 was pointed out by Niels Bohr. Based on the periodic system of elements, which allowed for determining nuclear charge and the full number of electrons in atoms of various elements, Bohr also explained the structure of electron shells of atoms and the sequence of their filling. Bohr proved that electrons in an atom around the nucleus are arranged in shells, forming several atomic shells.

In this process, the first shell contains 2 electrons, the second—8, the third—18, etc. Bohr established that, as a rule, the second electron shell is formed only after the first is constructed, and the third—after the second. However, in the future, this order of shell construction is broken. And when Bohr examined lanthanides on this basis, it turned out that lanthanum, which has atomic number 57, already has fifth and sixth electron shells around the atomic nucleus, but 14 seats in the fourth shell remain unfilled. From this, Bohr concluded that all lanthanides total only 14. Consequently, the last element

should end with atomic number 71, i.e., the element lutetium. And since the undiscovered element with atomic number 72 has as many electrons, the 72nd electron must fit not into the fourth shell (since it is filled), but into the fifth.

Based on this, Bohr established that the undiscovered element should belong not to the lanthanides, but to Group IV of the Mendeleevian system, i.e., it should be analogous in its physical and chemical properties to zirconium and thorium. This meant that one must look for it not among rare earths, as some scientists (such as Urbain) claimed, but in zirconium ore.

Bohr's foresight was soon confirmed by the discovery in 1923 by Coster and Hevesy of a new element in zirconium ore—hafnium, having atomic number 72. In light of atomic structure, and especially the distribution of electrons across orbits (shells), it became clear why such regularity exists in the arrangement of elements in the table and why properties repeat in chemical elements.

On the basis of the periodic law, transuranic elements were also discovered. It was proven that fluctuations in atomic weights (for example, tellurium—128 and iodine—127) are not the result of pure chance, but are explained by atomic structure. It was also proven that the break in the table at uranium is not a random affair, but the result of instability of new chemical elements. Similarly, the low prevalence of rare earth elements was explained not by chance, but by natural properties of these elements, etc.

Just as thanks to the law of conservation and transformation of energy and D. I. Mendeleev's periodic law, chance was

banished from physics and inorganic chemistry, so too thanks to the theory of chemical structure created by A. M. Butlerov was chance banished from organic chemistry. Prior to A. M. Butlerov's theory, organic chemistry, with the theories prevailing in it at the time—Davy–Berzelius's electrochemical dualism, and later Gerhardt's unitary theory of types—was essentially not a science, for it lacked predictive power, did not believe in the possibility of knowing chemical reactions and molecular structures, and considered chemical formulas merely a convenient way to describe chemical transformations. New organic substances were discovered in the vast majority of cases by chance.

Thus, in 1828, German chemist F. Wöhler, instead of ammonium cyanate—a substance he wanted to obtain by evaporating a mixture of solutions of two salts: ammonium sulfate and potassium cyanate—obtained a white crystalline substance: urea.

Equally by chance in 1856, Englishman Perkin, during the oxidation of aniline, obtained the synthetic organic dye mauveine, which laid the foundation for industrial production of synthetic aniline dyes.

Butlerov's theory put an end to the dominance of chances in finding and discovering chemical compounds. It helped turn organic chemistry into a true science, giving organic chemists perspective, power, and orientation in complex experimental studies. Butlerov's theory raised the scientific thinking of chemists to such heights that it became possible not only to know existing organic compounds in nature, but to predict and create completely new compounds, thereby changing nature.

Butlerov's theory of chemical structure was of particularly great importance in banishing chance from organic chemistry regarding the discovery of isomeric compounds[10]. "In this respect," writes Academician N. D. Zelinsky, "the significance of Butlerov's theory of structure in chemistry can only be compared with the significance of Mendeleev's brilliant periodic law: both allow one to scientifically foresee phenomena of nature still covered in darkness; the periodic law of Mendeleev predicted elements as yet unknown, and Butlerov's theory of structure predicted organic compounds not yet discovered by science. Butlerov's theory gives chemical thinking such power and confidence that makes it possible not only to know organic compounds existing in nature, but to create completely new compounds, altering and supplementing nature" (*Oktyabr* Journal, Book 8, 1948, p. 173).

Indeed, if one proceeds from the fundamental regularity established by the theory of chemical structure—namely that the chemical nature of a complex particle is determined by the nature of elementary constituent particles, their quantity, and chemical structure—then the number of isomers must coincide with the number of theoretically possible ones. Consequently, if certain theoretically possible isomers are not yet known to science, one must find them or produce them through laboratory means.

As early as 1864, A. M. Butlerov, conducting a series of experimental works, synthesized trimethylcarbinol, the first

---

[10] Isomers in organic chemistry are defined as compounds that have the identical composition, but differ in their physical and chemical properties.

representative of tertiary alcohols, the existence and structure of which were predicted by him on the basis of structure theory. A short time later, he not only pointed out the existence of three higher homologs of trimethylcarbinol, but also synthesized them. Butlerov also proved the existence of isomerism among saturated and unsaturated hydrocarbons.

Butlerov's student V. V. Markovnikov, based on Butlerov's theory, approached the study of petroleum and discovered naphthenes and naphthenic acids in it. Another student of Butlerov, A. M. Zaitsev, guided by his theory, developed methods for obtaining tertiary alcohols, lactones, hydroxy acids, and halo-alcohols. In contrast to the contrived theory of "resonance," which views the organic molecule not as a specific formation having a structural formula, but as a set of fantastical, non-existent structural formulas that supposedly determine all molecular behavior and properties, Butlerov's theory of chemical structure in studying compound structure proceeds from real, objective relations.

Based on the theory of chemical structure of substances, present-day chemists solve complex questions of searching for the simplest and most accessible ways to process natural raw materials into substances used in the national economy and daily life. Such substances include: synthetic motor fuel, synthetic rubber, shatterproof glass, plastics, artificial dyes and fibers, medicinal substances, vitamins, anti-tuberculosis and anti-malarial substances, and a number of chemical compounds used for fertilizing fields and destroying harmful insects.

The successful development of biology is also due to the fact that, despite anti-scientific, metaphysical-idealist theories that

based their conclusions on the dominance of chance and divine arbitrariness (preformationist theories, Cuvier's catastrophe theory, etc.), it relied on objective regularities of living nature.

Lamarck and especially Darwin, having studied complex biological interconnections, regularities of life, and development of plants and animals, refuted teleological, metaphysical views of nature. Darwin, extending the idea of development to living nature, proved, as noted by Engels, that the entire modern organic world—plants, animals, not excluding man—developed as a result of a long process of development from a few original unicellular germs, which in turn formed from protoplasm or protein that arose through chemical means.

V. I. Lenin, giving a high evaluation to Darwin's teaching, pointed out that he "put an end to the view of species of animals and plants as unconnected, random, 'created by God' and immutable, and for the first time placed biology on a completely scientific footing, establishing the variability of species and succession between them" (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 124).

Evaluating the contributions of Lamarck and Darwin to the development of science, N. V. Stalin noted that their evolutionary method put biological science on its feet.

In creating his teaching on natural and artificial selection, Darwin relied on the recognition of variability in living beings, the transmission by inheritance of acquired traits and properties during an organism's life under the influence of external environmental conditions. However, he was still unable to give

a scientific explanation for the causes inducing variability. Darwin believed that solving this problem was a task for future biology.

Reactionary biologists took every measure to cast Darwinism's materialist core aside, vulgarize it, and defile its scientific foundation. The personification of such a vulgarization of Darwinism was the "Weismann–Mendel–Morgan" teaching, termed "neo-Darwinism." This "teaching" not only revived old idealist and metaphysical views of living nature discarded by Darwin, but aggravated them. Weismannism-Morganism in our day, sparing no means, opposes the materialist biology—Michurinist teaching. Equipping false-scientific arguments with racism, Malthusianism, and cosmopolitanism, it is one of the most reactionary trends of the rotten ideology of imperialism.

Proceeding from the philosophy of Machism, Kantianism, positivism, Weismannism-Morganism denies the regularity of nature, causal and necessary connections of its phenomena, and views surrounding reality as a "chaos of elements" (elements of "hereditary substance"), as a collection of chances.

According to such "science," says Academician T. D. Lysenko, "'gene' mutations occur randomly. 'Chromosome' mutations also appear randomly. The direction of the mutational process is also random as a result of this. Proceeding from these fabricated chances, Morganists construct their experiments on a random selection of agents acting on the organism with so-called mutagenic substances, believing that these act on a fabricated non-existent hereditary substance, and hoping to obtain by chance what might turn out to be useful".

According to Morganism, the divergence of so-called maternal and paternal chromosomes during reduction division is also subject to pure chance. Fertilization, according to Morganism, occurs non-selectively, but on the basis of random encounter of germ cells. From here—randomness and splitting of traits in hybrid progeny, etc. (*Agrobiology*, pp. 578–579).

In contrast to Mendelism-Morganism, Michurinist teaching is built on the dialectical-materialist idea of necessity, regularity, and irreconcilable hostility to chance. Proceeding from the premise of dialectical materialism that mutual connection and mutual conditionality of phenomena, established by the dialectical method, represent the regularity of development of moving matter, Michurinist teaching everywhere, where Mendelists-Morganists see only a play of chance, uncovers real objective regularities and studies them.

Understanding that living nature has developed and is developing on the basis of strict regularities inherent to it, that organisms and species develop on the basis of natural necessities inherent to them, Michurinist teaching sets as its main task the cognition of regularities of life and development of living bodies, and the development on their basis of methods for managing the development of plants and animals according to the interests of socialist practice.

Guided by the directives of the classics of Marxism-Leninism on the connection between organism and external environment, Michurinist biology has substantiated this connection using vast factual natural-scientific material. It has shown that an organism and the conditions necessary for its life represent a

unity, and that changes in life conditions and metabolic changes contain the main cause of variability in living bodies. Thereby, Michurinist biology refutes the false propositions of Mendelism-Morganism regarding the complete independence of hereditary properties from life conditions of plants and animals, as well as the presence of some special "hereditary substance" in the organism.

The connection and unity of a living body with its conditions of life is expressed in metabolism taking place between the organism and the external environment. Life itself, as F. Engels teaches, is a "mode of existence of protein bodies, the essential element of which is constant metabolism with surrounding external nature, and with the cessation of this metabolism life also ceases, leading to the decomposition of protein" (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 244).

Weismannism-Morganism, perverting the regular connection between living bodies and the environment, searched for various random mutagenic factors to explain variability in organisms.

Michurinist teaching does not deny the action of mutagenic substances (X-rays, colchicine, etc.), since it recognizes the impact of environmental conditions on a living body. However, it proves that "impacts of this kind, penetrating the organism not through its development, not through process of assimilation and dissimilation, only in rare cases and only by chance can lead to results useful for agriculture. This is not the path of planned selection, not the path of progressive science" (T. D. Lysenko, *Agrobiology*, p. 576).

Proceeding from unity of organism and environment as the main law of living nature, and building upon the proposition of dialectical materialism concerning development as a gradual quantitative change leading to leap-like, qualitative transformations of phenomena, T. D. Lysenko created the theory of the phased development of living bodies, which has general biological significance.

The essential meaning of this theory lies in the fact that a plant in its development undergoes a series of successive stages, which are essentially fundamental qualitative shifts in metabolism (vernalization stage, light stage, etc.). At each stage in a plant organism, a qualitative turning point occurs in requirements for external environmental conditions. And for this turning point to occur, specific external conditions are required (temperature, light, humidity, air availability, etc.). After the organism receives them and assimilates them, a qualitative transformation—a leap—occurs, development passes to a new stage, and the organism again changes its requirements for the external environment. These stage-wise changes occurring in a plant or in its individual organs are irreversible.

With the help of the theory of phased plant development, T. D. Lysenko and his colleagues achieved the targeted transformation of winter forms of grains into spring forms and vice versa, obtained frost-resistant winter forms of wheat, overcome potato degeneration in the south, and achieved heritable changes in plants during vegetative hybridization, reduced vegetation periods for cereal plants, and thereby saved them from the destructive effects of dry winds, etc.

By establishing the regularities of individual development of plant and animal organisms, Michurinist teaching refuted the far-fetched mutational "theory" explaining speciation through random and incomprehensible restructuring of the chromosome set of "hereditary substance." It scientifically explained regularities of speciation and uncovered paths of transformation from one plant species into another.

T. D. Lysenko considers that "the primary cause of the appearance of certain species from others, as well as the primary cause of intra-species diversity of forms, is a change in living conditions of plants and animals, a change in metabolic type." (T. D. Lysenko, *Problems of Michurinist Biology*, Vol. 2, p. 95. 1951).

The emergence and development of new species is associated with such changes in metabolic type during the development of organisms that affect their specific species characteristics.

Practical proof of the correctness of regularities of speciation discovered by Michurinist biology is provided by work conducted by Michurinists on transforming hard, 28-chromosome wheat into soft, 42-chromosome wheat, and vice versa; soft wheat into hard wheat; single-grain clover into double-grain; headed cabbage into rutabaga, etc.

O. B. Lepeshinskaya's discovery of the possibility of cell formation not only from cells, but also from non-cellular living substance, also helps explain causes of speciation. For example, if different types of wheat give rise to rye, this can be represented, as T. D. Lysenko writes, as follows:

"In the body of a wheat plant organism, under the influence of appropriate living conditions, grains of rye body are generated. But this generation occurs not by transforming old into new; in this case, wheat cells are not transformed into rye cells, but rather arise in the depths of the body of an organism of a given species from substance that does not have cellular structure, grains of body of another species. These grains initially may not have cellular structure, but subsequently cells and buds of another species form from them" (*Agrobiology*, p. 702).

Altering living conditions forces the very type of development of plant organisms to change. The altered type of development is, thus, the primary cause of changes in heredity.

At the same time, Michurinist teaching conclusively proved that heredity is not some incomprehensible, independent living substance, but a property, quality, and specificity of a living body. Michurinist biology considers that any part of a living body possesses a definite heredity.

Extensive factual material on vegetative transmission of various traits in potatoes, tomatoes, and a number of other plants shows that vegetative hybrids do not differ from sexual hybrids, and that all living matter, any cells, and any particles of the body—not just chromosomes—possess heredity.

In recent times, works by S. I. Bogolyubsky on overflowing egg white from eggs of one chicken breed into eggs of other breeds during embryo development, works by P. M. Sopikov on blood transfusion from black chickens to white ones, works by G. V. Borichok-Nizhnik on grafting two organisms (sheep, goats, rabbits) proved that in birds, rabbits, sheep, and goats,

just as in plants, vegetative hybridization is possible, and that vegetative hybrids essentially do not differ from sexual ones in terms of obtained changes.

O. B. Lepeshinskaya's experiments on cell development from yolk spheres of a chicken egg also deal a blow to idealist chromosome theory. For if embryo cells arise not only by division of a fertilized egg cell, but also through development from living non-cellular matter, then it is clear that carriers of hereditary properties and traits are not only chromosomes of parental germ cells, but all parts of the egg. "Therefore," writes T. D. Lysenko, "it will be incorrect, proceeding from the idea that chromosomes possess heredity, to consider them in an organism and cell as the sole hereditary substance or organ of heredity. In an organism there are and can be various organs, including organs of reproduction, but there is not and cannot be an organ of heredity. To search in an organism for a special organ of heredity is the same as searching in an organism for an organ of life" (*Agrobiology*, p. 515).

The teaching of Michurinist biology on heredity also shows that the phenomenon of dominance is not caused by a random mechanical combination of "hereditary substance," as Mendelists-Morganists believe. It is not subject to the invented law of hybrid progeny splitting according to the $3:1$ ratio, but is the result of individual development of an organism under concrete environmental conditions, the result of a complex interaction between organism and environment. Michurinist teaching considers that splitting of hybrid progeny depends on a number of diverse factors: heat, cold, degree of

air and soil humidity, light strength, wind, soil composition, etc.

The phenomenon of dominance, according to Michurin, can also depend on the age of the variety, age and condition of crossed plants, and degree of domestication of crossed forms, etc.

Through Michurinist teaching and the works of T. D. Lysenko, regularities of the fertilization process were established, which is of enormous biological and practical importance. Morganists believed that during fertilization a purely mechanical combination of "hereditary substances" of germ cells occurs, resulting in chromosome substances not mixing biologically or chemically. Michurinist teaching, however, proved that, unlike all other metabolic processes, during the fusion of two germ cells, assimilation and mutual digestion of one another occur, as a result of which a third, new cell—a zygote—is formed instead of male and female cells, creating a new quality: the beginning of a new organism.

Proceeding from regularities of fertilization, T. D. Lysenko proposed a method of intra-varietal crossing of plants and distant hybridization of animals, which significantly increased crop yields in agricultural fields and productivity in animal husbandry on collective and state farms.

Thus, contrary to the metaphysical and idealist teaching of Weismannism-Morganism, which perverted objective regularities of living nature for class purposes and built its conclusions on pure chances, Michurinist teaching proved that the primary cause of change in all forms of organic nature is

the contradiction between organism and environment, the contradiction between external and internal. The form of resolution of this contradiction is a change in the nature of heredity of organisms, which is brought about by a change in the type of metabolism occurring under the influence of changing environmental conditions.

Biological science, like physics and chemistry, bases its conclusions not on chance, but on knowledge of objective regularities of development of living organisms verified by practice. From the proposition that science is an enemy of chance, it by no means follows that people must ignore chances. From this it follows only that people, relying on objective regularities, must overcome chances, limit the sphere of their action, banish chances from science, and, on the basis of known natural laws, utilize the forces of nature in human interests.

Human mastery over nature consists precisely in the ability to correctly apply and utilize known laws in practice. When speaking of conquering natural forces or dominating them, this means that people can discover laws, master them, learn to apply them with full knowledge of the matter, and use them in the interests of society.

In Soviet science, guided by the teaching of dialectical materialism and its propositions on the regularity of the objective world, elements of random discovery have diminished. Today, the success of science is determined by the fact that it does not wait for favors from nature, but strives to study objective regularities and thereby systematically advance

against nature, compelling its forces and riches to serve the needs of people building communism.

The successes of Soviet science are to a significant degree the result of the fact that the Communist Party has always directed and continues to direct Soviet science toward studying objective regularities of development of the material world and toward fighting against chance.

By banishing chance from science and directing science toward the study of objective laws of development of nature and social life, Soviet scientists will achieve solutions to the tasks set before them by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: not only to catch up with, but to surpass the achievements of science abroad, ensuring that Soviet science occupies first place in world science.

14. ON CERTAIN LAWS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

M. I. SIDOROV

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have always devoted great attention to questions regarding the history of philosophy. They emphasized that for the elaboration of a scientific worldview, a materialist illumination of the history of philosophy is of primary importance for the development of theoretical thinking.

"...Theoretical thinking," wrote Engels, "is an innate quality only as a capacity. This capacity must be developed, perfected, and for this there is no other means than the study of all previous philosophy.

The theoretical thinking of every epoch, and therefore of our epoch, is a historical product, which takes on very different forms at different times and at the same time a very different content. Consequently, the science of thinking, like any other science, is a historical science, the science of the historical development of human thinking" (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 22. 1950).

Already in their early works, Marx and Engels turned to the consideration of the main stages in the history of philosophy. From active thinkers prior to Hegel and Feuerbach, the entire history of philosophy found its scientific evaluation in the works of Marx and Engels.

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, developing the materialist history of philosophy after Marx and Engels, formulated a series of propositions in their numerous works that are of fundamental importance for the scientific history of philosophy, especially for the history of Marxist philosophy and the history of pre-Marxist Russian philosophy.

In his famous work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Lenin gave an evaluation of the most important philosophical schools and trends of the 18th–19th and early 20th centuries.

Of particular importance are the works of V. I. Lenin devoted to the history of Marxism and the history of Russian philosophy, in which a scientific characterization of the theoretical heritage of Marx and Engels was given for the first time, and the scientific foundations of the history of Russian materialist philosophy were developed.

Expressing the essence of the Marxist understanding of the history of society, including the history of its spiritual development, V. I. Lenin wrote in his article "Karl Marx": "Marxism showed the path to an all-embracing, all-round study of the process of the emergence, development, and decline of socio-economic formations, considering the sum total of all contradictory tendencies, reducing them to precisely definable conditions of life and production of the various classes of society, eliminating subjectivism and arbitrariness in the selection of individual 'dominant' ideas or in their interpretation, revealing the roots without exception of all ideas and all various tendencies in the state of material productive forces" (*Works*, Vol. 21, p. 40).

In a number of his works, V. I. Lenin subjected various anti-scientific, idealist concepts of the history of philosophy to crushing criticism, primarily the Hegelian concept.

Without denying Hegel's merit in the development of the history of philosophy, V. I. Lenin points out that on fundamental issues Hegel stood on false positions; he viewed the history of philosophy as the history of the development of the absolute idea, spirit, as a manifestation of the spirit in the realm of consciousness. Lenin notes that Hegel's *History of Philosophy* contains rational propositions—on continuity, on the connection of one type with another, on the relative independence (absolutized by Hegel) of the development of philosophical thought. Hegel was able to see the progressive development of philosophy.

Lenin criticizes Hegel for one-sidedly illuminating the history of materialism and distorting historical reality. In his *History of Philosophy*, Hegel devoted only two pages to Democritus, whereas he smeared Plato's philosophy across many dozens of pages, citing all his dialogues.

Hegel "smears in detail... the 'natural philosophy' of Plato, an absurd mysticism of ideas, like 'the essence of sensible things are triangles,' etc., a mystical view. This is super-characteristic! —says Lenin.—The mystic-idealist-spiritualist Hegel (like all universe-wide, popish-idealist philosophy of our time) exalts and chews the mysticism-idealism in the history of philosophy, ignoring and carelessly trampling materialism. Cf. Hegel on Democritus—nill! On Plato three volumes of mystical smearing" (*Philosophical Notebooks* by V. I. Lenin, p. 263).

V. I. Lenin also holds the merit of routing the vulgar-authorial, subjectivist views on the history of philosophy held by Shulyatikov, Vekhi figures, and others.

Criticizing Shulyatikov, Lenin emphasized that the attempt to uncover a direct connection between philosophical views and the productive forces of society causes only harm to the scientific investigation of the history of philosophy.

J. V. Stalin, like Lenin, paid great attention to historical-philosophical problems. In his works, there are statements on the most important stages in the history of philosophy. Particular attention was paid by J. V. Stalin to the elaboration of the history of Marxism as the Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

The Marxist teaching on the objective nature of the laws of nature and society, developed by J. V. Stalin in *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, is directed against all kinds of subjectivist-idealist constructions in the history of philosophy and in the history of ideology in general.

Uncovering the contradictions between the productive forces of society and production relations, J. V. Stalin convincingly shows what a huge role new social ideas and institutions play in resolving these contradictions.

"After the new productive forces have matured," teaches J. V. Stalin, "the existing relations of production and their bearers—the ruling classes, turn into that 'insurmountable' obstacle which can only be removed from the path by means of the conscious activity of the new classes, by means of violent actions of these classes, by means of revolution. Here, the

tremendous role of new social ideas, new political institutions, new political power, called upon to abolish by force the old relations of production, stands out especially vividly... New ideas organize and mobilize the masses, the masses unite into a new political army, create a new revolutionary power and use it to abolish by force the old order in the field of production relations and establish a new order" (*Problems of Leninism*, p. 561, 11th ed.).

Thus, advanced ideas, in particular philosophical views, play an active, transforming role in the history of society, especially during periods of change in relations of production.

Philosophical views of society and their corresponding institutions, constituting an integral part of the superstructure, are determined by the economic structure of society.

They are not indifferent to the base that gave birth to them; along with other social views and their corresponding institutions, they actively help it take shape, strengthen, and eliminate the old base and its corresponding superstructure.

Philosophical views of society, including philosophy as a science, develop in an inseparable connection with their base, on its foundation. At the same time, the development of philosophy, like any other field of ideology, is not always and not in everything directly determined by the base of society. The development of philosophical views is influenced by class struggle, politics, and science.

The development of philosophy does not start anew each time, in a empty place. Every new stage in the development of philosophical thought, invoked by historical necessity to

eliminate old and establish new production relations, relies on the achievements of the scientific-theoretical thought of the preceding period.

"As a special realm of the division of labor," says Engels, "the philosophy of every epoch possesses as a presupposition a definite intellectual material passed down to it by its predecessors, and from which it departs" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 430, 1948).

V. I. Lenin repeatedly emphasized that Marx and Engels did not discard the intellectual heritage of the past, but critically reworked all the best that had been created by human thought throughout the history of humanity.

Dialectical materialism arose as a result of the development of all preceding science, including philosophy.

The classics of Marxism repeatedly spoke out against the vulgarizers of Marxism, who denied the connection of Marxist philosophy with the progressive heritage of social thought and depicted Marxism as a sectarian doctrine standing aside from the highway of human thought.

Vulgarizers of Marxism like Shulyatikov and his like-minded associates confused the question resolved in Marxism concerning the relationship to theoretical heritage, and the sources of Marxism; they attempted to derive the philosophical views of society directly from the nature and state of the productive forces or even from the level of technical development and tools of production. They revealed a complete misunderstanding of the fact that philosophical, as

well as other, views of society are not directly connected with productive forces.

In the classical work of Marxism, the preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, K. Marx deeply revealed the interconnection and interaction of base and superstructure:

"...At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed" (p. 7).

Developing this Marxist proposition, J. V. Stalin in his work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* revealed the dialectics of the interaction of base and superstructure, showing that the superstructure is connected with the process of production not directly, not immediately, but through the medium of the economy of society. Therefore, the superstructure reflects changes in the development of productive forces after reflecting these changes in the base.

***

The Marxist teaching that the mode of production of material goods, necessary for the life of society, conditions the social, political, and spiritual life of society, is of decisive importance for any historical research. Social being, teaches Marxism, determines the social consciousness of people. From this it

follows that an all-around study of the contradictions of the material life of society, the study of the conflict between the productive forces and production relations of society at any given time serves as the foundation for the correct illumination of the history of the development of social consciousness.

The development by J. V. Stalin of the Marxist teaching on the dialectic of productive forces and relations of production, the new formulation of the law discovered by Marx on the mandatory conformity of production relations to the nature of productive forces, and the application of this law to explain key aspects of social development provide a scientific basis for the Marxist illumination of the history of ideology, including the history of philosophy.

The history of ideology testifies to the fact that the flourish of progressive social thought and the rise of revolutionary ideological struggle against old, outmoded relations of production and their defenders have always served as evidence of the need for political, revolutionary struggle against old production relations, and for the establishment of new ones. The advanced, progressive thinkers of society reflected in their activity the matured needs of the development of the material life of society. Acting as the bearers and heralds of new, advanced ideas, the ideologists of the rising class paved the way for revolution, theoretically prepared it, and mobilized the oppressed masses for the struggle against reactionary, feudal economic and political institutions that throttled social progress.

In the 17th–18th centuries, in a number of West European countries, supporters of the materialist worldview reflected the

interests of the then-progressive bourgeoisie. Fighting for science and against idealism, superstition, and religion, they thereby opposed feudal relations of production, which were defended by the ideology of feudal society.

The materialists and Enlightenment thinkers of the 17th–18th centuries played a major role in the ideological preparation of revolutionary forces and the overthrow of the old feudal order. F. Engels pointed out that the French Enlightenment thinkers prepared the French people for the reception of the coming powerful revolution. "The great men who in France enlightened men's minds for the coming revolution were themselves extreme revolutionaries" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 107. 1948).

The French bourgeoisie during the revolutionary struggle against feudalism used the ideas of the French Enlightenment as an ideological weapon. Adopted by the National Assembly on August 26, 1789, the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen" reflected in main ideas of the bourgeois Enlightenment thinkers. Bourgeois social relations, which corresponded to the nature of the productive forces of that time, were subsequently consolidated in the Constitution of 1791. Thus, the big bourgeoisie of France, having ideologically substantiated the necessity of overthrowing feudalism, seized power in their own hands. True, they did not remain the bearer of the progressive ideology of materialist Enlightenment thinkers for long. Soon they abandoned the progressive worldview and began to defend other ideas that suited their interests as a ruling class that did not wish to concede its gains; on the contrary, it strove to perpetuate its dominance. Its

ideology became idealism and positivism, which hindered the development of the revolutionary consciousness of the working class called upon by history itself to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie.

The progressive ideas of Russian materialists of the 19th century were a new major step forward compared to the French Enlightenment of the 18th century. Anti-serfdom revolutionary-democratic ideas and the materialist philosophy of Russian revolutionary democrats of the 19th century arose under different, more progressive conditions.

Relying on a significantly broader scope of scientific knowledge, Russian materialists reflected the objective world fuller and deeper than the materialists of the 18th century. All this allowed 19th-century Russian revolutionaries to pose the question of the violent overthrow of the serfdom system, the elimination of existing, old production relations that had come into complete conflict with the nature of the productive forces, and the establishment of new relations of production.

One of the characteristic features of Russian classical philosophy of the 19th century consists in the fact that Russian philosophers consciously put philosophical materialism at the service of the revolutionary transformation of the country and the peasant democratic revolution. The political program of Herzen and Chernyshevsky was designed to raise the peasantry to the struggle against serfdom.

The classics of Russian materialist philosophy were "peasant democrats". All their philosophical, literary, and publicistic activity expressed the interests of the broad masses of working

people and assisted the peasant struggle against serfdom and serf institutions.

By virtue of historical conditions, the Russian bourgeoisie was unable to head the revolution. The peasantry was fragmented, and the working class was then only emerging. Frightened by peasant uprisings, the tsarist autocracy carried out the peasant reform and thereby resolved the conflict to a certain extent, opening room for the development of capitalism in Russia. Relations of production temporarily came into a certain alignment with the nature of productive forces.

Russian materialist philosophers of the 19th century understood the limitations of bourgeois social relations, and this was a major step forward compared to the French materialists, as well as Feuerbach. However, remaining idealists in their understanding of the essence of social development, being utopian socialists, they could not overcome the shortcomings of their materialist predecessors and could not create a scientific form of materialism, although their views approached dialectical materialism.

Thus, progressive philosophical schools contributed to the victory of the new social system, but not one of them prior to Marxism could give a scientific explanation of the law governing the replacement of one set of production relations by another, nor scientifically explain the law of social development.

Only Marx and Engels, whose activity unfolded in a new historical setting when the new class—the proletariat—entered the arena of social struggle and when science had reached

sufficient development, were able to become the ideologists of the working class—the only consistently revolutionary class—and create a consistently materialist worldview: dialectical materialism. The emergence of Marxist philosophy was a leap, a revolution in philosophy. Consistently materialistically interpreting not only nature but also the phenomena of social life, Marxist materialist philosophy overcame the limitations inherent in old bourgeois materialism: its metaphysics, mechanicism, and contemplativeness. The philosophy of Marxism—dialectical and historical materialism—emerged as the philosophy of the oppressed and exploited masses, as a program of revolutionary action of the working people led by the working class in the struggle for the overthrow of the exploitative private-property system and for the establishment of a new social system, socialism.

The highest form of materialism—dialectical materialism—is the worldview of Marxist-Leninist parties. This worldview fully and comprehensively, correctly and accurately reflects the laws of the objective world, the law of the replacement of one social formation by another. Being the worldview of Marxist-Leninist parties, dialectical materialism is the only scientific and most fruitful method of knowing the laws of nature surrounding human beings, as well as society.

According to the main requirement of the dialectical method of historical investigation, history must be illuminated as a law-governed process of social development. "History," notes J. V. Stalin, "does nothing significant without special necessity for it". A Marxist historian must proceed from the premise that the basis of social development lies in the interaction of productive

forces and relations of production, the class struggle, the struggle of advanced forces against reactionary ones, for the elimination of production relations that have turned into a brake on social development.

History cannot be embellished or degraded. In analyzing social phenomena, teaches Marxism, one must proceed from a concrete analysis of historical facts. A Marxist historian is not content with superficial observation; they comprehensively investigate every given historical event. Penetrating deeply into the essence of phenomena, they uncover behind external, apparent motives the true underlying forces and laws of social development. That is why the only scientific, Marxist history of philosophy, being a reflection of the objective laws of the development of social thought, helps public figures and people of science comprehend and deeply understand the historical law of social development.

The Marxist proposition regarding the law of mandatory conformity of production relations to the nature of productive forces is of special significance for the scientific periodization of the history of philosophy. Only by relying on this law can one determine with scientific accuracy the main periods in the history of philosophy, which are inseparably linked with the replacement of the economic base, that is, relations of production. In the light of Marxist teaching on the determining role of the mode of production of material life in society, on the base and superstructure, and on the law of mandatory conformity of production relations to the nature of productive forces, one must consider the development of philosophy and

the struggle between various schools and trends in the history of philosophy.

All errors and perversions in illuminating the history of philosophy committed in recent years are explained by the fact that comrades working in this field departed from Marxist principles of historical research, from the Marxist requirement for a concrete-historical analysis of real phenomena, and an all-around study of the activity of a given thinker in close connection with social relations, the struggle of parties, classes, and states.

It seems necessary to us to consider the question raised by some comrades working in the field of the history of Russian philosophy regarding the forms of materialism. It is known that the classics of Marxism, considering the question of the forms of materialism, established that in the pre-Marxist period materialism had two forms. They considered the first form to be the active, naive materialism: philosophy as a science had not yet separated from natural science, and Greek thinkers knew a single, undivided science, which organically included philosophy.

To the second form, the classics of Marxism assigned bourgeois materialism, the founders of which were F. Bacon and T. Hobbes. French materialists and Feuerbach developed and perfected this form of materialism.

In his work *Ludwig Feuerbach*, Engels gave a comprehensive evaluation of this form of materialism. Lenin reproduced it in his work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. The classics of Marxism, Lenin wrote, noted three "limitations" of 18th-

century materialism: first, it was essentially "mechanical" in the sense that old materialists applied "exclusively the yardstick of mechanics to processes of a chemical and organic nature"; second, it was characterized by a metaphysical approach to natural phenomena: the materialists of that time viewed the world not as a process, not as matter in continuous historical development, but as something immutable and frozen; third, the 18th-century materialists did not understand historical development and were idealists "from above".

Listing these signs of the limitation of old materialism, Lenin writes in conclusion: "On all other, more elementary issues of materialism (perverted by Machists), there is no difference, nor can there be any, between Marx and Engels on the one hand and all these old materialists on the other" (*Works*, Vol. 14, p. 228).

Marxist dialectical materialism fully overcame these shortcomings. It drew upon the achievements of 19th-century natural science without discarding them, and fully utilized the gains of the dialectical thought of the first third of the 19th century.

Before comrades working in the field of the history of Russian philosophy, the question arose: to which form of materialism should the materialism of 19th-century Russian revolutionary democrats be assigned?

Proceeding from the idea that the characterization of the second form of materialism is completely inapplicable to the philosophy of Russian materialists, comrades decided that the

materialism of 19th-century Russian thinkers constitutes a special, "third" form of pre-Marxist materialism.

In favor of the argument advanced in defense of this "third form," the reason given is that Russian materialists were dialecticians, that they advocated the idea of development and enriched old metaphysical materialism. This, of course, is true. Russian materialists, as G. V. Plekhanov colorfully put it, "created a viable embryo of materialist dialectics". They subjected metaphysical views to criticism and overcame, to a certain extent, contemplativeness. Their works are imbued with the spirit of class struggle.

However, the materialism they developed had the very same shortcomings inherent in old, pre-Marxist materialism. Russian materialists were unable to fully overcome the anthropologism of their predecessors—the French materialists and Feuerbach. "Science speaks of the people, and not of separate individuals, of man, and not of a Frenchman or an Englishman, not of a merchant or a bureaucrat," wrote Chernyshevsky. "Only that which constitutes the nature of man is recognized in science as truth; only that which is useful to man in general is recognized as true good..." (*Selected Philosophical Works*, p. 110. 1938).

Russian materialist philosophers were unable to overcome mechanicism. In the work *Anthropological Principle in Philosophy*, which with full right can be called the "credo" of 19th-century Russian materialism, Chernyshevsky states the following proposition: "The difference between organic and inorganic combinations of elements does not exist... For example, a tree differs from some inorganic acid primarily in that the acid is a combination that is not complex, whereas a

tree is a combination of many complex combinations. It is as if the difference between 2 and 200 is a quantitative difference, nothing more... Self-evidently," Chernyshevsky further says, "that when we find an identity in a theoretical formula through which a process occurring in Newton's nervous system during the discovery of the law of gravitation is expressed, and a process occurring in the nervous system of a hen seeking oat grains in a pile of dust and trash, one must not forget that the formula expresses only the identical essence of the process, and not at all that the size of the process was the same..." (ibid., pp. 65–66, 99–100).

As can be seen from these statements, the philosophical views of N. G. Chernyshevsky were by no means foreign to mechanicism. As for the views of Russian revolutionary democrats on history, they were mainly idealist in nature. Russian materialists believed that the development of science and enlightenment was one of the main factors in the progressive development of humanity. True, they expressed a series of brilliant insights, but those remained merely insights.

Thus, we have no basis to claim that Russian materialists created a new kind, a new form of materialism, qualitatively distinct from 18th-century materialism and the materialism of Feuerbach. They, as Lenin said, came right up to dialectical materialism and stopped before historical materialism.

It seems to us more correct to consider that 19th-century Russian materialists developed a system of views completing pre-Marxist philosophy, that Russian materialist philosophy was the pinnacle of pre-Marxist philosophical thought, and that

it constituted an integral part of the second form of philosophical materialism.

Russian materialists, revolutionary democrats—as ideologists of the revolutionary peasantry acting against the yoke of serfdom—took a serious step forward compared to 18th-century materialists who acted as ideologists of the revolutionary bourgeoisie fighting against feudalism.

The recognition of Russian materialism as qualitatively distinct from all pre-Marxist materialism—as a special, third form of materialism—led, as is known, to a whole series of errors: to the assertion of the existence of two sources of Leninism, to the detachment of 18th–19th-century Russian culture from the development of universal human culture, to counterposing it to all world progressive social thought, and so on.

Such a point of view also leads to the identification of the materialism of Russian revolutionary democrats with Marxist materialism, erasing the boundary between them, which is deeply erroneous. The scientific history of philosophy knows no intermediate form of materialism between pre-Marxist and dialectical materialism.

The harm of this point of view also lies in the fact that it leads to counterposing Russian materialists to all other materialist schools of the pre-Marxist period. Such counterposing exists in certain articles on the history of Russian philosophy. Characterizing the views of Herzen, Dobrolyubov, and Chernyshevsky, the authors of these articles counterpose them to the views of 18th-century materialists and Feuerbach.

These comrades apparently believe that by counterposing Russian materialists to all other materialists, they exalt Russian materialist philosophy. In reality, they diminish Russian philosophy and create the impression that Russian materialist philosophers did not understand the great significance of the struggle between materialism and idealism, confusing these two main trends in philosophy.

It is clear that revealing the specifics and uniqueness of Russian materialism and its class conditionality is necessary, just as it is necessary to see the differences between Feuerbach's materialism and Diderot's materialism. But counterposing them to one another gives no grounds.

Unfortunately, one must admit that such errors are found not only in philosophical literature. In 1951, Makogonenko's book *Nikolai Novikov and the Russian Enlightenment of the 18th Century* was published. The author of this book claims that Russian Enlightenment thinkers allegedly waged a struggle against the works of French Enlightenment figures as pillars of tsarist autocracy. Defining the specific features of the 18th-century Russian Enlightenment, Comrade Makogonenko writes:

"Another important feature of the Russian Enlightenment, already defined in the 18th century, is its anti-bourgeois nature. French, American, and German Enlightenment, by force of historically developed circumstances, was a bourgeois ideology" (p. 210). And since the 18th-century Russian Enlightenment was, in the author's opinion, anti-bourgeois, and therefore more democratic, it "had to fight not only against

ideologists of absolutism, but also against figures of Enlightenment from other countries".

Comrade Makogonenko's mistake lies in the fact that he approached the evaluation of the bourgeois ideology of that period anti-historically.

Comrade Makogonenko fails to see the revolutionary nature of bourgeois ideology of that period, when the bourgeoisie served as the standard-bearer in the fight against feudalism.

It is well known that French Encyclopedists were ideologists of the bourgeoisie, and that they prepared it for the struggle against feudalism, against old production relations, for the establishment of new relations of production.

French Encyclopedists proved in their works the inevitability of the liquidation of the feudal system and feudal ownership.

Marx and Engels note in *The Holy Family* that French Enlightenment figures fought for the ideas of a new world. V. I. Lenin, in the struggle against idealism and mysticism, systematically utilized the heritage of the great French Encyclopedists. In his article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism," he suggested translating them into Russian and publishing their works.

***

Our party decisively fights against both subjectivism and bourgeois objectivism, which departs from the principle of party-mindedness (*partiinost'*) in philosophy. Objectivism essentially means a rejection of the materialist explanation of the emergence and development of philosophical schools and

trends, and a shift to positions of idealist interpretation of philosophical phenomena as self-development, or filiation of ideas. An objectivist interpretation of the history of philosophy inevitably leads to a departure from the Marxist explanation of the development of philosophical views as reflections of the economic system of society, class and party struggles, and the expression of objective laws of development, towards a rejection of consistent party-mindedness and dialectical materialism.

The party-mindedness of dialectical-materialist philosophy assumes an objective, scientific character of the content of this philosophy.

Materialist philosophy, in contrast to idealist philosophy which mystifies real relations in nature and society and distorts them, relies in all its conclusions and judgments on the objective laws of nature and society, portraying the world as it actually exists in reality. In the true reflection of reality, in knowing the laws of the objective world, lies the essence of materialism.

Marxist party-mindedness and objectivity never contradict each other. The ideology of reactionary classes—idealist philosophy—is unscientific; it distorts the laws of reality. The ideology of the proletariat—dialectical-materialist philosophy—is objective in its content, because it adequately reflects in its laws and categories the objective laws of the world, and the laws governing the replacement of socio-economic formations.

The scientific Marxist-Leninist history of philosophy studies the laws of the development of philosophical views of society

and their corresponding institutions. It views this development as a deeply content-rich process.

The history of philosophy is the process of the inception, emergence, and development of the dialectical-materialist worldview and its laws. Since materialism grew and developed in struggle against idealist trends, the history of philosophy is also the history of the struggle of materialism against idealism.

The history of philosophy must, consequently, analyze the inception, emergence, and development of materialism and materialist dialectics, which is an integral part of our worldview, its struggle against metaphysics, as well as trace the development of logical categories as a scientifically generalized reflection of human practical activity.

Prior to the emergence of Marxism, prior to the appearance of a scientific history of philosophy, there existed feudal-gentry and bourgeois concepts of the history of philosophy (the latter exist to this day). However different these concepts were, in their overwhelming majority they suffered from common main flaws that stemmed from the erroneous, anti-Marxist views of their authors.

Bourgeois historians of philosophy, firstly, did not see the material foundations of the development of ideology in general and philosophy as a special form of social consciousness in particular; as the source of the development of philosophical views, they considered the creative activity of human reason, or the so-called absolute spirit or abstract idea.

Secondly, failing to see the material basis for the development of philosophy, they were unable to uncover the laws governing

this development. In their overwhelming majority, they viewed the history of philosophy as a accidental accumulation of schools and directions.

Thirdly, bourgeois historians of philosophy relied on the traditional false scheme according to which philosophical thought developed only in ancient Greece, Rome, and certain West European countries—primarily England, Germany, and France. If proponents of this thoroughly reactionary scheme turned to the philosophical thought of ancient China and India, it was only to illustrate the alleged "stagnation" in the spiritual development of the peoples of these countries. Thus, this scheme of the history of philosophical thought does not reflect the development of the philosophical thought of the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the globe, especially Slavic peoples and the peoples of Eastern countries.

Fourthly, all bourgeois historians of philosophy without exception, acting under the flag of quasi-objectivism, treated the materialist direction in philosophy with contempt, slandered materialism, and exalted idealism.

At present, such falsifiers of the history of philosophy as Russell, Hyer, Lossky, Wetter, and other ideologists of imperialist reaction—servants of obscurantism—continue to attack materialism, distorting the actual content of the works of outstanding materialist thinkers. They go so far as to depict Spinoza and Chernyshevsky as consistent idealists.

Unwilling to understand the laws governing the development of philosophical views of society and their corresponding institutions as an integral part of the superstructure,

contemporary bourgeois "historians" of philosophy continue to experience the Hegelian, anti-scientific concept of the history of philosophy discarded long ago by the classics of Marxism, tailoring it in every way to the demands of their masters—the imperialists.

The first attempt to give a scientific analysis of the history of philosophy belongs to Russian revolutionary democrats, primarily Herzen and Chernyshevsky. In their works, they examined the struggle of materialism against idealism, showed the fundamental opposition and irreconcilability of these trends, and exposed the anti-scientific nature of idealism. To them belongs the credit of criticizing the idealist interpretation of the history of philosophy.

However, Russian revolutionary democrats did not create a scientific history of philosophy. They remained idealists in their understanding of history and could not, therefore, reveal the laws governing the development of society's philosophical views.

Marx and Engels were the first to develop the foundations of a scientific history of philosophy. Lenin and Stalin developed them further, enriched the main propositions of classical Marxism, and raised the study of the history of philosophy to a new level. The works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism contain exhaustive guidance for creating a scientific history of philosophy.

15. On the Specifics of Content and Form in Art[11]

A. I. BUROV

The problem of content and form in art is one of the most important problems of aesthetics. Even the answer to the question of what should be understood by the content of art and what by its form, that is, the definition of the concepts themselves as applied to a work of art, presupposes posing the question of the nature and specifics of art as a form of social consciousness. The problem of content and form in one way or another becomes and finds a particular solution in literally all aesthetic theories. It is precisely in this question that the struggle of materialism and idealism in aesthetics manifests itself with the greatest force and sharpness.

A clear answer to the question of what is content and what is form in art has not only theoretical, but also practical significance, since a different interpretation of these categories directly reflects on the character of artistic creation and on art criticism. A clear understanding of these categories represents a necessary theoretical basis for exposing the anti-artistic essence of formalism and naturalism, for the practical struggle against their recurrences in Soviet art.

The named problem has long needed its researchers, turning from the repetition of philosophical truths about the dialectic of

[11] In publishing this article, the editorial board invites specialists to express their views on the issues raised in it.

content and form in general, to finally clarify their specifics in art.

For a long time, as is known, the question of the specifics of art was simply ignored. Art was considered mainly from the side of the general that it has in comparison with other forms of social consciousness, up to its dissolution in philosophy, history, sociology, politics. After the publication of J. V. Stalin's work *"Marxism and Problems of Linguistics"*, which illuminated a number of very important questions of scientific methodology, a turn toward the study of the specific features of art was outlined in our aesthetics. However, an incorrect, in our view, tendency was established here, which consists in seeing the specificity of art *only* in its form. As for the content of art, it turns out to be deprived of any specificity whatsoever.

In our theoretical literature, the assertion of V. G. Belinsky has been cited repeatedly that the difference between science and art is *"not at all in the content, but only in the method of processing the given content"* (Selected Works, p. 586. 1947). This proposition, understood in a simplified way, led some critics and even artists to deny the specificity of artistic content, to identify art with science. It reached the point of asserting that natural-scientific laws (like photosynthesis, vibrational movements of bodies, intra-atomic processes, etc.) in principle could be the subject of art, if the latter were able to reflect them in an image-based, objective form. The basis of such an assertion is the thesis of art as a reflection of reality, which takes into account the specificity of the form of reflection, but does not take into account the specificity of the content of art.

It is clear that identifying natural-scientific content with artistic content does not withstand any criticism. Belinsky, in the proposition cited above, compared art primarily with the social sciences (political economy in particular). But even in this case, as we shall see below, one cannot speak of the identity of the content of science and art, of the absence of specificity in artistic content.

Belinsky's assertion regarding the unity of content in art and science is correct in the sense of the **materialist** formulation of the question, in the sense that consciousness always in one way or another reflects real reality. But this assertion cannot be understood in such a way that it removes the question of the specifics of the subject and content of art, that it denies the specifics of form as a **derivative** of the specifics of content.

One should not forget when and in the struggle with what opponents the revolutionary democrats resolved questions of art. In aesthetics, they defended materialism against idealism. In the struggle against the prevailing idealistic (mainly Hegelian) aesthetics, they needed to prove that the content of all knowledge is ultimately real reality. Thus, Chernyshevsky defended the thesis of art as a reflection of reality as opposed to the Hegelian thesis of art as an expression of the absolute spirit. Chernyshevsky substantiated and defended philosophical materialism on the material of aesthetics. This task was decisive in the aesthetics of Belinsky as well. That is why the great critic emphasized above all the **unity** of the content of science and art, leaving aside the question of their specific difference. Belinsky's conclusion oriented artists toward the

study of reality in contrast to romantic theories of "divine revelation", the cult of genius, etc.

Substantiating philosophical materialism in aesthetics is the greatest historical achievement of the Russian revolutionary democrats. Much was done by them in revealing the specific features of art as well. Defending and theoretically substantiating realism in art, especially its ideational content (*ideynost*), the revolutionary democrats had to, first of all, distance themselves from the idealistic interpretation of content, to prove its invalidity.

It is known that the requirement of the ideational content is by no means foreign to idealistic aesthetics as well. "...The content of art," wrote Hegel, "is the idea, and its form is the sensory, image-based presentation" (*Works*, Vol. XII, p. 74. 1938). Such a definition of content corresponds in Hegel to his idealistic understanding of the nature and essence of art, which allegedly takes its origin from a certain absolute idea and whose goal is the sensory depiction of the absolute itself.

The image-based, sensory form of art, according to Hegel, "is clearly opposite to thought, and if the latter wants to function in its own way, it is forced to destroy this form." Hence the disarming conclusion that art is unable to yield truth and therefore must disappear, yielding its place to scientific-philosophical knowledge.

It is clear that such speculative interpretations of ideational content and the material form of art are based on an idealistic rift between consciousness and reality, on opposing consciousness as allegedly true and primary to material reality

as untrue and secondary. Meanwhile, consciousness exists only to the extent that it is a reflection of real reality in one form or another. Consciousness relates to reality as form to content. "If the material side, external conditions, being and other similar phenomena..." wrote J. V. Stalin in his work *"Anarchism or Socialism?"*, "...we call *content*, then the ideal side, consciousness and other similar phenomena we can call *form*. From here arose the famous materialist proposition: in the process of development, content precedes form, form lags behind content" (*Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 316–317).

Thus, the content of any form of social consciousness is ultimately real reality. In other words, consciousness is a reflection of reality. Art, as one of the forms of social consciousness, is also a reflection of reality, "reproduction of phenomena of real life that are of interest to man" (Chernyshevsky).

This materialist philosophical proposition has the significance of a general methodological premise in approaching the solution of the question of the specifics of the subject and content of one or another concrete variety of social consciousness, but in itself it does not give an answer to this question and does not even set itself such a task, for this is the task of each individual science. Philosophical definitions cannot replace concrete scientific definitions, although they represent the methodological basis upon which the latter arise.

Thus, materialist philosophy and aesthetics have indisputably proven that real reality is the subject of art and constitutes its basis, the "real principle" (Chernyshevsky) of its content. To disagree with this means to depart from materialism in

aesthetics, but to **limit oneself** to this means to halt the development of aesthetics as a science, for the main task of science is to clarify in the studied phenomena the specific features that distinguish these phenomena from one another and which are most important for science.

Meanwhile, as indicated above, the question of the specifics of the subject and content in art was, in essence, removed. Having satisfied themselves with the fact that art reflects **reality** (in general), ignoring the question of **what** in reality, **to what extent**, etc. can be reflected in art, our researchers until now focused mainly on the question of **how**, in **what manner** one must reflect "something", that "reality in general" which they considered and consider to be the subject of art. They sought an answer to the question of what is the specificity of the artistic form regardless of the question of the specificity of content. Since this specificity of artistic form is not motivated by the specific subject and content, it is not motivated at all, except by references to examples. And why **precisely in this way** must reality be reflected, where is the objective law here, is there one? Why in general do two forms of reflecting reality exist: scientific-logical and artistic? It is impossible to get an answer to these questions with an undifferentiated approach to reality as a subject of art.

Not every objective reflection of reality can be attributed to art, no matter how carefully or masterfully it was executed. For example, a model or a drawing of a machine, being a visual-objective reflection of some aspect of real reality, cannot be attributed to art precisely because of the absence of artistic content in it. The specificity of art is determined not only by

the form of reflection, but also by the features of the **subject** of reflection itself. Moreover, the subject determines the form of reflection as well.

In what consists the specificity of the subject and content of art?

The very first thing that catches the eye when looking at the subject of art consists in the fact that this subject is always a **single whole**.

A living phenomenon is taken by art in the synthesis of its aspects; the artist approaches the phenomenon as a living whole, whereas the scientist, on the contrary, dissects the phenomenon, so to speak, "anatomizes" it and studies it in parts.

Art precisely because of this turns to an image form, that it reflects living phenomena synthetically, holistically: the whole exists and can be reflected only as something individual, concrete, singular. Unlike art, this or that science takes certain aspects of the whole and therefore in an image-based, sensory form, as a rule, does not need it. It reflects the world in the form of logical generalizations, resorting, however, to all kinds of schematic representations, which in principle do not differ from the former.

Taking into account the fact that logical thinking operates only with generalizations, we can say that in principle it does not reflect phenomena in the forms of life itself, that is, as a concrete, living whole. In the expression of I. P. Pavlov, science gives us the "skeleton of life", reflecting the **essence** of

individual aspects of a phenomenon or the essence of the whole, whereas art gives the living whole.

It is not difficult to understand that along with the need to reflect essential aspects of the phenomena of reality (scientific knowledge), there exists a legitimate human need to reflect phenomena as a whole, in the form in which they exist, without dissecting them.

Already at the dawn of the existence of humanity, we can discover both forms of thinking. And if the objectivity (imagistic nature) of thinking at the early stages of development signified also its lack of development, the very fact that subsequent successes of scientific, abstract thinking did not eliminate the need for an image-based reflection of life, but, on the contrary, contributed to its development and perfection, testifies to the fact that this form of thinking is vitally necessary, that there are such qualities, features of life that require for their reflection precisely the artistic form.

To understand the objective conditionality of the emergence and existence of artistic form (for it did not arise out of nowhere, like "pure form"!) is possible, apparently, only when taking into account the features of its content. Special content requires a special form. Perception of a phenomenon as a living whole is one of the important conditions of **aesthetic** contemplation. However, this most important feature of the subject of art does not determine its specificity completely. One could, for example, as we noted, give a very detailed image of some machine or another similar object, taken as a whole, and yet not have an artistic work.

Is the subject of art subject to any localization? It is known that every individual form of social consciousness, for example, every science, has its own circle of phenomena of reality that it studies. There are boundaries (true, relative and fluid) between the subjects of mechanics, physics, chemistry, biology—boundaries that are determined by the qualitative distinctiveness of various forms of motion of matter that have become objects of scientific research. It is quite possible to reveal relative boundaries in the subjects of individual social sciences: history, political economy, law, etc.

At first glance at art from the standpoint of defining its subject, an unusual breadth of coverage of phenomena of reality in it catches the eye. The subject of art seems boundless: any phenomena of the external world—landscapes of nature, people and social relations, animals, tools of production, production processes—all this can find and finds its reflection in works of art. But this is a seeming boundlessness of the subject. First of all, the listed phenomena of reality are not equivalent for art.

Man, human life—is the **main** object of art even in the sense of the immediate subject of reflection. Most often art turns precisely to the depiction of man. However, the matter is not only in this. The matter is that in relation to man as an object of art, all other phenomena in all cases are in a subordinate dependence and do not have self-sufficient significance. Running somewhat ahead and considering already the content of art (which does not exist without a subject), one can say that in art, properly speaking, **man, his environment and his relationship to the environment** are depicted.

And even in those cases when man is not shown, not depicted as the main object directly, the content of the work must necessarily be "human", reveal holistic living connections and relationships of social man. Whatever the immediate subject may be, for example, of a lyrical poem (mountains, sea, night, road), the main pathos of it is in the striving for a deep disclosure of the character of the lyrical hero. It is enough to recall classic examples of "landscape poetry" to be convinced of this (*"To the Sea"* and *"On the Hills of Georgia"* by Pushkin, *"Mountain Tops"* by Goethe — Lermontov, etc.).

The same is the case in landscape painting. In such paintings as *"Autumn Day. Sokolniki"*, *"Above Eternal Peace"*, *"March"*, *"Vladimirka"* by Levitan, *"Morning in a Pine Forest"* by Shishkin, *"The Ninth Wave"* by Aivazovsky and others, we have not simply a forest, a river, the sea, the sky, etc.; in them is conveyed not only a typical picture of nature, but also—and above all—a deep characteristic of human experience, a typical state of man, his thoughts and feelings upon contemplating nature are expressed.

Is the independent value of pictures of nature as such denied in this case? Of course not. The point is an indispensable condition under which a picture of nature reflected becomes a landscape, a work of art. A picture of nature must convey some typical state, experience of man in order to be artistic. A soulless copy of nature, due to the absence in it of this typical experience, is not perceived as a work of art. Pictures of nature in landscape works fundamentally perform the same function as pictures of nature in plot (genre, historical) paintings and in poetic lyrics. Therefore, to paint a good landscape, an artist

must understand not only and even not so much the physical properties of nature (that is, be a botanist, geologist, zoologist), as the human soul (be a poet).

Thus, whatever the artist depicts, he must above all be able to reveal a typical experience of man, his character. In some forms and genres of art, this subordination of the task of depicting the environment to the task of revealing human character is completely obvious already in the subject itself, without appealing to the content of the work as a whole.

All the diversity of subjects and phenomena of the external world finds reflection in art due to the fact that man is organically connected with them and outside of them does not exist as a real person. To realistically depict man, an artist cannot fail to show him in his true connections with surrounding reality. Thus, man in his real living connections constitutes, in the final analysis, the **subject of art**.

It is known, however, that a whole series of sciences about man and human society exists, starting from anatomy and ending with historical materialism. But if each of the sciences about man studies the latter from some one side, art takes man in all his living completeness, in the synthesis of the sides of his life, without which a living person does not exist.

Thus, the object of reflection in science and in art, strictly speaking, is one and the same, but the artist takes it differently, and by virtue of this the subject of art has its own specificity. In this sense, one should understand the "special" subject of art.

In proof of the cognitive capabilities of art (and at the same time the "identity" of its subject with the subject of science),

our country very often compares, for example, the political-economic writings of K. Marx and *"The Human Comedy"* of Balzac, *"What Is to Be Done?"* of N. G. Chernyshevsky and *"Mother"* of M. Gorky, etc. In relation to these works, they directly speak of the identity of their content with differences only in the form of reflection. Meanwhile, this is incorrect. If the classics of Marxism take and study the **social-economic and political aspects** of the development of the life of society of their time, then artists take the life of contemporaries **as a whole, in the synthesis of its aspects**. By virtue of this, we have both a different processing of living material and different ways of reflecting life. Engels learned very much from the works of Balzac in the sense of economic details, but this does not mean that Balzac wrote "economic" novels. This only means that Engels in this case was interested mainly in the economic side of social life depicted by the artist. In Balzac's novels, naturally, reflected are not only the economic aspects of society's life, but also moral-political, everyday, etc.

If an artist reflects whole, typical characters in typical circumstances, and therefore in conflicts typical for a given time, then his works will yield food for thought and conclusions of any social science. That is precisely why Lenin wrote about Tolstoy that if we have before us a truly great artist, then he must have reflected at least some of the essential aspects of the revolution in his works. Identifying the subject and content of art and social sciences in artistic practice is fraught with undesirable results for art: it leads to a one-sided and schematic depiction of life, as not infrequently happens with some artists.

In art, man is considered not only from the side of his social-economic position, social activity and views, but also from the side of his individual character, everyday life, intimate experiences, etc. Such a holistic portrayal of human life is not given to us by any single social science. Thus, historical materialism, with exceptional breadth of coverage of social life, reveals the essence of human society, the driving forces and general laws of its development, abstracting in this case from many particular aspects of human life. Man is characterized here from the point of view of his social essence, which this science expresses in a logically generalized form corresponding to the subject.

Art reflects human life precisely as an individual whole in which all its diversity and richness are preserved. Man, by Marx's definition, is "the ensemble of social relations." Since art reflects human life in the diversity of its living connections and relations, it gives a multifaceted image of man, since it reflects in one way or another the picture of social relations in their concrete historical unity. Genuine art is therefore a monument of an epoch, has enormous cognitive-historical value. A living image of an epoch rises before us from the pages of works by Shakespeare, Cervantes, Pushkin, Balzac, Gogol, L. Tolstoy, and other great artists.

L. N. Tolstoy's novel *"War and Peace"* broadly reflects the epoch of 1812 precisely because the people of that epoch are characterized both from the side of their social-political, state, military and other social activity, and from the side of family and everyday relations and life conditions. The inner world of the heroes of L. Tolstoy's novel is revealed also in all its

diversity and richness not only from the side of worldview, social-political views, ideals and aspirations, but also from the point of view of the level of culture, moral representations, mental capabilities, personal tastes and habits, traits of temperament, etc. L. Tolstoy created typical images, living human characters. Man as a living whole necessarily represents a character. Here it should be emphasized that in order to draw a character, an artist must show, reveal the inner world of man, his spiritual image.

There are such genres and genre forms of art in which the possibility of direct depiction of man, his behavior and activity is excluded (for example, many genres of music, lyrics in poetry). What compensates in lyrics for the absence of a plot, an unfolded depiction of events, actions, and circumstances in which character is revealed in any epic work? It is compensated by a direct and immediate appeal to the inner state of the hero, thanks to which an exceptional concentration and force of manifestation of character is achieved. This is especially noticeable in music.

Speaking of the national distinctiveness of Russian, and then Soviet music, A. A. Zhdanov noted that it found "its own paths of development, which gave the possibility to reveal the richness of **the inner world of our people**" (*"Conference of Soviet Music Workers at the CC of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)"*, p. 139. Spacing mine. — *A. B.*).

Music reproduces typical experiences of a concrete historical man. The disclosure of the spiritual image of man is an indispensable condition for the existence of character in art, and therefore, the reflection of human life as a living whole.

This proposition should not be understood in such a way that the task of art reduces to depicting the spiritual world of man. The latter would mean an orientation toward bad psychologism. The task of the artist consists in reflecting life in all its diversity, but since this is done **through** the depiction of characters, it is necessary to internally motivate the behavior of the hero; here it is clear that the spiritual image of man is and must be given as a derivative of the conditions of life in which man acts and which ultimately determine his character. But what is important is that there is no character in art without revealing his spiritual image. That is why knowledge of the "dialectics of the soul" is mandatory for an artist.

Depth of penetration into the inner world of a hero has always been the main indicator of the artistic completeness of a work. Noting the artistic weakness, dryness, lifelessness of the image of Insarov in I. S. Turgenev's novel *"On the Eve"*, Dobrolyubov in the article *"When Will the Real Day Come?"* draws attention to the fact that the reader does not think, does not dream, does not experience along with Insarov. Even Insarov's love for Elena is not shown, not revealed, but only declared. The reader observes Turgenev's hero as if from the outside, and does not live his life, and therefore weakly believes in its truthfulness.

An artist is a heart-reader, a human-knower. Balzac called art "the history of the human heart", Gorky — "human-knowledge". J. V. Stalin called writers, artists "engineers of human souls." We often repeat this wonderful formula of J. V. Stalin, but not always deeply enough understand it. Well aware that this definition points to the educational function of art called upon to form consciousness, the soul of a new,

communist man, we sometimes forget that for this an artist needs to be a connoisseur of the human soul, to study it and be able to depict it.

It is no secret that some works of certain artists of ours in this respect leave much to be desired. In the new novel by A. Avdeenko *"Labor"*, dedicated to the life of Soviet miners, the overwhelming majority of characters are outlined schematically, shown mainly from the side of their profession. In this work, the rich inner world of Soviet people, the diversity of their interests, aspirations, spiritual demands are not revealed. Production processes, machinery here squeeze out, absorb man. This testifies to the fact that some writers forget about the specifics of their field.

Reference is often made to the fact that since labor constitutes the basis of life of Soviet man, its main content, this allegedly gives the writer the right to concentrate only on depicting the production process at the expense of depicting everyday life, personal life, and main—at the expense of revealing the inner, spiritual world of Soviet man. This profoundly erroneous and simplified conception has nothing in common with socialist realism, which requires of the artist a deep and comprehensive disclosure of human character.

New, socialist forms of labor and community have engendered a new man, a new attitude toward life, toward people, a different structure of thoughts and feelings, interests and aspirations, a new culture, new everyday life, new characters. The task of the artist consists in showing this **changed spiritual image of Soviet man**, and by no means signifies a revision of the very subject of art, all its nature and specifics.

The tendency to consider production-technical and natural-scientific questions in art as self-sufficient, and not as subordinate to the task of a deep and multifaceted portrayal of human characters, manifests itself not only in literature. Some filmmakers declared a new "scientific-artistic" genre of film the type of *"Academician Ivan Pavlov"*, *"Michurin"* and others, similar to them, on the grounds that these films reveal the essence of scientific research of one or another scientist and thereby allegedly can no longer be "simply artistic" films. These comrades do not understand that films of this kind must set and solve the task—to show the type of Soviet man, the scientist-citizen, the scientist-innovator, the revolutionary in science. Precisely in this is the enormous educational significance of these films for all Soviet people, representatives of any professions, for in all professions one can and must be an innovator, a revolutionary, a patriot. Clearly, in fulfilling this task, the authors of such films must show remarkable people in their labor, reveal the essence of their scientific feat. But another topic does not mean another genre. Otherwise it turns out that, for example, films dedicated to Mussorgsky and Glinka are also not "simply artistic", but, say, "art-history-artistic", and *"Donbass Miners"* — a "production-artistic" film, and so on. How many professions — so many genres!

The predominance of production interests in characterization of heroes of some works takes on, as has already been noted in our press, sometimes anecdotal forms. A hero declares his love, the lovers engage in a heartfelt conversation, an engineer hears the crying of his newborn child—all this is given in a strictly "production" framing.

In some novels "positive" characters are portrayed as gray, featureless people because, as a rule, they are interested in nothing and know nothing besides production, profession. It is clear that such a character from a multifaceted personality is turned into a kind of production mechanism. The alignment of the personal and the social in our life by no means signifies the disappearance of personality in a production or any other collective; on the contrary, it signifies the flowering of personality, the emancipation of all its possibilities shackled under capitalism.

Speaking of the difference between socialist realism and critical realism, it is not infrequently pointed out that there is a fundamental change in the nature of conflicts lying at the basis of artistic works. The change consists as if in that if the plot in old works was built on personal, most often love intrigue, then the conflict in works of socialist realism must bear an exclusively social character.

It is true that the social determinacy, the ideational-political orientation of conflicts in our art has grown. This occurred because the social interests and incentives for the behavior of Soviet man, educated in him by the whole system of Soviet life, have immeasurably grown. All this is true. But one must keep in mind that personal conflict in works of critical realism of the past did not exclude the posing of social questions and their resolution. On the contrary, precisely by social pathos was Russian realism of the 19th century strong. Tolstoy in his work, including in such a novel as *"Anna Karenina"*, reflected, as Lenin pointed out, a whole post-reform period of Russian social life of the 19th century, that period when in the economy

of Russia "everything was turned upside down and was only beginning to settle." And this despite the fact that the plot is built on deeply personal collisions: Anna — Vronsky, Kitty — Levin. In art, things cannot be otherwise: no matter how significant and great social collisions may be, they can be given only through the collision of personal fates, individual characters.

It is bad when the reverse happens, when production-technical, scientific problems overshadow, impoverish man. Simplifications of this kind are incompatible with the principles of socialist realism, with the principles of Soviet art, the most humanistic art in the world. Soviet readers speak of this completely explicitly. Thus, for example, A. Markov correctly points out that in A. Bylinov's novel *"The Metallurgists"* "the transition to a new method of technology, conference on issues of fulfilling the program and many other episodes of production activity are described not badly... But to distinguish the majority of the characters from one another is difficult. In the depiction of human feelings much is simplified."

Another reader of the same novel, D. Efimov, also sees its main defect in that this is, "as they say, a purely production novel, with accidental and weak sketches of family and psychological lines... the actions of the heroes internally are poorly justified... Our five-year plans are a law of our life, and our whole life is subordinated to great state tasks. Therefore, our Soviet literature first of all shows people at work. But to show not a scheme of a man, but a living person, one needs to

show him in all his multifaceted life" (see *"Literaturnaya Gazeta"* of September 13, 1952).

The reader does not forgive the disappearance from a novel of living people with their personal fates, for from the sum total of individual human fates the future of socialist society is formed. Regardless of any "theoretical" constructs, no matter how clever they may be, he sees in this the destruction of the main feature of art and simply declares that such a work was "boring for him to read", that he read it "with difficulty." For a writer there can be no harsher judgment of his labor. No doubt, it is difficult to be an "engineer of human souls." But Soviet artists must remember that there are no other paths for creating great art worthy of our epoch.

"The power and significance of realistic art," said G. M. Malenkov in the report to the XIX Party Congress, "consists in that it can and must reveal and disclose high spiritual qualities and typical positive character traits of the ordinary man, create his vivid artistic image worthy of being an example and object of imitation for people."

Materials of the XIX Congress of our party, results of the fifth session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR once more with convincing power show that our government and the Communist Party do not and cannot have another concern than concern for the good of Soviet people. Growth of the material and cultural level of man is the goal of all efforts of our society in the economic and cultural life of the country. This great truth of socialism not for a minute must be forgotten by the Soviet artist. Party and government again and again orient him toward

a deep study of the life of Soviet man as the decisive object of artistic creation.

Thus, the specifics of the subject of art consist in that it takes man as a living whole, in his real environment and his relationships to it. Realism, wrote Engels, requires, besides truthfulness of detail, fidelity in the reproduction of typical characters in typical circumstances. In this formula is contained an indication of the subject of art—human character, which can be given both directly and mediatedly, indirectly—through the expression of a typical experience (music, lyrics, landscape).

The content of art does not reduce to its subject. Even Aristotle pointed out that art represents not a mechanical reflection, repetition of reality, but such a reflection that is connected with an understanding of the depicted. Before being reflected in a work of art, phenomena of reality must be reflected in the consciousness of the artist, they must be comprehended, understood by him. As Chernyshevsky wrote, the generic trait of art is that in it "everything is set on display, explained by the author himself, whereas nature and life must be solved by one's own powers. The power of art is the power of commentary" (*"Aesthetic Relations of Art to Reality"*, p. 107. Gospolitizdat. 1948).

An artist does not simply reflect life: he interprets it, evaluates it, pronounces a verdict upon it. In this consists the essential difference between a phenomenon of life and an artistic work as a reflection of this phenomenon. Consequently, an artist, depicting life, gives in the work his understanding and explanation of it. This understanding, explanation must have the character of objective truth, reveal the essence of the

depicted. Only then does it condition artistic images full in the sense of content.

The content of an artistic work has, thus, two sides: objective (the subject) and subjective (explanation of the subject and evaluation of it by the artist). It is known that one and the same phenomenon can be interpreted and evaluated differently in art, but only the alignment of the objective and the subjective yields truth. Obviously, without taking into account the subject, one cannot speak of the content of an artistic work.

Here it should be emphasized with all force that an artist—is not simply a "thinking being", but a member of a definite society, in the struggle of which he by necessity must take part, for to live in society and be free from society is impossible, Lenin taught. An artist—is a person of a definite worldview, bearer of definite class, political views, aspirations, sympathies and antipathies. In short, an artistic work under conditions of class struggle always has one or another ideological direction, propagandizes progressive or, on the contrary, reactionary social-political, moral and other ideas and views. This factor, as a rule, in a decisive way affects the character of content and the quality of an artistic work as a whole.

Since the ideology of an artist in many respects depends on the correctness of the reflection of life and the very character of mastering it, the approach to it, then is it impossible on this basis to reduce the content of a work of art to the ideology expressed in it, to social-political, class views that have received reflection in it?

Precisely such a definition of the content of art was at one time proposed by vulgar-sociological aesthetics. The content of art, wrote one of the proponents of this trend, is ideology, understood as "the aggregate of social representations and emotions that prompted the artist to a social act, i. e., to the creation of an artistic work" (M. S. Grigoryev, *"Form and Content of a Literary-Artistic Work"*, p. 60. M. 1929)[12]. Curious is the argument in favor of such a definition. This definition of the content of art as ideology, writes the same author, "forces us to abandon many deep-rooted representations of art and in the first place the naive-realistic representation of art as a mirror reflecting life. Art indeed reflects life," he clarifies further, "but only a special sphere of it—the sphere of ideology. Recognition of art as a mirror indifferently reflecting life would lead us to extreme difficulties: we would be forced to seek in Turgenev's *'A Sportsman's Sketches'* an objective depiction of peasant life, and in *'War and Peace'* — reflection of the epoch of the year eighteen twelve, and, of course, would find in them neither the one nor the other; but on the other hand we could easily find the ideology of Turgenev and his class in *'A Sportsman's Sketches'*, and in *'War and Peace'* — the ideology of Tolstoy and his class, i. e., ideological reality not of the year eighteen twelve, but, say, of the 60s" (ibid.).

Thus, according to vulgar sociologists, art is not a reflection of reality, but only an image-based expression of ideology. True, ideology is defined here as a "special sphere of reality", but

---

[12] Referring to one of the old works of M. S. Grigoryev, we, of course, do not mean to extend to his subsequent activity the views from which he abandoned.

this, of course, is only a logical trick: ideology itself is already a socially conditioned reflection of objective reality in the consciousness of social man.

It turns out that art is not an independent form of social consciousness, is not a reflection of reality and its real laws, but represents some kind of ideological emanation, a superstructure over a superstructure. The philosophical basis of this theory is constituted by Machist absolute relativism, agnosticism, denial of objective truth.

Vulgar sociologists tore art away from reality. Meanwhile, being a reflection of life, art is a special, fully independent form of social consciousness. The independence of art, its organic connection with life are proven by the fact that it not infrequently outstrips other forms of ideology and even science in revealing essential aspects of reality, poses problems put forward by life itself, and sometimes turns out to be even in the vanguard of other forms of social consciousness. So it was in Russia in the middle of the 19th century in relation to artistic literature. It is known, for example, that I. S. Turgenev was the first to respond to such an event as the appearance on the arena of social life of a new social force—the raznochintsy-democratic intelligentsia, and already from the novel *"Fathers and Sons"* the concept of "nihilist" (in the sense of "raznochinets", "democrat") was picked up by Pisarev and began to figure in philosophical and political polemics of that time.

There is no doubt that ideational content, ideational direction constitute a most important component of the content of an artistic work. A poet or artist, as N. G. Chernyshevsky asserted,

not being in a position to cease being human, cannot, even if he wanted to, refuse to pronounce his verdict upon the depicted phenomena. In this verdict upon the phenomena of life, decisive significance belongs to the social ideal of the artist, in a class society—his class views, in the first place political views. In the verdict is expressed the relationship of the artist to a living phenomenon, the correct or incorrect evaluation of it, which leaves a most essential imprint on the entire character of an artistic work.

An artist—representative of progressive social forces, of progressive ideology, all other conditions being equal, deeper, more correctly reflects life than an artist representing a reactionary camp, for in the second case the process of knowledge is distorted by self-serving, class striving of the artist to falsify reality to please his class, whereas in the first case the subjective interests of the ideologist of the progressive class more or less coincide with the objective laws of development of reality itself.

Under conditions of class struggle, ideas and tendencies bear a class, party character. Hence the proposition of the class nature of art in a class society, the doctrine of the party spirit of our Soviet art, openly and consistently fighting for the interests of working people, against imperialist reaction and its corrupt ideology. Hence the struggle of our party and all society for Marxist-Leninist purity and scientific quality of ideas of Soviet art as a struggle for its contentfulness and, consequently, completeness. Here it should be remembered that ideational direction, party spirit in art must not exist outside of artistry. Highly evaluating the role of "tendentiousness" in art, Engels at

the same time pointed out that ideas and tendencies must not bulge out here from the living fabric of a work, but must be perceived as the logic of life itself.

The question of the ideational content of art is closely connected with the problem of the typical. It is known that in the Marxist-Leninist understanding the typical by no means signifies some kind of statistical average. Typicalness corresponds to the **essence** of a given social-historical phenomenon, and is not simply the most widespread, frequently repeating, ordinary. The typical is the main sphere of manifestation of party spirit in realistic art. The problem of typicalness is always a political problem.

Namely the disclosure, emphasizing of the **essence** of a given social-historical phenomenon, definition of the place and significance of this phenomenon among other phenomena of life presupposes an evaluation of it and a verdict upon it. It is clear that under conditions of struggle of classes and parties this verdict upon a social phenomenon cannot fail to have a class, party character.

To capture the **essence** of a social-historical phenomenon, an artist, undoubtedly, resorts to the help of reason, logical thinking, and, consequently, some preliminary logical formulation of it. However, an artist must possess not only a logically formulated truth, but also an **image-based representation** which in the highest degree and in a living, objective form would express this essence.

Above we said that in the scientific sphere one or another phenomenon is not reflected in the form of a concrete whole. A

Soviet artist in his study of life must rise to the realization of general essential laws of these or those phenomena of reality, to serious ideational generalizations. Consequently, without abstract thinking an artist cannot do. But he will fall into a deep error if he limits himself to this realization of general laws of life, if he perceives them not as a guiding thread in the study of life, but as the end of his research. In this case the artist instead of a living, multifaceted image will give a thin personification of an abstract idea.

The essence contained in phenomena never exists in life in "pure form" (this is possible only in logical expression). In real reality the essence is given in phenomena in one case to a lesser degree, in another—to a greater, in a third—to the highest, but never is given in identity. In a work of art, as in life, essence cannot be given outside the phenomenon. Essence and phenomenon cannot be identical. Otherwise the image will turn into a scheme, into an illustration of a law, which is always incomplete, approximate, does not cover all the richness of contradictory connections. It is clear that from such personification a logical idea will not become a living whole, individual, it will exist only in a kind of pale, one-sided, schematic likeness of an artistic image. As a result of such "embodiment of ideas" without taking into account the specifics of the subject of art as a living whole, schematic images of party organizers or Stakhanovites are produced in novels, in whom what is called blood and flesh, who outside of production and production interests are not shown and are terribly like one another. They are alike because these are not

living Soviet people at all, but the personification of general ideas, say, the idea of production innovation.

All this speaks of the fact that although logic in art is necessary, it must manifest itself as a living and contradictory logic of life, and not as a ready-made publicistic formula lying on the surface of a work or hidden beneath colorful patches of "living material." Engels in a letter to M. Kautsky, highly valuing the significance of "tendentiousness", ideational direction in realistic art, at the same time noted that the tendency must arise of itself from actions and circumstances, without this being specifically pointed out. This speaks of the fact that in a work of art a full-fledged realistic image is significantly richer and more convincing than an abstract idea and cannot be reduced to it.

A critic acts correctly when, in disclosing the content of an artistic work, he sets forth the main course of events, actions, relationships of characters, main conflicts, revealing at the same time the ideational direction of the work and evaluating it in the light of the tasks of the present day. An error is the reduction of the content of a work of art to a single idea, allegedly exhausting its content. One cannot, for example, formulate the idea of Vasnetsov's picture *"Morning of the Execution of the Streltsi"* [Surikov's picture] in such a way that it exhausts all the diverse content of the canvas. Having singled out the main thought, it is necessary to trace how it is revealed through all images in all their complexity and interconnectedness, otherwise we impoverish the content of this work.

Let us consider the question of the content of art from one more side. It is known that a perfect artistic work we call such a one in which artistic form to the highest degree corresponds to content. What does this correspondence of content and form mean? Is this the correspondence of the idea of a work and its embodiment? By no means. Let us take for example such a leading "idea" of modern American decadence, surrealist Salvador Dalí: "The only reality is my paranoiac will; things must be such as I want to see them; the real world is an illusion." And now famous "soft watches" appear—watches depicted in the form of a flat cake made of melted test. Here an ugly idea is expressed in an ugly form, but, of course, to no normal person (reactionary bourgeois critics do not count!) will it occur to consider the mentioned "work" perfect on the basis of this correspondence of "content" and "form."

Hence it is clear that the content of an artistic work does not reduce to an idea. To art one should approach as to a reflection of life, and the principle of fidelity to life must be the decisive criterion for evaluating an artistic work both from the side of its ideational content and artistic form.

The main *credo* of Russian revolutionary-democratic criticism of the 19th century consisted in "interpreting phenomena of life itself on the basis of a literary work", for the main task of artistic criticism is "the explanation of those realities of life that called forth a given artistic work" (Dobrolyubov). To clarify during the analysis of a work the correspondence or non-correspondence of its content and form—means to clarify to what extent the depicted in it corresponds to real reality, its

objective laws. In this case, questions of mastery in artistic creation will inevitably arise.

From what has been said it is possible, in our view, to draw the conclusion that **the content of art is human life with its natural (social and natural) environment, taken in the synthesis of its aspects and comprehended by the artist in the light of definite social ideals.**

By virtue of the specifics of its subject and content, art, naturally, strives to reproduce life "in the forms of life itself" (Chernyshevsky). This applies mainly to the visual side of art, to one degree or another inherent in all its forms. The artist reproduces (often imitates) forms of life with the help of a system of visual-expressive means specific to each given form of art. Line, color, volume, musical sound, word, physical action, etc., convey the diversity of the visible and audible world: natural contours and plastic volumes of objects, color, illumination, movement, sounding, rhythm and intonation of living human speech, etc.[13]

The function of these means is not only visual: in depicting, they must **express**. Only under this condition do these means constitute the primary basis of artistic form.

However, in themselves visual-expressive means represent no more than "building material" of art. This "building material" in each given form of art is organized according to special laws inherent to the latter by internal laws. Thus, modern musical

[13] Art turns only to the senses of sight and hearing. Sight and hearing are the most "social senses." Art is a means of acting upon the social human being and social life.

system includes in total about a hundred musical sounds, strictly determined by pitch, force (or loudness), duration and timbre. Operating with this limited number of sounds, composers, however, created and create an enormous richness of soundings, which in principle is inexhaustible. In music there exist sufficiently well-developed laws of sound combination that ensure its rhythmic-intonational richness. These are the laws of mode, harmony, orchestration, etc., which are specific musical laws and to a significant degree are determined by the nature of the musical means themselves—sounds. Knowledge by a composer of these specific laws of music is mandatory.

The laws of using visual-expressive means in painting have quite another specificity, for there the means are different too. In painting over the course of centuries-long development, laws of drawing, linear and aerial perspective, coloring, laws of composition, etc., have been developed. A painter can reproduce color, light, perspective, plastic volume, movement, development in space and time (through illusions and associations achieved by special kind of pictorial techniques). For example, the development of action in time is usually given in painting (as in sculpture) through the depiction of a phenomenon, an event in such a (culminating) moment of its development by which one can judge what was before and what will be later (*"They Did Not Expect Him"* by Repin).

As we see, painting can convey all or almost all properties and qualities of the external world, although far from all with equal immediacy and completeness. Obviously, the creation of a pictorial image requires special techniques of artistic mastery,

special artistic qualification and culture. Whatever form of art we take, in each of them an image is built by specific means and according to specific laws.

To be, for example, a good writer—means to be a master, an artist of the word. For a writer it is not enough to possess a rich vocabulary, although this is very important (Shakespeare's vocabulary included about 16 thousand words), it is not enough to master grammatical forms to perfection, because vocabulary and grammar in themselves do not yet give artistic language. Artistic language cannot be identified with ordinary: it has along with grammatical also its own special, artistic laws. M. Gorky wrote that artistic literature is the art of plastic depiction through words. The special character of these laws cannot be understood without taking into account the specific nature of words as a tool of artistic literature. A writer must possess a highly developed "feeling for the word", with which in the highest degree endowed was, for example, Mayakovsky, who knew how to, as it were, "feel" the word.

Professional-technical artistic techniques are conditioned by the necessity of reproducing living forms and expressing living laws. In this is their function, from which stems the decisive objective law of their use. However, one should not forget that artistic means are very carefully and strictly selected by man from all the diversity of the visible and audible world, that they are "discovered" by man, of course, not without taking into account the influence of these means on his psychophysiology. Thus, the musical-sound nature of the word plays a large role in the rhythmic organization of poetic speech (especially rhymed), in creating sound effects. "Genuine beauty of

language, acting as a force," wrote M. Gorky, "is created by accuracy, clarity, sonority of words that form pictures, characters, ideas of books" (*"On Literature"*, p. 344). It is impossible to fully understand the specifics of pictorial techniques without taking into account the nature of color and the laws of color combinations.

In music, for example, completely explicitly they speak of the law of "mutual gravitation" of sounds, that a given sound requires a sound of a definite character and "does not tolerate" the proximity of a sound of some other character. The law of such a phenomenon is rooted, obviously, in the physiology of the auditory apparatus. On the necessity of taking into account this side of the matter in creating melodic, beautiful music spoke A. A. Zhdanov at the conference of Soviet music workers in 1948.

It is quite clear that defining the laws of artistic form, one must proceed not only and not so much from the material nature of the means themselves (sound, word, color), as from their function. The character of laws, for example, of artistic speech is determined by the fact that the word in literature acquires the function of painting, visual-meaningful, and not simply meaningful. Thus, with the help of words alone, which are always known generalizations, a writer must depict a picture of life in all its brightness and colorfulness. This is achieved by such a juxtaposition of words and phrases, such a structure of speech, which give rise to vivid visual, auditory and other associative representations and, consequently, heightened emotionality of speech perception. Literature has developed a whole series of such artistic techniques as simile, metaphor,

epithet, sound effects like assonance and alliteration, rhythm, meter, rhyme in poetic speech, etc.

Visual-expressive means become artistic form only when they embody, shape a **definite living-ideational content**. Prior to this they are only an abstract form, a possibility of form. Otherwise speaking, means and techniques become artistic form only when they function normally. Therefore, artistic form as such manifests itself only in the living fabric of a work, in images. The contentfulness of form is a condition of its existence. Form devoid of content, having no visual-meaningful significance sound-color-word combination not only does not yield an artistic image, but inevitably leads to its destruction, for in it ignored is precisely the **function** of visual means.

Precisely here one should discern the connection of artistic techniques (style) with the principles of the artistic method. For example, realist K. S. Stanislavsky and formalist Meyerhold each in his own way developed concrete techniques for creating a stage image. The fundamental difference between these techniques is determined by the fact that Stanislavsky proceeded from the requirement of recreating living truth, while Meyerhold's "biomechanics" proceeded from the self-sufficiency of the artistic technique, in it, in essence, ignored was the real function of visual-expressive means.

In folk poetry, striking for its rhythmic and euphonic richness, broadly using all means and techniques of poetic euphony and colorfulness, we find examples of using techniques for organizing poetic speech. The beginning of the art of the word is in folklore, said M. Gorky. He called upon writers to collect

folklore, learn from it, process it. The facts of literary luminaries turning to folklore as a model of mastery and a source of inspiration are very indicative in this respect. In the rhythms and euphony of folk songs with exceptional vividness transmitted are all, even the most subtle sides and shades of living life:

Down along mother Volga,

Across the broad expanse,

The storm broke out,

The top wind,

The wave wind...

Here rhythm creates a tangible impression of wave-like motion. A. M. Gorky recorded a barge-hauler song:

Oh-eha, oh-eha,

The top wind blows!

Pull harder, friend.

Lean into the strap too!

The rhythm of this song well conveys the slow, difficult movement forward, which is even more reinforced by alliteration: "Lean... strap too" ["*Lo-zhis... tu-zhe*"].

Extremely rich is folk song from the side of euphony too. Sound painting, alliteration, assonance, anaphora and epiphora, internal rhyme, etc. are represented in it broadly. The people know how to convey complex experiences, deep thoughts and feelings in the artistic word. Artists must use all the richness of poetic means and techniques that the people have always applied in their creation.

The function of visual-expressive means and artistic techniques consists in conveying living truth in the forms of life itself. Artistic means and techniques must be completely subordinated to this function. Ideal in respect to artistic qualities is always such a work in which means and techniques have become a **living form** and separately as such are not perceived. The artist N. Zhukov, evaluating the talented painting of F. Reshetnikov *"Failed Again!"*, correctly wrote of the painting's art and composition: "You don't notice any of this, which means it is good" (newspaper *"Sovetskoye Iskusstvo"* of January 10, 1953).

From this, of course, the conclusion does not follow that a critic should not analyze the means and techniques with which a work was created. On the contrary. Now, when the question of raising artistic mastery stands so sharply, we especially expect from our criticism a deep and skillful analysis of correctly understood form. This only means that means and techniques must reproduce forms and laws of life. For this they must "disappear" in the living fabric of the work and not stick

out on its surface in the form of scaffolding, springs, props and other auxiliary devices.

All the more important is that to these devices absolute self-sufficiency not be attributed. In the latter case there is a danger of slipping into positions of formalism.

Enormous significance among elements of artistic form have composition and plot. Compositional and plot laws are also by no means arbitrary and have an objective foundation. The task of plot and composition consists in concretizing and individualizing connections and laws of reality discovered by the artist, in reproducing them in living forms. Striving to reflect life in all its diversity and truthfulness, art cannot give the reader and viewer a logically expressed general necessity and lawfulness in the forms in which social science does, say, sociology, history, and other social sciences. Living life's lawfulness, necessity is always realized, accomplished in the collision or interaction of living people, their personal fates, in the complex struggle of the new with the old. Just as in life, necessity in art must manifest itself in living individual forms.

Soviet society moves toward communism. Steadily growing are socialist industry and agriculture, the material and cultural level of Soviet people is rising. Such is the general lawfulness of our life. Some artists, proceeding from this general lawfulness, discarded, in essence, from their works all the diversity of forms in which this lawfulness is accomplished, discarded the living struggle of the new with the old, collision of personal fates, discarded accidents.

Mastery of constructing a plot consists in the ability to show a typical character in typical circumstances. This requirement is not infrequently understood among us in a simplified way: a character must be placed in such circumstances that emphasize his essence according to the principle of direct correspondence. Thus, a Stakhanovite, they say, can be depicted only at a machine or in a mine, otherwise circumstances allegedly can no longer be "typical." This is incorrect. Any circumstances can be typical if they, firstly, are real, secondly, concrete-historical, and, thirdly, serve as an active, and not passive background for action; only in this case do they help to reveal the essence of a given character. Here the principle of direct correspondence is by no means mandatory. The principle of contrast is also possible. Bazarov in Turgenev is shown not in his raznochinets environment, but in an environment completely alien to him—that of manorial nobility, in which he displays his typical traits.

The laws of plot construction (the mandatory presence of exposition, development of action, climax, denouement) cannot be arbitrary: they represent the theoretical expression of objective life lawfulness. Precisely in such a form (at first the emergence, and then resolution of a contradiction) life develops. The individual and accidental must be in art, as in life, a form of manifestation of necessity.

Visual-expressive means and artistic techniques creating in each given work of art its form have their own laws of development. Above all, they possess great stability. Artistic means and techniques of realistic art are the product of a whole series of epochs, over the course of which they are shaped,

enriched, developed, polished. Thus, the means and techniques of painting developed over the course of many centuries until they reached the modern level. The means and techniques of poetry are continuously enriched, closely connected with the development and perfection of language. More and more they develop on the basis of technique visual-expressive capabilities of cinematography.

Developing and enriching themselves, artistic means and techniques **do not undergo explosions and do not have a class character**. For example, a close-up, medium, long shot, being a specific medium of cinema, can be used and is used by both Soviet and bourgeois cinematography, expressing in both cases fundamentally different content. The situation is fundamentally the same in other forms of art as well.

But here, as is known, there is another side to the matter. If artistic means and techniques are indifferent to classes, classes are not indifferent to them, they try to use them in their interests. Modern bourgeoisie is interested in distorting normal aesthetic representations and demands of the people. Bourgeois artists-formalists violate the normal functioning of artistic means and techniques called upon to reflect the truth of life, with the aim of disorienting and leading people away from posing and resolving vitally important questions. Any attempts to "explode" artistic means and techniques accumulated over centuries bear an unconditionally formalistic character and lead in the end to the destruction of artistic form, to the liquidation of art.

Formalism in art, denying existing norms and laws of art, covers itself, as a rule, with leftist phrases about "innovation", about "revolution" in art.

Exposing formalistic pseudo-innovation in music directed at overturning the laws of its development, Comrade A. A. Zhdanov said that the formalistic phrase about innovation signifies, in essence, "a revision of the foundations of music... a rupture with such laws and norms of music from which one cannot depart. And that from which one cannot depart is not conservatism, but that from which they depart is by no means innovation" (*"Conference of Soviet Music Workers at the CC of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)"*, pp. 140–141).

Great innovator of poetry V. V. Mayakovsky, bearing in mind *"Eugene Onegin"* of Pushkin, called to "learn from this item with maximum conscientious creative techniques that give endless satisfaction and true formulation of caught, felt thought." These words of Mayakovsky do not hurt to remind some "innovating" to this day poets who begin their "innovation" with a revision of means and techniques of poetry, ignoring classical norms of literary-artistic language.

Soviet art is socialist in content and national in form. National features in artistic form have enormous significance, for they reflect features of the life of one or another nation. It is clear that reproducing life in its forms, art must necessarily take into account this moment as well. Moreover, national nationality of form—is an indispensable condition of **artistic** form. Classic artistic works are always deeply national. In Surikov's painting *"Morning of the Execution of the Streltsi"* Russian reality of the beginning of the 18th century is depicted, and this is

emphasized by all details of the painting—up to the Russian ornament on the arch.

Where form ceases to be national, it ceases to be artistic form altogether, for it loses its function of reproducing life in its real forms. The decay of form in modern bourgeois "art" is accompanied by the loss of its national features, a striving toward some abstract "cosmopolitan" forms. There is, for example, no possibility to distinguish French surrealism from American: here and there is meaningless, senseless daubing, chaos of geometric figures or parts of the human body. But this formalistic disregard for national form, signifying at the same time the liquidation of properly artistic form, leads art to inevitable ruin. Rootless cosmopolitanism, antipatriotism not by chance always gravitated in art toward formalism.

***

F. Engels, defining the contours of the art of the future, wrote that it will represent "a complete fusion of great ideational depth, conscious historical meaning... with Shakespearean vivacity and effectiveness..." (K. Marx and F. Engels. *Works*, Vol. XXV, p. 258). Not a single artist of the past possessed a fully scientific view of life, of the laws of its development, and consequently, could not to the end reveal the historical meaning of events and phenomena of reality. And yet, on the basis of those historically conditioned moments of objective truth in the understanding of life that they possessed, artists of the past knew how to create high models of art. The art of socialist realism represents a historically higher stage in the artistic development of humanity primarily because it, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, is capable of scientifically

revealing the historical meaning of events of life. Soviet art possesses a wonderful artistic heritage, is its legitimate heir and continuer. However, many of our artists still do not know how to reflect reality as the classics knew how to do it.

The XIX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union set before our artists the requirement—to raise the quality of works, to raise the ideational level and artistic mastery. In the report to the party congress Comrade G. M. Malenkov noted that "despite serious successes in the development of literature and art, the ideational-artistic level of many works still remains insufficiently high. In literature and art there still appear many mediocre, gray, and sometimes simply hack works distorting Soviet reality."

The Party press has repeatedly pointed out, in particular, the impermissibility of uncalled-for haste in creating new works, which still takes place among individual artists, the intolerable hack attitude toward work. The Soviet artist must always remember that he acts as a representative of socialist art opening new paths of artistic development, that the mission of him as a singer of true human truth, as an educator of millions of masses in the spirit of communism is unusually high, honorable, and responsible.

An irresponsible attitude toward artistic creation, which has become among us truly a part of a general national cause, can be justified by nothing. The conception of an artistic work must be carefully nurtured, and in accordance with it in the smallest details must be thought out the artistic form. It is known that I. E. Repin, working on the painting *"Arrest of a Propagandist"*, made several completed versions. L. N. Tolstoy in some cases

re-worked his productions more than ten times. All great painters worked with great care over individual fragments of future paintings. For Soviet critics, who, unfortunately, still cursorily and superficially consider the most important questions of artistic mastery, lies in this matter a great and responsible task. One must learn to analyze a work in detail from the side of its artistic form, be able to analyze it in connection with the content of its specific components, otherwise criticism cannot be artistic and professional.

"Constant concern for ideational purity and living truth of artistic creation, awareness of one's social duty, study of life, of the people, unflagging raising of mastery—that is what most fully expresses the demanding attitude of an artist to his work" (newspaper *"Pravda"* of January 9, 1952).

The guarantee of growth and perfection of Soviet art is the close attention to it of our Party, its wise assistance to Soviet artists in the matter of creating great works worthy of the heroic Soviet people.

16. Reality and the Beautiful in the Aesthetics of N. G. Chernyshevsky

N. V. DRAGOMIRETSKAYA

The aesthetics of Chernyshevsky, the great figure of revolutionary Russia of the 1860s, representative of Russian revolutionary-democratic thought, is the highest achievement of pre-Marxist aesthetics.

The aesthetic views of Chernyshevsky were formed in the epoch of the second, according to Lenin's periodization, stage of the Russian revolutionary-liberation movement. Figures of this stage were inspired by the goal that characterizes the entire Russian revolutionary movement as a whole up to the February Revolution—the struggle against serfdom and its remnants. The uniqueness of Chernyshevsky's epoch lies in the fact that it was the preparation for a peasant revolution, which was conceived by the revolutionary figures of this epoch as a great socialist revolution bringing the people liberation from all forms of slavery and oppression. Democratism and socialism in the epoch of the revolutionary situation of the 1860s merged into one, and the great revolutionary democrat Chernyshevsky, who objectively fought for a bourgeois-democratic revolution, was a convinced and passionate socialist.

On Chernyshevsky's aesthetics lies the vivid imprint of the characteristics of his revolutionary epoch. Chernyshevsky began his activity as a continuer of Belinsky's cause. Conforming to the conditions of Russian social life, Chernyshevsky made his aesthetics a field of class battles with

the enemies of the Russian people and a powerful tool for enlightening and revolutionizing the masses. In this sense, he further extended Belinsky's teaching. To those propositions at which the great critic arrived at the end of his activity, Chernyshevsky gave the character of a complete materialist concept. He deserves huge credit for exposing the class essence of idealist aesthetics, hostile to the people and the revolution. Chernyshevsky crushed the idealism of Western European philosophical thought in its classical manifestation in the systems of Kant and Hegel, revealing in the liberalism of these systems the hotbed of political reaction.

In creating his aesthetic theory, Chernyshevsky was guided by the interests and demands of his revolutionary modernity. He saw the purpose of literature in serving the people, revealing the dark sides of reality, and pronouncing judgment upon them. The imperishable significance of his aesthetics lies in its active interaction with the powerful Russian realistic literature, which was undergoing a turbulent rise and flourish under conditions of growing democratic sentiments. Chernyshevsky's aesthetics defended and affirmed as the only progressive direction in literature the critical realism of Gogol and Ostrovsky, Turgenev and L. Tolstoy, Nekrasov and Shchedrin.

Chernyshevsky's ideas fertilized the development of Russian realistic literature, fine art, and music of the second half of the 19th century (the work of the "Peredvizhniki," the "Mighty Handful"), contributing to the affirmation in them of realism and popular character (*narodnost*). Expanding the range of reality's phenomena covered by art, ever more conscious, bold,

and sharp sounded the judgment of artists upon serf-owning reality.

Chernyshevsky was not only a theorist in the field of art, but also a remarkable artist who mastered new paths for Russian realistic literature.

The outstanding art and music critic V. V. Stasov, in his work *Twenty-Five Years of Russian Art*, quite correctly linked the flourish of Russian realistic art of that time directly with the aesthetic activity of N. G. Chernyshevsky.

The aesthetics of N. G. Chernyshevsky is close and harmonious with our socialist aesthetics in its humanistic, active character. Just as in socialist aesthetics, at the core of Chernyshevsky's aesthetics lies the idea of beautiful reality. Reality for the great materialist was "precious"; it measured our concepts and was the source of the beautiful. Without disclosing how Chernyshevsky understood reality, it is impossible to characterize his philosophical and aesthetic position, the historical distinctiveness inherent to it.

The idea of peasant revolution in Russia and the revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of autocracy determined the content and meaning of that understanding of reality which Chernyshevsky defended throughout his entire activity. In *Essays on the Gogol Period of Russian Literature* (1855), Chernyshevsky wrote:

"...Here let us say a few [words] about how one ought to understand 'reality' and 'positiveness,' to which, according to modern concepts, such important significance should belong in

all branches of mental and moral activity" (*Full Coll. Works*, Vol. III, p. 225, GIKHL, 1947).

Disclosing the content of the concept "reality," Chernyshevsky poses the main philosophical question—on the relation of spirit to matter, consciousness to being. In this plane, he also considers the relation of fantasy to reality (by "fantasy" Chernyshevsky understood human ideas and concepts in general).

"The power of our fantasy is extremely limited, and the creations of its imagination are pale and weak compared to what reality presents," wrote Chernyshevsky (ibid., p. 227). Ideas, inventions, fantasy, according to Chernyshevsky's thought, are not independent and "absolute," as idealists assert; they are human concepts, man's knowledge of the surrounding world.

In the article "A Critical View on Modern Aesthetic Concepts" (1854), Chernyshevsky, having posed the question of how one ought to look at nature, answers: "Just as chemistry, physiology, and other natural sciences command us to look. In nature there is nothing to search for in terms of ideas; in it there is diverse matter with diverse qualities; they collide—the life of nature begins" (*Works*, Vol. II, p. 154).

In the understanding of reality defended by Chernyshevsky, matter and nature are the primary foundation of everything existing. In *Essays on the Gogol Period*, another, no less essential feature for Chernyshevsky's philosophical worldview is disclosed. Reality is understood by him as the arena of human activity. If the first above-mentioned feature, inherent in

his understanding of reality, characterizes Chernyshevsky as a materialist, the second feature reveals in him the nature of a fighter and a revolutionary. In the understanding of reality as the arena of human activity lies the pathos of all philosophical and aesthetic thought of Chernyshevsky. It is not accidental that in the works of the great Russian revolutionary democrat, "reality" and "practicality," "reality" and "positiveness" are closely linked with one another, one concept presupposing the other (see *Works*, Vol. III, p. 226; Vol. II, p. 103, and others).

Despite the vicious concept, not fully eradicated to this day, regarding Chernyshevsky as allegedly an imitator of the anthropological materialism of L. Feuerbach, it is necessary to especially emphasize the essential difference of the philosophical views of the "peasant democrat," leader of the revolutionary movement in Russia in the 60s, from the philosophy of contemplative materialism of Feuerbach, ideologist of the timid liberal German bourgeoisie who failed to understand the revolution of 1848 in Germany and shrank back from it.

The leading idea of anthropological philosophy is the idea of the materialist monism of the world. Strong in its affirmation of the unity of spirit and matter, the anthropological principle is completely insolvent in the scientific illumination of the problems of historical materialism. It is alien to posing the question of man as "the ensemble of social relations" (Marx); an extra-historical approach to society from the standpoint of "normal," eternal, natural human nature is inherent in it. In the revolutionary Chernyshevsky, from whose works, as Lenin writes, blows the spirit of class struggle, in his teaching on

reality as the arena of human activity, this principle acquires a different, revolutionary resonance.

In Chernyshevsky, the materialist principle of the unity of spirit and matter is that basis upon which grows the cherished idea of his entire life—the unity of thought and deed, spiritual and practical activity of man—an idea that elevated the great Russian thinker above all pre-Marxist materialism, which only explained the world.

A deep thinker and simultaneously a man of revolutionary action, Chernyshevsky equally does not recognize as reality either a thought born in people out of a contemplative, inactive life and not embodied in action, nor a "practical" life that is severed from and opposed to the spiritual, mental life of man. Belinsky was the model of a human being for Chernyshevsky, whom he called "the engine of reality," for he saw in him the embodiment of the unity of thought and deed. It is precisely to the unity of thought and deed that Chernyshevsky turns main attention in propagating his materialist understanding of reality.

"Reality," asserts Chernyshevsky, "embraces not only lifeless nature, but human life as well, not only the present, but also the past, insofar as it has expressed itself in action, and the future, insofar as it is prepared by the present. The deeds of Peter the Great belong to reality; the odes of Lomonosov belong to it no less than his mosaic paintings. To it belong not merely the idle words of people who say: 'I want to be a painter'—and do not study painting, 'I want to be a poet'—and do not study man and nature. Thought is not opposed to reality—because thought is engendered by reality and strives toward realization, therefore constituting an integral part of reality—and idle thought, which

was born out of idleness and remains a toy for a person who likes to sit with folded arms and screwed-up eyes. Exactly in the same way, 'practical life' embraces not merely one material activity, but mental and moral activity of man as well" (*Works*, Vol. II, p. 103).

Speaking of Lomonosov's odes as phenomena of reality, Chernyshevsky in this case allows an inaccuracy, since this formulation does not distinguish reality from its reflection in art; but for us it is valuable that in Chernyshevsky's mind thought and deed are one, that thought is real in the case where it owes its origin not to contemplative, "dreamy" life, but to the practical activity of man.

Deed always inspired the great Russian revolutionary. Chernyshevsky saw his task not only in correctly understanding and explaining reality, but also in helping man transform and rebuild it. In contrast to idealists striving to tear man away from earth and life, Chernyshevsky armed man for struggle, affirming the necessity of his drawing closer to real life, for man derives all his strength only from knowledge of real life. He said: "Lasting enjoyment is given to man only by reality"; "those feelings and demands that are called forth and supported by reality are far stronger than all fantastic aspirations and hopes"; "and love and hatred are given and aroused in the highest degree by objects that belong to the sphere of real life" (*Works*, Vol. III, pp. 229, 231).

Chernyshevsky considered man's most essential right to be the right to change reality in accordance with his goals and tasks. This thought, which Chernyshevsky developed in all his works

—historical, philosophical, literary-critical, artistic—was based entirely on a materialist view of reality.

Condemning the views of idealist aesthetics on the sublime, Chernyshevsky pointed out that to idealists, nature appears as a living being, extremely irritable, extremely touchy regarding its inviolability. Unsurprisingly, such a concept of nature undercuts the initiative and activity of man. "Is it really," asks Chernyshevsky, "—is nature really offended? Is nature really taking revenge in fact? No; it continues to act eternally according to its own laws, it knows nothing of man or his deeds... Nature is indifferent to man; it is neither an enemy nor a friend to him: it is... a convenient or inconvenient arena for his activity" (*Works*, Vol. II, p. 27).

Directing the aspirations of the best people of his time toward changing reality, Chernyshevsky had in mind first of all that system of dishonorable relations in Russia resting on the enslavement of the multi-million masses of the people.

The teaching on reality as the arena of human activity helped Chernyshevsky overcome the abstractness of anthropological materialism, approaching the scientific posing of the most important problems of dialectical and historical materialism. From the positions of his materialist and revolutionary teaching on reality, Chernyshevsky sharply exposed the reactionary essence of idealist philosophy, the anti-scientific nature of its concepts of reality.

For the materialist Chernyshevsky, a view of reality based on opposing spiritual and material aspects of life was completely unacceptable. With the sensitivity of a revolutionary,

Chernyshevsky disclosed in it the potential possibility of a reactionary sermon of contemplation, an apology for "quietism and apathy." Having appreciated at true value the dialectical method of Hegel, he at the same time showed its inconsistency and exposed the class nature of Hegel's idealism. By Chernyshevsky were exposed the speculative constructions of Hegel that created the appearance of proximity of his philosophy to real life. Chernyshevsky gave a sharp critique of the dualistic positions of Hegel, leading the latter in the final analysis inevitably to reconciliation with that vulgar reality from which he flees into the sphere of "spirit and freedom." Chernyshevsky criticized Hegel for his half-heartedness, compromise nature, for all that hated by the revolutionary spirit of liberalism, which the philosopher-idealist masked as the anti-popular essence of his philosophy. Deeply true is the evaluation of Hegel that we find in Chernyshevsky, being the result of his class, party approach to philosophy.

The active materialist teaching of Chernyshevsky on reality, foreign to contemplation, lay also at the basis of his theory of knowledge. With all force, the role of practice in the theory of knowledge is emphasized by Chernyshevsky. Practice for him is the criterion of truth and authenticity of human knowledge obtained through sensations and perceptions of the real world. "Practice is the unshakeable touchstone of any theory," "judgment is passed by man himself through his life."

Chernyshevsky especially emphasizes the immense significance of practice in modern science. "Practice is the great exposer of deceptions and self-delusions not only in practical affairs, but also in affairs of feelings and thought.

That is why in science now it is accepted as an essential criterion of all disputed points. 'What is subject to dispute in theory is decided clearly by the practice of real life'" (*Works*, Vol. II, pp. 102–103).

Chernyshevsky rejected the possibility of "a priori knowledge," "the development of science out of itself" (ibid., p. 264). Only that theory is valuable and represents scientific truth, spoke he, which relies on the facts of reality and arms man with knowledge for life, for the struggle for its restructuring.

Under the conditions of his activity, Chernyshevsky could not form a consistently scientific view of practice as social-productive human activity that determines the movement of the historical process, as in Marxism. However, his concept of practice applies not only in the realm of epistemology—it has huge significance in his historical views, being that factor that helped the great revolutionary overcome Enlightenment idealism in interpreting questions of history.

Chernyshevsky, who headed the preparation for the peasant revolution in Russia, understood practice as purposeful impact upon reality, as its revolutionary change by man. Even while a student, he spoke out for the struggle of classes, for only in open struggle, in his thought, would the predatory essence of all "sanctified" state institutions become clear to the people, and primarily the essence of Russian autocracy.

V. I. Lenin, emphasizing the deep and excellent understanding by Chernyshevsky of his contemporary reality, valued especially highly his class approach to social phenomena of life. As a vivid example of such a class approach, Lenin cited

Chernyshevsky's attitude toward the central event of his epoch —the reform of 1861. Quoting those passages from Chernyshevsky's writings in which he exposed the predatory essence of this reform, Lenin wrote:

"Genius was needed precisely then, in the epoch of the very accomplishment of the peasant reform (when it was not yet sufficiently illuminated even in the West), to understand with such clarity its basic bourgeois character—in order to understand that already then in Russian 'society' and 'state' there ruled and governed social classes irrevocably hostile to the working person and unconditionally predetermining the ruin and expropriation of the peasantry" (*Works*, Vol. I, p. 263).

The deep class analysis of social reality with which we constantly meet in the works of Chernyshevsky is based on that revolutionary idea of action that inspired the great Russian democrat and that constitutes the most important feature of his philosophical understanding of reality.

* * *

New aspects of Chernyshevsky's teaching on reality are disclosed also in his understanding of the beautiful.

The aesthetic theory of Chernyshevsky, placed at the service of the great liberation movement of the popular masses, is entirely imbued with the spirit of class struggle and revolutionary innovation. Revolutionary innovation by Chernyshevsky in aesthetics is the aesthetic rehabilitation of reality, developed in his works from the positions of consistent philosophical materialism. Aesthetic categories are not merely categories of

human consciousness and art. The beautiful and the ugly, the sublime and the base, the tragic and the comic, proved Chernyshevsky, are sides and properties of objective reality itself.

Laying the philosophical foundations of the new aesthetics, Chernyshevsky clearly realized that the need had matured to decisively reconsider the prevailing aesthetic views that justified and reinforced the system of social inequality. In idealist concepts planted in Russia after Belinsky's death by Hegel's epigones, the "realm of the beautiful" was recognized only in art. The natural, material form of existence of the beautiful was defamed. The beautiful had the significance of the absolute, opposed to life as a "sphere of the finite and relative" and unnatural to it. For the materialist Chernyshevsky, the tendencies of idealist aesthetic teachings to exclude nature and life from the sphere of the beautiful, the contempt of idealism for material form, and the defaming of sensory perception in the name of the "spiritual" were hostile and unacceptable. From the positions of the materialist principle affirming the unity of spirit and matter, Chernyshevsky untiringly exposed the fantastic ghostliness of idealist representations of the beautiful.

To Chernyshevsky, finding "flaws" in real reality solely because it is real and material seemed absurd and ridiculous. He wrote with irony of the purely idealist understanding of the beautiful as "purely spiritual form": "That we, enjoying the beautiful, destroy in it its material side, seems strange to us to say: the beautiful object in reality remains in our eyes as it is in reality, and its entire material side remains with it. 'Is it really,'

exclaims Chernyshevsky, '—for the sake of enjoying a landscape aesthetically, one must imagine it as a theatrical decoration or something like a painted panorama of Palermo, and not a real landscape with a river in which wet water flows, with a forest in which oak trees are sturdy and massive, with good dairy cows from which another brings home a whole bucket of milk? Is it really, aesthetically admiring a beauty, necessary to imagine that she is—an airy apparition, that if she gives us her hand, we, squeezing this hand, will feel that this is not a living hand, but an empty kid glove?'" (*Works*, Vol. II, p. 157).

Agreeing with German aesthetes that aesthetic perception of an object has its own specificity, Chernyshevsky decisively opposes pushing the opposition of aesthetic feeling as absolutely "disinterested" and "unselfish" to the point of complete opposition to all other human feelings, failing to see how in life one feeling is supported and reinforced by another, passing into another.

Chernyshevsky sees the specific characteristic of aesthetic feeling in the fact that it arises from such enjoyment of an object that, without calling forth gross, utilitarian interest, is inextricably linked with the demands of man's practical life: "Aesthetic enjoyment is always unselfish only in the sense that I admire, for example, someone else's grove, without thinking that it does not belong to me, that money raised for the corn growing on it will not go into my pocket; but I cannot help thinking: 'thank God, a wonderful crop is ripening; the peasants will recover nicely from this year's harvest! Lord, how much human happiness, how much joy for people matures on this

field!' And it must be said that this thought, perhaps dimly, vaguely for me myself acting upon me, prepares and disposes me all the more to aesthetic enjoyment of the cornfield" (ibid., p. 155).

Exposing the insolvency of idealist representations of the beautiful, of "pure form," of the "disinterestedness" of aesthetic taste, Chernyshevsky convincingly proved that the sphere of the beautiful is not limited to art, that aesthetic feeling is not a specific feeling of enjoying the beautiful in art. Chernyshevsky threw at "pure" aesthetes with their Sybaritic worship of the beautiful in art: "Admire your Apollo Belvedere, O high minds, for whom everything walking on earth is low and not worth a dead statue on a marble pedestal!"

Chernyshevsky ardently defended the poetry of real life, those human feelings in which a "burst toward life" is expressed. He asserted that aesthetic feeling first of all and strongest of all is called forth by the phenomena of reality itself. By his aesthetics he turned contemporaries face-to-face with living reality, making people find beauty in life itself, see it with their own eyes. The famous definition of the beautiful put forward by Chernyshevsky: **"The beautiful is life... such as it ought to be according to our concepts"** (ibid., p. 10)—asserts life in the unity of its material and ideal phenomena as the source of aesthetic feeling, the source of poetry.

Such is the first and main meaning of the definition of the beautiful, strictly corresponding to the materialist representation of Chernyshevsky regarding reality.

Another most important meaning of this definition lies in the fact that in it the problem of the aesthetic ideal is broadly posed. The characteristic feature of Chernyshevsky's aesthetic ideal is that this ideal is not opposed to life, as in idealist aesthetics, but is inextricably linked with it, growing out of it. Vulgarizers attempted to interpret the famous formula of Chernyshevsky "the beautiful is life" in the sense that it allegedly orientations the artist toward passive perception of everything that exists in life. But in doing so they kept silent about how Chernyshevsky himself interpreted this formula in a completely opposite plane, emphasizing that beautiful is that being "in which we see life such as it ought to be according to our concepts," that is, called for changing life, for active struggle against that which in life itself is hostile to beauty. Hence stems the great social purpose of art, which Chernyshevsky consistently defended.

To the "fantastic" idealism of "pure" aesthetes, who saw "gross" and "unaesthetic" elements in life's phenomena, the great democrat opposed his understanding of the beautiful. As Chernyshevsky establishes, reality securing man's movement forward is his labor activity. "Life has as its main element labor, and therefore the main element of reality is—labor, and the truest sign of reality is—actuality" (*Works*, Vol. II, p. 119). In his famous comparative characteristic of two manifestations of female beauty—the healthy beauty of a peasant girl and the sickly beauty of a high-society belle—Chernyshevsky gives all his sympathies to the village beauty precisely because her beauty includes the representation of labor.

Labor in a broad sense as an active human attitude toward life enters into the aesthetic ideal of the great revolutionary democrat. Affirming his understanding of the beautiful, Chernyshevsky taught people not to turn away from "real dirt" of life. Only the perception of reality in all its fullness, in the unity of its material and ideal phenomena, is that aesthetic perception that creates necessary prerequisites for activity, a revolutionary human attitude toward reality, for his active struggle for the happiness of the people.

It is remarkable how Chernyshevsky and his comrades aesthetically perceived their time—the epoch of the 60s. Social life of the revolutionary epoch allowed representatives of the new generation to feel immense, incomparable joy of creative participation of man in real, practical, and not ghostly, fantastic life, the joy of creative creation of new reality, sharpening at the same time in them critical perception of ugly serf-owning Russian reality.

The revolutionary epoch attracted Chernyshevsky not by revolutionary "bursts," not by "flight of spirit," of which "pure aesthetes" spoke, masking their anti-popular essence. He recognized and accepted the entire "unaesthetic," "reverse" side of the peasant revolution, considering it "the most real reality," because in the peasant revolution Chernyshevsky saw the greatest historical deed of his time, the struggle against the ugliness of the autocratic system, for complete renewal of Russian national life. That which for "poetic" natures—aesthetes A. V. Druzhinin, V. P. Botkin, and others—in spontaneous uprisings of Russian peasantry of the 60s appeared "unaesthetic," and in essence class-hostile, to the "peasant

democrat" Chernyshevsky could not push away from the revolution; he perceived it as a cleansing thunderstorm that brings liberation to the people. Precisely in this Chernyshevsky saw the supreme manifestation of the beautiful.

Chernyshevsky condemned idle life, engendered and supported by relations of social inequality and exploitation, alien to movement and activity. This is the life of people who do not know labor, who possess only a contemplative attitude toward reality. Chernyshevsky shows how on the soil of contemplative life in people grow absurd, fantastic desires and aspirations having nothing in common with real human needs. To one of the typical representatives of such contemplative life—Grushnitsky from *A Hero of Our Time* by M. Y. Lermontov—Chernyshevsky gives the following characteristic: "This funny Grushnitsky tries with all his might to feel what he does not feel at all, to achieve what he in essence does not need at all. He wants to be wounded, he wants to be a simple soldier, wants to be unhappy in love, fall into despair, etc.—he cannot live without possessing these alluring qualities and blessings for him. But with what grief would his fate strike him if it took a mind to fulfill his wishes! He would refuse love forever if he thought that whatever girl might not fall in love with him" (*Works*, Vol. II, p. 95).

Chernyshevsky maliciously ridiculed the fantastic desires of representatives of the gentry class, tied to their idle, parasitic life. In one of his articles ("A Russian Man at the Rendez-vous"), Chernyshevsky severely condemned the type of the so-called "superfluous man" who did not find in the years of revolutionary rise his place in social struggle. "An aimless life"

with "petty aimless relations and deeds" made out of the best, by Chernyshevsky's own admission, representative of his class not "a man with a noble character," but merely an "individual of the male sex," timid and helplessly retreating from everything that requires "broad decisiveness and noble risk." Chernyshevsky wrote his article in an atmosphere of heated, but empty and fruitless disputes of gentry liberals over land reform and emancipation of peasants. Speaking of the absence of "broad decisiveness and noble risk" in the best representative of the gentry class, Chernyshevsky meant first of all the timid behavior of him in social affairs, his indifferent attitude toward the main task of the time—the impending popular revolution.

In this article Chernyshevsky condemns human life deprived of participation in civic activity, which excluded civic motives from the sphere of its aspirations. Chernyshevsky cites as an example a society consisting of such individuals, that terrible world that appeared to Mr. Peregrinus Tyss (hero of Hoffmann's novella *Master Flea*), who possessed the miraculous gift of seeing through people. Thanks to this capacity of his, Peregrinus Tyss saw human society in all the ugliness of predatory, unmasked instincts of its representatives. Upon whomever he glances, every man appears to him a petty coward or treacherous intriguer, every woman—a coquette, all people—liars and egoists, petty and low to the last degree, so that beauty, nobility, virtue, love, friendship—all that is beautiful and great disappeared for him from the world.

The gloomy fantasy of Hoffmann Chernyshevsky explains as a consequence of his impressions of surrounding reality. The

writer had seen enough of what is called in Germany *Kleinstädterei*, that is, life deprived of civic motives, philistine life of his contemporaries. As an unshakeable truth, Chernyshevsky's conclusion is perceived by us: "It is better for a person not to develop than to develop without the influence of thought on social affairs, without the influence of feelings awakened by participation in them."

In the aesthetics of Chernyshevsky, the beautiful for the first time becomes a genuinely humanistic category. It ceases to be a divine absolute, opposed to man in his life. The aesthetic ideal of Chernyshevsky vividly embodies the revolutionary nature of the great Russian materialist, affirming the fighter-person, the revolutionary, relating with enthusiasm to the life needs of the people.

In his artistic practice, in the famous novel *What Is to Be Done?*, Chernyshevsky showed his high aesthetic ideal of human life—the realm of a bright and beautiful future. Chernyshevsky depicted that period when, as Engels put it, people, having finally become masters of their own social being, become thereby masters of nature. This is an epoch of gigantic development of all productive forces of society and at the same time an unprecedented flourish of all its spiritual riches. This is a world of free creative collective labor that has ceased to be merely a means to life. The content of labor is disclosed by Chernyshevsky in the novel as a victorious struggle against elemental forces of nature, which man has made a "convenient arena" for his activity.

The brilliant ideas—foresights of Chernyshevsky about a bright future of humanity, where blind, elemental forces of

nature will be placed at the service of society—are embodied in our days in reality by creators of a new life in the Soviet country and countries of people's democracy. In the novel *What Is to Be Done?*, Chernyshevsky created the image of a beautiful person, his contemporary, who dedicated his life to revolutionary struggle for this realm of the future, whom Chernyshevsky for his time calls a special person, but whom in our time we would call a genuine person.

* * *

The concept of the beautiful in art, inextricably linked with the beautiful in reality, of a qualitatively new kind of beautiful created by creative human labor, grows in Chernyshevsky as a concretization and further development of his materialist and revolutionary representation of reality. This concept was determined already in the first theoretical work of Chernyshevsky—in the treatise *Aesthetic Relations of Art to Reality*—developing and enriching itself throughout his subsequent aesthetic activity.

From the positions of his teaching on the beautiful in real reality, Chernyshevsky untiringly fights against the main proposition of idealist aesthetics, as if art in its works realizes the idea of some absolute beauty, opposed to reality. To this idea of idealist aesthetics Chernyshevsky denies any scientific significance. In his words, it is one of the a priori hypotheses of German absolute idealism. Chernyshevsky convincingly shows that this false idea in practice, that is, in art itself, inevitably degenerates into false idealization, into embellishing reality, that it inevitably leads to a refusal of truthful, comprehensive depiction of life, from realism, and, what is most important, in

it is hidden a sermon of severing art from life and social struggle.

In the theory of "pure art," in the assertion that the beautiful is possible only in art, Chernyshevsky exposes the selfish interests of the ruling classes of serf-owning Russia. The sermon of "exquisite Epicureanism" of "pure art" Chernyshevsky viewed as an attempt to destroy the progressive direction in art linked with life. Chernyshevsky pointed out that in various theories words that art must be independent of life always served as a cover for struggle against truthful, realistic art defending popular interests.

The great democrat consistently and in principle defended in his works and articles the materialist theory of art, the theory of reproducing life in art. Real, actual life, in which are contained all aesthetic values, all that constitutes "the object of our joyful love," acts in Chernyshevsky's concept as a full-fledged object of art. The beautiful in art is a phenomenon of a secondary order, the result of a truthful reproduction of life. Art, teaches Chernyshevsky, like any human activity, only then achieves brilliant development when it is in living connection with the needs of society. "That which has no roots in the soil of life remains flabby and pale, not only acquires no historical significance, but also in itself, without relation to action upon society, is nothingness" (*Works*, Vol. III, p. 299).

The requirement of an unbroken, vital connection of art with life, truthful, comprehensive reproduction of reality determined Chernyshevsky's struggle for the Gogolian direction in art. Extremely indicative in this sense is the characteristic that Chernyshevsky gives to Gogol in *Essays on the Gogol Period*:

"We call Gogol without any comparison the greatest of Russian writers by significance. In our opinion, he had full right to say words whose immense pride confused in his time his hottest admirers, and whose awkwardness is understandable to us: 'Rus! What do you want of me? What incomprehensible connection lurks between us? Why do you look so, and why has everything that is in you turned upon me eyes full of expectation?' He had full right to say this," asserts Chernyshevsky (ibid., pp. 10–11).

That which even to the hottest admirers from among Gogol's contemporaries seemed self-conceit, in the eyes of Chernyshevsky is an expression of the artist's genius precisely because in this appeal to Russia Gogol showed his unbreakable connection with Russian life, society, and the people.

In his treatise *Aesthetic Relations of Art to Reality*, Chernyshevsky expresses a famous proposition on the judgment of the artist upon life as an essential and integral quality of great art—a thesis in which with all force manifested itself the active character of the aesthetics of the great Russian revolutionary. In Chernyshevsky's thought, art-as-judgment is a "textbook of life," because it reproduces essential sides of life, is an art of great social generalizations. In a conversation with L. Tolstoy, V. V. Stasov, defining the significance of Chernyshevsky's aesthetics, called his teaching on art-as-judgment "a great word" of the Russian thinker.

In his aesthetic treatise Chernyshevsky does not develop in detail his teaching on art-as-judgment and on the role of the artist in creating works of art, but his entire rich historical-

literary and critical activity is imbued with this militant principle, affirming the active, revolutionary nature of art.

In the historical-literary and critical articles of Chernyshevsky, the creative, constructive role of the artist is emphasized with immense force. The source of poetic activity Chernyshevsky sees not only in "inquisitiveness" of man, a purely theoretical drive, but in a practical desire to create, to produce. The artist appears in Chernyshevsky as an actor of his historical epoch. His role and place in social life are determined primarily by the activity of participation in the liberation struggle of the people. Affirming the active, creative nature of art, Chernyshevsky exposed idealist concepts of "pure art," revealing the contemplation and deadness of these concepts.

Proceeding from the fact of real interconnection and conditionality of spiritual and physical needs and aspirations of a living person, Chernyshevsky thus characterizes human action in general: "In every human action participate all aspirations of human nature, although one of them was predominantly interested in this affair" (*Works*, Vol. III, p. 237).

Even considered realistically, as one of human aspirations, the idea of the beautiful, asserts Chernyshevsky, cannot be placed at the basis of the philosophy of art, for in such a form it represents an abstraction, a detachment from the living, real person, in whom "all parts and aspirations are inextricably linked with one another." In life, teaches Chernyshevsky, the desire for the beautiful is subordinated to real needs of human nature, needs of "truth, love, and improvement of life."

To the flabby and helpless idealist abstraction—"the idea of the beautiful"—Chernyshevsky opposes his materialist assertion that art, like any other human action, cannot be based on one single desire: "...Art is produced not by an abstracted desire for the beautiful (the idea of the beautiful), but by the combined action of all forces and capacities of a living person" (ibid.).

The beautiful in art, the power and degree of its artistic impact, its aesthetic influence are born out of a living and active intervention of the poet in life, his capacity to respond with his whole being to the needs and demands of his time, by the power and depth of judgment upon life. Chernyshevsky spoke of how only that artist creates genuine great art who is inspired by living and strong ideas that have become his own condition, his passionate passion. Art is not a dead, soul-less copying of the existing; it is born out of the living thought of the artist, living and strong ideas that have become the pathos of his whole life. Without changing his basic materialist proposition —"the beautiful is life"—Chernyshevsky finds and discloses life in great creations of art.

Through all articles and works of Chernyshevsky passes the image of the artist-patriot, growing as a generalization of the main, leading feature of great Russian literature. Among ideas inspiring the poet, the first place, as Chernyshevsky emphasizes, belongs to patriotism, which he discloses as an act for the good of the motherland and people.

Chernyshevsky deeply believed in the revolutionary possibilities of the people. He asserted that a genuine understanding of patriotism is incompatible with the defense of "pure art" and "pure science," at the base of which lies a

contemplative attitude toward life, society, and the motherland. Exponents of these contemplative, inactive theories cannot claim the sacred name of patriot: they are false patriots. Chernyshevsky saw the distinctiveness of the Russian historical process in the fact that the activity of every great Russian person was always subordinated to a noble and beautiful idea of serving his motherland.

The most vivid expression of patriotism for Chernyshevsky was the activity of his great predecessor—Belinsky. Love for the good of the motherland, wrote Chernyshevsky about him, was his sole passion, which guided him; every fact of art Belinsky evaluated depending on what significance it had for Russian life.

The poet-patriot under new conditions of revolutionary reality of the 60s must, in Chernyshevsky's thought, illuminate in a new way the problem of the people. This task Chernyshevsky posed before contemporary writers in the article "Is a Change Beginning?" (1861). The people, wrote Chernyshevsky, "appeared before us in the form of Akaky Akakiyevich, about whom one can only feel sorry, who can receive benefit for himself only from our compassion." "Read stories from folk life by Mr. Grigorovich and Mr. Turgenev, with all their imitators—everything is thoroughly saturated with the smell of the 'overcoat' of Akaky Akakiyevich."

"The smell of the 'overcoat'" of Akaky Akakiyevich is that traditional "love for the lesser brother" that fully satisfies a purely contemplative feeling of pity and compassion toward him. This "love" forces writers to embellish, idealize their object, but deprives them of the capacity to believe in the

people. Chernyshevsky demanded of Russian writers to depict the people without embellishment. Let a dark picture of folk life be drawn corresponding to reality, but the people must be depicted not as an object of pity and compassion, but as an actor in whose hands lies their own fate. Unembellished truth of depiction presupposes the creation of new typical images from the people. These are images of a protesting people, spontaneously rising to struggle with their oppressors. Such an image of the people Chernyshevsky called "truth without any embellishment," and with it linked "the beginning of change" in Russian literature.

In his struggle for this new artistic truth, externally severe and merciless to the people, but based on deep revolutionary faith in them, Chernyshevsky was guided by the conviction that only such art can correctly illuminate the revolutionary epoch in Russia.

Genuine exponents of the new truth defended by the great writer-revolutionary were a galaxy of revolutionary-democratic artists headed by Chernyshevsky himself: Saltykov-Shchedrin, Nekrasov, and others. Their work marks a whole epoch in the development of Russian classical literature.

The artistic practice of Chernyshevsky in the highest degree clearly testifies to how fruitful the aesthetic principles and ideas of the great materialist were. His famous novels *What Is to Be Done?* and *Prologue* develop the traditions of Gogol's critical direction and at the same time represent a new, distinct phenomenon in 19th-century realistic literature.

A remarkable artist and great figure of revolutionary Russia during the period of serfdom's collapse, Chernyshevsky for the first time in Russian literature creates positive images that, in the breadth of their generalization, go far beyond the boundaries of his epoch. The greatest artistic success of Chernyshevsky was the created image of the "special person," Rakhmetov. In him Chernyshevsky typified exceptional, distinct phenomena, far from mass-scale, not widespread. But the Rakhmetovs had deep social roots in historical reality, and to them belonged the future. Precisely for this reason the image of Rakhmetov acquired the significance of a supreme norm of human behavior, becoming a model upon which whole generations of revolutionaries were educated and formed.

In the novel *Prologue*, judgment upon serf-owning reality is pronounced by means of satirical exposure. Here Chernyshevsky rises to sharp socio-political satire. Portraying images of the so-called "figures" of the peasant reform, the revolutionary Chernyshevsky mercilessly rips off their liberal masks and in the manner of Shchedrin exposes under their smoothed and pomaded exterior the most vicious enemies of the people.

The source of the powerful vital force of Chernyshevsky's aesthetics lies in its unbroken connection with the vital needs of revolutionary reality. The aesthetics of Chernyshevsky in our time as well has not lost its militant character as one of the most effective antidotes against attempts to revive idealist concepts of art. The steadfast and principled struggle of Chernyshevsky against idealist aesthetics, the exposure of its anti-popular, reactionary essence, its anti-scientific character

help us fight against all tricks to smuggle idealist views into Marxist-Leninist aesthetics.

It is necessary to use the aesthetic heritage of the great materialist in the struggle for the further development of Soviet art, worthy of our people and our epoch.

17. On the Objective Character of the Laws of Realistic Art

V. S. KEMENOV

I

Marxism holds that the laws of science reflect objective processes occurring in nature and society independently of human will. Science cannot live and develop without recognizing objective regularities, without studying these regularities. People who deny this premise essentially reject science and embark on the path of subjective idealism.

In art history and aesthetics, considerable damage has been done by Machist subjective-idealist attitudes, which, as is known, served as the theoretical basis for formalism and the struggle against realistic art by the Proletkultists and RAPPists. The rout of Machism and Bogdanovism in V. I. Lenin's book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and the exposure of the relapses of Bogdanovism in I. V. Stalin's works *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* and *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* are of vast importance for the struggle against subjective-idealist tendencies in aesthetics and art, and for the defense and affirmation of realism in aesthetics and art.

All formalist "theories" in the field of art are united by one common feature: the ignoring of the objective regularity of real processes and their significance for the artist's work. The favorite little theory of aesthetes and formalists is built on the assertion that art is "above life," claiming that art possesses its own special regularities of "pure form," the nature of which

allegedly has nothing in common with the regularities of life or the objective processes of real reality.

Regarding what these special regularities of artistic form are, many heated disputes are conducted, and there are as many different points of view, small schools, groups, and cliques in the formalist camp as there are artists. But through all the disputes and squabbles, all these aesthetic-formalist trends are united by the common conviction that the laws of art are completely independent of the objective regularities of the real world—that the artist, by virtue of his own genius, "creates" through his work the "laws" of art without any connection to life or real reality.

The Impressionists reduced the task of art to conveying the fleeting, subjective impressions of the artist and, in pursuit of light effects, displayed complete indifference toward objects and the regularities of the real world, toward people, their activity, and their spiritual life. "The main character in a painting is light," said Manet (Mauclair, *Impressionism: Its History, Its Aesthetics, Its Masters*, p. 26). The stable connections and regularities of objective life were, in essence, denied by the Impressionists and replaced with a complex of the artist's subjective impressions.

The theorists of Expressionism condemned realistic art for having its forms develop out of the object-visible world. "Roughly speaking, in this art one can always recognize what it is about," writes Hausenstein. Instead, Expressionism demands that art manifest "the artist’s passion, his fanaticism regarding dynamics, arbitrary violence toward the object..." (V.

Hausenstein, "On Expressionism in Painting," collection *Expressionism*, pp. 140, 149. M. 1923. *Spacing mine.—V. K.*).

The theorists of Cubism, Ozenfant and Jeanneret, viewed a painting as a simple combination of forms and colors unbound by real objects, asserting: "The ideal toward which Cubism and Purism strive is to create combinations unbound by nature" (Ozenfant and Jeanneret, *Contemporary Painting*. Cited in *Master Artists on Art*, Vol. III, p. 473. Izogiz, M. 1934).

Finally, the Surrealist Salvador Dalí declared that the task of Surrealism is "to contribute to the total discredit of objective reality" (see M. Nadeau, *Histoire du surréalisme*, p. 210).

"Surrealists believe that the subconscious is the source of all that is valuable in art, and their painting and poetry are full of expressions of this faith... They guide the brush as freely as the imagination, unleashed on the canvas, creating images with reckless arbitrariness..." (H. Barr, *What is Modern Painting?* The Museum of Modern Art, New York, p. 33).

Hence stems that anarchic arbitrariness and adventurism in the realm of artistic form that are so characteristic of formalist trends in painting, music, sculpture, poetry, etc., and which destructively impact art. Being severed from life, art degenerates into empty trickery and acrobatics, inevitably falling into decay.

Bourgeois ideologists find a favorite tool for resisting realism in thoroughly hypocritical, idealist arguments about "freedom of creativity" and the alleged "specificity" of art, which is supposedly incompatible with recognizing any objective laws

in reality and art. According to these arguments of bourgeois aesthetes, the "freedom of creativity" of an artist is complete independence from any laws of objective life whatsoever, and resemblance between a work of art and real objects is considered unworthy of a genuine artist.

Decadent bourgeois art, from the standpoint of an idealist worldview, denies the very existence of these objective laws and even the existence of objective reality itself; it seeks to prove that the world is a realm of chaos and chance, and that the artist has every right to commit arbitrary acts upon this chaos, since extreme subjectivism allegedly guarantees "freedom of creativity." It is precisely such "freedom of creativity"—that is, disregard for objective reality and its laws—that gives rise to various hideous "works" by modern formalist writers and artists in the USA, England, France, and other capitalist countries. Arbitrariness and adventurism, recklessness and trickery, the delirium of paranoia, mysticism, and irrationalism are proclaimed by the entire chorus of reactionary bourgeois art critics as a manifestation of "freedom of creativity."

To this bourgeois-individualist, anarchic interpretation of "freedom of creativity" in Impressionism, Expressionism, and Surrealism, Marxist-Leninist aesthetics opposes its own understanding of creative freedom, based on the understanding of freedom as *recognized necessity*. "Freedom," wrote Engels, "consists not in an imagined independence from natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws and in the possibility thereby made available of systematically making them work

towards definite ends. This holds good in relation to the laws of external nature as well as to those..."

"...which regulate the physical and mental life of man himself —two classes of laws which we can separate from one another at most in idea, but not in reality" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 114).

The fact that Engels writes here about the objective character of the laws regulating the "physical and mental life of man himself" clearly indicates that such a form of human mental activity as literature and art relies on objective laws. Deep study of life by the artist for the purpose of comprehending the regularities of its development is the most essential condition of art, the steadfast basis for creating artistically valid images, an imperative demand of the aesthetics of socialist realism. Freedom of creativity for the Soviet artist, relying on the study and cognition of reality and its laws (recognized necessity), is the freedom to reflect and express the truth of life in art, the freedom to honestly serve their people and all progressive humanity with their art. Any other interpretation of "freedom of creativity" inevitably leads to subjectivism and formalism.

In the resolutions of the Central Committee of the Party on literature and art, it was pointed out that ignorance of life and the refusal of artists to deeply study the laws of its development lead to aimlessness and apoliticism in art, to anti-popular tendencies in art, and give rise to arbitrariness and formalist trickery in questions of artistic form. All this leads to the violation of the basic regularities of art, to the decay of images, and ultimately to the liquidation of art itself.

In Soviet art criticism of the 1920s–30s, formalist views—which denied the objective character of the content of artistic works and the cognitive role of art—acted in alliance with the fabrications of vulgar sociology. The latter viewed the historical process from Menshevik positions, reduced the entire course of history to the activities and struggles among the ruling exploiter classes, and completely ignored the role of the popular masses, the working classes, in the historical development of society. In the realm of art history, vulgar sociologists denied truthfulness in art, realism, and popular character (*narodnost*), declaring these categories to be "classless" and demanding that art be viewed as a form of ideology akin to religion rather than science.

Of course, religion, like art, being a social phenomenon of a superstructural character, is conditioned in its development by the base. "Even foggy formations in the brain of people," wrote Marx, "are necessary sublimates [products] of their material life process" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. IV, p. 17). But it does not follow that the objective content of religion and art is one and the same; nor does it mean that the creative process and all the practical activity of the painter, composer, playwright, architect, writer, etc., are identical to the process of activity of preachers of any religious system simply because both express a certain worldview—and in a class society, a class-conditioned worldview—ultimately determined by the base. As for art, it is impossible to understand its real role in the class struggle or the reason for the longevity of its outstanding works if one investigates art independently of whether it is true or false in relation to real reality, or if one

views art merely as the "socially organized experience" of a given class.

Recall that Lenin, criticizing Bogdanov, exposed such a point of view as Machist. "'Catholicism,' wrote Lenin, 'socially organized, harmonized, agreed upon' by its centuries-long development; it 'fits' into the 'chain of causality' in the most indisputable manner, for religions did not arise gratuitously; they keep their hold on the masses of the people under modern conditions not by accident, and philosophy professors who adapt themselves to them do so quite 'lawfully.' If this undoubtedly universally acknowledged and undoubtedly highly organized social-religious experience does not 'harmonize' with the 'experience' of science, it means that between the two there is a fundamental, radical difference, which Bogdanov erased when he rejected objective truth" (*Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 112–113).

Is there a fundamental, radical difference between art and religion in their relationship to reality? From the standpoint of realistic aesthetics, yes, there is. From the standpoint of Machist, Bogdanovist aesthetic theory—no. In the debates and struggle against the Machists, Lenin defended the materialist understanding of science as well as art. In 1910, in "Notes of a Publicist," Lenin wrote: "In our time, in the realm of science, philosophy, and art, the struggle of Marxists against Machists has come to the fore. It is at least ridiculous to close one's eyes to this universally known fact" (*Works*, Vol. 16, p. 185).

Lenin explained that from the standpoint of Marxism, unlike Machism, the limits of our knowledge's approximation to objective, absolute truth are historically conditional, but the

existence of this truth is unconditional, as is the fact that we are approaching it. The contours of the picture are historically conditional, but it is unconditional that this picture depicts an objectively existing model. "In a word, every ideology is historically conditional, but it is unconditional that to every scientific ideology (as distinct, for instance, from religious ideology) there corresponds an objective truth, absolute nature" (*Works*, Vol. 14, p. 123).

Does art, unlike religion, have such an objectively existing model outside the artist's consciousness—one with which authors compare their works and toward whose increasingly full depiction realistic art gradually moves over the course of its centuries-long development? Of course it does! And that is life, objective reality; so answer the adherents of realistic aesthetics, and in this sense they emphasize the kinship between art and science.

V. G. Belinsky, for whom the content and starting point for science as well as for genuine art was real reality, wrote: "They see that art and science are not one and the same thing, but they do not see that their difference lies not at all in the content, but only in the method of processing the given content. The philosopher speaks in syllogisms, the poet—in images and pictures, but both say one and the same thing... One proves, the other shows, and both convince, only one with logical arguments, the other—with pictures" ("A Look at Russian Literature of 1847," *Works*, Vol. III, pp. 797–798, 1948). N. G. Chernyshevsky also defended similar ideas on the fundamental proximity between science and realistic art.

Belinsky persistently emphasized that the task of poetry, as well as painting, is "to be faithful to reality, which it has undertaken to reproduce," that art "is a reproduction of reality, a repeated world created anew," that art is an activity of a special kind, its subject being truth. This, of course, does not mean that every work of art is truth. Among works of art and literature, there are quite a few false ones that give a (deliberately or involuntarily) distorted, fake depiction of life. But it means that all deviations from the truth, all distortions of truth inevitably lower the artistic quality of works of art, depriving their images of persuasiveness and full artistic value.

Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, and Dobrolyubov repeatedly showed that preaching false, reactionary ideas leads art to decay, and that writers who embark on this path sever themselves from the people, destroying themselves as writers and as artists (it is enough to recall Belinsky's famous letter to Gogol). Modern decadent art in capitalist countries—which demands that the artist distort the truth of life, having long served as a mouthpiece for war promoters and a defender of the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie—provides vivid examples of the ruin of many talented artists and a picture of the marasmus and decay of art itself.

The Marxist proposition that art is a social phenomenon of a superstructural nature, that in a class society it carries a class character, helps us understand the entire complexity of the process of art's development (its ideational content and artistic forms), which is conditioned by the class struggle and, ultimately, by the development of the economic structure of society.

The Proletkultists and RAPPists vulgarized and distorted the Marxist formula regarding the class character of art and literature in a class society. Interpreting class character in a Machist-Bogdanovist sense, they refused to view the history of art and literature as the history of a struggle between two main directions: realism and all sorts of anti-realistic trends. Simplifiers and vulgar sociologists, with their formulas on class nature, only hindered the understanding of the actual content of the class struggle in art and the full complexity and diversity of its manifestations.

In a class society, art depends on the struggle of classes, is inextricably linked with it, takes an active part in it by expressing the ideas and interests of a particular class, and cannot be understood outside the class struggle and its laws. Does this mean that the *only* law of art is that it expresses the ideas of certain classes of society? No. It is known that art arose before the division of society into classes, and that art will not be liquidated, but will continue to exist and develop after the liquidation of classes in a classless society. Therefore, the laws of class struggle—which for thousands of years, from the end of the primitive communal system to communism, have a decisive influence on the development of art—do not at all negate the existence of the *specific* laws of art.

The question of the connection between art and the class struggle, and of the class character of art in a class society, must be considered from two sides: 1) what does art give to a particular class interested in having art express its ideas, defend its interests, and serve its class goals in the struggle against other classes of society; and 2) how does the participation of

art in the class struggle affect the ideational content and artistic form of art itself?

While answering the first question is relatively easy—since every class is interested in having art serve its needs, expressing and defending its interests—answering the second question is more complex. To answer it, one must first know *what* class and under *what* concrete historical conditions we are talking about; one must know *what specific* class ideas and interests are expressed by a given artwork: reactionary or progressive ones. One must know whether this class at a given stage of its development is interested in a truthful depiction of life, in the cognition of its objective processes, or whether, on the contrary, it is gripped by fear before the truth of life and a reluctance to reckon with the objective processes of its development. One must know the relationship of this class to the interests of the popular masses, to fundamental questions of the historical development of society, of a given nation, etc.

It turns out that for the development and fate of art itself, it is far from indifferent *what* ideas and views it defends, *whose* class interests it expresses. This means that art, as a specific ideological form of social consciousness, besides general laws, has its own specific laws that cannot be violated with impunity, just as a violation of these laws inevitably impacts art itself destructively—at its ideational-artistic level and in its form.

In this process, the following regularity is observed in the development of art, conditioned by its role in the class struggle: Art that serves the interests of reactionary classes serves the dying forces of society and is anti-popular; this art is reactionary in its ideational content, distorts reality, and

inevitably leads to decay in artistic form as well. And, on the contrary, art that serves the advanced forces of society expresses advanced ideas; it is truthful, progressive, and advanced in its artistic form. The main and decisive factor here is the question of the relation of art to objective reality, and the question intimately bound up with it regarding the relation of the artist's work to life and the struggle of the masses—that is, the problem of **realism** and the problem of **popular character (*narodnost*)** in art.

Marxist-Leninist science proceeds from the premise that the working masses, who create all material wealth, are the decisive creative force of society, that the people are the creator of history. "The history of social development is the history of the producers of material wealth themselves, the history of the working masses, the history of peoples" (*Pravda*, June 10, 1953). The most talented, outstanding personalities (including talented writers, artists, composers, etc.) will not achieve success if their activity, ideas, and aspirations run counter to the needs of society's development and are not linked with the masses. Striving in their work toward a truthful depiction of reality, artists cannot content themselves merely with their own limited experience; they must rely on the experience of the people, listen to the people, learn from them, and be imbued with the thoughts, feelings, aspirations, and yearnings of the people. This is the pledge of a truthful, deep understanding and depiction of life in works of art, even in cases where the people are not the immediate subject of these works. The popular character of art means that whatever subject, event, or aspect of reality the artist depicts, his

approach to and evaluation of the depicted subject must be imbued with the thoughts and feelings of the people. Naturally, the popular character of socialist realism represents a new quality compared to the popular character of the art of past epochs. But indisputably, one cannot understand the ideational and artistic value of classical art without revealing its popular foundation.

Marx and Engels in their statements on art repeatedly emphasized the close connection between realism and popular character. In their correspondence with Lassalle, they noted the deep popular roots of Shakespeare's realism. Marx noted that Rembrandt painted the Madonna from a Dutch peasant woman. In statements on the flourish of classical art—in ancient Greece and the Renaissance—Marx emphasized that one of the most important conditions and grounds for this flourish was the mass character of artistic and poetic creation among the working people—craftsmen and peasants. Lenin noted that Belinsky's letter to Gogol reflected the mood of the serf peasants. Lenin showed that the power of Tolstoy's realism depended on his ability to convey with remarkable force the mood of the broad masses, oppressed by the existing order, to depict their position, to express their spontaneous feeling of protest and indignation, and from these positions to deliver a merciless critique of the "orders" of post-reform and pre-revolutionary Russia; while the power of Gorky's realism was conditioned by the fact that Gorky "firmly bound himself through his great works of art to the workers' movement of Russia and the whole world" (*Works*, Vol. 16, p. 89).

Popular character and realism in art must be viewed concretely and historically, in an inextricable link with the course of the class struggle and the distinctiveness of national forms of culture. In 18th-century France, the popular character of art manifested differently than in 17th-century England or 19th-century Russia. Thus, for example, David painted a series of patriotic pictures expressing the ideas of the French bourgeois revolution, depicting republicans who fell victims to counter-revolutionaries (Lepeletier, Marat, young Barra), calling for the imitation of Greeks and Romans, believing that features of heroism and civic virtues, revealed to the gaze of the nation, electrify its soul and engender in it a desire for glory and self-sacrifice for the good of the fatherland. Along with the compositions of revolutionary neoclassicism ("The Oath of the Horatii," "Brutus," "The Tennis Court Oath"), David created magnificent realistic portraits capturing vivid images of Frenchmen of the revolutionary era (Danton, Barère, the greenseller). The class-bourgeois character of David's art did not contradict its popular character, but was closely tied to it, because at the end of the 18th century in France, the interests of the bourgeoisie in the fight against the feudal monarchy did not yet bear a narrow class character, but coincided with the interests of the peasantry. It was precisely this close link between David's art and the struggle of the entire Third Estate that gave such power to his best works. Moreover, the abstractness and universality of the aesthetic formulas of revolutionary neoclassicism did not contradict these tasks, but facilitated their resolution, since in these artificial forms French revolutionaries found the "illusions necessary to hide from themselves the bourgeois-limited content of their struggle" (K.

Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 324). Being bourgeois in its content, this art was at the same time popular, which increased the power of its realism and enabled the artist, albeit in a restricted form, to truthfully express certain aspects of reality and its processes.

For the Russian revolutionary democrats and advanced writers and artists of the second half of the 19th century—who prepared through their works the destruction of autocracy and serfdom—unlike the French of the late 18th century, there was no need for artificial forms and illusions to which revolutionary neoclassicism had resorted in France during the bourgeois revolution. And we see that in Russia in the second half of the 19th century, the art of the *Peredvizhniki* (Wanderers) in painting and the "Mighty Handful" in music represents realism and popular character in a far more mature quality than was the case in French revolutionary art of the 18th century.

The question of an artist's class positions, popular character, and realism is often complex. Sometimes an artist's adherence to the interests of a certain class can enter into contradiction with the objective meaning of his works, provided they are realistic. Thus, for example, Balzac—who, by Engels's definition, gave in his *Human Comedy* a most remarkable realistic history of French society—was politically a legitimist, and his work was a continuous elegy on the irreparable decay of upper-class society. Balzac's sympathies were on the side of the class doomed to extinction, but he truthfully showed the inevitability of the fall of the aristocrats and saw the people of the future in the figures of republican heroes. In this, as Engels emphasized, was manifested one of the greatest victories of

realism, one of the most valuable traits of Balzac, who was forced to go against his own class sympathies and political prejudices.

Fidelity to the truth of life, fidelity to realism can even compel this or that artist belonging to the ruling class to break with his class and speak out against it, as was done, for example, by Leo Tolstoy.

At the same time, the history of literature and art knows numerous examples of an opposite nature, when an artist or writer betrayed the lofty ideas of art, betrayed the truth, forgot his responsibility to the people, and, to please the ruling exploiter classes, tendentiously distorted reality in his works, ultimately destroying his talent.

The truthful reproduction of reality in art, proclaimed by realistic aesthetics, is something far broader than simply the requirement of one of many artistic movements. It is an indispensable condition for the full value of an artistic work, a condition for the existence and flourish of any genuine art. At the same time, it is also a condition for the natural development of talents and capabilities in artists.

The entire history of art confirms that the truthful reflection of reality is the most important objective law of realistic art. Goethe said that as long as a poet expresses only his few subjective feelings, he cannot yet be called a poet; but as soon as he can master the whole world and find expression for it, only then does he become a poet. And then he is inexhaustible and can forever be new, whereas a subjective nature quickly speaks out its little bit of inner content and perishes, falling into

mannerism. "I want to reveal something to you," Goethe once said to Eckermann, "and in your life you will find many confirmations of this. All epochs that go backward and are gripped by decay are full of subjectivism, whereas all epochs that move forward have an objective direction" (J. P. Eckermann, *Conversations with Goethe*, p. 292. M.–L. 1934).

This remark is important for understanding the history of art. Indeed, the flourish epochs of art have always had an objective direction—that is, they were periods of realism's development. And, on the contrary, subjectivism and mannerism are an inherent attribute of epochs of art's decay, including contemporary bourgeois formalism, whose main slogan is the preaching of total anarchy of the artist's "genius" in relation to objective reality and the denial of the objective character of art's laws. That is why a consistent struggle against formalism and all its manifestations in art is an unflagging duty of Soviet artists and art historians.

II

The relation of realistic art to objective reality and its processes is clearly manifested in the artist's process of typification of life phenomena. The very formulation of the question regarding how typical these or those images of an artistic work are presupposes comparing them with reality and the ability to correctly understand its processes. No matter how talented or brilliant a writer, painter, actor, or director may be, no matter what bold creative fantasy and mastery he possesses, if he wants to create living, artistically full-fledged images, he resorts to realistic typification, and the possibility of arbitrary action toward reality is excluded for him. In this respect,

realistic art and science are kindred: the typical in art and the law in science rely on the life processes of nature and human relations existing objectively, outside the consciousness of any scientist or artist.

Emphasizing the objective character of laws, Marxism teaches that a law is not something accidental, singular, or external; a law expresses an internal connection, internal essential relations, causal connections, and expresses the essence of a given phenomenon. A realistic work of art that deeply and truthfully reflects objective reality also cannot limit itself to the accidental or external; it must convey the essence, the internal connection of life's phenomena. But unlike science, which operates with logical formulations, art reveals the essence of phenomena in the form of living, artistic images. In this case, the ideational and artistic power of a work of art directly depends on the depth and force of the typicality of its images. Typification, therefore, is not merely one of the requirements made of art, but an objective, lawful requirement of realistic art, a law whose violation destructively impacts the ideational content and form, as well as the entire structure of an artistic work.

The classics of Russian revolutionary-democratic aesthetics attached immense importance to the problem of the typical in realistic art. Belinsky wrote: "When in a novel or a story there are no images and faces, no characters, there is nothing *typical* —no matter how truthfully and carefully everything was drawn from nature, everything told in it will leave the reader with no naturalness; he will not notice anything correctly observed, deftly caught. Faces will be mixed up among themselves in his

eyes; in the story he will see a muddle of incomprehensible incidents. It is impossible with impunity to violate the laws of art" ("A Look at Russian Literature of 1847," *Works*, Vol. 3, pp. 789–790).

In the aesthetic views of the classics of Marxism, the problem of the typical in art and literature occupies one of the central places. Engels wrote that realism presupposes, besides truthfulness of details, the truthful reproduction of typical characters in typical circumstances, considering it a merit of a realistic work when characters are drawn with clear individualization, so that each face is a type, but at the same time a fully defined personality.

The problem of the typical is the central problem of socialist realism: precisely here is decided the question of artistic generalization, of the possibility of art reflecting in concrete images the essential aspects and processes of reality's development.

For the creative practice of Soviet art, a substantial role is played by the theoretical elaboration of the typical in realistic art—a question that, after the 19th Party Congress, stood at the center of attention of our criticism and art history. Comrade Malenkov, in his report to the Central Committee, paid great attention to clarifying the Marxist understanding of the typical in realistic art, exposing the theoretical basis of mediocre, boring, gray works that do not convey, but often distort, Soviet reality, of which we still have quite a few.

In order for a work of art to be able to burn away everything negative, rotten, and dead from life—so that a work of art can

reveal and disclose the high spiritual qualities and typical positive character traits of the ordinary person—the artist must understand that the typical in art is not some kind of statistical average, frequently repeated, devoid of deep thought and vivid form, and simply copied from nature.

From where did this incorrect view of the typical—as a "statistical average," as something commonplace, most widespread, which allegedly excludes the possibility of heightening, character sharpening of the image, and underlining the essence—penetrate into Soviet art and criticism?

This false, hostile-to-realism understanding of the typical arose as a result of the influence of the aesthetic ideas of bourgeois **naturalism** on Soviet art. The theorists of naturalism in their time opposed the critique of typical artistic images of immense generalizing power created by the classics of realism. The motives of this naturalistic critique are worth recalling now.

In the images of Shakespeare and Balzac, the power of artistic generalization, the moment of conscious exaggeration for the sake of underlining the essence, serves as a means of revealing the typical. But precisely for this reason, the artistic images created by them were subjected to attacks by naturalists, who considered that Balzac was truthful only where he depicted interiors or costumes, but as soon as he turned to characters, goodbye truth. "Balzac's characters represent exceptions; they are not typical. His heroes are strange geniuses, obsessed with giant projects that ought to shock the earth. If Balzac depicts a politician, he is bigger than Richelieu; if an artist, he is bigger than Michelangelo..." wrote Hippolyte Castille in the journal

La semaine on October 4, 1846. Even in this accusation, the critic proceeded from an understanding of the typical as the commonplace.

With even greater clarity, Émile Zola expressed this view in his theoretical articles on naturalism (the creative practice of which, however, significantly contradicted his naturalistic theory). Zola writes of Balzac that his novels are distorted precisely by this desire to inflate his heroes, making them all seem to exceed their stature. Zola explains that if, for example, a naturalist writer wants to write a novel, he needs only to gather and study materials. "And after all these documents are gathered, the novel... will form by itself. The writer is left only to logically distribute the events. From all that he has heard, a dramatic episode will stand out, an incident needed by him to build the skeleton of the main chapters. The interest of the work lies no longer in the singularity of this incident; on the contrary, the more banal and ordinary it is, the more typical it will be." Therefore, Zola reproaches Balzac, for example, for creating the character of Vautrin. "This is what I call the phantasmagoria of Balzac," wrote Zola. One cannot agree with this.

Balzac's Vautrin is an escaped convict, a man of extraordinary power who enjoys the support of the criminal underworld in his struggle against French society. Having met in the highest circles of society such hardened criminals as himself among brilliant, noble, and rich representatives, he eventually becomes the chief of police and then devotes himself to domestic politics. It is not surprising that to Louis Philippe's government even the somewhat softened image of Vautrin seemed socially

dangerous, and the play *Vautrin* was banned by the Minister of the Interior after its first performance.

Can Vautrin be considered an atypical image solely on the grounds that he is not commonplace, not frequently encountered? Of course not! In Vautrin, Balzac created an image of immense generalizing power, and by means of this image was able to disclose and expose the contradictions of bourgeois society, the hypocrisy of its morality, and show the direct contact of the criminal world with high society, the aristocracy, financial nobility, and government circles of bourgeois France. Balzac's artistic imagination helped him create a genuinely realistic generalization that reveals the typical traits and characters of bourgeois society and retains its condemnatory significance to this day. One involuntarily recalls Balzac when reading in the newspapers the exposures of connections between a given senator, state governor, or financial tycoon in capitalist countries and the world of gangsters and criminals.

From the standpoint of the naturalistic understanding of the typical in art, Shakespeare's Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice* is even greater fantasy and total absurdity. Where was it ever seen for a usurer to cut out a pound of flesh from his debtor? Meanwhile, from the position of the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the typical as that which with the greatest fullness and sharpness expresses the essence of a given social force, the image of Shylock is typical and represents a remarkable achievement of Shakespeare's realistic genius. In Shylock was expressed not only the merciless essence of usurious capital, but also a number of other traits characterizing

the face of the bourgeoisie—in particular, the hypocritical, formal character of bourgeois law. In Shakespeare's trial scene, every time Portia confirms that according to the overdue bond Shylock may cut out "quite lawfully" a pound of flesh, Shylock exclaims: "O wise judge! O learned judge!" And, refusing to hear any arguments, Shylock demands his pound of flesh; everything else is irrelevant to the matter.

The deep ideational content and typicality of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, based on the conscious sharpening and exaggeration of images, made the very name of Shylock a household word and enabled V. I. Lenin to use this image to fight against the worst enemies of the socialist revolution. Lenin exposed the renegade Kautsky, who "shamelessly glazes over bourgeois democracy, keeping silent, for example, about what the most democratic and republican bourgeois in America or Switzerland do against striking workers. Oh, wise and learned Kautsky is silent about this! He does not understand, this learned political figure, that silence on this matter is meanness... Oh, learning! Oh, refined servility before the bourgeoisie!"

Lenin writes that Kautsky "forgot," "unlearned" how to pose the question: democracy *for which class?* He reasons from the standpoint of "pure" (i.e., classless) or non-class democracy. He argues like Shylock: "a pound of flesh," nothing more. Equality of all citizens—otherwise there is no democracy (*Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 224, 228–229).

Particularly great importance in the development of art is possessed by those typical characters in which is reflected "a new movement of popular life"—as, for example, the image of

Katerina in Ostrovsky's *The Storm*. The image of Katerina will seem unconvincing if viewed from the standpoint of a vulgar, naturalistic understanding of the typical, for by no means could it be considered the most widespread, mass phenomenon of Russian life in the middle of the 19th century for a young woman—married off without love and living under a terrible yoke—to commit adultery, then publicly repent of it in church, and finally commit suicide by throwing herself into the river. But Dobrolyubov saw the typical significance of her character, the artistic power, and popular character of this image precisely in the singularity and novelty of Katerina's behavior in relation to the world of the "realm of darkness." He showed how in people previously suppressed, submissive, and meek, the consciousness of truth and right inevitably awakens; sound common sense and the demand for life's necessities awaken; and the impossibility of enduring any longer that to which arrogant and wild bullies force them becomes clear. Dobrolyubov proved that in the person of Katerina a strong Russian character was depicted—concentrated, resolute, faithful to the instinct of natural truth, self-sacrificing in the sense that to her death was better than life under principles repulsive to her—and that this character "corresponds to a new phase of our national life."

One should not think, however, that the typical in art is possible only where the author depicts people of large stature with resolute, powerful characters and strong passions. Natures small and petty, gray and boring people who are often encountered in life also represent valuable material for creating bright, full-fledged artistic images in art. But in this case, the

power of typical generalization, of conscious sharpening, must be directed at revealing their pettiness, grayness, philistine vulgarity, and revealing their social essence.

V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin repeatedly used vivid images from Russian literature in the struggle against enemies of the Party and the Soviet people, against everything obsolete and rotten, because the power of typification of these images was so great that they became household names for designating phenomena and character traits such as "Khlestakovism," "Manilovism," "Sobakevichism," which long retain their vitality in other social conditions as well.

V. I. Lenin, exposing the remnants of the past, said: "There was such a type of Russian life—Oblomov. He lay on his bed and made plans. Since then much time has passed. Russia has undergone three revolutions, yet the Oblomovs remained, for Oblomov was not only a landowner, but also a peasant, and not only a peasant, but also an intellectual, and not only an intellectual, but also a worker and a communist. And, criticizing in 1922 idle talkers uselessly wasting time in endless committees and endless meetings, Lenin drew the conclusion that 'the old Oblomov remained, and he needs to be washed, cleaned, beaten, and scrubbed for a long time before any sense will come of him'" (*Works*, Vol. 33, p. 197).

During a meeting, artists of the Moscow Art Theatre informed I. V. Stalin that the theatre was preparing the play *Dead Souls*. Comrade Stalin approved the theatre's intention to stage Gogol's remarkable work. "Pondering a moment," as if answering his own thoughts, he pronounced: "Well, we too still

have our own Manilovs, Nozdrevs, Sobakeviches..." (*Sovetskoye Iskusstvo* newspaper, December 21, 1939).

Shylock, Hamlet, Don Quixote, Faust, as well as Katerina, Oblomov, Khlestakov, Rakhmetov, and other typical images of world art, are not found ready-made in everyday life. They are the result of observation and accumulation of material, comparison, contrasting, and selection of the most essential and characteristic, and the discarding of the accidental; the result of thought activity and creative imagination of the artist, who combined and concentrated in a single persona traits noticed in many individuals. But the objective basis, soil, and material for large-scale typical images of art is that which in life itself exists in less vivid manifestations, in a less concentrated combination—these character traits are encountered in many people, smaller, less integrated ones; and "out of these small ones, like towers or belfries out of bricks, artists of the word reasoned out, 'invented' generalizing 'types' of people—household names. Any liar we now call Khlestakov, a flatterer—Molchalin, a hypocrite—Tartuffe, a jealous man—Othello, etc." (M. Gorky, "On How I Learned to Write." *Selected Literary-Critical Articles*, p. 226, GIKHL. M. 1941).

Therefore, typical images represent an artistic generalization, in creating which the author proceeded from real life, from a deep and comprehensive study and comprehension of its objective laws. And to grasp them, observations alone are not enough: creative fantasy, imagination, conjecture, and invention are required.

It is precisely against such a path of creating artistic images that naturalists have always spoken out. Being under the

influence of bourgeois positivism (A. Comte, Spencer, Taine) and vulgar materialism, naturalists believe that for the analysis of human society one must apply the very same methods as for the analysis of nature. Social phenomena, as human phenomena, should undoubtedly be classified among physiological phenomena, declared A. Comte. Naturalistic aesthetics likes to emphasize the "scientific nature" of its method, asserting that the process of artistic creation proceeds according to the same rules as natural-scientific research.

Naturalists declare that in place of the novel of imagination comes the novel of observation and experiment. It is enough, they say, to gather materials—and "the novel will write itself." There is no need to *invent* a plot; on the contrary, the more banal and general it is, the more typical it will be. There is no need to combine and concentrate in one vivid image characteristic traits noticed in several individuals, achieving unity of individual and social definiteness in that image. It is enough merely to describe the person who fell into the orbit of the author's observations. The more frequently such a person is encountered, the more ordinary he is, the closer he is to the **statistical average**, which, in the opinion of naturalists, is the "typical." At the same time, theorists of naturalism take pride in their "impartiality," seeing in their refusal to generalize, analyze social roots and causes of phenomena, their apoliticism and aimlessness.

The aesthetic principles of naturalism are hostile to the principles of ideational, classical realism, as they demand that the artist abandon artistic generalization and turn into a

dispassionate photographer, that he abandon ideational comprehension of reality and thinking in images.

The aesthetics of naturalism treats the question of the relationship between reality and art in an extremely vulgar, simplified way, believing that the **simple transfer of the first random, most common facts and phenomena of life onto the pages of a book or canvas** is already sufficient for a truthful work of art to arise. This is a profound mistake, which is sometimes encountered in the works of Soviet artists as well. Art, wrote Balzac, differs from life in that in life every fact is authentic by virtue of its very existence. To translate a fact from everyday action into a plausible book "action," the writer must show all its roots.

The simple transfer of what is seen in life—no matter how often it is repeated—onto canvas, into a play, into marble, or into sound, the transfer without creative processing of facts and phenomena observed by the artist, does not yet yield the typical, does not yet yield an image. This is an objective law of art, and its violation gives rise to mediocre, flabby, and boring works. Evidence of this is the appearance at exhibitions of impressionistically raw paintings devoid of composition, bright typical images, and color, which are gray, contentless, naturalistically copying the accidental without any selection or generalization. Evidence of this is also many boring novels overloaded with petty facts, in which there is no living action or vital characters, and where everything seen by the author is naturalistically described indiscriminately. Meanwhile, some Soviet critics have advanced a proposition that, in a simplified, vulgarizing way, treats the question of art's relationship to

reality under Soviet conditions. These critics, while correctly emphasizing the fundamental difference between socialist reality and preceding class-antagonistic social formations, one-sidedly and too simplistically mechanically applied to art the formula "the beautiful is our life!", resulting in an erroneous position of naturalistic identification of art and reality.

It is easy to notice the connection between the naturalistic identification of art and reality and that incorrect understanding of the typical spoken of in the report to the 19th Party Congress by Comrade Malenkov. Indeed, such "theories" instill in the artist the idea that since our life is beautiful, the showing of negative phenomena and images in art, and even more so the sharpening of these images, is an unactual task, since such images are allegedly "not typical" for Soviet reality. For such a "theory," the bearers of vices, shortcomings, and remnants of capitalism—false people who are still encountered in our life—can only thank the critics, as it helps them escape the bright light of art's spotlights and evade satirical exposure and denunciation.

Equally incorrect conclusions from the naturalistic identification of art and Soviet reality follow regarding positive images. Artists are told that since the heroes of our life are ordinary, simple people, it follows that there is no need to rack one's brain over the creation of an artistic image, over the study and comparison of many people, or over selecting and generalizing the most characteristic traits and concentrating them in a single large-scale and bright positive image. After all, as is known, in every individual person there is the general; therefore, naturalists reason, it is enough to truthfully transfer

onto their works individual phenomena, facts, and faces that the artist encounters in our reality, since this reality is socialism, and works of art... of socialist realism will automatically result. This point of view is completely incorrect; however, in Soviet art and literature there are still quite a few works created by precisely this method.

Often in a novel or painting it is felt that the author observed and studied only a single object, and on its basis alone created his work. Unsurprisingly, in such cases, even undoubtedly talented authors create images that are insufficiently full-fledged, which lowers the level of their works (for example, A. Plastov's painting *Tractor Drivers' Dinner*, V. Panova's novella *Clear Shore*).

In Soviet art and literature, the problem of the typical acquires even greater significance than in the realistic art of the past, since the Soviet artist creates on the basis of the creative method of socialist realism, guided in studying and comprehending life by the great worldview of Marx–Engels–Lenin–Stalin. Soviet writers and artists must create bright, genuinely typical images possessing the power of example for Soviet people. Only then will Soviet art fulfill its ideational-educational role. Only then will the Soviet artist—not in declarations, but in creativity itself, in the very process of artistic generalization, in the process of typifying life phenomena and creating images—manifest communist party-mindedness (*partiinost*) and justify the honorable title of "engineer of human souls."

As a result of simple naturalistic copying of everyday life phenomena, the author is unable to give a correct artistic

generalization, as he cannot discern what is accidental and what is lawful; he cannot understand the leading tendencies of development, or distinguish the new, progressive, and bright from the obsolete, decayed, and dying, nor can he support the new in its struggle against the old with his art. An incorrect understanding of the typical in art inevitably leads to a violation of the principle of party-mindedness.

The theory that only that which is most frequently encountered is typical is a most widespread, harmful theory. It manifests its bankruptcy equally in relation to negative and positive phenomena in Soviet reality. According to this "theory," there is no need for the artist to notice and depict negative phenomena still taking place in our life, since they are not the most widespread, and therefore, "are not typical." In turn, new, positive phenomena and tendencies in Soviet reality (the work of innovators, various forms of Soviet initiative, etc.), upon their emergence, act only as sprouts, germs of the most advanced, and therefore at first, naturally, are not yet the most widespread. It turns out that the sprouts of the new are also "not typical," and the artist has no need to notice and reflect them. Such an understanding of the typical is harmful precisely because it disarms the Soviet artist, deprives him of sharpness of vision, blunts his feeling, prevents him from correctly seeing and understanding life in its development, and atrophies his active relationship to reality and its processes.

The conscious underlining, exaggeration, and sharpening of images—both positive and negative—provided it relies on correctly noticed and correctly understood essence of a given social force, does not distort life, but, on the contrary, more

deeply reveals and discloses its essence, helps to better understand it, and contributes to its transformation. Gorky, in an article on socialist realism, emphasized that the writer in relation to contemporary life is "called upon to perform two roles simultaneously: the role of midwife and gravedigger" (M. Gorky, "On Socialist Realism." *Selected Literary-Critical Articles*, p. 298).

Therefore, the artist must not wait until a negative tendency arising from the resistance of the dying, old world develops fully and becomes a constantly encountered, frequently repeated negative phenomenon capable of inflicting serious damage on our cause. As soon as the Soviet artist sees the emergence of this negative tendency and understands where it can lead in the case of its unimpeded further development, he has the right and even the duty to create such typically sharpened images and circumstances in which the essence of this tendency will be revealed in its perspective. He can even show, by emphasizing and exaggerating, the future result of this tendency. Thereby, the artist will help to timely notice this tendency and draw attention to its bearers, disclose its roots and causes, show its connection with other forces and tendencies, and help positive forces fight against the old and dying. The typical as generalization and sharpening will act in this case as a sphere of manifestation of party-mindedness in realistic art.

One example of such realistic sharpness and courage of a writer in revealing negative tendencies is V. Ovechkin's story *District Routine*, which shows how a formal, soul-less attitude of a district party secretary toward fulfilling a grain

procurement plan hampers the development of advanced collective farms and engenders dependency attitudes among lagging ones.

The artist also must not wait until a positive tendency arising from the advance of the new, socialist principle over the dying, old one develops and acquires a widespread and prevailing character. The art of socialist realism cannot drag at the tail of events and be their simple registrar. The duty and right of the artist is not to be a passive observer. The new at first appears as a sprout; it can easily be overlooked, allowing it to wither. The realistic artist, as soon as he notices the sprouts of the new and understands their meaning, must, through the power of his art, support these sprouts and their bearers—the advanced people.

Regarding the ability to see phenomena in life that contain a fundamentally new, socialist content—the ability to support this new in time—the examples of Lenin's attitude toward communist *subbotniks* (the article "A Great Beginning") and Stalin's toward socialist competition (the preface to E. Mikulina's pamphlet *Competition of the Masses*) bear witness.

In art and literature, those images in which the authors succeeded in creating a bright, living individuality and conveying the typical positive traits of an advanced person's character—his high moral stature—became, by virtue of this, an example upon which whole generations were brought up. Recall Rakhmetov in Chernyshevsky's *What Is to Be Done?*, Pavel Vlasov and Nilovna in Gorky's *Mother*. In Soviet art, immense educational significance is possessed by the images of Chapayev, Pavel Korchagin, the Young Guardsmen,

Meresyev, Voropayev, and other favorite heroes of Soviet people.

Critics who defend the understanding of the typical as commonplace, "statistically average," most widespread, and frequently encountered, want to substantiate its suitability for Soviet art by referring to the fact that the heroes of Soviet reality—and, consequently, the heroes of Soviet art—are simple, ordinary people. But in doing so they forget that simplicity and banality are not one and the same thing. (An error of this kind was committed, for example, by the artist Laktionov in his painting *Into a New Apartment*.) Soviet people are simple in the sense that they are foreign to love of showy effects, boasting, pretension free from conceit, individualism, boastfulness, etc. But their internal, spiritual world, their deep ideational conviction, their high moral qualities, their readiness for heroism and self-sacrifice in the name of communism's triumph, the diversity and richness of their interests are immeasurably richer and higher than those of many personages glorified and praised by the bourgeois press and historiography as bright individualities.

Therefore, the approach of our artists and writers to depicting the Soviet people—ordinary Soviet people in art and literature—must be imbued with immeasurably greater responsibility than that of many art figures of past epochs who depicted far less contentful people of their time and yet managed to create inspired, often classical images.

The 19th Party Congress called upon Soviet art figures to reveal in positive artistic images people of a new type in all the magnificence of their human dignity, thereby contributing to

educating in the people of our society characters, habits, and skills free from the sores and vices engendered by capitalism.

This program excludes the path of naturalism—of mindless and soul-less photographic copying—as a result of which an image cannot arise that has the significance of an example and imitation for other people, since each of these "others" can with equal success be copied in the form of such a commonplace, frequently encountered "statistically average" personage. In an ordinary, simple Soviet person, the artist must be able, through a correct, non-naturalistic understanding of the typical, through sharpening the image, to reveal his spiritual nobility, his best qualities and traits.

III

The fact that art reflects objective reality and its processes—which exist independently of human will—does not at all mean that the forms and means of artistic reflection of reality in art do not depend on the degree of historical development of man's social feelings, including his aesthetic feeling. An essential feature of works of art consists in the fact that they satisfy the aesthetic need of people, delivering aesthetic pleasure to them. The artist, reflecting in a work of art objective reality existing outside man, at the same time expresses definite aesthetic ideas and feelings of people—in a class society, of classes. Therefore, it would be incorrect to view art as a kind of automatic reflection of reality, as a dispassionate, mechanical reproduction devoid of thoughts and feelings—similar, for example, to a chemical reaction occurring on light-sensitive film during photography. It would be incorrect, speaking of the

reflection of life, to exclude from the sphere of art such an essential element as historically developed aesthetic feeling.

Statements of the classics of Marxism emphasize that aesthetic feeling is not a biological phenomenon, that it is created and formed in the process of long development of social man—the development of his thinking and all his senses, which changed and improved over thousands of years in the course of labor activity. The classics of Marxism repeatedly asserted that labor created man, that by acting on external nature and changing it, man at the same time changes his own nature. "He develops its slumbering powers and compels them to act under his sway" (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, pp. 184–185, 1949).

Man affirms himself in the objective world not only through thinking, but through all his senses, Marx notes. In the process of practical activity of social man transforming objects of nature, there occurs also the development and affirmation of man himself, the "objectification" of his essential powers. How this occurs "depends on the nature of the object and the nature of the corresponding essential power, for it is precisely the definite character of this relationship that creates a special real form of affirmation" ("Preparatory Works for *The Holy Family*," K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. III, p. 627). For example, for an eye possessing color, form, and deep vision, a given object has a different appearance than for an ear perceiving pitch, force, and timbre of sound; and the object of the eye in this sense is different than the object of the ear.

The senses of social man, the perfection of which occurred in the process of labor parallel with the development of the brain, Marx considers in two aspects: 1) how they were imprinted in

the results of man's productive activity in all the diversity of created objects, and 2) how these senses developed subjectively, enriching and making far finer and more flexible the human capacities of sensory perception of the world compared to the perception of animals. It is known that an eagle's eye sees much farther than a human eye, "but the human eye sees considerably more in things than the eagle's eye," writes Engels (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 135. 1952). The same applies to hearing and smell. Animals perceive sounds and smells considerably more keenly than man, but they do not distinguish a hundredth part of that richness of properties of objects perceived by human hearing and smell, as well as human sight. Marx wrote: "Only through the objectively unfolded richness of the human essential being is the richness of subjective human sensibility—a musical ear, an eye for beauty of form, in short, senses capable of human gratification, senses affirming themselves for the first time—either cultivated or brought into being..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. III, p. 627). Along with this, at a certain stage, a special form of human activity arises—artistic activity, creating works of art to satisfy the aesthetic needs of man and, in turn, actively awakening aesthetic feelings in the people who perceive these works. "Only music awakens the musical sense in man," writes Marx (ibid.). "The object of art..." he notes, "...creates a public that understands art and is capable of enjoying beauty" ("Introduction to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*", K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XII, Part 1, p. 182).

Man is not simply a part of nature, but a part of it that, unlike animals, acquires and affirms its human essence in the processing and transformation of nature through conscious, goal-oriented labor. "Through production, nature appears as his work and his reality... wherefore he sees himself in a world he has created" (*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, K. Marx and F. Engels *On Art*, p. 57. 1937).

By objective reality reflected in art, one must understand, consequently, not "raw," wild nature, but nature "humanized" by labor, which in the form of industry, agriculture, architecture, household items, culture, etc., forms a world created from the substances of nature transformed by man himself. This is his reality—directly surrounding him and bearing on everything the imprint of his creative, transforming activity. Precisely this reality, its objects and forms, colors and sounds, form the immediate content of human sensory perception and, in turn, develop and form the capacities of this perception, including aesthetic feeling, "capable of enjoying beauty."

Indeed, it was necessary to learn to chop and saw wood, plane and turn it, cover it with carving and inlay, bend, polish, and paint it, etc., in order to reveal all the internal possibilities, including all the **aesthetic properties of wood** as a specific form of natural substance (taking into account even the characteristics of various wood species: their color, density, grain pattern, etc.), and to derive aesthetic pleasure from the magnificent works of art made of wood. A long path of development had to be traversed by human labor and the human capacity for sensory perception so that, starting from

making homespun raw canvas and coarse cloth, man learned to produce silk and satin, velvet and fine cloth, heavy gold brocade and transparent, air-like veils, and all sorts of fabric samples that did not exist in nature as such. Created by human labor, they delight the human eye, which has learned to understand their beauty and perfection, the richness of their relations, the variety of their textures, coloring, folds, etc., and then learned to virtuously use all these qualities of fabrics in art. Recall the stunning beauty of flowing drapery folds in ancient sculpture, for example, the *Nike of Samothrace* or the famous drapery folds of the eastern pediment of the Parthenon, the solemn rhythm of clothing folds in I. P. Martos's monument to Minin and Pozharsky, or the rapidly wind-blown garments of sculptural monuments by V. Mukhina (*Worker and Kolkhoz Woman*; young Gorky). Recall the harmony and endless color richness of various garments in paintings by Titian, Veronese, Holbein, Velázquez, Rembrandt, and the Dutch masters, in canvases by Levitsky, Rokotov, Gainsborough. Recall the stunning beauty of folk attire and embroidery in paintings by Surikov and many other painters, delivering immense aesthetic pleasure to viewers.

The same applies to a multitude of other objects. Thus, for example, the existence of metals in a form suitable for consumption brought to life human labor, which extracted them from the depths of the earth, smelted them from ore, and widely and diversely used them in production and everyday life. Parallel with this, human sensory perception regarding metals also developed—the capacity to perceive various metals

from the side of their aesthetic properties as well, which led to the creation of various ornaments made of bronze, copper, iron, etc. Regarding gold and silver, for example, Marx notes that "their aesthetic properties make them the natural material for luxury, ornamentation, splendor, festive use... They appear as a kind of self-luminous light extracted from the subterranean world, since silver reflects all light rays in their original mixture, and gold reflects the color of highest intensity—red. The color of gold is the most popular form of aesthetic feeling in general" (*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XII, Part 1, p. 138).

Thus, all these objects—processed wood, glass, all kinds of fabrics, various metals—are not found in nature ready-made; they are all created by human labor, all belong to that human-created world in which man sees himself, that is, he sees in all these different objects the unfolded richness of his human essence, and is capable of seeing this precisely because in the process of creating these objects the richness of his subjective human sensibility also developed.

Labor is, therefore, the force that created social man, developed his thinking and his senses, including his aesthetic feeling. Thanks to labor, human art reached the degree of perfection that was able "to bring to life the paintings of Raphael, the statues of Thorvaldsen, the music of Paganini" (F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, p. 133). Aesthetic feeling is not a biological phenomenon, and widespread parallels in this question between humans and animals are incorrect.

Such an inaccuracy was committed by Victor Hugo.

Striving to emphasize the very correct thought of an organic connection between architecture and the creativity of the popular masses, Hugo in his book *Notre-Dame de Paris* wrote: "Great monuments of the past do not belong so much to individual creations as to the social work of a whole society; they are the result of the creative efforts of a people rather than a brilliant flash of genius; they are a deposited layer left behind by a nation, accumulations left by centuries, the sediment resulting from the successive evaporation of society—in a word, a kind of organic formation. Every wave of time leaves its alluvium on the monument, every generation adds its layer, every individual adds his stone. So do the beavers, so do the bees, so do men" (Victor Hugo, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 91. GIKHL. 1952).

Shortly after the publication of Hugo's book, Marx, emphasizing that man, unlike an animal, makes his life activity the object of his will and consciousness, wrote as if in polemic with the author of *Notre-Dame de Paris*: "It is true that animals also produce. They build nests and dwellings, like the bee, the beaver, the ant, etc. But an animal produces only what is immediately necessary for itself or its young; it produces one-sidedly, whereas man produces universally; an animal produces only under the compulsion of immediate physical need, whereas man produces even when he is free from physical need and only truly produces in freedom therefrom; an animal produces only itself, whereas man reproduces the whole of nature; an animal's product belongs directly to its physical body, whereas man freely confronts his product. An animal forms objects only in accordance with the standard and need of

the species to which it belongs, while man knows how to produce in accordance with the standard of every species and knows how to apply everywhere the inherent standard to the object; man therefore also forms objects in accordance with the laws of beauty" (*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, K. Marx and F. Engels *On Art*, pp. 56–57).

The cited propositions of Marx are of immense importance for understanding the laws of artistic creation. Above we spoke of how the truthfulness of reflecting reality in realistic art is greater the stronger the artist's connection with the people, the more the artist knows how to learn from the people, who have accumulated vast life experience, to listen to the voice of the people, and to be imbued with the thoughts, feelings, and yearnings of the people. But the popular character of art has another essential side relating to artistic form. The cited propositions of Marx reveal the deepest connection of the aesthetic feeling of social man and the laws of beauty with the labor activity of the people—a connection so vividly manifested in folk art.

"The founders of art," wrote Gorky, "were potters, blacksmiths, and goldsmiths, weavers, stonemasons, carpenters, woodcarvers, armorers, painters, tailors, and generally—craftsmen, people whose artistically made items delight our eyes, fill museums" ("On Art," *Nashi Dostizheniya* journal, No. 5–6 for 1935, p. 4).

In folk ornaments, woodcarvings, embroideries, ceramics, folk architecture, folk songs, fairy tales, epic poems, dances, etc., genuine treasures are contained that possess imperishable artistic value for masters of professional art, because the works

of folk creativity—in which the centuries-old aesthetic life experience of the people is embodied, imbued with harmony and elegance, distinguished by clarity and nobility of proportions, and perfected in artistically executed form—are created "according to the laws of beauty," a capacity felt and created by laboring people.

I. V. Stalin's proposition that "only the people are immortal, everything else is transient," retains all its significance for art as well. The inexhaustible source of truth and beauty is the people, their life and aesthetic experience. This is the reason for the attraction of the greatest classics of art and literature toward the people, toward life, labor, aspirations, struggle, and creativity, where outstanding writers, painters, composers, and architects always found the sources of truth and beauty—that is, the sources of genuine art.

Realistic artists, organically linked with the people, express in their works the desire for life's truth and all the richness of expressive means inherent in the people; all the perfection of colors and lines, sounds and forms they subordinate to the task of a truthful depiction of objective reality. Therefore, the material for the realistic artist in a broad sense is the whole diverse life of nature and society, all human life. Looking into reality, the painter endowed with a developed aesthetic sense of the beautiful sees in life itself, and not on his palette, an infinite variety of color shades, the flutter of light and shade, the richness of plastic forms and proportions. Marble, paint, bronze, and other specially developed means of art only help the painter and sculptor reveal the beauty of reality. "The artist," wrote Goethe in an article on Falconet, "finds in nature

itself far more harmony than in marble, which recreates this harmony. Here is the source from which he draws unceasingly, and with which he has nothing to fear... of turning out to be a poor colorist."

The correct solution to the question of art's relationship to reality inherent in realism is replaced by completely incorrect and flawed solutions in two different decadent trends of bourgeois art: formalism and naturalism.

Formalists, whose creative work is severed from real life and the people, and who express in their works the reactionary ideas and perverted aesthetic tastes of the ruling exploiter classes, inevitably come to the destruction of the image, to the violation of unity and integrity of artistic expression. Standing on positions of subjectivism, formalists replace the concept of "material of art." For formalists, the material of art is not real life, but immediate technological materials and means with which a given art figure works. For example, in painting these are paints, canvas; in sculpture—wood, marble, etc. And formalists attempt to find the "laws of art" in the properties of these materials, independently of the laws of depicted real reality. As a result, they sever these means of artistic expression from the task of depicting living life and turn them into objects of senseless trick combinations and experiments, into an absurd, disharmonious heap of spots, volumes, lines, sounds, into a chaos of ugly fragments and deliberately primitive, hideous forms. In Expressionism, for example, as its ideologists declare, painting, color, light, tone, drawing elasticity, and devotion to nature disappear. Instead, there appeared "a conscious barbarism of colors, with complete

renunciation of intimate brush flexibility," a passion for elementary forms of things, a crude line, and a motionless contour. The Expressionist artist wants to be a barbarian a savage. Expressionism leads consciously to "super-naturalistically tuned, chimerical convulsions of Gothic, Gothic primitives, and from here to any primitivism in general—to pile dwellings and fetishes of savages" (V. Hausenstein, "On Expressionism in Painting," collection *Expressionism*, pp. 148, 151).

A passion for crude naturalistic primitives is characteristic of Cubism, Futurism, and other formalist trends. A further step on the path of formalism's degeneration consists in the desire of a number of sculptors and painters to go into the depth of ages and appeal to the animal impulses of primitive man, generally to animal instincts characteristic of lower organisms of organic nature (works of Jacques Lipchitz, Laurens, Beothy, Tanguy, Matta, O'Keeffe, etc.).

Not by chance do hideous, repulsive "compositions" of formalists—treating man as a savage or reptile, fully satisfying the perverted, pathological tastes of the bourgeoisie—arouse disgust among the people, among people with a normally developed, healthy aesthetic sense.

The creativity of naturalists is also severed from the people, their thoughts and feelings, their aspirations and experiences, and from the rich life and aesthetic experience accumulated by the working masses. Naturalists, proceeding from the flawed theory of identifying art and reality, extend the action of this theory not only to the content of images, but also to artistic forms and means of art. Naturalists are convinced that at every

step they meet already prepared artistic images and forms. They need only transfer onto canvas, into a novel, score, etc., everything they see and hear around them—and works of art will allegedly arise almost automatically. Naturalists ignore the role of artistic expressiveness in creating works of art, completely failing to understand its aesthetic nature.

If formalists, severing art from life and arbitrarily combining colors, lines, and forms, shout about "pictorial quality" and "plasticity," although in fact their "works" represent a senseless, hideous chaos of spots, lines, and volumes hostile to the healthy aesthetic sense of the people—naturalists, absorbed in mechanical copying, simply discard such categories of art as pictorial quality and plasticity, declaring them "a formalist invention." That is why a statue made by a sculptor-naturalist in marble looks like a repulsive plaster cast, and a painting written by a painter-naturalist with oil paints looks like a repulsive hand-colored photograph. Naturally, with such a primitive view of art and its means, naturalists also cannot truthfully depict the multi-faceted, bustling life of Soviet society, or convey in bright artistic images the positive character traits and magnificent qualities of advanced Soviet people.

Depicting negative, hideous life phenomena dispassionately and soul-lessly, without revealing their inner meaning, without disclosing an attitude toward what life *ought* to be, the naturalist in the content of his works always risks slipping into the position of an apologist for these phenomena, and in artistic form—slipping onto the path of savoring depicted repulsive

phenomena, which happens very often with works of naturalists.

Naturalists do not understand that only a genuinely artistic, truthful work depicting reality delivers aesthetic pleasure to people. And this is possible only when its author in questions of art form is closely linked with the people, relies on the historically developed aesthetic sense of the people, and uses the role of words in poetry, color and line in painting, sound in music, etc., simultaneously and as a means of depicting reality and as a means of expressing the thoughts and feelings of the people, including their aesthetic sense. A naturalist, for example, cannot understand that color in painting serves not only to designate the coloring inherent in objects in nature, but at the same time possesses an immense power of emotional impact on the viewer, for color beauty, as Marx wrote, is the most popular form of aesthetic sense in general. Since naturalists do not see or notice the aesthetic richness of color in reality, in their paintings there is no richness of shades, relations, transitions, or interconnections of color that in its complex totality with lighting forms a harmonious unity, constituting color in painting. Likewise, naturalists do not feel and do not notice all the richness and diversity of lines and plastic forms in real reality, the harmonious unity of which, conveyed by the artist in fine art, creates the beauty of drawing and sculpture.

Naturalistic works are incapable of awakening aesthetic feeling in viewers and listeners precisely because they themselves were not created according to the laws of beauty. "By beauty," wrote Gorky, "is understood such a combination of various

materials—as well as sounds, colors, words—which gives to the created, crafted thing by a human master a form acting on feeling and mind as a force awakening wonder, pride, and joy in people before their capacity for creativity" ("On Socialist Realism." *Selected Literary-Critical Articles*, p. 297).

Naturalism is foreign to beauty. Therefore, naturalists either engage in mechanical, mindless, and soul-less copying of any life phenomena encountered by the author—which in the realm of form leads them to tedious, gray photography; or they simply transfer into their works crude, unrefined "pieces of nature." In music this leads to naturalistic sound imitation: all kinds of noise, squeals, wheezes, rumbles, screeches, and similar sounds occurring in reality but incompatible with the laws of melody, harmony, tonality; in painting—to pasting onto canvas various natural objects like pieces of wood, newspaper scraps, postage stamps, etc.

Naturalism, like formalism, often appeals to the "biological nature" of man, which finds expression in sickeningly detailed descriptions of various physiological moments in naturalistic novels, in savoring crude sensuality and eroticism in theatre, cinema, fine arts, etc.

Works of naturalists and formalists that distort reality—expressing anti-popular, reactionary ideas that appeal to base, animal instincts—are hostile to truth and beauty, hostile to genuine art.

In the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, the deep hostility of capitalism to the development of culture and art is revealed. The basic economic law of modern capitalism—

aimed at securing maximum capitalist profit through exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of the majority of the population—explains that picture of complete marasmus and decay, decline and ruin of art, which is characteristic of the contemporary art of ruling exploiter classes.

And, on the contrary, the basic economic law of socialism—aimed at securing maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the whole society through continuous growth and improvement of socialist production on the basis of higher technology—creates conditions for comprehensive development of physical and mental abilities of all members of society. The socialist system conditions the development of artistic amateur activity of the working people the rise of folk creativity, and an unprecedented flourish of multi-national Soviet art, the ideational, life-truthful works of which are created "according to the laws of beauty."

IV

In creating typical images that truthfully reflect life, the artist must possess good knowledge of and ability to use the specific regularities of various types and genres of art, which differ from one another in their capabilities and means. Thus, the embodiment of a typical image in book illustration is built by other means than, for example, in monumental sculpture; the embodiment of a typical image in an easel painting is achieved by other means than, for example, in a poster; a typical image in a lyrical poem is revealed differently than in drama or opera, etc.

Formalists, denying the objective content of art, deny also the objective character of specific regularities of its types and genres, proclaiming in this respect too the right of the artist to complete arbitrariness.

Exposing the subjectivist, anarchic attitudes of formalists, it is necessary to develop problems of content and form in the art of socialist realism and pay more attention to studying the regularities of various types and genres of art. Although these questions have the most direct, immediate relation to the problem of artistic mastery—which the Party calls upon Soviet writers and artists to raise—our criticism pays completely insufficient attention to them. Moreover, attempts to develop these questions arouse among some critics contemptuous talk about "normative aesthetics" as a dogmatic invention unacceptable for Soviet art. We, of course, are against metaphysical recipes and dogmas, but this does not at all mean that art in its techniques, methods, and rules does not rely on certain internal regularities and norms that cannot be violated with impunity without leading a given type or genre of art to decay.

The creative method of socialist realism presupposes and stimulates an extraordinary diversity of forms, styles, and genres in art; it provides rich opportunities for the manifestation of creative individuality for every Soviet artist, writer, composer, architect, etc. The creative method of socialist realism presupposes genuine innovation, which has nothing in common with formalist trickery. The diversity of types, genres, and forms of art relies on the diversity of real reality itself and its various aspects reproduced in art; it is

based on a thoughtful study by the artist of both this reality and that accumulated over many centuries of experience that constitutes the realistic traditions of art and literature history. The diversity of forms, genres, and types of art in socialist realism rejects, therefore, both the subjectivist arbitrariness of the artist and adventurism in artistic form, as well as the dogmatism of *a priori* recipes and rules invented "for all cases of life."

Various vulgarizers—Proletkultists and RAPPists—wasted quite a bit of ink to theoretically "substantiate" the complete unacceptability for Soviet art of a multitude of various genres and types that, in their opinion, were doomed to "extinction." Characteristically, invented scholastic signs of "pure proletarian" art, drawn from Bogdanovist writings, led these vulgarizers to completely ignore the fact that various types and genres of art were created not arbitrarily, but worked out by humanity over many years in the process of reflecting various aspects of reality.

The specific regularities of various types and genres of art have nothing in common with the "immanent" laws of "pure form" proclaimed by aesthetes. These regularities represent an array of techniques, means, and rules of reflecting reality and its various aspects in art, polished over centuries and worked out in struggle against all anti-realistic trends. The specific regularities of various types and genres of art arose not by chance. They are a consolidation of human achievements in the aesthetic mastery of the world, in the cognition of objective reality processes in the form of artistic images: literature, painting, music, architecture, theatre, cinema, sculpture, etc.

Vulgarizers and simplifiers declared that all these genres and types of art were a product of the ideology of exploiter classes and therefore allegedly hostile to Soviet art. These harmful, liquidatorial attitudes of vulgarizers were routed by the Party, which exposed their Machist-Bogdanovist essence in the famous letter of the CC "On Proletults" and emphasized the importance of critical utilization and processing of cultural heritage.

But even after the defeat of Proletkult, vulgarizers continued the fight against the Party line. "Novy Lef" in 1928 proclaimed the liquidation of easel painting, theatre, and fiction as traditional forms that "continue to act in the interests of the class that birthed them—the old society." The same liquidatorial attitudes, albeit in a softened form, were repeated in the 1930s by RAPPists, "proving" the necessity of extinction in Soviet literature of such genres as lyrics, tragedy, satire.

How persistent the remnants of LEF-RAPP vulgarization were in this question, and what harm they inflicted on Soviet art, is visible in the example of the notorious "theory" of the extinction of conflict in Soviet dramaturgy. Authors of this flawed "theory" believed that conflictlessness was a special property of Soviet dramaturgy, asserting that conflict took place only in the art of class-antagonistic formations, while for Soviet theatre and dramaturgy, by virtue of their socialist nature, conflicts were allegedly uncharacteristic—they disappear, die out. In arguments about conflictlessness—that in our life there are no difficulties, no struggle, that struggle against difficulties, against negative phenomena, is harmful, and false people are "not typical" for our reality—in these

arguments life is distorted, handed over to oblivion is the fact that the struggle of the new with the old and dying is the law of our development. Such arguments lead to the resurrection of RAPP varnishings of reality, to abandonment of realism for the sake of an invented, embellished scheme. At the same time, the "theory" of conflictlessness means nothing less than the liquidation of Soviet dramaturgy, and with it Soviet theatre.

Another flawed conclusion flowing from disregard for objective laws of life—from the harmful "theory" that our Soviet reality allegedly has no contradictions or difficulties and is free from conflicts—was the denial of satire as one of the most important genres of Soviet art. At the 19th Party Congress, such views were completely exposed and condemned.

Contrary to all fabrications of vulgarizers about the alleged "extinction" of a number of types and genres of art, Marxist-Leninist aesthetics proceeds from the fact that the epoch of socialism is an epoch of growth and flourish of socialist culture, literature, and art. Under conditions of socialism, on a qualitatively new, immeasurably higher basis, art in socialist realism acquired the opportunity for growth and flourish; and those types and genres of art that under conditions of the capitalist system were doomed to extinction and wither—since the causes of this extinction lie ultimately in the characteristics of the capitalist system hostile to art, and not in the characteristics of these types and genres of art—are historically created forms of artistic mastery of the world by social man. They should not be discarded, but critically utilized and reprocessed in accordance with new content, put at the service

of solving new tasks—tasks of communist education of working people.

Naturally, in this process, historically formed types and genres of art do not remain unchanged; they enrich and will enrich themselves with new great ideational content, and will accordingly develop and perfect their techniques and methods. But this change, brought about by new ideational content, occurs only on the basis of a truthful depiction in various types and genres of Soviet art of new objective regularities of our reality, and therefore has nothing in common with frozen recipes of dogmatists, nor with the subjectivism of formalists covering their anarchic arbitrariness with cries about "innovation."

The decisive struggle of socialist realism's aesthetics against dogmatism and nihilism—for the diversity of various genres, styles, forms, and techniques, for multi-faceted manifestation of artistic individuality—does not at all mean that an artist according to his own arbitrariness can eclectically mix in one work indiscriminately any techniques, without reckoning with objective regularities of life and violating specific regularities of various genres and types of art. Such anarchic arbitrariness would mean a chaos of forms and techniques, helpless and anti-artistic eclecticism.

The question of specific characteristics, capabilities, means, and techniques of artistic expressiveness of each type and genre of art is developed still very weakly. In this is also manifested the lag of our art history science from pressing demands and needs of Soviet art. Not by chance do outstanding practitioners of Soviet art—directors of theatre and cinema,

actors, architects, sculptors, composers, etc.—striving to generalize the rich creative experience accumulated by them, pay such great attention to the problem of specificity of various types of art, as well as specificity of its various genres—that is, the problem of specific regularities of art.

In its decisions and directives on art questions, the Central Committee of the Party gave remarkable examples of analyzing works of art from positions of socialist realism. Decisions of the CC CPSU contain an evaluation of both ideational content of works and their artistic form, including specific features of a given type of art (for example, decisions of the CC on architecture, opera, poster). All these decisions enrich, develop, and concretize general principles of socialist realism as applied to the specificity of individual types of art, and rely on a deep scientific understanding of their regularities.

* * *

The question of specific regularities of art, its types and genres, invariably attracts the attention of artists who in their daily creative work must practically deal with these regularities. A correct solution and concrete elaboration of this question are very important for the further success of socialist realism's art. In solving this problem, the aesthetics of socialist realism also fights against formalism and against naturalism.

Formalists believe that specific regularities of art exist, but, in their opinion, these are so-called immanent laws of "pure form," which are absolutely in no way connected with the reflection of life and its objective regularities—that is, they are thoroughly idealist, purely subjective. Such an understanding

of art's regularities, in essence, differs in no way from a total denial of any regularities, for if in art everything depends on the subjective arbitrariness of the artist, the road opens for total anarchy, for any adventurism in artistic form, for irrationalism, delirium of psychopaths, etc., which we observe in decadent bourgeois formalist art of Europe and America.

Naturalists believe that specific regularities of art do not exist; that it is sufficient to accurately copy reality, protocol, describe in detail facts, to automatically receive full-fledged art. Naturalists, it would seem, recognize the primacy of life and its objective laws, but this is only in words. The naturalist simply identifies art with life; he takes the accidental, the first thing encountered, and slavishly copying it, transfers it into his work, not noticing the main, essential thing. As a result, the naturalist slips along the surface, past regularities of life, being unable to reflect them in his work. Often he presents as essential and lawful that which is accidental and fleeting—that is, creates images giving a false generalization, thereby distorting reality, and this, in turn, leads art to decay.

Socialist realism recognizes the existence of specific regularities of art, but considers that these are not immanent laws of "pure form," but historically formed regularities of reflecting real life and its various aspects with the help of specific means and techniques of various types and genres of art. Socialist realism rejects subjectivist arbitrariness of the artist in relation to life and artistic forms, as well as naturalistic identification of reality and art. To both these flawed, erroneous views, the aesthetics of socialist realism opposes an understanding of art's specific regularities that serves as a

concretization for its various types and genres of the main objective law of realistic art—the truthful depiction of reality in its revolutionary development.

18. V. I. Lenin's Struggle Against Vulgarizing Views of Proletkult on Art

F. Ya. MATYTSIN

Lenin's exposure of the vulgarizing, anti-Marxist views of the Proletkultists on art is of exceptionally vital importance for understanding the laws governing the development of our art, as well as for the elaboration of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics. V. I. Lenin not only revealed and exposed the reactionary essence of Proletkult theories, showing their great harm to the emerging new, Soviet art, but along with this, developed the Marxist doctrine on art under the conditions of the victory of the socialist revolution. Deep illumination was provided in Lenin's works on questions of party spirit (*partiinost'*), realism, national character (*narodnost'*) of art, the utilization of the cultural heritage of the past, and many others. Guided by this Leninist doctrine, further developed by Comrade Stalin, our party leads the struggle for the building of a socialist culture, for the creation of an art worthy of our great era.

The works of Lenin and Stalin, and their remarkable statements on literature and art, help us to successfully fight against various remnants of Proletkult ideology, which, unfortunately, are still encountered in our days as well.

J. V. Stalin, in his new works on linguistics and economic issues, exposed such vulgarizers of Marxism as Marr and his followers in linguistics, and Yaroshenko in political economy —vulgarizers reviving long-since exposed reactionary theories of A. Bogdanov and other enemies of Marxism.

In his work "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," Comrade Stalin notes that vulgarizing views similar to those of Proletkult undoubtedly exist and continue to live in the minds of some confused comrades. In the decisions of the Party Central Committee on ideological issues, and in speeches in the party press regarding literature and art, a crushing blow is dealt to all attempts to revive harmful Proletkult ideas and views. It is enough to recall the exposure by our party of the harmful activities of the anti-patriotic group of cosmopolitan critics who propagated national nihilism and cringed before foreign elements, as well as the severe criticism of those who attempted to slander and spit upon the great classical art of the past. The Party subjected to criticism the false "theory" of conflictlessness, and the erroneous interpretation of the problem of typicality in art, which brought harm to our art.

All this indicates that remnants of Proletkult vulgarization are found in our days too, and that the fight against them is one of the most important tasks of our art. A comprehensive and deep study of the works of Lenin and Stalin will give us the opportunity to correctly understand the laws of the development of art, as well as to expose and unmask in a timely manner all kinds of alien "theories" that brake and delay the development of Soviet literature and art.

* * *

Proletkult arose in the period between the February and October revolutions. At that time, as a cultural and educational organization, it set itself the goal of cultural upbringing and education of workers. In relation to the provisional bourgeois government, Proletkult strove to be in an independent position,

and its independence from the bourgeois government had a positive significance, as it contributed to the unification of workers and the liberation of the proletariat from the influence of bourgeois ideology. However, in a short time, Proletkult found itself politically in incorrect, false positions. This became clearly apparent after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the creation of the Soviet government. Proletkultists, proclaiming their "independence"—now already from the Soviet state—began to plant hostile, thoroughly bourgeois, anti-popular views in the field of literature and art.

Covering up with loud, clamorous, outwardly revolutionary phrases, they in fact led working people astray from the correct, revolutionary path. The people strove to join in knowledge, to build a new life, and the Proletkultists could not give them anything useful, for the so-called theorists of Proletkult carried out in practice a bourgeois, decadent line in art and literature.

The theoretical basis of Proletkult was the subjective-idealist philosophy of Machism, which was propagated by A. Bogdanov, Pletnev, and other leaders of Proletkult. Having penetrated Proletkult organizations, alien elements sought to establish reactionary views on life, art, and literature. In its letter "On Proletkults," the Central Committee of the Party pointed out that "those same anti-Marxist views, which flourished so luxuriously after the defeat of the 1905 revolution and for several years (1907–1912) occupied the minds of the 'social-democratic' intelligentsia, who revelled in a time of reaction in God-building and various forms of idealist philosophy,—these very same views under a disguised form of

anti-Marxist groups, the intelligentsia now attempted to instill in proletarians."

It is known that Machist subjective-idealist philosophy denies the objective reality existing independently of human consciousness. The surrounding world, in the opinion of the Machists, exists only in our consciousness, in human perception, as a sum of sensations. Even before the October Revolution, Lenin exposed and unmasked the idealist essence of Machism. However, hostile elements after the victory of Soviet power tried to resurrect this reactionary philosophy.

A. Bogdanov sought to spread the subjective-idealist views of the Machists into the field of art. He viewed art not as a definite form of reflection of the human objective world, but as a means of "organizing experience," i.e., human subjective sensations not connected with objective reality, and not being a reflection of this reality.

Machist philosophy denied the existence of objective laws of art's development, which led to the liquidation of the science of art and of art itself. It is no coincidence that the subjective-idealist philosophy of Machism lay at the foundation of decadent, formalist directions in art. "In our time,—noted Lenin even before the revolution,—in the sphere of science, philosophy, and art, a struggle of Marxists against Machists has come forward" (Works, Vol. 16, p. 185).

On the philosophy of Machism, as is known, such decadent trends in art as impressionism, symbolism, futurism, expressionism, and others were also based.

Guided by this reactionary philosophy, the Proletkultists attempted to tear art away from life. They denied the role of artistic heritage in the development of art, spoke out against the leadership of the party and state over art, etc. These were hostile, liquidational views on art. In 1920, Lenin wrote in the preface to a new edition of his book *Materialism and Empirio-criticism* that "under the guise of 'proletarian culture' A. A. Bogdanov is smuggling in bourgeois and reactionary views" (Works, Vol. 14, p. 9).

It is known that bourgeois "theorists," including opportunists from the Second International, always argued that art must develop independently of parties and politics. One of the leaders of the Second International was clever on this account: "Art requires absolute freedom. Any constraint cripples it. The state has only obligations towards art and no rights. It must attempt to serve science and art, and not utilize them" (collection of articles *Art in Bourgeois Society*, p. 87, St. Petersburg, 1906).

An analogous view on art was attempted to be carried out under the conditions of Soviet power by Proletkult as well. Its "theorists" babbled about how the party and the Soviet state should not lead art and direct its development. What did the Proletkult demand to isolate and separate art from the party and state actually mean in reality? It meant handing art over to bourgeois elements, the worst enemies of Soviet power. In practice with the Proletkultists, this is exactly what happened. After the revolution, they actually found themselves in the hands of alien elements who, having crept in there, conducted their bourgeois ideology in the field of art. In its letter on

Proletkults, the CC RCP(b) pointed out that "petty-bourgeois elements, socially alien to us, flooded into the Proletkults, and... in fact seized control of the Proletkults into their own hands."

The Party, led by Lenin and Stalin, waged a decisive struggle against the hostile, anti-Marxist views of the Proletkultists, striving to direct the activity of Proletkult onto the right track. Such documents as the Letter of the CC RCP(b) of December 1, 1920 "On Proletkults," Lenin's speech at the 3rd Congress of Komsomol, the resolution "On Proletarian Culture," and I. V. Stalin's speech "On Political Tasks of the University of Peoples of the East," along with many others, played a decisive role in exposing the reactionary essence of Proletkult theories and outlined the correct path for the development of Soviet art.

In the draft resolution "On Proletarian Culture," written by Lenin in 1920, all attempts to invent one's own special culture, to isolate oneself in separated organizations, to delimit the work of Narkompros (People's Commissariat for Education) and Proletkult, or to establish "autonomy" for Proletkult inside Narkompros institutions, etc., were decisively condemned as theoretically incorrect and practically harmful. Further in the resolution, it was stated that "the duty of all Proletkult organizations is to consider themselves entirely as auxiliary bodies of the network of Narkompros institutions and carry out their tasks under the general leadership of Soviet power (specifically Narkompros) and the Russian Communist Party as part of the tasks of the proletarian dictatorship" (Works, Vol. 31, p. 292).

In the draft outline of the resolution on proletarian culture, Lenin wrote that Proletkult must be subordinate to Narkompros: "Not 'apart from Narkompros', but as part of it... Close connection and subordination of Proletkult to NKPros" (*Leninist Collection XXXV*, p. 148).

Lenin's directives on questions of literature and art, and on the relationship of the party and Soviet state to art, represent a further development of Marxist theory on the party spirit of literature and art under new conditions—under the conditions of the victory of the socialist revolution and the establishment of Soviet power. Lenin pointed out that in a Soviet state, art is called upon to serve the interests of the people. The great leader repeatedly emphasized that the party and Soviet power must lead art and direct its development.

From the very first days of the establishment of Soviet power, Lenin paid immense attention to questions of leadership over art from the party and state. Raising the question of making Proletkult subordinate to Narkompros, Lenin achieved the implementation of this in practice. In August 1920, the Deputy People's Commissar of Education, in response to Lenin's inquiry regarding the relationship of Proletkult to Narkompros, reported that it works "under the control of Narkompros." Lenin underlined the words "under control" three times, and in the margins wrote: "How to make this real?" (*Leninist Collection XXXV*, p. 148). Lenin sought to ensure that control over the work of Proletkult by Narkompros was real and effective. In a note addressed to the Deputy Commissar of Education, Lenin writes: "*1) What is the legal status of Proletkult? 2) How and 3) by whom is its governing center*

appointed? ...5) What else is important regarding the situation, role, and results of Proletkult's work" (ibid., p. 147).

The Leninist principle of state and party leadership over art was laid as the basis for the further development of Soviet art.

Enemies of Soviet power in the form of all kinds of Trotskyite-Bukharinite groupings sought to knock our art off the correct path, but since its development was directed by the party and state, all enemy attempts suffered complete defeat.

Famous party documents—the resolution of the CC RCP(b) of June 18, 1925 on party policy in the field of belles-lettres, the decree of the CC VKP(b) of April 23, 1932 on the restructuring of literary and artistic organizations, party decisions on the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, on the repertoire of drama theaters, on the motion picture *A Great Life*, and others, as well as editorial articles in the newspaper *Pravda*—played a decisive role in the development of Soviet art.

Speaking of the necessity of leadership over literature and art from the party and state, Lenin at the same time always emphasized the specific nature of this area of activity, noting that here the nature of leadership must be different than in other sectors of party and state work. Even before the revolution, Lenin pointed out that "in this field it is undoubtedly necessary to guarantee greater scope for personal initiative, individual inclinations, scope for thought and fantasy, form and content" (Works, Vol. 10, p. 28).

Lenin's thoughts that the development of art requires scope for personal initiative, that "literary work is least of all subject to mechanical leveling, uniformity, the rule of the majority over

the minority" (ibid.), found further development in the works of Comrade Stalin. Speaking about the formation and development of Soviet dramaturgy, Comrade Stalin pointed out that this development must proceed by way of competition between new literature and old: "...Step by step to burn off the stage old and new non-proletarian trash by way of competition, by creating powerful, artistic plays of a Soviet character that can replace them. And competition is a big and serious thing, for only in an atmosphere of competition can we achieve the formation and crystallization of our proletarian artistic literature" (Works, Vol. 11, p. 328).

The instructions of Lenin and Stalin on creative initiative of Soviet writers and artists, on competition in literature and art, were of exceptionally vital importance for the development of all forms of our art. Guided by these instructions, the party fought against those elements that sought to establish the dominance of individual groups and organizations in literature and art (*Pereval*, RAPP, etc.) and thereby caused harm to our art.

It must be noted that on issues of leadership over literature and art, the party always proceeded from the concrete historical situation, from concrete tasks facing the people at a given period in their struggle for the transformation of life, in the struggle for building socialism. The party's policy in the area of literature and art was always connected with general political tasks facing the party, and was always based on objective laws of the development of art.

Thanks to the correct, skillful leadership of our party and state, we have significant successes in the development of Soviet art

and literature. Marking the great achievements of Soviet art, Com. V. M. Molotov in his speech on the 31st anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution said that "we have every right to be proud of the successes of Soviet art and in recent times, in particular, the successes of Soviet literature, which is no small achievement of the guiding leadership of the party."

The 19th Party Congress paid great attention to questions of the development of literature and art. In his report, Com. G. M. Malenkov, noting major successes in the development of Soviet literature, fine arts, theater, and cinema, set a number of new tasks for art, the realization of which will enable writers and artists to "create major artistic works worthy of our great people."

* * *

V. I. Lenin's most important contribution to the science of literature and art is his outstanding and substantiated proposition on the inalienable connection between art and life, with the practical struggle of the proletariat for socialism. As early as 1905, in the article "Party Organization and Party Literature," Lenin raised the question that literature must be closely tied to the practical struggle of the proletariat, that it must organize and educate the masses for the revolutionary struggle. In this article Lenin writes that it is necessary to organize "broad, multiform, varied literary work in close and inalienable connection with the social-democratic working-class movement" (Works, Vol. 10, p. 31). This Leninist article dealt a crushing blow to bourgeois theories and theorists who preached the slogan "art for art's sake" and sought to tear art away from the active political struggle of the proletariat. After

the October Socialist Revolution, V. I. Lenin with all sharpness spoke out against Proletkultists who preached the most harmful "theory" of the independence of art's development from the economic and political life of the country, from the struggle of the proletariat for the victory of socialism in our country.

Proletkultists asserted that the proletariat must create its own culture, its own art in laboratories, studios, workshops isolated from practical life, from its struggle for building socialism. They demagogically declared: "The working workshop of the proletariat for working out its culture is the proletarian club," "The studio teaches the worker to create new forms of art and create new methods of scientific thought." "These studios,—they said,—can best be compared (as is often done) to laboratories where, in a special, often artificial environment, experiments are conducted in search of new cultural achievements."

Proletkultists went so far as to claim that art should not take part in social life, that it allegedly should be "free" from politics and class struggle. "...True art,—they declared,—as proletarian art ought to become, cannot be limited by any tasks and goals." It is completely understandable that statements of this kind poured water on the mill of the enemies of Soviet power.

The desire of Proletkult to isolate the development of art from life, from social practice, in essence led to the liquidation of art. It is known that only through active social practice does man know life and change it in his interests. This applies to all forms of human cognition, including art. Art is a reflection of social life in artistic images. To create a truthful, full-fledged

image, an artist must be closely tied to the social life of his era. The "artistic" products of Proletkult clearly show that their "theories" led to the liquidation of art. Torn away from social life and enclosed in "creative" laboratories, Proletkult artists created absurd, abstract, useless works that in reality had nothing in common with art.

The Communist Party has always viewed questions of art and literature in close and inalienable connection with the tasks of the proletariat's struggle for the victory of socialism. Before the October Revolution, the task of the proletariat was to overthrow the power of landowners and the bourgeoisie and liquidate the exploitative system. For this, high organization and high ideological consciousness of the working class were required above all. In all his works where Lenin touches upon questions of art and literature, he considers them precisely under this angle, i.e., from the point of view of the interests of the revolution, the interests of the working class. It is sufficient to point out Lenin's attitude toward the work of M. Gorky, A. Serafimovich, D. Bedny, and other writers to see how Lenin strove to ensure that art and literature were closely tied to the struggle of the working class. Regarding M. Gorky's novel *Mother*, Lenin said that this "is a necessary book; many workers took part in the revolutionary movement unconsciously, spontaneously, and now they will read *Mother* with great benefit for themselves" (See *Reminiscences of M. Gorky about Lenin* in the collection *Lenin on Culture and Art*, p. 302. Izogiz. 1938). Assessing Gorky's work as a whole, Lenin wrote: "By your talent as an artist, you have brought such immense benefit to the working-class movement of

Russia—and not only Russia—you will bring even more benefit..." (ibid., p. 156).

V. I. Lenin sharply criticized those writers who detached themselves from real life. Lenin advised A. Bogdanov: "Now if you were to write a novel for workers on the theme of how the exploiters of capitalism robbed land, wasted all oil, all iron, wood, all coal. That would be a very useful book, my dear doctor!" (ibid., p. 303).

V. I. Lenin pointed out that art must reflect life, and by its artistic means it must fight for the consolidation of the Soviet state, for the building of socialism in our country. The most important task of art is the struggle to educate the people in the spirit of socialism, in the spirit of communism. Guided by these Leninist instructions, the 8th Congress of the RCP(b) noted in its resolution that "there are no such forms of science and art that would not be tied to the great ideas of communism" ("VKP(b) in Resolutions and Decisions," Ch. I-a, p. 310). Speaking of the close connection of art with communist ideas, Lenin always emphasized that this connection should not be in words, not detached from life, as the Proletkult "theorists" thought, but in practice, in deed.

In his speech at the 3rd Congress of Komsomol, Lenin pointed out the necessity of connecting theory with practice, education, and learning with the daily struggle for communism. In the resolution "On Proletarian Culture," Lenin recorded a special point that in the Soviet workers' and peasants' republic the entire presentation of education, both in the political-educational field in general and specifically in the field of art, must be imbued with the spirit of the class struggle of the

proletariat for the successful implementation of the goals of its dictatorship, i.e., for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for the abolition of classes, for the elimination of any exploitation of man by man (Works, Vol. 31, p. 291).

The Proletkultists in their Menshevik writings argued that first one must create a "proletarian culture," and then, through the dissemination of this culture among the working masses, build socialism. Lenin called this "theory" utopian. People are educated in struggle, in practical activity; socialist culture grows and develops in the process of building socialism, and not isolated from it. "We want,—said Lenin,—to build socialism immediately out of that material which capitalism left us from yesterday to today, right now, and not from those people who will be prepared in hothouses, if you indulge in this fable." Lenin emphasized that "we want to build socialism from those people who were educated by capitalism, were spoiled and corrupted by it, but on the other hand were hardened by it for struggle" (Works, Vol. 29, p. 51).

Nurtured in struggle, for these people to become full-fledged builders of a socialist society, they need to free themselves from those remnants and vices that remained as a legacy from capitalist society.

Lenin noted that in the education of man, alongside other forms of ideology, an exceptionally vital role can and must be played by Soviet art and literature. For art to educate people and teach them to fight against shortcomings, it must be closely connected with life, with the people. "Closer to life,—taught Lenin,—More attention to how the working and peasant mass

actually builds something new in its daily work. More testing of how communist this new thing is" (Works, Vol. 28, p. 80).

In this respect, a most valuable document is Lenin's letter to M. Gorky dated July 31, 1919, where the great leader advises the writer to directly observe how workers and peasants "build life in a new way there... in the countryside or at a provincial factory (or at the front). There it is easy by simple observation to separate the decay of the old from the shoots of the new" (Works, Vol. 35, pp. 349–350).

The Leninist plan of monumental propaganda (1918) is a vivid example of the practical implementation of the Leninist idea of the inalienable connection of art with life, with the practical struggle of the proletariat for socialism. According to this plan, the erection of monuments to great revolutionary figures, figures of science, art, and literature who dedicated their lives to the people and the fight for their liberation was envisioned.

In telegrams and orders regarding the speediest erection of these monuments, Lenin emphasized that this measure was extremely important "from the point of view of propaganda."

Leninist ideas on the inalienable connection of art with life, with the practical struggle of the people for building socialism, formed the basis of our art from the very first days of Soviet power. Everything best, progressive, and advanced in literature and art sided with Soviet power and was guided in its creative activity by Leninist ideas. The work of such writers as M. Gorky, V. Mayakovsky, A. Serafimovich, D. Bedny, and others was closely connected with social life, with the struggle

of our people and our party for victory and the consolidation of the Soviet socialist system.

In his "Order to the Army of Art," V. Mayakovsky, addressing figures of art, called on them to connect more closely with life, to take an active part in the building and strengthening of the Soviet state. He sharply criticized poets who were detached from life and floating in cloudland. "Poets and writers,—said Mayakovsky,—instead of leading language, climbed into such cloudland that you can't drag them out by the tail. You open some magazine—it's entirely speckled with verses: here are 'pearl teeth', and 'chitons', and 'Parthenon', and 'reveries', and the devil knows what else isn't there. We ought to ask the gentlemen poets to come down from heaven to earth" (Works in one volume, p. 495, 1940).

The work of Mayakovsky, Cheremnykh, and other writers and artists who took part in producing posters on topical satirical themes, so-called "ROSTA Windows," testified to the close connection of their creativity with life, with the revolutionary struggle of the people. This was a sharp, accessible form of agitation that responded to all topical questions during the Civil War.

A close connection with the revolutionary struggle of the people is also characteristic of the creative work of D. Bedny, whose poetry enjoyed broad popularity among the working people, inspiring them to a heroic fight for Soviet power.

The writer A. S. Serafimovich, working during the Civil War as a correspondent for the newspaper *Izvestia*, covered in his realistic works the heroic struggle of the people at the fronts

and in the rear. He was one of the active fighters for the development of realistic art.

Already in the first years after the revolution in our country, a new, realistic Soviet art grew and developed, inalienably connected with the practical struggle of the people—art that played a huge educational and revolutionary-transformative role. Take, for example, graphic art. The work of such artists as Deni, Moor, and many others was closely tied to the tasks of the revolution. That is why they created remarkable works in their power. A list of titles of the best posters of those years shows how timely and necessary this work of artists was: "Have you enrolled as a volunteer?", "All to the defense of Petrograd!", "We will not give up the Urals!", "Give us Perkop!", "All to fight against ruin!", "Let us restore transport!", "Let us give coal to our factories and plants!", etc. The posters called the people to a heroic struggle against the enemies of the revolution, mobilizing them for selfless work to restore the ruined national economy.

Only a close, vital connection of Soviet art with the practical struggle of the people for the consolidation of the Soviet state and the building of socialism always guaranteed its success. In those cases when individual figures of art and literature detach themselves in their creative work from our Soviet reality, they create hollow, ideologically deficient, and artistically helpless works, alien in spirit to the people. The Party always sharply condemned artists who detached themselves from our reality, directing their creativity onto the right path. In decisions of the Central Committee of the Party on issues of literature and art, and in the party press, those writers, artists, and composers

who in their work detach themselves from the life of our people and create contrived, lifeless works were subjected to criticism first and foremost.

In recent years, there were quite a few instances of the appearance in art and literature of works that crudely distorted our reality. Many mediocre and drab works published in the pages of literary and artistic journals testify that their authors know life poorly and do not know how to generalize its most characteristic phenomena. In them, technique frequently consumes people. Due to an infatuation with technical details, they do not see the inner world, feelings, and thoughts of living Soviet people. Thus, for example, in O. Ziv's novel *The Hot Hour* there are no living, memorable images, for the author is carried away mainly by a detailed description of manufacturing processes. The talented writer Yu. Laptev in his novel *The Path is Open* pays too much attention to the production activities of his heroes, without revealing the multidimensionality of their aspirations and interests. A young writer, A. Andreev, in the novel *Broad Current*, is clearly carried away by a description of the technique of blacksmithing.

The Party demands from Soviet writers a truthful depiction of Soviet people, knowing how to "reveal and expose high moral qualities and typical positive character traits of an ordinary person, to create his vivid artistic image, worthy of being an example and object of imitation for people" (G. M. Malenkov).

A detachment from life, ignorance of the laws of its development, and concrete forms of their manifestation in life led some philosophers (V. Chertkov) and literary scholars (L. Timofeev and others) to the vicious "theory" of

conflictlessness, to an erroneous interpretation of the problem of typicality in our art.

The Party sharply criticized the "theory" of conflictlessness as alien to our art. Com. G. M. Malenkov in his report at the 19th Party Congress pointed out that "our Soviet literature and art must more boldly show life's contradictions and conflicts, know how to use the weapon of criticism as one of the effective means of education." Along with criticism of the negative, rotten, and dying—everything that holds back forward movement—art must show everything positive and vital that can serve as an example and pattern in the matter of educating our people. But for Soviet art to successfully cope with this task, it must be organically connected with life, with the struggle of the Soviet people for the victory of communism in our country.

In his brilliant work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, J. V. Stalin showed what immense importance the knowledge of objective laws of reality and the skillful application of them for transforming life in the interests of man possesses. This has a direct bearing on art as well, the successful development of which is possible only in close connection with life.

* * *

Under the guise of creating proletarian art, Proletkult pursued a line of isolating literature and art from the people. One of the exponents of this most harmful theory, speaking of the construction of proletarian culture, wrote that "this work must be accomplished by the proletariat itself, exclusively by its own

forces, without cooperation with other laboring elements of Soviet Russia, for example, the peasantry."

All activities of Proletkult to create "proletarian art" were, in essence, anti-party. Proletkultists created an art far removed from the people, alien to them. The Proletkult poet V. Kirillov wrote: "It is no trouble that a work is incomprehensible, that it is inaccessible to broad understanding; the desire to be popular is not so much a merit of a poet as his shortcoming."

It is known that a striving for pretentiousness and striving for originality are characteristic of bourgeois decadent art. It was precisely this line and practice that Proletkultists carried out. Exposing Proletkult idealist theories, the party pointed out that art which tries to be incomprehensible to the people, which does not express their advanced ideas and interests—such art is not needed by the people: it is alien to them.

Lenin decisively condemned reactionary, hostile to socialism Proletkult theories that sought to isolate art from the people. He ridiculed and sharply criticized V. Pletnev's article "On the Ideological Front," in which views alien to Marxism were propagated. In the place where V. Pletnev writes that "the task of building a proletarian culture can be resolved only by the forces of the proletarian itself," Lenin underlined the word "itself" twice, and in the margins wrote: "And the peasants?" (*Lenin on Culture and Art*, p. 284).

Lenin repeatedly pointed out that art should be created not for the sake of some small handful of people and not for chosen individuals who consider themselves "supermen." Our art must be popular; it must serve the masses. Lenin, even before the

revolution, noted that the art of the proletariat is called upon to serve not the "upper ten thousand," but millions and tens of millions of working people. What is important is not what art gives to a few hundred, or even a few thousand out of a total population numbered in millions. Art belongs to the people. It must extend its deepest roots into the very thick of the working masses.

Lenin pointed out that the greatest works of art always appeared as a result of their authors striving to express the vital interests of the broad masses of the people, the advanced aspirations of these masses. And the deeper a writer penetrated into the life of the people, the broader he encompassed it, the grander and more significant were the works created by him. This is especially clearly visible in the example of Russian classical literature. Assessing the work of a number of advanced writers of the past, Lenin constantly emphasized their national character (*narodnost'*), their sympathetic attitude toward the liberation struggle of the popular masses. Lenin wrote that Tolstoy "was able to convey with remarkable force the mood of the broad masses oppressed by the modern system, to depict their condition, to express their spontaneous feeling of protest and indignation" (Works, Vol. 16, pp. 293–294).

Speaking of the close connection of art with the people, Lenin pointed out the necessity of involving the broad popular masses in participating in artistic creativity. Soviet power for the first time created the opportunity to "draw a real majority of working people into the arena of such work where they can show themselves, develop their abilities, reveal talents, of which in the people there is an untapped spring, and which

capitalism crushed, suppressed, and suffocated by the thousands and millions" (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 26, p. 367).

These thoughts of Lenin find full reflection in the work of our party on educating and growing writers and artists from among workers and peasants. Thus, in the resolution of the 13th Party Congress "On the Press," it was noted: "The main work of the party in the field of belles-lettres must be oriented toward the creativity of workers and peasants becoming worker and peasant writers in the process of the cultural elevation of the broad working masses of the Soviet Union. Worker correspondents (*rabkory*) and village correspondents (*sel'kory*) must be viewed as reserves from which new worker and peasant writers will be advanced" ("VKP(b) in Resolutions and Decisions," Ch. I-a, p. 602).

Leninist ideas on the national character (*narodnost'*) of art lie at the foundation of all policies of our party in the field of literature and art. They run like a red thread through all decisions and resolutions of the party on literature and art issues.

In the resolution "On Party Policy in the Field of Belles-Lettres" (1925), the Central Committee of the Party especially emphasizes the thought of the necessity of developing literature closely connected with the people, reflecting their life and struggle. The party pays special attention to the issue of a close connection of art and literature with the people in its post-war resolutions. In the decree on the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, it is pointed out that Soviet art must reflect the life of the people, that it "has and cannot have other interests besides the interests of the people, interests of the state."

However, in our days too, there are instances when individual figures of art, just as in their time Proletkultists did, create formalist works incomprehensible and alien to the people. Moreover, just as Proletkultists created anti-popular works under the guise of "new" proletarian art, so now formalist art is created under the flag of innovation.

In the decree of the CC CPSU on V. Muradeli's opera *The Great Friendship* and at the conference of music figures at the CC Party (1948), these harmful tendencies were sharply criticized.

Speaking at the conference of music figures, A. A. Zhdanov pointed out that formalists, under the guise of innovation, propagate formalist, decadent music. "...Followers of the formalist trend,—said Com. Zhdanov,—use this little word (innovation.—*F. M.*) mainly for purposes of propagating bad music. For one cannot call innovation every kind of pretentiousness, every kind of grimacing and distortion in music."

Guided by Leninist-Stalinist instructions, our party teaches art figures so that they create such works as would be accessible, understandable to the people, and reflect their aspirations and interests.

* * *

In connection with the tasks of building a socialist culture and developing Soviet art and literature, Lenin resolves the most important question on the relationship to the classical heritage of the past. The propositions stated and substantiated by Lenin on this issue are a valuable contribution to Marxist aesthetics.

Proletkultists nihilistically rejected classical artistic heritage, treating it as supposedly hostile to the proletariat. These extremely harmful views on cultural heritage for Soviet art were attempted to be instilled by Proletkult into the consciousness of broad working masses who greedily drawn toward knowledge. A contemptuous attitude toward the art of past epochs was systematically propagated in Proletkult journals. Thus, for example, the poet-Proletkultist Kirillov in his poem "We" wrote: "In the name of our tomorrow—we will burn Raphael, destroy museums, trample art's flowers." Rejecting classical artistic heritage, Proletkultists in every way bowed before the rotten bourgeois art of the era of imperialism, actively propagated futurism, cubism, and planted ideas of cosmopolitanism in art.

The Party could not reconcile itself with such "theories" and waged a decisive struggle against them. In his speech at the 3rd Congress of Komsomol, in the resolution "On Proletarian Culture," and in other documents, V. I. Lenin subjected the vicious Proletkult theories to a crushing critique and developed a harmonious doctrine on the relationship of the victorious proletariat to the cultural heritage of the past.

The proletariat after the revolution must build a new, socialist society. But this new society, as Lenin noted, does not fall from the sky ready-made; it is created by the people out of that material which remained from the previous society. Out of this material a new culture is built as well. Lenin said: "We must take all culture that capitalism left behind, and out of it build socialism" (Works, Vol. 29, p. 52).

Lenin pointed out that the doctrine of Marx–Engels, by which we are guided in the struggle for socialism, arose as a result of a critical assimilation of the cultural heritage of past epochs. "...Marxism by no means threw out the most valuable achievements of the bourgeois era, but, on the contrary, assimilated and reworked everything that was valuable in the more than two-thousand-year development of human thought and culture. Only further work on this basis and in this direction, inspired by the practical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat as its last struggle against any exploitation, can be recognized as the development of a truly proletarian culture" (Works, Vol. 31, p. 292).

Speaking of the immodesty and boastfulness of the Marrist figures, these overthrowers of the past heritage, vulgarizers of Marxism of the Proletkult type, Comrade Stalin noted that "Marx and Engels were much more modest: they believed that their dialectical materialism was the product of the development of sciences, including philosophy, in preceding periods" (*Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, p. 34, 1952).

Proletkultists declared that old culture must be discarded when creating proletarian art; the party, on the contrary, taught that the cultural heritage of past epochs should and can be used by the people with the greatest completeness only when they take power into their own hands.

Lenin repeatedly pointed out that for all cultural heritage to become the property of the people, a revolution is needed, a socialist upheaval is needed, as a result of which the people take power into their hands. Only under these conditions can the people use all the values of past culture. Speaking of the

artistic heritage of L. N. Tolstoy, Lenin wrote: "Tolstoy the artist is known to an insignificant minority even in Russia. To make his great works truly accessible to all, a struggle and a fight against such a social order which condemned millions and tens of millions to darkness, ignorance, forced labor, and poverty is needed; a socialist upheaval is needed" (Works, Vol. 16, p. 293).

Having taken power into their hands, the working masses do not throw away cultural values that were created over centuries, but use them to create a new, socialist culture. In doing so, Lenin teaches us to critically use heritage, taking from it everything that helps the people in their struggle for socialism. "Without a clear understanding,—said Lenin at the 3rd All-Russian Congress of Komsomol,—that only with exact knowledge of culture created by the entire development of humanity, only by reworking it can one build a proletarian culture—without such an understanding we cannot solve this task" (Works, Vol. 31, p. 202).

V. I. Lenin pointed out that in evaluating and understanding old culture we must be guided by the worldview of Marxism, for only it "is the correct expression of interests, viewpoint, and culture of the revolutionary proletariat" (Works, Vol. 31, pp. 291–292).

Exceptionally vital significance for studying the culture of the past is held by Lenin's directives on what the approach to old culture should be. The culture of the past is not something uniform and homogenous, having equal value throughout. Past culture was created in a society torn by class contradictions,

and this found its reflection in it. On the one hand, in the culture of the past there are progressive, socialist, democratic elements; on the other hand—reactionary, anti-popular ones. Lenin recognized the presence of two cultures under capitalism and wrote that "in *every* national culture there are, even if undeveloped, elements of democratic and socialist culture, for in *every* nation there is a laboring and exploited mass, whose conditions of life inevitably spawn a democratic and socialist ideology" (Works, Vol. 20, p. 8).

In the draft resolution "On Proletarian Culture," Lenin emphasizes that our goal is the "*development of the best examples, traditions, and results of existing culture*" (*Leninist Collection XXXV*, p. 148).

Exposing the hostile theories of Proletkultists on the question of relationship to the cultural heritage of the past, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin scientifically substantiated the proposition that critical utilization of artistic heritage is a necessary condition for fruitful development of Soviet art. Guided by this Leninist-Stalinist directive, the Communist Party constantly leads and conducts the struggle to ensure that our writers and artists persistently learn mastery from the classics.

Leaders of the Communist Party repeatedly pointed out to our writers and journalists the necessity of learning from classics of Russian literature to write clearly, simply, and expressively. Speaking before young writers in 1940, M. I. Kalinin said: "If you want to be a master, a Soviet master, you must learn from previous generations; you need to master the best of what was conquered by humanity, and, proceeding from this, move on to

the new" (*Articles and Speeches. From VI to VII Congress of Soviets of the USSR*, p. 246, 1935).

In his report on the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, A. A. Zhdanov noted that "our Soviet culture arose, developed, and reached its bloom on the basis of critically reworked cultural heritage of the past."

Jubilee dates of great figures of literature and art celebrated by the Soviet government vividly show with what attention and love the Soviet people treat the cultural heritage of the past.

In party decisions on ideological issues, as well as in editorial articles of *Pravda* over recent years, attempts by some writers to revive Proletkult and RAPP-like views on classical heritage and belittle its significance were subjected to sharp criticism.

A group of theater critics-cosmopolitans, just like Proletkultists, bowing before rotten bourgeois art, mistreated the heritage of great Russian art in every way. In the party press, an article by A. Gurvich was sharply condemned, in which an anti-patriotic view on the image of the positive hero in Russian classical literature was expressed. The Party decisively exposed remnants of Proletkult and RAPP views, calling on Soviet writers and artists to more boldly develop advanced traditions of classical art in their creativity.

The directive of Com. G. M. Malenkov in his report at the 19th Party Congress that we need Soviet Gogols and Shchedrins, who with the fire of satire would burn out everything rotten and dying in our life, confirms what immense importance classical artistic heritage of great Russian satirists holds for the development of our art.

* * *

In questions of defining the creative method of Soviet art, Proletkult occupied an anti-Marxist position. Leaders of Proletkult spoke out against realistic art and sought to direct art along a path deeply hostile to the Soviet people. In the journals of Proletkult, a multitude of articles was published in which realism and truthfulness in art were mistreated in every way.

Proletkultists in their writings asserted that realistic art, truthfully reflecting life, was unacceptable for the working class. One of the Proletkultists regarding realistic theater wrote: "Since realistic = representational theater (Maly, Art, etc.), it repeats what exists, since the form of its action is determined by similarity to what is already created (read: to life), therefore this theater will ultimately be thrown out by the working class into the garbage bin of history."

Speeches of Proletkultists against the Art, Maly, and other theaters are direct evidence of how hostile the views of Proletkult were to realistic art, hostile to the interests of the people. The Moscow Art and Maly theaters have always been the pride of Russian art. In the power of realism, truthfulness of depicting life, they have no equal in the world. From the very first days of Soviet power, the party and government took all measures to preserve and strengthen the Art and other theaters standing on realistic positions. A. V. Lunacharsky recalls that when the question of the necessity of helping the MXAT (Moscow Art Theater) arose to preserve it, V. I. Lenin said: "If there is a theater which we must save and preserve from the past at all costs, it is, of course, the MXAT" (A. V. Lunacharsky, Speech at the meeting dedicated to the 30th

anniversary of MXAT, in the book *Lenin and Art* (memoirs), p. 169).

Art as one of the means of educating people, as a method of mastering the world, was rejected by Proletkult. Proletkultists, not understanding the specifics of art, demanded its merger with production. They viewed the artist as a craftsman manufacturing objects necessary for daily life. One of the "theorists" of Proletkult, expounding liquidational views on proletarian art, wrote: "All this bourgeois classification of artists into genre, portrait, still-life will fall into oblivion, and in their place will enter metal-artist artists, woodworkers, textile workers, electricians, friends and co-workers of their great class. Art organically coincides with productive labor." At the foundation of these arguments lies Bogdanov's "universal organizational science," which reduces all social development merely to the organization of productive forces, denying production relations, economic relations, and their significance in the development of society. Comrade Stalin in his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* with all clarity showed that this "theory" is absurd and has nothing in common with Marxism.

Proletkult strove to reduce art to technical craft, which inevitably led to the liquidation of art as a form of ideology. Such a liquidational position was dangerous and ruinous for Soviet art; against it, Lenin decisively spoke out, and our party spoke out.

It should be said that tendencies to limit art only to the description of technical processes of production, where human activity is excluded, problems of social order are removed, as

noted above, can often be met in our days as well in the works of some writers. This is a remnant of the Proletkult, vulgarizing view of art and its tasks.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that art is one of the forms of ideology, that it is one of the means of knowing and changing life. Classics of Marxism always valued the cognitive and educational significance of art highly. Engels, for example, pointed out that from the works of Balzac he "even in the sense of economic details learned more... than from the books of all specialists—historians, economists, statisticians of this period taken together" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, p. 406. 1947).

In letters to Gorky, in articles about Tolstoy, V. I. Lenin pointed out many times the cognitive and educational role of literature. "By studying the artistic works of Lev Tolstoy,—wrote Lenin,—the Russian working class will know its enemies better..." (Works, Vol. 16, p. 324). About Saltykov-Shchedrin and Nekrasov, Lenin wrote that they "taught Russian society to distinguish under the polished and pomaded appearance of educated serf-owning landlord his rapacious interests, taught to hate the hypocrisy and callousness of such types" (Works, Vol. 13, p. 40).

Lenin subjected formalist, ideologically empty art spreading through Proletkultists to severe critique, emphasizing that formalism is unacceptable in our art, that it is necessary to fight against it as an alien direction hostile to our art. Lenin pointed out that candidates from the bourgeois intelligentsia, disguising themselves behind words of "proletarian culture," present workers and peasants with the most foolish grimacing,

imposing absurd inventions on them. With these elements, Lenin said, it is necessary to decisively fight, for they lead our art off the correct path. C. Zetkin writes that Lenin, condemning formalism in art, said: "I am unable to consider the works of expressionism, futurism, cubism, and other 'isms' the highest manifestation of artistic genius. I do not understand them. I experience no joy from them" (*Lenin on Culture and Art*, p. 299).

In their memoirs, N. K. Krupskaya, C. Zetkin, A. V. Lunacharsky, and others note that Lenin always subjected formalist, ideologically empty art to severe criticism. Reviewing works of art submitted for monumental propaganda, Lenin categorically rejected those of them that were executed in a formalist spirit. According to Lunacharsky, Lenin, having once visited Vkhutemas and seeing that many beginning artists were carried away by formalist art, gave sharp criticism to these infatuations.

The most important task of art is a truthful depiction of life in its revolutionary development, wherein truthfulness in art must be combined with the task of ideological education of the people in the communist spirit. These Leninist and Stalinist instructions are laid at the foundation of the policy of the Communist Party on issues of literature and art. Fighting against various vulgarizers of Marxism in art, the Party created exceptionally favorable conditions for a powerful flowering of the art of socialist realism in our country.

The 19th Party Congress, which outlined a grand program for building communism in the USSR, paid great attention to questions of the development of Soviet art. G. M. Malenkov in

his report posed a whole series of most important problems facing our art that possess exceptional significance for its development. The questions raised and substantiated by Com. G. M. Malenkov on typicality in art, etc., are a most valuable contribution to Marxist-Leninist aesthetics and will play a huge role in the successful development of all forms of Soviet art.

The brilliant works of Comrade Stalin *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* and *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* raised all our science to a qualitatively new level. They arm figures of Soviet science and art with a powerful theoretical weapon in the struggle for the triumph of communism in our country.

19. FOR MILITANT SOVIET SATIRE

Ya. E. ELSBERG

I

Soviet writers and artists are called upon to truthfully reflect in their work the rich and multifaceted life of the Soviet people, its world-historical victories, the spiritual growth of the Soviet person, and the noble character of our people.

Soviet literature and art take an active part in the struggle for the victory of communism in our country, help the growth of the new, and oppose everything old and stagnant, everything hostile that hinders our forward movement.

An important role in solving the historical tasks facing Soviet art is played by such a form of artistic works as satire. The statements of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and the directives of the leaders of the Communist Party contain the foundations for developing the theory of satire and for determining its ideological and artistic principles.

The great and immortal leaders of the revolution, Lenin and Stalin, repeatedly pointed to the need to consistently and mercilessly expose and scourge the shortcomings and vices found in Soviet society. In his speech regarding the events in Dymovka, I. V. Stalin stated that "one should not be afraid to drag pieces of life into the light of God, no matter how unpleasant they may be" (Works, Vol. 7, p. 22).

In Soviet satire, truthfulness and denunciatory power are combined with the task of the communist education of the working people. Soviet satire is called upon to help the party

educate Soviet people in the spirit of high political vigilance, which Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin always taught.

Soviet satire must arouse contempt and anger against all enemies of the party and the Soviet people, must teach how to recognize their habits, expose their intrigues and machinations, and ridicule their absurd hopes to turn back the course of history. Soviet satire plays a major role in the struggle against the "masters" of the capitalist world.

Soviet satire, as a tool of criticism from below, is capable of providing significant assistance to our party and the Soviet people in combating all that is old, stagnant, backward, with shortcomings, vices, and unhealthy phenomena encountered in life, work, and daily existence, with the vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness.

The possibilities and paths for the development of Soviet satire are diverse. Satirical motifs and types can play a prominent role in those artistic works that are focused on depicting the heroic growth of the Soviet person. Thus, for example, in Mikhail Bubennov's novel *The White Birch*, bright lyrical poetry is combined with sharp and merciless satire. Having created poetic images of spiritually growing Soviet people, M. Bubennov at the same time, with genuine satirical consistency and relentlessness, "in the manner of Shchedrin," traces the history of the fall and ruin of the corrupt, false man Loznevoy. *The Young Guard* by A. Fadeyev, imbued with the pathos of the heroic struggle against the fascist invaders, contains at the same time sharp satirical portraits of traitors. The writer shows how spiritual weakness and instability lead to betrayal of the Motherland.

Whatever the relative weight of the satirical element in a given work, the writer's primary task is to truthfully depict life and the struggle of the new against the old taking place within it. At the same time, works that are satirical in nature must resolutely and boldly sharpen the question of the vestiges of capitalism in consciousness and daily life, of shortcomings in work, and of bad, false people, and must teach political vigilance.

V. I. Lenin highly valued the sharp political orientation of Mayakovsky's famous poem "Re-conferencing": "I don't know about poetry," wrote Lenin, "but as for politics, I guarantee that it is absolutely correct" (Works, Vol. 33, p. 197).

I. V. Stalin, characterizing in a letter to the poet Bezymensky dated March 19, 1930, the significance of his satirical works *The Day of Our Life* and *The Shot*, noted that the main feature and pathos of these works consists in their sharpening attention toward "the shortcomings of our apparatus" and in a deep belief in "the possibility of correcting these shortcomings." In this—wrote I. V. Stalin—"is the main point both in *The Shot* and in *The Day of Our Life*. In this lies their chief merit" (Works, Vol. 12, p. 200).

Setting major political tasks for Soviet satirical literature, our party demands that satirists deeply study and creatively develop the great traditions of classic Russian satire. In the works of Gogol and Shchedrin, brilliant examples of satire were created that remain unequaled in all world literature in terms of realistic power and truth to life, ideological purposefulness, and artistic mastery. In the satirical works of Gogol and Shchedrin, as well as in the articles of Russian

revolutionary-democratic critics, the basic principles of advanced 19th-century realistic satire were developed.

Classic Russian satire exposed and scourged the foundations of the landlord-bourgeois system. Even Gogol, speaking of Fonvizin and Griboyedov, pointed out that "our comedians... rose up not against a single person, but against a whole multitude of abuses, against the deviation of all society from the straight path" (Works, Vol. 6, pp. 455–456, Goslitizdat, 1937).

Saltykov-Shchedrin believed that "the only fruitful ground for satire is popular ground" (Complete Works, Vol. VIII, p. 297, Goslitizdat, 1937), for only by proceeding from the interests of the people and expressing their protest could the satirists of pre-revolutionary Russia truthfully depict and mercilessly expose all oppressors and exploiters of the popular masses.

In Soviet reality, those dreams of a beautiful and just life that possessed Gogol and Shchedrin—those democratic "ideals of the future" that inspired their satire and their struggle for the happiness of the people—have been realized. Therefore, fidelity to the great patriotic traditions of classic Russian satire and their creative continuation by Soviet satirists is expressed in the exposure of vestiges of the past. This strengthens the socialist social system and reinforces the Soviet state. These were precisely the tasks that M. Gorky and V. Mayakovsky always set for themselves.

In recent years, Soviet satire devoted to themes of internal life has ceased to occupy the important place in literature that rightfully belongs to it.

In the report to the 19th Party Congress on the work of the Central Committee of the Party, Comrade G. M. Malenkov pointed out that "in our Soviet fiction, drama, as well as in cinematography, such types of artistic works as satire are still lacking." The reason for this was the widespread adoption among a section of writers and critics of erroneous notions that Soviet reality allegedly does not provide material for satire, and that defects, vices, and vestiges of capitalism in the consciousness and daily life of Soviet people do not deserve serious attention because negative phenomena cannot be considered something typical, etc. The development of Soviet satire was also hindered by the notorious "theory of conflictlessness," which smoothed over and denied the actual struggle of the new against the old. These views fostered complacency, blunted vigilance, and had their roots in the theory of the dying down of the class struggle, which had been smashed by the party.

The theory of satire was in complete neglect, often replaced by far-fetched and hastily concocted fabrications that essentially aimed to prove that satire on internal topics allegedly could not occupy any prominent place in Soviet literature. Thus, for example, terms like "positive laughter" and "positive comedy" were in vogue, reflecting the crudely erroneous idea that satirical laughter and satirical comedy were allegedly devoid of life-affirming content.

In textbooks on literary theory, formulaic and schoolbook definitions of satire borrowed from the arsenal of liberal-bourgeois science are still rehearsed. In doing so, the experience of classic Russian satire is frequently ignored. It

should be noted that even in works published in recent years specifically dedicated to the study of the works of Gogol and Shchedrin, the question of the significance of the heritage of these great writers for the development of Soviet satire and the theory of satire is, as a rule, not touched upon. This major shortcoming is present, for instance, in the brochure "Shchedrin and Our Contemporaneity" (1951).

All this shows how necessary it is, proceeding from the statements of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and party directives, based on an analysis of the works of classic Russian satirists and the best achievements of Soviet satirists, to develop a theory of Soviet satire.

II

The young Marx, exposing and criticizing in his work *A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* the social order of Germany, wrote that the "main pathos" of this critique is "indignation, its essential work is exposure" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, Vol. 1, p. 387, 1938). Marx defined the tasks of this critique as follows: "The burden must be made still more oppressive by adding to it the consciousness of oppression; the shame must be made even more shameful by publishing it" (ibid., p. 388).

These words of Marx formulated the essential requirements that satire must meet when exposing the landlord-bourgeois system and inspired by advanced aspirations and ideals. Pathos of "indignation and exposure," merciless realism, the strive to endlessly arouse the popular masses—such are the distinctive features of such satire. Only a satirist possessing an advanced

worldview is capable of achieving these high goals. Only in this case will their blows be truly accurate, unerringly reaching their target, and the satirical negation of the old will be permeated with clear, positive aspirations.

Engels, in a review of the humorous lecture-poems of the German democrat Valesrode, noted the author's "sparkling wit," who possessed a "sharp eye that immediately catches the vulnerable, targetable side in events." However, according to Engels, "the true humorist would have emphasized this even more than Valesrode did, against the general background of a positive, broad worldview." Engels demanded from the author a consistently pursued, "higher, more complete point of view," pointing out that individual judgments must correspond to the "level of philosophy of a given era" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, Vol. II, pp. 235 and 236).

This high conception of advanced, democratically spirited satire, contained in these statements by Marx and Engels, found its realization in classic Russian satire—primarily in the satirical works of Gogol and Shchedrin, which occupy an exceptionally prominent, leading position in all world literature.

Pre-October *Pravda*, in an article by M. S. Olminsky, characterized Shchedrin as a "tireless defender of popular rights, who for decades fought not only against serfdom, violence, arbitrariness, and exploitation by the upper classes, but also against the downtroddenness, lack of consciousness, and insufficient solidarity of the oppressed themselves"

(Collection *Pre-October "Pravda" on Art and Literature*, p. 137, Goslitizdat, 1937).

Gogol called on the satirists in *Dead Souls* to paint "a stern and heroic portrait of satire that dares to bring to light all that is before our eyes every minute, but which indifferent eyes do not see: the whole horrifying, shocking mire of trifles that has entangled our life, the depth of cold, fragmented, everyday characters with which our earthly world swarms..." (Works, Vol. V, p. 154, Goslitizdat, 1937). Boldly turning to the people with an ardent exposure of the dark, burdensome, and agonizing sides of the present, such a writer awakened the desire for a different, better life.

In the pre-Marxist period of the development of materialist aesthetics, Russian revolutionary-democratic critique accomplished an immense amount toward developing the principles that should guide advanced, idea-driven satirical literature.

V. G. Belinsky saw the task of satire as inspiring in the reader a "contemplation of the lofty and beautiful, and a longing for the ideal through the depiction of low and vulgar life" (Works, Vol. II, p. 615, Goslitizdat, 1948). Gogol expressed an identical thought.

N. A. Dobrolyubov called for "grouping the facts of Russian life that require correction and improvement" so that the reader would "finally be touched to the quick, jump up with passion and exclaim: 'What is this, indeed? This is worse than penal servitude! Better to perish than to live in this swamp any longer!'" (*Selected Philosophical Works*, Vol. II, pp. 402–403,

Gospolitizdat, 1946). Russian satire helped to revolutionate the popular masses. In the satire of Gogol and Shchedrin, realism was inextricably combined with high ideality.

Revolutionary-democratic critique considered an advanced worldview on the writer's part to be the most essential condition for a deep depiction of reality. This requirement was presented with particular force by critics to the satirist writer. As N. A. Dobrolyubov emphasized, "a writer, and especially a satirist, must first of all have convictions; consequently, first of all he must be a human being, and only then possess a certain talent to convey his convictions to others" (Complete Works, Vol. I, p. 452, Goslitizdat, 1934).

Shchedrin noted that "instability of outlook on life" is in satire "completely inadmissible"; in it, "least of all is yieldability understandable, and especially the kind of yieldability that is openly allowed under the influence of external noise and one's own internal timidity" (Complete Works, Vol. V, p. 376). According to Shchedrin, only a satirist standing at the level of the advanced ideas of his time is capable of truly deeply and realistically reflecting the dark sides of reality, exposing everything ugly and monstrous, and contrasting it with the "ideals of the future."

These ideals were not for Shchedrin something arbitrarily invented or abstract. Calling them "glowing points that flicker in the perspectives of the future," Shchedrin pointed out: "Only to the short-sighted mind do these points seem groundless and detached from reality; in essence, they represent not a negation of the past and present, but the result of all that is best and

human, bequeathed by the former and developed in the latter" (Complete Works, Vol. XVII, p. 99).

Shchedrin believed that "the healthy tradition of any literature claiming educational value lies in preparing the soil for the future... Literature predicts the laws of the future, reproduces the image of the person of the future" (Complete Works, Vol. VII, pp. 454, 455).

The satire of Gogol and Shchedrin was able to realistically trace in actual life the complex and difficult process of the growth of elements of the future. Gogol and Shchedrin did not indulge in abstract fantasies and dreams about the "future person." They tirelessly studied the ways a positive hero formed in Russian reality as a broad social type embodying the best traits of the Russian national character. Shchedrin in his satires created figures of advanced Russian people representing the revolutionary youth. In the book *Abroad*, the writer, comparing the historical destinies of Russia and the countries of Western Europe, exposes and ridicules serfdom in Russia and the bourgeois system in the West, passionately and vividly revealing the spiritual world of the Russian person—a patriot and democrat fighting for the liberation of his native land.

Profound realism combined with an advanced ideological outlook, consistent and fearless exposure of the landlord-bourgeois system, and unselfish service to the people are the distinguishing features of 19th-century Russian classical satire. Gogol and Shchedrin were the first in world literature to create monumental satirical works containing a broad and colorful realistic picture of popular life—works imbued with a bright faith in a wonderful future for humanity. The significance of

this classical heritage for the development of Soviet satire is immense.

Meanwhile, a correct understanding of the traditions of Gogol and Shchedrin and their fruitful continuation and development in Soviet satire are hindered by certain erroneous statements found in textbooks on literary theory. Certain definitions of satire that to one degree or another distort its realism and attribute a romantic character to it are still in circulation. From such a perspective, we encounter, in particular, *Theory of Literature* by Prof. L. I. Timofeyev (1948 edition).

The author of this book proceeds from the deeply erroneous notion, debunked by the party press, of realistic art as a form of earthbound naturalism incapable of seeing traits of the future in the present. Therefore, claiming that the "image depicting people as they ought to be, according to the artist's mind, must be romantic" (*Theory of Literature*, p. 80), the author asserts that "in a satirical character we face, as it were, negative romanticism—the opposition of life to the ideal." "In satire..." it says further, "we have before us a realistic depiction of reality, but at the same time it is so acutely perceived that it grows into romantic protest against evil, into a clear opposition of reality to it" (ibid., p. 87).

Satirical works of Gogol and Shchedrin completely refute this false and internally contradictory premise, which leads to an undervaluation of the realistic richness of Russian classical and Soviet satire. Soviet satire learns from Gogol and Shchedrin how to create artistic satirical realistic works of grand scale possessing powerful typifying power. Gogol and Shchedrin help refute liberal-philistine notions of satire as something

narrow, subjective, occupying an isolated position in literary development, and most importantly—incapable of providing a broad realistic depiction of reality in all the richness of its colors.

Sharpening attention on certain defects, Soviet satirists must strive to create a broad realistic panorama of our life, to truthfully depict the struggle of the new against the old. They must educate Soviet people in the spirit of vigilance and irreconcilability toward everything stagnant and backward that hinders our forward movement. The weak side of satirical stories, sketches, and poems that have appeared in recent years lies precisely in the fact that in them the deep, vivid depiction of the struggle of the new against the old, reproducing the full variety of light and dark features of reality, was replaced by sketches of individual, fragmented, small, petty manifestations of the old as something accidental, curious, and non-typical.

Such sketches, of course, were unable to convey the true drama of the struggle between the new and the old. They hardly featured types fighting against the old, positive types in all the richness of their spiritual makeup. These works lacked a powerful spirit of party-mindedness, of exposure, and of indignation; one did not hear the voice of the satirist-citizen and patriot of the Soviet land. They did not arouse anger and contempt toward everything obsolete and dying, but mostly evoked only a smirk from readers; they did not teach people to imitate those who selflessly and steadfastly fight against defects, nor did they expose rootless cosmopolitans, false individuals, or hidden enemies.

It is appropriate here to recall the words of A. M. Gorky, who, speaking of people who consciously and unconsciously commit sabotage, loiter, and shirk work, noted that from among them come draft-dodgers, wreckers, spies, and traitors. "About these remnants thrown out of our country's trash heap," wrote Gorky, "we have quite a few books written, but almost all of them are insufficiently strong, very superficial, and dimly depict the enemy. Based on 'individual cases,' they carry an anecdotal character; they lack 'historical necessity' essential in an artistic work, and the socialist-educational value of these books is very low" (*On Literature*, p. 349, 1937). Gorky held up the works of Gogol and Shchedrin as examples for Soviet writers.

A. M. Gorky himself, having created in the character of Klim Samgin a classic representative type of the corrupt bourgeois intellectual, teaches us to recognize enemies, traitors, and double-dealers, and arouses against them anger and contempt.

Historical conditions under which Soviet satire develops differ radically from the historical conditions in which 19th-century Russian realist satirists operated. Never before in world history have the masses fought so actively and consistently against everything old, and never before have people been held to such high moral and political standards as in our time. Fighting with the weapon of satire for communism, our writers must, with pioneering boldness, continue and develop the great realistic traditions of classic Russian satire. Gogol and Shchedrin experienced with grief and pain the fact that in their time the ordinary person had not joined the advanced camp. The Soviet satirist, confident in the active support of the entire Soviet people, has the right and duty to depict ordinary people as

people of a new type. Gogol and Shchedrin could only dream of the victory of the new over the old, of the bright future of their country and people. Soviet satirists, armed with the Marxist-Leninist worldview and inspired by the victories of the Soviet people, know the laws of historical development and clearly see before them the beautiful and majestic character of our country building communism. "In our Soviet society there is not and cannot be a class basis for the dominance of bourgeois ideology," said Comrade G. M. Malenkov at the 19th Party Congress. Bad, false people constitute an explicit minority among us.

The method of socialist realism enables Soviet satirists, by sharpening attention on defects, to paint positive types, show the victory of the new over the old, broadly and comprehensively depict Soviet reality in its revolutionary development, and reflect the beauty and justice of our life. This is evidenced by the entire experience of Soviet satirical literature.

Ridiculing and scourging in *The Bathhouse* people who are stagnant, corrupt, bogged down in bureaucracy, and in the grip of capitalist vestiges, Mayakovsky at the same time depicts advanced people with warm sympathy, possessed by an irresistible desire to accelerate his native country's movement toward socialism. Before us arise pictures of Soviet reality in its complexity and contradictoriness: the old suffers defeat, but does not cease to resist, trying to defend its existence; the new wins and moves forward.

Attempts to create a broad picture of life and daily existence were noticeable in contemporary satirical literature as well.

In the recently published comedy screenplay "A Quiet Corner" (*Iskycstvo Kuno* No. 11 for 1952), Nikolai Virta satirically characterizes backward people of a collective farm village who are content with what has been achieved, deaf to the call of the new and the demands of the people, and hoping to live out their days in a "quiet corner." In sharp strokes, he depicts, for example, a slanderer and hypocrite, as well as an outright idler whom everyone was used to considering an "activist." But as the action of the screenplay unfolds, the appearance of the village of Quiet Corner changes before our eyes; advanced people take leadership of Soviet and collective farm construction, and the new triumphs over the old.

N. Virta achieved a certain breadth of depiction of reality, but his screenplay lacks exposure pathos, especially toward the end of the work, as well as consistency and depth.

Soviet literature, continuing world artistic development, has the capability to create satirical works of unprecedented realistic scale and richness of colors. Therefore, in the satirical works of Soviet literature, a picture of popular struggle led by the Communist Party against the old must be reflected. Satire must convey the drama and tension of this struggle, anger and contempt toward everything obsolete, humor and laughter exposing the old, and expressing unshakable confidence in the invincibility of the new.

The Soviet satirist can and must contrast the poetic images of people of the new type with the vile characters of the past, hidden enemies; he must expose their nature and show the danger they represent. At the same time, the Soviet satirist

must act as an attentive and sensitive educator, helping people free themselves from the vestiges of capitalism and strengthening their faith in the invincibility of the great cause of Lenin and Stalin. All this speaks to how rich and versatile the palette of the Soviet satirist can be, and how many feelings and thoughts he is capable of touching and awakening!

Fearless truthfulness and stern realism, communist party-mindedness, and vital Soviet patriotism, the pathos of exposure and indignation, sharpening attention on shortcomings, and faith in the possibility of their correction, a life-affirming force —these are the most important principles of Soviet satire.

III

In the report to the 19th Party Congress on the work of the Central Committee of the Party, Comrade G. M. Malenkov indicated: "The typical is the main sphere where party-mindedness manifests in realistic art. The problem of typicality is always a political problem." This statement stems from the Marxist-Leninist concept of the typical. Lenin taught that a social type's true essence can only be determined "from the point of view of politics, i.e., from the point of view of millions of people and relationships among millions..." (Works, Vol. 29, p. 502).

In order to correctly understand, evaluate, and embody a social type, the writer must look at it from precisely this perspective. In typification, the writer's party-mindedness, political foresight, ability to capture and summarize the essential features of a social phenomenon, and the strength, passion, and expressiveness of his artistic images are revealed.

Literary types must reflect the struggle of the new against the old, acute political and social conflicts. They possess immense educational significance. This is evidenced with particular clarity by the experience of classic Russian literature. Thus, the satirical types created by Gogol and Shchedrin became a powerful factor in social development. When *Dead Souls* appeared, real Sobakeviches and Nozdryovs recognized themselves with fierce malice in the types of Gogol's poem, while advanced Russia gained a powerful weapon for exposing these serf-owners. The images in *Dead Souls* represent an inexorable indictment against the autocratic-serf system and evidence of its crisis.

When Shchedrin's *The History of a Town* was published in the early 1870s, one of Marx's Russian correspondents recommended this book to the founder of scientific socialism as a source for studying "types... that are only now appearing among us"—types of bourgeois predators and their ideological servants (see *Correspondence of K. Marx and F. Engels with Russian Political Figures*, p. 92, 2nd ed., 1951).

If Gogol's pen penetrated deep beneath everyday surfaces, revealing the political content of daily conflicts, Shchedrin concentrated with revolutionary-democratic consistency on depicting political relationships. From this angle, the author of *The History of a Town* created his satirical types. Glupovites he called a race that was "politically existing" (Complete Works, Vol. IV, p. 239). Yet both Gogol and Shchedrin evaluated social types and revealed their political essence from the point of view of the interests of millions of working people.

Shchedrin sought to create types that provided an "explanation of an entire estate" represented by them (see Vol. VIII, p. 451). At the same time, Shchedrin emphasized that creating types that deeply reveal social trends not yet fully studied or generalized by contemporaries was especially important. It is precisely such types that are capable of exerting a particularly great educational influence.

Lenin required that characterization of a given social type include above all an indication of its "main feature," its "chief properties" (see Works, Vol. 29, pp. 502–503). One of the essential features of satirical typification lies in the emphasis the author places on the main negative trait of the satirical type, which constitutes the essence of the phenomenon under consideration.

Gorky, Mayakovsky, and Demyan Bedny, satirically depicting the masters of the capitalist world and especially the masters of imperialist America, emphasized above all their brutal nature, the animal fear inherent in them before everything advanced and revolutionary, taught hatred for these enemies of humanity, and pointed out the danger of their plots.

Soviet writers and artists have created many vivid satirical characters exposing the man-eating face of imperialist obscurantists, warmongers, and their servile lackeys. It is enough to recall the image of the cunning and dangerous enemy in K. Simonov's poem "Tiger" (from the cycle *Friends and Enemies*). Convincingly and with fine psychological nuance, the poet shows how behind the mask of outward restraint and politeness, a major representative of the capitalist

press of the United States conceals a wild, animal hatred for the land of socialism.

In the consciousness of Soviet people, the inspirers of imperialist reaction stand out in sharp satirical images created by our artists of the word and drawing. As an example of great satirical power, one can point to a drawing by the Kukryniksy artists titled "Nurtured by Wall Street" (*Krokodil* magazine No. 20 for 1952). Following Shchedrin, branding the "triumphant swine" of reaction, the Kukryniksy created an image of a blood-drenched swine—the American military brass, evoking the wrath and contempt of all advanced humanity.

How accurate and timely this image is shown by the words of the progressive American writer Howard Fast, addressed to the Soviet people and exposing US imperialists: "Nurture hatred for the swine who stamp into the dirt everything bright and precious in our country" (*Literaturnaya Gazeta*, January 15, 1953). Such satirical images help heighten political vigilance and contribute to the communist education of working people.

Political purposefulness, depth, and sharpness of types, vividness of artistic colors, and above all, the merciless power of realism explain why the satirical works of Gorky and Mayakovsky, scourging American imperialism, have lost none of their topical significance today; on the contrary, they exert an ever-growing promotional influence. At the same time, I. Ilf and E. Petrov's book *One-Story America*, devoted to depicting American life, never possessed such significance and is now hopelessly outdated precisely because its critique of the American bourgeois order does not rise to the level of political satire. It is limited to more or less superficial sketches of daily

life and fails to reveal the immense danger that American imperialism poses to all humanity. Ilf and Petrov failed to see all the sharpness of social struggle and the contrasts of wealth and poverty, skyscrapers and dirty slums in America.

While Gorky and Mayakovsky called for vigilance, the American sketches and stories of I. Ilf and E. Petrov miss the mark in this regard.

Deep satirical typification is generally absent in other works by the same writers, such as *The Twelve Chairs* and *The Golden Calf*. The main flaw of these works lies in the fact that socially dangerous individuals are depicted as fairly innocent tricksters and clowns.

An important task of contemporary literature is the creation of types reflecting vestiges of capitalism in consciousness and behavior, shortcomings in work, and all kinds of vices and monstrous phenomena still encountered in Soviet society. Without vivid satirical types shown under typical circumstances, there can be no satirical work.

Meanwhile, such types appear more frequently in satirical newspaper feuilletons than in creative literary works. Thus, *Pravda* in a whole series of feuilletons scourges gapers whose political carelessness and complacency open the door to criminal actions by all sorts of adventurers and shady individuals.

Undoubtedly, the materials and decisions of the 19th Congress of the CPSU have already had a beneficial influence on the development of Soviet satire, particularly satirical drama. In recent months alone, theatres have staged or published a

number of satirical comedies directed against gapers, bureaucrats, slanderers, and other bearers of evil. Such are the plays by S. Mikhalkov (*Crayfish*), S. Narinyani (*Anonymous*), N. Virta (*The Ruin of Pompeyev*), and others.

However, as a rule, satirical types created recently in drama and other genres still lack depth and sharpness. Thus, for example, in the mentioned plays by S. Mikhalkov and S. Narinyani, the figures of the fraudster (in *Crayfish*) and the slanderer (in *Anonymous*) remain politically unrevealed and prove insufficiently typical. In S. Mikhalkov's play, this character is even designated as an "unknown person." The reader and viewer are deprived of the opportunity to judge with full reliability the degree of danger of such types. They are exposed not through their behavior on stage, but through actions taking place offstage. In characterizing these personages, Mikhalkov and Narinyani neglect the primary satirical method of self-exposure of negative characters, which Gogol and Shchedrin applied so purposefully, depicting, for example, the Mayor and Khlestakov, Furnachev, and Prokofy Pazukhin.

S. Mikhalkov reports that the fraudster he depicts commits embezzlement. Such people are capable of any crime, including the gravest crimes against their Motherland. How did such a person form, and why was he not exposed and neutralized sooner? S. Mikhalkov's play provides no answer to these questions. The fraudster Lenskii is merely ridiculed here, but the dramatist does not evoke anger against him.

In terms of satirical purposefulness and accuracy, S. Mikhalkov's comedy falls far short of his best fables, which have achieved wide fame.

Of the slanderer Kravchenko from S. Narinyani's play, we know little more. The dramatist emphasizes only his philistine tendencies. This is vulgar. One of the characters describes him at the very conclusion of the play as a "man with a double bottom." However, the author of the play gives no clear idea of Kravchenko, nor does he show the extent to which he is hostile to Soviet society. The play lacks political sharpness and genuine humor. Good Soviet people here are sometimes endowed with vulgar traits.

Regrettably, it must be admitted that S. Narinyani, who painted accurate and concrete portraits of bearers of various defects in a number of feuilletons, failed to find artistic means to create a representative satirical type in his play.

The absence of such satirical types in artistic works of recent years is explained by the fact that among writers and critics, the grand successes of the Soviet people evoked moods of complacency and carelessness, and an uncritical attitude toward shortcomings. This led, in particular, to negative characters in criticism being viewed as non-vital. Negative phenomena were frequently passed over in silence or declared untypical of our reality. It came to the point that certain critics, evaluating Mikhail Bubennov's novel *The White Birch*, preferred not to mention the image of the false man Loznevoy created in that work, although in all Soviet literature of recent years one could hardly find a sharper and more exposing embodiment of a despicable villain who cast off his mask the

moment he found himself on territory temporarily occupied by Hitlerites. There were even statements to the effect that the image of Loznevoy was allegedly unsuccessful.

Pravda subjected to criticism the assertion that negative characters in Soviet literature cannot be of a typical nature, as they supposedly represent only isolated, individual phenomena. The problem of the typical can by no means be solved in an arithmetical way, based on the notion of the average statistical unit. Defects that are rarely encountered in life, but characterize the essence of a particular social phenomenon, can serve as material for creating a typical satirical character.

The following example can be cited. In *Krokodil* magazine (No. 31 for 1952), an interesting satirical drawing by the artist V. Vasilyev was published with the following caption beneath it:

"GREAT ABILITIES IN THE AREA OF NEEDS— Let someone else work; personally, I have everything ready for the arrival of communism!"

The drawing depicts a supremely self-satisfied and complacent young man. He has settled on the edge of a large open trunk, making himself very comfortable without forgetting to place a soft cushion under himself and a footstool under his feet. Evidently, the trunk is prepared to hold the benefits that this idler expects to receive in accordance with his needs.

Artist V. Vasilyev, creating this drawing, used a statement from the 19th Party Congress noting that alongside the multi-million army of working people selflessly building

communism, we have individual people who, instead of actively participating in constructive work, sit and wait for the arrival of communism like some "heavenly manna." Such people do not want to work, but only wish to receive from society according to their needs.

Although such isolated, few individuals carry these noted defects, they merit satirical typification. The subject depicted by V. Vasilyev is the type of person inclined to assume that the path to communism is easy, requiring no effort, vigilance, tension, or creative labor.

The artist managed through art to convincingly show that such a view on the movement toward communism, such complacency and political carelessness represent a vestige of capitalism in the consciousness of individual Soviet people. The trunk is equipped with a sturdy lock, in which the key is left. This detail, emphasized by the artist, speaks to the fact that the idler depicted, hoping that under communism he will receive full satisfaction for his extensive needs, approaches expected benefits with a private-property mindset. To grab these benefits and hide them from others' eyes—such is his dream, distorted, as in a convex mirror, representing relationships between people under communism, and evoking laughter due to its groundless and vulgar pretentiousness.

Artist V. Vasilyev created a satirical type. He applied here conscious exaggeration and sharpening of the character.

In general, the concept of "conscious exaggeration and sharpening of an image" is an extremely important aesthetic category requiring deep development. It should be noted that

the term "hyperbolization," which literary scholars frequently use, is much narrower; primarily, it means the exaggeration of merely external features of an image, whereas the concept of conscious exaggeration and sharpening points to all the variety of artistic means helping to reveal the main aspect in an image —its essence. It must also be kept in mind that the term "hyperbolization" is used mostly when analyzing internal satirical and folklore works. Probably, the term "hyperbolization" will be preserved in the future only to designate certain moments of exaggeration and sharpening of an image.

Conscious exaggeration and sharpening of an image is an extremely important artistic tool of realistic satire, allowing one to deeply and truthfully reflect various social phenomena and their essence. In this connection, it should be emphasized that caricature realism is an equal genre of art in socialist realism.

In realistic art, the exaggeration and sharpening of an image are characterized by fidelity to life truth. Meanwhile, in textbooks on literary theory, one encounters erroneous assertions that satire constructs its images by violating real proportions of phenomena in life itself to highlight their main properties more sharply.

Soviet satire, like the classic satire of the past, while exaggerating and sharpening an image, remains invariably truthful. Violations of life truth appear in literature when a writer loses a sense of measure, allows anti-patriotic sallies, and substitutes broad satirical and realistic depiction of life with intentional digging up and collecting of the dirtiest,

lowest, and most vulgar traits of daily existence. Thus, in his time, following this false path, M. Zoshchenko reached the point of slandering Soviet reality.

Realistic satire, while exaggerating and sharpening images, does not violate real relations of phenomena; on the contrary, it deeply exposes trends embedded in these phenomena and in reality itself. That is precisely why an exaggerated and sharpened image is perceived as an image that fully corresponds to the truth of life. Describing *Pompadours and Pompadourasses*, reactionaries such as Fedenka Krotikov, and answering possible accusations of exaggeration, Shchedrin wrote:

"However heavy these objections may seem, I will allow myself to think that they are nothing more than the fruit of a misunderstanding. Obviously, the reader puts the form of the story first, and not its essence; what he calls exaggeration is in essence only an implication, that, finally, chasing after everyday, tangible reality, he loses sight of another reality, equally real, which although rarely breaks out, has no less right to recognition than the coarsest, most eye-popping concreteness" (Complete Works, Vol. IX, p. 203).

The realism of such exaggeration and sharpening of an image was demonstrated by Shchedrin, in particular, by the fact that "life sometimes goes against the most incredible satire," and he sarcastically wrote to shortsighted people who called satirists "distorters" and "caricaturists": "...Let them point out the limits of the stupid and vulgar that reality has not reached; let them at

least once in their lives understand and appreciate what their ear hears and their eye sees at every step!" (ibid., p. 204).

One of the most important tasks now facing Soviet literature and art is the creation of deeply truthful and realistic, acutely satirical representative types. Sober and skillful exaggeration and sharpening of artistic images is the path to creating such types.

In creative literature in recent years, vivid types of gapers who have lost political vigilance and readily open their arms to all kinds of fraudsters, false people, and chatterboxes unable to keep a state secret have not appeared.

Satire is called upon to mercilessly expose, in all its glaring monstrosity, the low, vile appearance of the lurking, hidden enemy who trembles in animal fear before the Soviet people.

Literature and art must teach how to recognize the bearers of all vices, whatever masks they cover themselves with. Meanwhile, our literature has rarely branded bureaucrats, grandees, rank-obsessed officials, those who stifle criticism from below, sycophants, hack-writers, idlers, slanderers, and other bearers of evil with the mercilessness inherent in Shchedrin and Mayakovsky. Teaching vigilance is the high duty of all Soviet literature and art, and in particular, our satire.

IV

Solving the major tasks currently facing Soviet satirical literature requires our satirists to master high artistic craftsmanship. Satire as a genre of artistic works can exist in various forms of art—in drama, prose, poetry, graphic art,

cinema, etc. Satire in its most diverse manifestations possesses specific artistic features that correspond to the ideological tasks it solves. Let us point out some of these features. Satirical typification is characterized primarily by concentrating attention on the main aspect, from the point of view of politics, defects, or vices that determine the essence of a given character. The satirist, like representatives of other types of literature, applies exaggeration and sharpening of outward features of an image, which by its content serves to reveal its internal nature.

Language in satire is distinguished by great distinctiveness; a prominent place belongs to the satirical-parodic reproduction of the jargon and phraseology of exposed social groups and their representatives. Mayakovsky called for "arming oneself with satirical knowledge" and raised the question of "proper satirical processing of words," of "schooling" and the means of laughter (see Complete Works, Vol. XII, pp. 46, 47, Goslitizdat, 1937).

The question of the satirist's craftsmanship is particularly acute now, as most satirical works produced in recent years are characterized by monotony, poverty of colors, and inexpressiveness of language. Theorists of satire, drawing on the experience of classical and Soviet satirical literature, must develop the question of artistic specificity and means of satire, thereby aiding its development.

Unfortunately, some attempts made in this area serve only to confuse the issue rather than contribute to its solution. Thus, in textbooks on literary theory, one encounters an opposition of

satire to humor, the tragic, and the heroic. This undoubtedly impoverishes the concept of satire.

Humor—a sense of the comical—plays a huge role in satire. It is in satire that humor reaches its highest expression, wittily noticing everything vulnerable in life. But both the tragic and the heroic can become elements of satire. This is demonstrated with sufficient clarity, for example, by Soviet satire on international topics. The aggression of imperialist reaction against peace-loving peoples evokes tragic and heroic images among satirist artists. Naturally, there is nothing tragic in the historical doom of imperialism. The Soviet satirist, firmly convinced of the inevitable victory of progressive humanity, mercilessly ridicules hypocrisy, false phrasing, and the internal insignificance of imperialist aggressors. At the same time, the artist has the right to contrast imperialist aggressors striving for world domination with the heroic figures of defenders of Korea and Vietnam. Tragic grief marks the images of women and children—victims of American military brass.

An erroneous concept that opposes satire to humor, the heroic and the tragic stands in contradiction to the main trends in the development of Russian classical and Soviet satire, as an ever-growing great realistic art reflecting all the richness of life's colors and the acute nature of class and ideological conflicts.

Questions of the theory of satire are also touched upon by V. Kirpotin in the article "Satire of Shchedrin and Contemporaneity" (*Oktaybr* magazine No. 1 for 1953). V. Kirpotin is correct when he points out that “satire, as a special form of art, presents specific difficulties for its definition and understanding.” But then he attempts to find a way out of these

difficulties by refusing to view satire as a special form of art: “Satire is capable of being applied to the conventions of any genre or type, and at the same time combining features of different literary types and forms, and even joining its means with such forms of literature as journalism.” Satire, he writes further, “should not be considered as one of the types in a row of ordinary artistic-poetic genres. Whether a given work belongs to satire is determined not by formal genre characteristics, but by its critical orientation and especially by the strength and intensity of criticism of negative phenomena of reality within it” (p. 169). Thus, V. Kirpotin denies the specific nature of satire.

Saltykov-Shchedrin, in one of his 1864 reviews, wrote that “the invasion of new life proper into our literature... was expressed either in the form of satire, which sees off everything dying into the kingdom of shades, or in the form of greetings—not always clear and definite—to those dark, as yet unknown forces, whose influx is so clearly felt by everyone. This is understandable and clear. New life is still taking shape; it cannot express itself otherwise than negatively, in the form of satire, or in the form of a presentiment and foretaste” (*Complete Works*, Vol. V, p. 372).

The great writer emphasized in these words the unity of tasks among all forms and genres of advanced literature in the struggle for the new, for the future, and defined the special nature of satire's tasks.

Satire is focused on the fight against everything old and dying. It depicts, lashes, and ridicules this old in the name of the

future, in the name of the victory of the new. Satire pronounces a death sentence upon everything historically doomed.

When classifying a given work as belonging to the satirical genre, one cannot proceed solely from the strength of its criticism of the negative. Chernyshevsky's novel *What Is to Be Done?* contains, of course, no less sharp criticism of the old than Shchedrin's satires. However, the pathos of this work is not satirical; it consists, to use Shchedrin's expression, in the "presentiment" of the new.

From the unique pathos and tasks of satire flows its artistic specificity. Although V. Kirpotin speaks of genres of satire, he dissolves these genres within literary forms, depriving satire of the specific traits and characteristics inherent to it.

As previously noted, the satirical genre, despite all differences in its manifestations across various art forms, shares many common features arising from satire's artistic specificity. Therefore, for example, in Mayakovsky's satirical poetry, the influence of Shchedrin's satirical prose was clearly evident; *The Government Inspector* and its character types resonated in the satires of the author of *Diary of a Provincial*. Shchedrin's prose fairy tales often echo Krylov's poetic fables, and the art of pictorial caricature can help many develop satirical animated films.

Now, when our party has once again pointed out to writers the impermissibility of satire being absent as an artistic form in fiction and drama, the development of issues related to artistic mastery of satire is of particularly great importance. Therefore,

it is necessary to decisively fight against attempts to narrow the artistic range of satire, to deny its artistic specificity.

In this lies the harm of V. Kirpotin's assertions.

Scholars developing issues of aesthetics face a number of urgent tasks in developing a theory of satire. These primarily include the study of the global significance and distinctiveness of Russian classical satire in connection with the development of critical realism; demonstrating the importance and tasks of satire in Soviet reality; and defining the innovative role of Soviet satire as the successor to the satire of Gogol and Shchedrin. It is necessary to investigate the principles of satirical typification, exaggeration, and sharpening of the image, the artistic specifics of satire as a form of artistic work, its artistic means, characteristics, and paths of development in the literature of socialist realism.

Fulfilling these tasks will contribute to the growth of Soviet satire as one of the genres of Soviet literature. This is especially important now, when the creative thought of many Soviet writers is working persistently in the field of satire.

Critics and art theorists must help our satirical literature overcome the serious shortcomings inherent in a number of satirical works that have appeared recently. Excessive attention to trivial everyday details and characters, inability to create archetypal types possessing general significance, depict sharp conflicts, and thereby shed light on serious political issues—all this hinders the development of Soviet satire and prevents it from fulfilling its patriotic duty: to become an effective tool for

the communist education of Soviet people in the spirit of high political vigilance.

20. Logical Empiricism—A Weapon of Imperialist Reaction

K. S. BAKRADZE (Tbilisi)

The strictly scientific substantiation by Marxism of the proposition on the objective nature of both the laws of natural science and the laws of social sciences gives philosophers a sharp weapon for exposing subjectivist-idealist ideology.

The starting point of Marxist-Leninist philosophy is the recognition of material reality existing independently of human consciousness. This reality is infinite, but it exists in the form of finite things.

Objects and phenomena of reality are linked with one another by diverse connections and relations, mutually condition each other, and are in a process of change and development. There are no objects and phenomena outside connections and relations, just as there are no connections and relations outside objects and phenomena, analogous to how there is no motion without matter and no matter without motion. Of course, connections and relations do not create things and phenomena, but the existence of things and phenomena conditions their mutual connections and relations.

Things and phenomena of the material world, acting upon human consciousness, are reflected in it in the form of sensations, perceptions, and concepts, which are subjective images of the objective world. Man cognizes reality in the course of his practical activity and on its basis. In the process of cognition, concepts and categories are elaborated, and a

scientific picture of the world is created, which has the character of objective truth. Truth is objective because in our representations and concepts there is content that depends neither on man nor on humanity.

The main goal of cognition is the discovery of the law, of regularity; knowledge of the law and knowledge of the general make it possible to cognize the particular, the individual. Only knowledge of laws gives a perspective of development; only relying on knowledge of laws can one foresee the course of events; only knowing the laws of nature and society can one purposefully act upon them and transform nature and society. Without knowledge of these laws, people would be slaves of nature. It is clear, therefore, what tremendous significance the problem of law possesses.

Connections and relations of the phenomena of reality represent regular connections and relations. Nature is not an accidental accumulation of things and phenomena, but a single whole. "If the connection of natural phenomena and their mutual conditioning represent the regularity of the development of nature, then from this it follows that the connection and mutual conditioning of the phenomena of social life represent not an accidental matter, but the regularity of the development of society" (J. V. Stalin, *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, p. 14, 1950). This is a universal law of the material world.

"The recognition of objective regularity in nature and the approximately correct reflection of this regularity in the human brain is materialism" (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 142).

J. V. Stalin teaches: "Marxism understands the laws of science —whether we speak of the laws of natural science or the laws of political economy—as a reflection of objective processes taking place independently of the will of people. People may discover these laws, cognize them, study them, take them into account in their actions, use them in the interests of society, but they cannot change or abolish them. Still less can they formulate or create new laws of science" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 4).

One can abolish or change only those laws that have legal force. They are created by people, but they are not laws of science that reflect objective processes occurring independently of the will of people.

Laws reflecting objective processes that take place independently of human consciousness lose their force, pass from the stage, and yield their place to new laws by virtue of changing conditions, by virtue of the fact that qualitatively new phenomena, new connections, and relations arise.

Marxist propositions on the objectivity of scientific laws reveal the essence and significance of science, substantiate the boundless power of human cognition, and open up the widest perspectives for the further development of humanity and its mastery over nature.

The ideologists of dying capitalism can counterpose nothing to the monolithic, uniquely scientific Marxist worldview, which reflects reality as it exists, without any subjectivist additions, and which sets a clear and definite goal both for the progress of

scientific knowledge and for the practical activity of the working masses.

The clarity and definiteness of the Marxist worldview, which gives the working masses clarity of perspective and points out the goals of practical struggle, force even the ideologists of imperialism to admit this. They lament with regret that they lack positive ideals that could be counterposed to communism. They note with regret that the ideas of communism are taking hold of the working masses and the intelligentsia, and admit with despondency that Soviet people have a sense of purpose that they themselves lack and to which they have nothing to counterpose.

In search of theories that could be used as a weapon in the struggle against Marxism, the ideologists of the contemporary bourgeoisie utilize all old idealist systems updated with new terminology. Berkeleyanism, Humeanism, Kantianism, Hegelianism, Platonism, and other idealist theories have been revived and presented under various trendy names. Most "fortunate" of all were Berkeleyanism, Humeanism, and Kantianism, which gained application under the name of Machism, empirio-criticism, fictionalism, pragmatism, etc.

Numerous neo-Machists, positivists, fictionalists, pragmatists, and other groups and cliques—who until now acted under the guise of independent schools allegedly possessing their own original views distinct from the views of other similar schools —have cast off the masks of independence and originality and united for the struggle against Marxism. Logical empiricism, as the participants themselves call this unification of

obscurantism, represents today the most widespread reactionary trend in the USA, England, and West Germany.

This name is intended to show that representatives of this school consider experience, empiry, as the starting point of scientific cognition, particularly philosophy; moreover, by empiry is understood the aggregate of experiences, data of the senses.

As for the name "logical," it is meant to indicate the circumstance that the main thing in philosophy is logic; philosophy is nothing other than the logical processing of our experiences.

Logical empiricism, which represents the "latest word" in imperialist philosophy, bases all its constructions on two points. First, on a false, fake interpretation of new discoveries and achievements of modern natural science, particularly physics. Just as Machism did earlier, logical empiricism parasitizes on discoveries in physics, distorting them. Second, on a reactionary, idealist interpretation of the logical teaching on laws in general and, in particular, on the forms and laws of thought. By means of a false interpretation of these laws of logic, logical empiricists attempt to pervert the essence of scientific cognition and the laws of science. "The essence of philosophy is logic," declares the leader of modern reactionary philosophy, the enemy of the Soviet Union, Bertrand Russell. This "discovery" became the slogan of logical empiricism.

Relying on their arbitrary interpretation of modern mathematics with its axiomatic method, logical empiricists completely discard the concept of truth from science. As in

pure mathematics, they say, we proceed from certain axioms and postulates and derive theorems from them with necessity, while completely ignoring the question of whether our conclusions or axioms and postulates are true in reality (Cohen and Nagel, *An Introduction to Logic*, p. 7), "so too in every genuine science the question of the truth of our propositions is ignored. If we condense science into a single judgment," say the logical empiricists, "we obtain a conditional judgment 'if—then,' in which the question of the truth of the preceding and following is not posed at all" (*ibid.*, p. 132). In other words, this judgment merely logically follows from arbitrarily taken premises, which may be like this, but could also be different.

Thus, philosophy, like all science, is reduced to formal logic. While Marxist-Leninist philosophy substantiates the proposition that the laws of logic represent a generalized reflection of the phenomena of objective reality—that the figures of logic are nothing other than a reflection in our consciousness of the billion-fold repetition in human practice of the connections and relations of things—logical empiricism, fighting against materialism, denies the principle of reflection and the principle of practice in the theory of knowledge, advancing the following propositions: 1. The subject of logic is language. 2. The principles of logic are the principles of philosophy, for the essence of philosophy is logic. Logic is reduced to the principles of language, which say nothing and can say nothing about reality. These principles are primarily principles of inference and serve to pass from one part of speech to another. To pass from the general to the particular, one does not need to turn to experience.

General judgments, in which the most valuable and profound knowledge of reality and knowledge of the laws of nature and society are expressed, are completely rejected by logical empiricists, because the little word "all," by means of which the general in phenomena is usually expressed, is, from their point of view, merely an operator of a sign system in language that corresponds to nothing in the objective world.

The nominalism and agnosticism of old Machism are replaced in logical empiricism by new terms, but their essence has remained unchanged. The interpretation by logical empiricism of the essence of science, the essence of the laws of science, differs fundamentally in no way from the Machist interpretation. The problem of truth—the main problem of the theory of knowledge—the problem of the relationship between the material and the spiritual, and others are resolved mainly according to the old recipes of Mach and Avenarius, who revived the subjective idealism of Berkeley, merely altering the terminology slightly and thereby veiling the outright character of this idealism.

The well-known physicist Einstein, standing on flawed Machist positions in philosophy, asserts that concepts do not reflect reality, that concepts do not deal at all with objective physical reality, that they represent merely a means, an instrument with the help of which the survey of the complex of our experiences is facilitated. "Concepts and systems of concepts are meaningful for us only to the extent that they facilitate the survey of complexes of our experiences; they have no other justification" (A. Einstein, *Foundations of the Theory of Relativity*, p. 8, M.-L. 1935).

Neither natural sciences nor philosophy have or can (or should) have anything to do with real material nature, with the objective world, assert logical empiricists. On the relationship of reality, matter, and consciousness, and on the reflection of reality by thought, spoke the old, i.e., outmoded, philosophy, they say. Contemporary philosophy, Carnap summarizes the views of philosophizing physicists, considers these problems unscientific, pseudo-problems. Furthermore, one cannot even speak of thoughts, Carnap asserts; one must speak only of sentences and the connections between sentences. Philosophy deals with language; philosophy is the "syntax of language". And syntactical rules are established by scientists at their own discretion.

Truth, proclaims S. Stebbing, author of a logic textbook distributed in imperialist circles, is a hard-to-define concept. And there is no need to define it; one should use the wonderful proposal indicated by Tarski: the sentence "snow is white" is true if and only if snow is white. One might think that Stebbing suddenly stood on the materialist point of view and defends the theory of reflection: the judgment "snow is white" is true if in reality snow is white, i.e., if the judgment reflects objective reality. But it turns out that no "fall into sin" with logical empiricists occurred. Stebbing clarifies: one should not think that this sentence reflects reality or corresponds to it. The point of view of reflection must be thrown out as unscientific. When we say that "snow is white," we do not at all express the objective state of snow, she asserts; we express a conditional judgment.

What then is truth, and how are we to understand Tarski's "wonderful indication" from the perspective of logical empiricism? To understand what truth is in the interpretation of logical empiricists, it is necessary to examine several propositions defended by them.

The laws of science do not at all reflect objective processes; they are logical consequences of conventionally adopted measurement procedures, as logical empiricists assert—exploiting not only the discoveries of physics, but also its terminology. In their opinion, time and space are arbitrarily introduced into science by means of definitions, and these definitions correspond to nothing in the objective world. The main conclusion consists in the fact that definitions should be convenient, satisfying logical requirements, and not that they reflect objective reality. It is completely superfluous to pose the question of whether experimental data give us knowledge of the physical world. The main thing is to achieve a conventionally accepted language.

The world exists as a system of conventional signs—such is the conclusion from all this pseudo-scientific jargon. Logical empiricism casts aside the question of whether the world exists objectively, independently of human consciousness, as a pseudo-problem. Joining the logical empiricists, the physicist Eddington noted that the world is the creation of the researcher, in particular, physics, just as the image of Mr. Pickwick is the creation of the writer.

Eddington, therefore, says that Dickens arbitrarily invented Mr. Pickwick with all his misadventures, and did not reflect in them the regularities of a huckstering, hypocritical bourgeois

society in which every honest and noble man looks like a ridiculous Don Quixote. Eddington strives to prove that physical objects are determined by science not as things possessing objective existence, but as a topic of a certain field of knowledge. For example, the question of whether an electron exists as a physical object independently of and outside human consciousness turns out to be meaningless from the standpoint of logical empiricism. An electron is introduced into physics to establish a certain principle, he says, on the basis of which we logically derive the readings of an instrument needle.

Just as at the beginning of the 20th century Machists "described" motion without moving objects, so currently logical empiricists "measure" objects that do not exist. According to their assurance, the operation of measurement creates the object. The old Kantian—or rather, neo-Kantian—point of view, which was stubbornly defended by representatives of the so-called logic of relations, asserted that things are created by relations, wherein they meant not material, objectively existing things, but "things" created by pure thought with the help of "categorical synthesis"; this is once again proclaimed as the latest achievement of science and philosophy.

The old question posed by Berkeley and resolved by him in a subjectivist-idealist manner—does an object exist outside perception?—is once again posed and "resolved" on the basis of modern scientific achievements. Modern physics has opened up micro-objects that are not given directly in sensation like macro-objects such as a tree, a house, etc.; they can be

perceived by us only with the help of measuring instruments. A similar proposition is possible with respect to macro-objects as well, if the object were given to the observer not directly, but through its shadow. Thus the question reduces to the following: what could we say about a tree that was perceived by us through its shadow? Could we say that this tree exists? One of the leaders of the German neo-Kantians who relocated to the USA and joined the logical empiricists, Reichenbach, profoundly argues: to this question one cannot give an unequivocal answer; the tree perhaps exists, perhaps even not one, but two or three, or perhaps there is no tree at all. Any answer, he believes, is legitimate from the standpoint of science, but only under one condition: we must change the laws of physics to justify one or another answer.

Thus, the laws of physics, it turns out, do not reflect objective processes at all; they have no objective significance; they are created by us, we can change them, and the picture of the world will depend on us, on those "laws" that we create.

The real, objective world is unknowable, repeat the servants of reaction. Moreover, one cannot even pose the question of whether it exists outside consciousness, outside our experiences ("data of sensation"). Reality is a metaphysical question, that is, a falsely posed question. As we see, modern obscurantists of science, interpreting the achievements of modern physics in the spirit of extreme subjective idealism, merely repeat the leftovers of Berkeley and Hume.

The denial of the laws of nature and society, the denial of causality, and the denial of the very possibility of cognizing reality transform reality into a chaos of accidents, which is

"ordered by our thought," allegedly introducing "necessity" into it. All this long-exposed subjectivist jargon is called upon today to serve the interests of warmongers who strive to disarm the working people in their struggle for a better future for humanity, in their struggle against the dying capitalist world. These subjectivist-idealist raving ideas, which deny the objective character of the laws of nature and social life, serve as the "theoretical" foundation for the adventurous plans of the new pretenders to world domination—the imperialism of the USA.

Critiquing subjective idealism, V. I. Lenin wrote: "...The subjectivist line on the question of causality, the derivation of order and necessity of nature not from the external objective world, but from consciousness, from reason, from logic, etc., not only tears human reason away from nature, not only counterposes the former to the latter, but makes nature a part of reason, instead of treating reason as a part of nature. The subjectivist line on the question of causality is philosophical idealism... i.e., a more or less weakened, diluted fideism" (*Works*, Vol. 14, p. 142). Lenin pointed out that "the expulsion of laws from science is in fact merely the smuggling in of the laws of religion" (*Works*, Vol. 20, p. 182).

It is interesting to examine in more detail the recent writings of those logical empiricists who allegedly broke with the one-sidedness of logical empiricism and "developed" it. In bourgeois philosophy, Kraft and Carnap are valued especially highly as "outstanding representatives of neo-positivism," i.e., logical empiricism.

The arguments of Kraft, who relies on Russell, Stebbing, the head of the "Vienna Circle" M. Schlick, and others, together with Carnap's "correction" of the one-sidedness of logical empiricism, are set forth in his book *Mathematics, Logic, and Experience*, published in 1947. Setting as his goal to refute the materialist theory of the laws of thought, Kraft asserts that the laws of logic have nothing in common with material reality, that they represent laws of ordering thought. The laws of logic are derived not from nature, says he, but on the contrary, the laws of logic create nature; they are *a priori*.

In these propositions, there is as yet nothing new compared to Kantian views long shattered by Marxism. Kraft invented nothing that could be counterposed to materialism. However, it turns out that Kraft's *a priorism* differs from Kantian *a priorism*. The point is that Kantians considered the laws of thought, which shape the chaos of sensations and create nature, to be necessary laws of thought. Man thinks in such a way and not otherwise because his forms and laws of thought are such. Kraft understands the *a priorism* of the laws of thought differently. The laws of thought, according to Kraft, do not possess the character of truth; they are simply enactments. As enactments, they are *a priori*, preceding experience. Thought itself establishes them and forces itself to submit to them. Thus, thinking is arbitrarily established connections and relations created by us and for us. To put it more simply: logical laws are something like the rules of a game (*Spielregeln*); it makes no difference which—chess or cards. The rules of a game, of course, do not reflect the regularities of natural phenomena; they are created by human mind. But if we accepted these

rules, agreed upon them, then in the process of the game we must submit to them. We can change the rules, create new ones, discard old ones, and change the game or create a new type of game.

From the standpoint of logical empiricism, the picture of reality created by scientific cognition depends on such rules arbitrarily created by our thought. The picture depends on what rules of the game we establish.

How is reality created with the help of these "rules of the game"? To this question, starting from Kant and ending with "outstanding representatives" of logical empiricism, one answer is given: by introducing order into the diversity of sensory data. Order is the result of the ordering activity of thought.

Kraft asserts that our thinking, establishing rules (enactments) and submitting to them, as happens during a game, introduces these rules into the world of sensations, creates order in it, creates connections and relations, and in this way creates objects.

It would seem that the standpoint of modern subjective idealism is explained. But Kraft considers it necessary to clarify the question of the possibility of applying these "rules of the game" to reality. First of all, it turns out to be a necessary condition to clarify what reality is being discussed. "Of course," writes he, "here we are not talking about reality existing outside and independently of consciousness" (pp. 120–121). The concept of reality, clarifies he, is used by us in three senses. Material reality is completely left out of account in the

theory of logical empiricism. The question of material reality is considered metaphysical by logical empiricists, i.e., falsely posed. There is also no point in speaking about reality constructed with the help of rules established by our thought. It is already constructed by the laws of logic. The subject of the theory of knowledge, asserts the logical empiricist Kraft, should consider reality as the aggregate of sensations. This is the only given reality, alogical, irrational, which must be rationalized, logified by rules created by our mind.

Thus, reality, i.e., the aggregate of sensations, can be both rational and irrational, ordered and disordered. Kraft believes that it should be thought of in stages: from complete order to complete disorder. Part of reality is already rationalized by rules created by us, while part remains irrational.

Let us assume that in reality our thinking creates rules and orders natural phenomena. When Kant and Kantians advanced this proposition, it was unacceptable, but understandable: human reason, they asserted, is characterized by necessary, *a priori* laws; it cannot think otherwise, it thinks in the way dictated by these laws. Human thinking does not and cannot have another way, another possibility. This was a completely definite, consistently idealist point of view.

But if rules and laws are created by the free creation of thought as "rules of the game," if they represent enactments, agreements, and by these rules and laws we attempt to bring the world of phenomena into order—wherein complete ordering is still not achieved (part is ordered, part remains a mixture of order and disorder, while part does not yield to ordering at all and remains alogical, irrational)—then the

question arises: what forces us to create these, and not other laws, these, and not other "rules of the game"?

For what purpose are rules and laws created from the standpoint of logical empiricism? In order to bring order into the world of phenomena. But in that case, logical empiricism falls into a hopeless situation. We should not create such rules that are unsuitable for ordering phenomena, with the help of which we cannot bring order into the world of phenomena. Consequently, we are not free in creating rules and laws; our thinking is not free at all in its "creation" of rules and laws; it cannot create just any arbitrary rules; it depends on what is given to us. The laws of science are not rules of a game, nor agreements; they are conditioned by that which exists independently of us, of our consciousness.

The laws of science are not "established" by us; they are not agreements of groups of scientists. There exist objective processes, the laws of which we can cognize. And if discovered, cognized laws do not explain everything, this circumstance, as shown by the classics of Marxism-Leninism, expresses merely the relativity of human cognition. The laws of science reflecting the regularities of objective processes, explain definite areas of reality, but there still exist uncognized things that will be cognized by people in the process of their practical activity.

Logical empiricism in all its forms is a deliberate falsification of science and its laws, a denial of the possibility of cognizing reality, and, consequently, a denial of the possibility of transforming it, a denial of the possibility of fighting for a better future for humanity.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy counterposes to the philosophy of dying capitalism the proposition—imbued with optimism, substantiated by science and the practice of humanity, the practice of building communism in our country—that our knowledge of the laws of nature, tested by experience and practice, is reliable knowledge, that there are no unknowable things in the world, but only things as yet uncognized, which will be disclosed and cognized by the forces of science and practice.

Reality exists outside and independently of consciousness as a regular whole. Advanced forces of society, on the basis of cognizing the objective laws of nature and society, remake reality and transform it in order to maximally satisfy the needs of people.

21. Agents of American Imperialism

Acad. A. M. DEBORIN

The Catholic Church throughout its centuries-long history has played a reactionary role, always standing in defense of the interests of the ruling classes and preaching humility and devotion to the exploiters to the oppressed classes. In the Middle Ages, the power of the Catholic Church, as an institution "divine" and "eternal," was above state power, which was presented as an institution temporary and passing. Characterizing the prelates of the church, F. Engels wrote:

"They exploited their subjects no less mercilessly than the nobility and princes, but acted even more shamelessly. In order to extort the last penny from their subjects and multiply the possessions of the church, every device of religion was used alongside brute violence, together with the horrors of torture—all the horrors of anathema and the refusal of absolution, all the intrigues of the confessional. Forgery of documents was a usual and favorite means of fraud for these worthy men. However, although in addition to ordinary feudal dues and tithes they also collected tithes, all these revenues proved to be insufficient. To extort an even greater amount of money from the people, they resorted to the manufacture of miraculous icons and relics, the organization of pious pilgrimages, the sale of indulgences, which for a long time enjoyed great success in this" (K. Marx and F. Engels. *Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 120).

The Church was the highest embodiment and sanction of the feudal system, at the very bottom of which was the peasantry, bearing the entire weight of feudal dues.

Distinguished by a great capacity for adaptation, maneuvering, and camouflage, Catholicism was always the ideology of reaction and obscurantism. At the current stage of imperialism, Catholicism, as a church organization headed by the Vatican, and reactionary ideology, represents nothing other than a special variety of imperialist reaction.

The epoch of imperialism is distinguished by a turn toward reaction all along the line, and there is nothing surprising in the fact that Catholic "philosophy," as an expression of the feudal worldview characterized by concepts of the world absolutely alien to science, plays the most reactionary role in the modern class struggle.

Catholicism of our time justifies and hallows all types and forms of exploitation and oppression used by imperialism.

Catholic philosophy juggles the concepts of divine and natural laws, allegedly inscribed in the heart of everyone. The concept of nature it identifies with the concept of God on the grounds that nature was supposedly created by God, and therefore the laws of nature are "divine laws". People need, according to the church's assertion, power and authority. Both society and authority, it declares, have one and the same source—God. From this, Catholic philosophy draws the conclusion: there can be no power except from God. Therefore, whoever possesses the right to govern uses this right from God. Everyone who disobeys power, who rebels against it, rebels thereby against

God. Such are the foundations of the philosophy of power of Catholicism.

In the middle of the 19th century, when the proletariat entered the arena of history as an independent class, when socialist parties arose in almost all countries of the world, the Catholic Church in the person of the Pope took up arms against new trends in the sphere of politics, science, and philosophy.

In 1885, Pope Leo XIII spoke out against "unbridled freedom," which consisted, in his words, in that people began to preach equality in social and political life, despite their alleged "natural" and racial inequality. Every person ceased to recognize himself as free from foreign authority.

In 1891, Pope Leo XIII issued the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, which laid out the "philosophy" of the Catholic Church on the labor question, on the question of the state—in short, the socio-political doctrine of Catholicism at the present stage of social development. Leo XIII proclaimed in his encyclical the thesis according to which only the Catholic Church is supposedly called to resolve the labor question. Not confining itself to the publication of its socio-political doctrine, the Catholic Church set about creating all sorts of Christian, yellow trade unions, cooperatives, and various other organizations aimed at diverting the working class from the struggle for its class interests, introducing split into the working mass, replacing class struggle with class peace—in a word, using the oppressed and distressed condition of the working people in the interests of the church and capitalism.

The first duty of the state, teaches the Catholic political doctrine formulated in the encyclical of Leo XIII, is the destruction of disagreements and struggle between classes and the restoration of "harmony".

The encyclical hypocritically laments the difficult situation of workers and sees the way out in the creation of a corporate system in which employers and workers will enter into single organizations, which will lead allegedly to class peace and the triumph of "common interests".

It is not difficult to guess that the state system proposed by the Catholic Church as a salvation means against class struggle and proletarian revolution, like two drops of water, resembles the fascist corporate state realized, for example, in Italy by the bourgeoisie headed by Mussolini.

The Catholic doctrine of the state represents a theological justification and hallowing of the system of exploitation and oppression. It sets as its goal the defense of property, preaches humility and patience to the oppressed masses, demands unquestioning submission to authority, very cleverly and slyly conducts its policy of deceiving the masses of the people in the name of the interests of the ruling classes.

Pope Leo XIII rails against "new principles" that allegedly contradict "natural law," against freedom of thought, civil and political freedom. Citizens inspired by "divine principles," he asserts, will forget about indignations and revolutions and will not resist state power.

Thus, the church cares exclusively about the interests of authorities, the interests of the ruling classes, sacrificing the masses of the people to them.

In the encyclical of Pope Pius XI *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), much attention is also given to the social question. The Pope is extremely concerned about the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. He also proposes to organize corporations consisting of workers and employers, and in such unions, corresponding, in his opinion, to Christian doctrine, sees salvation from the class struggle.

The Catholic Church fears the freedom of the laboring person like the devil fears holy water. It fabricated an entire theory merely to deprive man of his reason and the free use of it. According to this theory, man possesses reason unlike animals, which have only instinct. Man's reason allegedly reflects his immortal soul. The guide of man in all his actions is allegedly the law, which, being a product of divine reason, directs the will of man along the path indicated by God. This "natural law," embedded by God in the human soul, is the guide of man in everyday life. Thus, man, according to the false teaching of Catholic hierarchs, has free will, possesses reason, but at the same time depends in everything on the will of God.

In all documents emanating and originating from the Vatican as the center of Catholicism, the red thread is the defense of private property and the capitalist system. Pope Leo XIII warned workers against revolution and socialism. "While social questions worry and disturb working people," he said, "you keep your souls in peace, relying on those master-Christians who with such wisdom guide your laboring weekdays, who

with such faultlessness and justice award you with wages, while at the same time introducing you to your rights, explaining to you the great and saving designs of the church and its head... Love your masters" (see Roger Garaudy *L'église, le communisme et les chrétiens*. Paris, p. 56. 1949).

Such are the basic "ideas" of the Catholic socio-political doctrine, which are called upon to carry out "to the world" Catholic, including the so-called Christian-Democratic parties that occupied before and after the Second World War in a number of countries (in Spain, France, Italy, Western Germany, and Portugal) a ruling position.

The Catholic Church created the idea of a corporate system used by fascism, and Christian-Democratic parties, which are pro-fascist organizations, attempt to put this idea into practice, striving to prepare the complete triumph of clerical fascism.

The Vatican and the Catholic Church led by it helped Mussolini come to power, using for this purpose its army of priests, monks, and press. Cooperation of the Vatican with the fascists was secured by the Lateran Treaty. For recognition by the Vatican as an independent state, priests of all Italian churches had to take an oath of loyalty to the fascist state. "The fact that the Vatican came to the Lateran Agreement," writes Rossi, "testifies clearly that the policy of alliance with fascism is the policy of the church, because only in this policy does the church see its salvation" (Rossi *L'église et le fascisme*. Paris, p. 40. 1933).

The Concordat of the Vatican with Hitler (July 1933) provided for the education of youth in the "consciousness of patriotic duties" before the Hitlerite fascist state.

"The fact," writes Avro Manhattan, "that fascism arose for the first time and came to power in a Catholic country, or rather, in the very heart of Roman Catholicism, is not a simple coincidence or a caprice of history. This is explained by various factors of social, economic, and political order, among which no small role was played by cooperation and assistance rendered by the Vatican to fascism during its inception and subsequently" (*Vatican*, p. 107. 1948).

A faithful servant of the interests of capitalists, Pope Pius XI was an active fascist, an accomplice of Mussolini; he contributed to the coming to power of the Hitlerites in Germany, helped Franco, etc.

"The Pope," writes Manhattan, "did not tire of praising Mussolini. On February 13, 1929, Pius XI for the second time proclaimed before the whole world that Mussolini was a 'man sent by divine providence,' and added that without Mussolini neither the Lateran Agreement nor the Concordat would have been possible. On February 17, 1929, at a reception in the Vatican, the entire Catholic aristocracy greeted the appearance of Mussolini on the screen with applause; in the following month (March 9, 1929), Roman cardinals declared in an address presented to the Pope that the 'outstanding statesman [Mussolini] governs Italy by the direction of divine providence'. And, finally, the authorities of the Vatican prescribed all priests at the end of daily mass to pray 'for the salvation of the king and duce'" (ibid., pp. 119–120).

The Catholic Church under the leadership of the Pope during the entire reign of fascism in Italy invariably supported and approved all crimes of Mussolini and bears full responsibility for them. The fascists and the Vatican acted hand in hand.

Pope Pius XI, proclaiming that war, "having become necessary for the expansion of a growing population," must be recognized as "just and right" (ibid., p. 124), is one of the culprits of the Second World War.

The Catholic Church, headed by the Vatican, represents a huge danger to progress and culture, especially now when it has completely stood on the position of predatory American imperialism.

The main characteristic feature of the "principles" of the Catholic Church is that it decisively opposes democracy. "All policy of the Catholic Church since the beginning of the 20th century was directed toward preventing the free development of nations with the help of an alliance with various reactionary movements. From this stems its direct and indirect influence on the political life of Europe and support for its fascist dictatorships" (ibid., p. 360).

The Catholic Church under the leadership of the Vatican created in the USA a set of reactionary, fascist organizations, headed by the "National Conference of Catholic Charities". In 1937, with the blessing of the New York Cardinal Hayes, for the struggle against communism, a special organization was created, and then also the "Association of Catholic Trade Union Members". Along with them were created the "Conservative Catholic Labor Union," "Pacifist Catholic Labor

Group," and many other reactionary organizations, like the openly fascist organization "America First," controlled by the fascist priest Coughlin.

"Coughlin and the leaders of this movement already worked out plans to transform the 'America First' committee, by involving millions of its radio listeners in it, into a powerful political party. In imitating European fascism, they went so far as to create their own kind of private army, masquerading under the guise of the organization 'Christian Front'. This army was supposed to be the vanguard detachment of the Coughlinite 'Christian revolution'" (ibid., p. 362).

Cardinals and bishops proclaimed the late Coughlin the second Christ, his speeches were called the "voice of God". The Vatican very favorably related to the fascist preaching of Coughlin, to his promises to seize power by way of violence.

Fulfilling the order of the reactionary "National Association of Manufacturers," the Catholic Church in the USA plays an active role, organizes fascist elements, spreads clerical-fascist doctrines, collects the scum of society for a "crusade" against communism.

The role of the Catholic Church in the USA especially increased after the Second World War and the declaration by Truman of a "cold war" against the Soviet Union. Joining in the post-war period the general imperialist anti-Soviet front headed by the USA, the Vatican marked its "new" course with two acts. On August 26, 1947, Pope Pius XII in a personal letter blessed Truman and his predatory imperialist enterprises. Simultaneously, on the eve of elections in Italy, Pius XII

declared war on the democratic front and proclaimed a crusade against communism.

As a personal representative of Truman to the Pope, millionaire Taylor, a fervent admirer of Mussolini, was appointed. For this reason, Truman and Pius XII exchanged messages in which they promised to render each other all-round support.

One of the most active warmongers in America is the Catholic Cardinal Spellman, propagating a new crusade against communism. Enjoying great weight in government circles of the USA, he serves as a mediator between the Vatican and the American government.

The Catholic Church possesses immense wealth. Engels wrote that "land possessions of the church, snatched with the help of donations, extortion, fraud, trickery, forgery, and other methods of criminal nature, assumed over the course of a few centuries colossal dimensions" (K. Marx and F. Engels. *Works*, Vol. XVI, Part I, p. 396).

In the epoch of capitalism and especially with the emergence of a new phase of capitalism, the character of the church's possessions sharply changed. In our day, the church became a capitalist organization that has merged with imperialist, financial oligarchy. Catholic hierarchs own today banks, industrial enterprises, etc. The Catholic Church headed by the Vatican turned into a major capitalist corporation.

P. Togliatti correctly emphasized that the Catholic hierarchy became a "constituent part of big capital" (newspaper *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!* of January 15, 1948). "Holy Fathers" of the Vatican with the Pope at the head

in one harness with other exploiters engage in savage exploitation, robbery of the popular masses, speculation. The interests of the Vatican completely coincide with the interests of American magnates of capital and capitalists of other countries. Defending capitalism, the Vatican wages a struggle above all for its own capitals.

Having lost feudal positions in the field of "worldview," the Vatican just as it once was in relation to feudalism, surrounded the capitalist system with its "sacred private property" with a "sacred halo of divine grace," gives religious justification for exploitation and division of people into rich and poor, preaches to the suffering and oppressed humility and obedience in the name of God, supposedly preparing a heavenly paradise for the poor in the next world.

In its "constitution," the Vatican preserved the hierarchical principle and at the present time is an international center of reaction, having its spies, i.e., intelligence agents, in all countries of the world.

As a result of the Second World War, capitalism in Europe suffered a series of defeats. The center of world reaction shifted to the USA. To save its capitals, the Vatican decided to strengthen its positions in America, counting on finding there not only a new field for misanthropic propaganda against communists, but also to unite its "spiritual" forces with the armed forces of imperialist America.

J. V. Stalin in his historical speech at the 19th Party Congress pointed out that the modern bourgeoisie—"the main enemy of the liberation movement,—became different, changed

seriously, became more reactionary, lost connection with the people and thereby weakened itself". Being itself extremely reactionary and representing a dying class, the bourgeoisie of the USA concluded an alliance with another reactionary force —the Catholic Church, with its ideology.

Blanshard—an official of the State Department of the USA—sings paeans to the Catholic Church, emphasizing that it is one of the outposts of capitalism against communism. In a special chapter of his book *American Freedom and Catholic Power*, Blanshard, revealing the perspectives of the development of Catholicism in America, declares that the Catholic Church and American "democracy" are completely compatible. For the sake of this alliance, the State Department official is ready to make the Vatican a series of substantial concessions. Under the control of the church, according to the author's proposal, should be transferred school affairs, general education in general, and family relations: marriages, divorces, etc.

Thus, in accordance with the plan to win world domination by Anglo-American imperialism, the Vatican, as a cosmopolitical organization, develops completely concrete plans for its spiritual world domination, contributing to the enslavement of peoples by American imperialism.

In the plans of American imperialists, the Catholic Church is called to play a major role in educating the population in the spirit of the most reactionary ideas, in the spirit of clerical fascism.

* * *

In 1946, a regular consistory took place, at which 32 new cardinals were elected from various countries of Europe and America. Pius XII, writes Jerome in *Political Affairs*, attempts to create a new "Holy Alliance," encompassing as many countries as possible, masking himself with phrases about the "universality" of the church, about its "supranational" character. It is not difficult to discern in these plans and their justification the very same ideology and predatory policy that is conducted by Anglo-American imperialism. "Holy Alliance" and "supranational state"—this, expressing it in secular language, is the Atlantic Pact and the idea of "world state," directed against the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy and constituting the general line of the predatory policy of American imperialism.

The election of cardinals at the consistory had as its main task support throughout all Catholic countries of a reactionary political course, fascist organizations, and the creation of an anti-Soviet coalition of international scope.

The number of cardinals from France was increased to 75% so as to support the Catholic party (MRP) and strengthen its influence on French foreign policy in order to aggravate relations between France and the USSR (see article by Jerome in *Political Affairs* No. 4, p. 313, 1945).

"The appointment of three new cardinals from Germany," writes Jerome, "is a scheme undertaken in order to strengthen pro-fascist Catholic groups in their attempts at unification and reorganization of the remnants of shattered Nazism on a new demagogic basis" (ibid., p. 314).

Thus, the Vatican not only supports all aggressive plans of American imperialism, but often acts as an initiator and instigator of treacherous plans of bloody American imperialism. Jerome correctly emphasizes that the elections of new German cardinals must be attributed to the Vatican's desire to prevent the democratic reconstruction of Germany.

New elections of cardinals show, writes Jerome, that the Catholic Church strives to penetrate into all corners of the globe and especially into those regions that lie in immediate proximity to the borders of the Soviet Union. The Vatican strives to "surround" the Soviet Union with "spiritual bases" in accordance with the tactics of American imperialism, surrounding the Soviet Union with its military-air bases.

Special significance attaches to the appointment of new cardinals in the USA. The appointment of four American cardinals is unprecedented in the history of the papacy. American cardinals are connected with the most reactionary, pro-fascist minded groups. Cardinal Mooney was appointed in Detroit in order to lead the struggle against the labor movement. Such a mission is performed by other cardinals as well. Mooney is also the direct leader of the fascist-priest Coughlin, bearing direct responsibility for his vile fascist propaganda.

Cardinal Spellman, right hand of Pope Pius XII,—the most probable candidate for the papal throne. "And if Spellman," writes Jerome, "has not yet received the post of Secretary of State in the Vatican, this is only because, as informed officials of the Vatican report, the Pope considers his presence in the United States most useful at the present time" (ibid., p. 319).

Spellman supports fascism in the USA and in Spain, declaring that the executioner of the Spanish people Franco is doing a "godly deed".

Outlining the activities of the Catholic Church in the USA, Jerome arrives at the conclusion that "the USA is now the main source of power of the Roman Catholic Church" (ibid., p. 321).

The Vatican—outpost of feudal monarchy—now acts as an apologist for American "democracy," i.e., plutocracy.

The Catholic writer Rommen, author of the work *The State in Catholic Thought*, cites a saying of Cardinal Satolli: "The Great Charter of humanity—is the Gospel of our Lord and the Constitution of the United States... Forward along the path of progress: with the Gospel in one hand and the Constitution of the United States in the other" (Heinrich A. Rommen *The State in Catholic Thought*, p. 481. 1947).

The same Rommen is forced to admit that in the so-called Catholic countries of Europe—in France, Italy, Austria, even Spain and Portugal—a large part of the bourgeoisie, intelligentsia, and working class broke away from the Catholic Church. But in England and in the USA "we observe something else, namely: a huge part of the bourgeoisie remained faithful to Christianity, the labor movement shows almost no signs of hostility to Christianity" (ibid., p. 454).

We see that the Catholic Church relates enthusiastically to American fascisizing pseudo-democracy and is very hostile to genuine democracy, to democracy of the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy. And no matter how Rommen

tried to present the Catholic Church in a favorable light, even he is forced to admit that "the majority of bishops in Spain and in Italy were on the side of fascist regimes. In the works of many Catholic writers," says he, "in almost all countries we find defense of anti-democratic theories that meet with great sympathy especially in those countries where a fascist or clerical-fascist regime was established" (ibid., p. 482).

All papal encyclicals were directed against the democratic concept and against socialism. They rejected the theory according to which the source of supreme power is the people. Leo XIII asserted that the idea of popular sovereignty is unacceptable because it denies the role of God in the origin of power, that this theory puts the will of the majority in place of God. The doctrine of popular sovereignty leads, in the opinion of Leo XIII, to the triumph of communism.

However, life does not fit into Catholic dogmas. The communist movement was becoming an ever more real force, and Vatican hierarchs engaged in inventing new, more flexible formulas ensuring the possibility of maneuvering.

Rommen in his book tells of how Catholic political and social movement "realized" that "economic conditions in which urban proletarian masses live form favorable soil for proletarian socialism. Catholics," writes he, "recognize the justice of many demands of the modern labor movement, the necessity of preserving the rural form of life for a huge class of farmers and through cooperatives preserving a vast middle class. The existence of this class rests on property and not on contract, but it finds itself under threat from big business, i.e., big capital.

Therefore Catholics organize Christian trade unions, cooperatives..." (ibid., p. 607).

Thus arose "social Catholicism," called to divert the working masses from Marxism, from scientific socialism.

This "declaration" of a prominent Catholic "theorist" reveals the true motives that prompted the Catholic Church to become "interested" in the situation of working people. The turn of workers to Marxist socialism forced the Catholic Church to step onto the path of new forms of "activity" among working people in order to corrupt and decompose them, in order to bring them to obedience and submissiveness to masters.

Deserves special attention the fact stated by the Catholic "theorist" that the spread of Marxism forced the Catholic Church hastily to step onto the path of declaring a political and social "doctrine" directed against Marxism and, naturally, against the working class.

Obviously, writes Rommen, simple rejection of Marxism could not influence the workers. A "positive program" was necessary.

For the suppression of the revolutionary labor movement and diverting working masses from it, a sophisticated program of demagogy was developed: Christian trade unions were created, which had as their task serving the interests of masters; farmer cooperatives were created; Catholic youth organizations were created; Catholic political parties were formed, invariably playing a pro-fascist role.

The reactionary bourgeois press began widely to advertise so-called "social" encyclicals (*Rerum Novarum* and

Quadragesimo Anno) as "revolutionary acts". In reality, these encyclicals had as their main purpose the suppression of the labor movement with the help of the Christian commandment "love thy neighbor". In the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, workers are recommended to "occupy without complaint the place that was designated for them by divine providence".

"Natural right of man to ownership of private property," says the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, "the right of transferring it by inheritance, must remain inviolable and untrammeled, it cannot be alienated by the state" (see Michael Oakeshott *The Social and Political Doctrines of Contemporary Europe*, p. 67. 1939).

Love your masters, preaches the Pope in his encyclicals. Your masters explain to you the "great and saving designs of the church and its head". The poor, i.e., deprived of property, must patiently bear their need, since "poverty is the easiest path to salvation". Could there be a greater mockery of working people?

In the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, a few words are devoted to the question of wages, which eloquently speak in defense by the Vatican of employers against "excessive demands" of workers.

Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum* turns into a duty of workers "in no way to inflict harm on property and not offend employers; in their own interests not resort to violence and not riot; not enter into communities of 'vicious' people who deceitfully instill exaggerated hopes" (see John Cronin *Catholic Social Principles*, pp. 412–413. 1951).

Pius XII speaks of the dangers of strikes, which fully justify legislative measures prohibiting in many countries "the use of this dangerous weapon" (ibid., p. 409). Capital and labor, as the Vatican asserts, are not hostile by their nature. On the contrary, "each of them needs the other; capital cannot exist without labor, labor cannot exist without capital. Harmony gives rise to beauty and order" (ibid.).

In *Rerum Novarum*, Leo XIII asserts that conditions of human existence are given as early as birth, along with birth. This "fact" testifies that "lowly in society cannot be equal with higher strata. Among people exist big differences from nature" (ibid., p. 258).

Capitalism, says Pius XII in the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, is not a vicious socio-economic system. Capitalism does not deserve condemnation. God destined capitalists to occupy the place they occupy: to extract profit. This is "granted" by God, and they only fulfill their Christian duty, exploiting their "brother" workers.

Thus, papal encyclicals, advertised by the reactionary bourgeois press, in every way defend the rights of employers. Encyclicals that received in the bourgeois press the name "social" and "revolutionary" in reality pursue the goal of reactionary defense of all pillars of capitalism. Workers are warned against fellowship and struggle for their vital interests. Encyclicals shamelessly set some workers against others, strive to split the united front of workers, just like right-wing socialists, with whom the Catholic Church is solidary in other questions as well.

According to Catholic doctrine, exploitation cannot and should not be destroyed. It is an eternal divine order. Private property also represents a sacred institution, not subject not only to abolition, but to any violation whatsoever. From here stems the hatred and malice that the Catholic Church and its "holy fathers" harbor toward communism. They defend in their "theoretical" constructions that which is an object of their "secular" interests: not only property of capitalists, but also their own colossal riches. "Theory" serves as an ideological justification for the capitalist system. God is the primary "guarantor," guardian of the sanctity and inviolability of the existing system.

In these "propositions" of the Catholic Church lie the foundations of the hierarchical structure of society, which fascists strove to realize. Consequently, in this respect too, between Catholic doctrine and fascist "theory" there exists complete unity of thought.

The unity of political and social views of the Catholic Church and fascism is confirmed by facts from the practical policy of the church, not to mention the identity of "doctrines". The Vatican, even after the defeat of fascism in the Second World War, continues secretly and openly to support neo-fascists in all countries.

American imperialists spend hundreds of millions of dollars on subversive work in the USSR and in countries of people's democracy, hoping with the help of espionage and all sorts of diversions to crush the countries of socialism. For this purpose, American imperialists use everything: the dregs of society, vile traitors from the camp of reactionary parties, Catholic priests,

Zionist scoundrels, and other scum. A series of trials that took place in recent years in countries of people's democracy proved graphically that along with fascist bandits from the camp of traitors Tito, in espionage and diversionary activity take part broad and most active participation Zionists and agents of the Vatican.

The Vatican wages a desperate struggle against democratic regimes throughout the world, being one of the most active conspiratorial centers aimed at destroying democracy. The Pope—is one of the most malicious warmongers, a war criminal, organizer of conspiracies and all sorts of crimes.

In all trials in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, etc., as criminals exposed in espionage, diversions, terrorist acts, invariably proved to be agents of the Vatican, starting from ordinary priests and ending with cardinals (for example, Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary).

Cardinal Sapieha in Poland and other leaders of the Krakow archbishopric were closely connected with conspirators from foreign powers betting on provoking a new war, which, according to their calculations, was supposed to lead to the liquidation of the democratic system in Poland.

In Hungary, successor to Cardinal Mindszenty was appointed Cardinal József Grősz, who together with American intelligence organized a conspiracy against people's democracy. A similar struggle against people's power was conducted in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania.

The Vatican is not limited to preaching the Catholic religion. It became a major political force, organizing everywhere so-

called Christian-Democratic political parties. In Italy, France, Belgium, Austria, and a number of other countries political power is exercised by Christian-Democratic parties in alliance with right-wing socialists.

* * *

Deserves the most attentive consideration the alliance between the Vatican and right-wing socialists. Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of 1891 did not consider it possible to find a common language with socialists. Leo XIII attacked socialists for standing for the destruction of private property and for converting it into public property. The Catholic Church headed by the Vatican considered "unjust" the taking away of property from its owners, as this meant a violation of "natural rights" of owners.

Through forty years separating the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII from the encyclical of Pius XI, the situation changed sharply. Powerful communist parties were formed. Under the leadership of brilliant leaders Lenin and Stalin in a vast country a socialist upheaval was carried out, as a result of which all instruments and means of production were converted into public property. The Second International, uniting social-democratic parties, suffered a collapse. The vast majority of social-democratic leaders betrayed socialism and went over to the side of the bourgeoisie, creating in almost all capitalist countries parties of right-wing socialists.

Preaching popery under the guise of "ethical socialism," proclaiming not only complete rejection of materialism, but also waging a struggle against materialism, advocating

reconciliation with religion, propagating various types of idealism—neo-Kantianism, Machism, etc.—leaders of right-wing socialists became closest allies of Catholic priests, poisoning the masses with the poison of religion.

With the traitors of socialism, the Catholic Church found a common language. Pope Pius XI spoke a different language than Leo XIII. In the labor movement he clearly saw two currents: communists, upholding class struggle and revolutionary methods of action, standing on the basis of dialectical and historical materialism, and socialists, who renounce revolutionary methods of struggle. To communists Pius XI related with undisguised hatred. In socialists he saw allies, since, according to his words, they make certain steps toward recognizing some essential truths of Christianity. Pius XI emphasized even that "there is observed a striking rapprochement of socialist demands with Christian 'social reform'" (see John Cronin *Catholic Social Principles*, pp. 138–139).

Thus, Pius XI praised, stroked the fur of right-wing socialists for "successes" in the field of betrayal and treason that they committed, and expressed at the same time the hope that they will go further in this direction.

Since the publication of the encyclical of Pius XI, twenty-one years have passed. During this time right-wing socialists made "further steps" toward the most reactionary forces of society and, in essence, adopted the doctrine of the Vatican. At the Frankfurt Congress of 1951, right-wing socialists formulated their "principles," testifying to their hatred toward Marxism. Right-wing socialists solemnly proclaimed that one can be a

socialist professing religious views, that socialism is compatible with recognition of private property, that class struggle and revolution are unacceptable for them, since they stand on the position of "evolutionism" and class peace. All these propositions of right-wing socialists, like two drops of water, coincide with Catholic social "wisdom" of the Vatican. Now there are no obstacles to joint struggle against the working class and baiting communists, which, by the way, has practically long been put into practice. But this practice received in the new "manifesto" of right-wing socialists "theoretical" sanction.

Modern Catholic "doctrine" represents a variety of fascism. It defends the corporate system, which was the basis of Italian fascism and German Nazism. In the same encyclical where Pope Pius XI so skillfully understood the fundamental difference of social democracy from communism, he spoke with praise about Italian fascism of Mussolini.

Approvingly describing corporate and syndicalist organizations in fascist Italy, Pius XI, summing up, noted that all economic activity of Italy is directed by state-controlled syndicates, in which employers and workers are represented, and the final decision belongs to the state. "Advantage of this system," says the Pope, "consists in class cooperation and in unified economic life" (see John Cronin, op. cit., p. 141).

Rapprochement between "social" encyclicals of the Catholic Church and the socio-political "ideology" of right-wing socialists occurs not only in the field of political doctrines. That alliance, that solidarity, which are established in political

"theory" between right-wing socialists and Catholic bodies, receive their expression in the field of practical policy as well.

One of the early preachers of medievalism and its ideology was, among others, former left-wing social-democrat Hendrik de Man, who rolled down to fascism, who long strove to throw a bridge between Catholicism and right-wing socialists.

In agreement with all fascists, de Man idealizes the medieval estate-corporate system, praises it as an ideal and harmonious structure of society. The Vatican together with certified lackeys of imperialism promises to revive this system.

The philosophical system of Thomas Aquinas, who is the supreme authority of the Catholic Church, whose system represents the "sacred covenant" of Catholicism, de Man characterizes as the synthesis of human thought.

As a "good" Catholic, "socialist" de Man sings in unison with all modern Catholic theologians and "philosophers" advocating a return to the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas.

It is not difficult to understand that the "harmony of estates," praised by the "synthetic system" of Thomas Aquinas, represents nothing other than a serf system characterized, in the expression of Saltykov-Shchedrin, as a "process of flaying skin from a living organism," i.e., brutal exploitation of working people.

The Frankfurt Congress of traitors created a "durable" platform for joint activity of right-wing socialists with Christian-Democratic parties. They form the so-called "third force," having as its direct purpose to deceive and blackmail the

masses in order under the guise of defending a "special line" to win them over to the side of American imperialism and pave the way for an American fascist dictatorship. This block has already done quite a lot: it warmly welcomed the "Marshall Plan," North Atlantic Pact, refusal of national sovereignty, creation of "world government," preparation of a new world war against the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy.

Christian-Catholic parties in accordance with the encyclical of Pope Pius XI *Quadragesimo Anno* strive to realize class cooperation of workers with master-employers so as to subject workers to employers, turn the modern state into a "Christian" state, where owners will be on the basis of "natural law" recognized as a "sacred" estate, and workers turned into rightsless slaves.

All chatter of Christian-Democratic parties that they stand for democracy is a brazen deception. In all countries where these parties are in power, terror reigns, working-class and communist organizations are persecuted; there, as we see in France and Italy, workers are shot, tried for peaceful propaganda. Christian democracy, based on Christian principles, proposes in the first place "defense" of Catholicism, persecution of all who reject religious prejudices.

In France, the Catholic party has as its main task in fellowship with right-wing socialists to give the country over to plunder and pillage to American imperialism, to block the path of the Communist Party—the only party defending the vital interests of the people—to power.

The same thing happens in Italy and in other countries where Christian "democrats" stand at power, sharing it with right-wing socialists.

"At the present time," declared at the 6th Congress of the Communist Party of Italy Palmiro Togliatti, "reactionary and conservative forces found their organizational center in the party of Christian democracy, in 'Azione Cattolica' and in the highest church hierarchy under the aegis of American imperialism. Thus, the Christian-Democratic Party turned into a party of social conservatism, into an American party, into a party that consistently acts in the name of restriction and destruction of the independence of our country" (newspaper *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!* of January 15, 1948).

Almost in all capitalist countries of Europe right-wing socialists form a coalition with Christian parties. This circumstance is explained by the fact that both these parties are equally the worst enemies of the working class and the Soviet Union. Right-wing socialists are welded together with Christian parties by their common bestial hatred of communism.

The author of "Survey of Christian Democracy in Europe" in the Catholic journal *Thought* (Antony Trawick Bouscaren. *Survey of Christian Democracy in Europe*. "Thought," 1951, vol. XXVI, No 102) could not refrain from stressing in a special section of his work, devoted to the question of reasons for joint activity of right-wing socialists with Christian Democrats, precisely this circumstance. In France, says he, both parties closely united. In Italy Saragat cooperated with De

Gasperi. The same process took place in Western Germany, where the party of Schumacher concluded an alliance with the party of Adenauer. Especially praises the author of the survey the late Léon Blum, with whom, according to his words, "easily and naturally" cooperated the MRP (see p. 412). He goes through all countries in which right-wing socialists cooperate with Christian Democrats, and arrives at the conclusion of the extreme importance of this cooperation. One of the most important tasks facing Christian-Democratic parties, says the author, is winning the proletariat to Catholicism, which, according to his assertion, is so all-embracing and universal that right-wing socialists are beginning to understand this. He asserts that the socialist party of France became a party of middle classes.

The fact that right-wing socialist parties are losing ground under their feet is, undoubtedly, true. But the author of the survey remains silent about the fact that they are squeezed out by communists, who become in all capitalist countries the single party of the working class. Against each other stand the Communist Party and reactionary Christian Democracy, behind which drag right-wing socialists.

The author of the survey with satisfaction emphasizes that socialists now form together with Christian Democrats a more close-knit front than ever before. He even attempts to formulate something like a common platform on which both parties could at the current stage "organically" converge. It goes without saying that the basis of a common platform he sees in the so-called "social" encyclicals of the popes (see p. 418).

This must be understood in the sense that both parties commit themselves to fulfill the order of American imperialism—to conduct work on propagating a new war against the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy. Catholic leaders pursue a far-reaching goal: further fascisization of the state on the basis of clerical-fascist doctrine.

It should be noted that among broad masses of Catholics grows a striving for unity of action in the struggle for peace and vital rights of peoples. It is also known that many rank-and-file members of socialist parties ever more clearly understand the perniciousness of the treacherous policy of leaders of right-wing socialists. Therefore, leaders of the Catholic Church and right-wing socialists strive to keep under their influence, fool the masses, going for this purpose to various machinations.

Christian-Democratic parties strive to seize into their hands leadership of trade unions, proposing to right-wing socialists in this respect a united front. This united front, for which a common "theoretical" base was created, bears an openly counter-revolutionary, anti-labor, anti-popular character; it is directed against the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy. As its task it has implementation of imperialist American policy of enslaving peoples and preparing a new world war.

The brilliant prediction of Comrade Stalin regarding the role of social democracy is completely vindicated before our eyes.

"Fascism," wrote Comrade Stalin in 1924, "is a combat organization of the bourgeoisie, resting on active support of social democracy. Social democracy is objectively the

moderate wing of fascism. There is no reason to suppose that the combat organization of the bourgeoisie can achieve decisive successes in battles or in governing a country without active support of social democracy. There is just as little reason to think that social democracy can achieve decisive successes in battles or in governing a country without active support of the combat organization of the bourgeoisie. These organizations do not negate, but supplement each other. They are not antipodes, but twins. Fascism is an unformed political bloc of these two main organizations, arisen in the conditions of post-war crisis of imperialism and calculated for struggle against proletarian revolution. The bourgeoisie cannot hold power without the existence of such a bloc" (*Works*, Vol. 6, p. 282).

The Frankfurt Congress signifies a new step of right-wing socialists toward reaction. Evidence of this is ideological and political solidarity between right-wing socialists, the Catholic Church, and American imperialism, conducting a fascist course both in internal and foreign policy.

American imperialism and its agents—the Catholic Church and right-wing socialists—pursue identical goals: destruction of democratic institutions and civil freedoms, abolition of constitutional regimes, and establishment of a police-fascist system, preparation of a new world war for the purpose of seizing foreign lands and realizing world domination of American imperialism.

The offensive of reaction against the remnants of democratic constitutions in Italy, France, Western Germany, Holland, and other countries testifies to the weakness of the bourgeoisie and

its governments, to their fear before working masses. Ruling reactionary parties cannot hold power with the help of existing constitutions, which turn out to be too "democratic"; they strive by all sorts of fraudulent methods to carry out "reforms" that would secure for them state power. These attempts to carry out constitutional "reforms" in the direction of fascism are a characteristic feature of modern political life of capitalist countries, testifying to the instability and weakness of reactionary regimes.

In Italy, the government of De Gasperi, feeling an immense, ever growing power of the popular masses, leading under the leadership of the Communist and Socialist parties a successful struggle for freedom, democracy, and peace, strives to carry out a coup d'état and actually abolish the existing constitution, replacing it with the fascist Acerbo law, which was introduced under Mussolini and which for Mussolini secured a majority in parliament in 1924. After the fall of fascism in Italy, former fascist minister Acerbo was sentenced to death, but subsequently was pardoned. De Gasperi resurrected that very law that helped Mussolini come to power and for which Acerbo was sentenced to death after the defeat of fascism in Italy. Palmiro Togliatti characterized the Scelba–Acerbo law as fraudulent. According to this law, a vote cast for clericals equals one, while a vote cast against the clerical bloc equals almost half a vote.

The government of De Gasperi managed to pass this fraudulent law in the Chamber of Deputies with the help of right-wing socialists from the gang of Saragat and Romita.

The clerical-fascist party of De Gasperi in its vile struggle against the people, against working masses relies on right-wing socialists, on traitors like Saragat and Romita. It should be noted, however, that this new betrayal of leaders of Italian right-wing socialists caused a crisis, equivalent to the collapse of the party of right-wing socialists. The draft "reform" of the constitution signifies a further step along the path of reviving a fascist regime in Italy.

The only parties in the country leading a consistent and heroic struggle against reaction, in defense of rights of the people, in defense of democracy,—are the Communist and Socialist parties.

"Ruling groups of big Italian bourgeoisie, subjected to American imperialism," writes Pietro Secchia, "feel that they are not in a position further to hold power, relying on the democratic parliamentary system. They know full well that if the will of the people could be expressed freely, without police violence and intimidation, without religious terror, without economic pressure and threats, without foreign intervention, it would mercilessly sweep away their government and their policy" (newspaper *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!* of January 30, 1953).

The draft of a new electoral law will still be considered in the Senate. The people are not inclined to lay down arms. On the contrary, the struggle will flare up ever more, as it concerns the vital interests of working masses.

A durable alliance between extreme reaction and right-wing socialists exists in France, where at power stand former collaborators, figures of clerical-fascist parties. And leaders of French right-wing socialists, starting from the late Léon Blum and ending with Guy Mollet,—are sworn reactionaries, direct accomplices of fascists. All these Blums and Ramadiers, executioners of the working class, did not go far from Laval and Pétain—today leaders of French right-wing socialists go in one harness with the Catholic party MRP (Mouvement Républicain Populaire), clearing the path to open fascism—Gaullism. "In unfolding in France anti-national activity to this day inseparable from each other are names of General de Gaulle and leader of the right wing of the French Socialist Party Léon Blum" (André Wurmser *De Gaulle and His Accomplices*, p. 27. 1948).

Blum served de Gaulle faithfully and truthfully, acting as an advocate of Gaullist, i.e., fascist, dictatorship. After Blum's death, his policy is continued by the present leadership of the fascist Socialist Party headed by Guy Mollet. Blum applied no small effort to strengthen the alliance of the right wing of the Socialist Party with the party of the Vatican, MRP. Between these parties and fascist Gaullism ("Rally of the French People" [RPF]) there always exists a tacit agreement.

The Gaullist party became the focal point of all scum of collaborationism and former fascist parties; now it prepares fascisization of France. With the blessing of leaders of French right-wing socialists, fascist de Gaulle possesses armed detachments for reprisal against the people, against laboring masses. Exactly so Hitler was preparing to seize power.

Authorities in France not only take no measures to disarm de Gaulle, but, on the contrary, in every way protect him, prepare ground for the victory of fascism. And if up to now de Gaulle failed to commit a fascist coup, to this the country is obliged to the single party defending the interests of working people and national sovereignty, the interests of democracy, freedom, and peace,—the heroic Communist Party of France. The anti-national, treacherous policy of ruling circles of France encounters the growing power of the Communist Party, which leads behind it the proletariat and democratic strata of the population adhering to it.

In order to facilitate coming to power for fascism, the reactionary governmental bloc in France, acting now on direct orders of American imperialists, just as happens in Italy, carries out insidious plans of "reform" of the constitution. This "reform" provides for deprivation of rights and representation in parliament of working people, in the first place, the Communist Party, which leads a self-sacrificing struggle against reactionary forces for freedom and democracy. Bourgeois parties in France already over the course of a number of years make attempts to trample democratic principles won by the people during the Second World War, but still fail to alter the constitution. Forces of democracy force them each time to retreat.

Actions of leaders of the Social-Democratic Party of Western Germany, on which American imperialists place special hopes in preparing the third world war they are hatching, speak of them being reliable servants of American monopolists.

To achieve their predatory goals, American imperialists strive to plant in all capitalist countries fascist regimes. Greatest success in this respect they achieved in Western Germany. Western Germany is flooded with Nazi organizations, militarized detachments, terrorist unions setting as their goal the physical destruction of progressive figures, in the first place members of the Communist Party of Germany, which is the single party defending national interests and democratic rights of the German people.

In this fascist "reserve" the state is headed by Hitlerite criminals, members of the Nazi party. Head of the West-German government Adenauer—leader of the Catholic party who voted in 1933 for granting Hitler emergency powers.

In Western Germany found shelter war criminals—SS child-killers, Nazi cutthroats, feverishly preparing for new crimes, to the slaughter of peoples with the gracious assistance of right-wing socialists.

SPD—is the most venal and morally decomposed party engaged in espionage and diversionary acts in favor of American imperialists. Top brass of this party consists of criminals, declared warmongers who are actually solidary with Nazis in their criminal designs. SPD has nothing in common with socialism, the signboard of which it needs for deceiving the masses. Like Hitler, leaders of right-wing German socialists propagate so-called "German socialism," protecting private property in means of production.

At the first conference of SED, W. Pieck said that the late Schumacher took upon himself the role of Judas, a traitor equal to whom is not found in German history.

Chief ideologist of SPD Schumacher—deceased, but Ollenhauer, Reuter, Neumann, Schmid, Heine, and others are living followers and executors of the political line of Schumacher. Acting in complete agreement with the fascist-Catholic party of Adenauer, they do everything to suppress the labor movement, put outside the law the Communist Party of Germany.

On November 26, 1951, Max Reimann in his speech at a press conference in Bonn said: "CPG—is the single party in Western Germany that warns West-German population of the danger threatening its existence. Thereby it leads the struggle for peace, against remilitarization, for national interests of the people. This—is the single genuinely patriotic party in Western Germany. In this struggle of our people it is ready to unite with all— Germans who are concerned about the welfare of our people, regardless of their party affiliation and worldview. Therefore CPG is the main obstacle to carrying out plans for accelerating the creation of German military formations, which with all the more persistence strive to achieve American imperialists. Therefore Dr. Adenauer and Lehr consider it necessary to ban CPG" (newspaper *Pravda* of November 29, 1951).

In connection with the sharpening of contradictions in capitalist states, as a result of the heroic struggle of democratic forces against the offensive of reaction against rights of the people, an

opposition formed in the SPD as well, speaking out with sharp criticism of the policy of Schumacherdom.

* * *

The Catholic Church and the Vatican heading it, being a relic of the Middle Ages, long ago degenerated into agents of imperialism.

Throughout its history, Catholicism played a reactionary role, speaking out against everything progressive in science and social life. The Catholic Church with the Pope at the head, defending feudalism, met the French bourgeois revolution of the late 18th century with execrations and rebellions. Revolutions of 1848 called forth an unprecedented wave of reaction and obscurantism, the inspirer of which was Pope Pius IX. When capitalism established itself, the Vatican became its primary servant. With animal malice and hatred toward the working people met the Catholic Church the Great October Socialist Revolution. A new stage in world history, characterized by the coming to power of the working class, to which the papacy harbors a special hatred, was marked on the part of the Vatican by the organization of conspiracies, terrorist acts directed against the state of working people.

The Vatican takes an active part in all gatherings of warmongers and leads a fierce struggle against international democracy, sending spies and diversants into countries of people's democracy that forever broke with imperialism. It supports all projects of American imperialism on creating a "European federation," propagating the corrupting ideology of cosmopolitanism.

The Catholic Church, hallowing capitalist slavery, will undoubtedly suffer a ignominious collapse, like all imperialist reaction. The bourgeoisie cannot fail to feel that its days are numbered; it sees that socialism in the USSR turned into reality. The struggle for socialism and democracy became the order of the day in all capitalist countries. In view of this, the bourgeoisie lives in constant fear and seeks protection from all reactionary forces.

For defense of the bourgeoisie and united today all forces of reaction—American imperialism, the Vatican, and right-wing socialists.

In the USA, England, France, Italy, and Western Germany power of capital holds mainly thanks to the alliance of these three forces. To the reactionary camp opposes now the powerful camp of democracy and socialism headed by the great Soviet Union. Communist and worker parties in all capitalist countries lead a heroic struggle against American imperialism and its agents—the Vatican and right-wing socialists.

J. V. Stalin in his historical speech at the 19th Party Congress revealed the regularities of the current stage of development of imperialism, indicated the path of struggle and victory of working masses.

"Banner of bourgeois-democratic freedoms," said J. V. Stalin, "is thrown overboard. I think that this banner you will have to raise, representatives of communist and democratic parties, and carry it forward…"

22. BERTRAND RUSSELL — SQUIRE OF IMPERIALISM

E. KOLMAN

The English Lord Bertrand Russell holds one of the leading places among the ideologues of the camp of imperialist reaction. Beginning in 1896, when, as a twenty-four-year-old attaché of the Great Britain Embassy in Berlin, B. Russell published his first little book "German Social Democracy," representing a malicious "refutation" of Marxism, he has specialized in the struggle against the ideas of socialism. At the same time, Russell always disguised his views. Thus, during the First World War, he posed as a "pacifist," which gave him the opportunity even to pass for a man who had "suffered" for his convictions. Meanwhile, he simply served the Kaiser and feared that the war might lead to revolution. In August 1952, in the American magazine "Atlantic," Russell himself stated: "I still think that the First World War was a mistake. If it had not occurred, there would be no communism... Under the Kaiser in Germany there was less oppression than now..."

An enemy of the Soviet Union, the author of a number of anti-Soviet pamphlets and articles, Russell constantly masks his propaganda with chatter about democracy and even about socialism. Russell falsely posed as a friend of the Chinese and Indian peoples, while serving in fact the interests of their bloody oppressors. Thus, in 1922, in the book "The Problem of China," he admired the regime of imperialist hirelings, the counter-revolutionary generals Zhang Zuolin and Wu Peifu, conjured the Chinese not to introduce industrialization in order

to preserve all the "charms" of the exotic (and, by the way, the profits of British importers), and persuaded them that for the sake of this it was worth sacrificing national independence.

However, the main means of camouflage served and serves Russell his philosophy. Russell engages in philosophy not only to fight dialectical materialism with its help, with the help of a variety of subjective idealism concocted by him, but also so that the practice of philosophy, science, would give him authority, which ordinary hacks from the camp of imperialist reaction make use of. And indeed, when the imperialists need to talk with the intelligentsia, they produce Russell. In doing so, they count on the fact that Russell is known as one of the figures of modern bourgeois science, the inventor of symbolic logic, and that therefore bourgeois scientists listen to his voice.

One of the most fashionable and influential figures among bourgeois reactionary philosophers, Russell has spent his whole life lecturing, journalism, writing popular pamphlets, and wrote a number of "scientific" books, such as "Principles of Mathematics," "The Analysis of Matter," "An Outline of Philosophy," "Mysticism and Logic," "A History of Western Philosophy," and others. All this bulky production is directed toward a single goal: in politics — to the struggle against the Soviet Union, against the English working class, against the liberation movement of colonial peoples; in philosophy — to the struggle against dialectical materialism, against the genuinely materialist, scientific worldview.

In the days of Munich, Russell, as was to be expected, "supported the policy of appeasement longer than the majority... 'I still consider the arguments for the policy of

appeasement very strong,'" so he wrote in the "New York Times" on February 11, 1941, that is, precisely when Hitler's bombs were bombing London, while Russell himself was prudently located (since 1938) across the ocean. Russell did not succeed in settling down in the blessed dollar paradise: in 1943 he was deprived of the right to teach in the "land of freedom," and he was forced to return to England. Why did Russell not "please" the American philistine? The Yanks — businessmen and Catholics — did not understand then that Russell's shocking "freethinking" helps this agile peddler of obscurantism entangle those social strata on which an overly clumsy, too primitive propaganda does not have the proper effect.

With the onset of the final stage of capitalism — imperialism — the task facing the bourgeoisie of ideologically subordinating the popular masses to its influence became more and more difficult. As is well known, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche already justified all the suffering, despair, and crime that this system inevitably generates by raising them to the rank of universal law. This clever trick was gradually adopted by bourgeois science. Physics, astronomy, biology, and psychology began to arrive at the most pessimistic conclusions: about the fatal doom of man, about the unknowability of the laws of nature, about the destruction of the universe, about the advantage of death over life. Political economy, history, and sociology began to prove that exploitation, unemployment, crime, aggression, and war are the innate, inherent qualities of human society. Psychology, anthropology, ethnology, and genetics began to assert that all vices are hereditary, rooted in

the very nature of man, which is determined by his race. In the same spirit of degeneration and decline, bourgeois literature and art were imbued. Bourgeois reactionary ideologues bent over backward to fulfill the task of deceiving the people, lulling their consciousness, and turning the people in the end into an incapable-of-reasoning, submissive cannon fodder.

It is known that when in Germany the proletariat entered into a clash with the bourgeoisie, the ideologue of the latter, Schopenhauer, released the booklet "Eristic, or the Art of Controversy," representing a systematic collection of the most impudent and unscrupulous tricks for achieving an advantage over an opponent in a dispute and fooling him. Schopenhauer proceeds from contempt for man, from the fact that "the majority of people are deprived of the capacity for self-reflection." "There is no view so absurd," he writes, "that people would not easily accept it as their own, if you succeed in inspiring them that it is generally accepted and widespread;" "people, if they hear something, are accustomed to think that behind a meaningless set of words and phrases some thought is hidden."

Russell not only mastered this art, but also significantly improved it, acting in the spirit of modern technology. Safe-crackers, after all, now use not a nail or a piece of wire, and not even a blowtorch, but a pneumatic drill and electric welding equipment. So acts Russell, applying his pseudo-scientific abracadabra, his gobbledygook symbolic method.

During World War II, Russell counted on the fact that the Soviet Union would emerge from the war bled white, would be forced to "abandon its communist principles," and turn into a

"sphere of influence" of English and other capital. But with every kilometer of advancement of our valiant army to the West, these hopes evaporated. And in people of Russell's type, furious hatred for everything Soviet grew with redoubled force. And when, by the end of the war, it became obvious that the Soviet Union not only did not weaken, but became even more united and powerful, hatred and malice toward it grew a hundredfold.

In October 1945, in the New York magazine "Common Sense," an article by Russell appeared titled "How to Avoid Atomic War," in which he wrote: "Now there are only two great powers — the USA and Soviet Russia, since Great Britain is completely dependent on the USA. In particular, with respect to Russia, British policy will be dictated by Washington... It is necessary to create a single army of Western powers. Now, given the existence of modern military technology, by creating such an army, there is nothing to fear from revolution."

Thus, no sooner had the war ended than Russell launched active propaganda for the idea of creating a "military Western bloc" against the Soviet Union. In this article, Russell preached the beneficence of foreign (i.e., American) conquest. "To achieve all this, the loss of national independence is inevitable," Russell declared, praising the "energetic and, perhaps, imperialist policy of the USA during those few years while other powers do not yet have the atomic bomb." The pen of Russell in those years served the policy of atomic blackmail.

Russell did everything in his power to ensure that the imperialist program of enslaving nations was implemented. In

the role of an open warmonger, he traveled around England, France, and the Benelux countries with lectures, hysterical howls about the need to immediately start a "preventive atomic war" against the USSR, and as a result of the war "create an international organization headed by the USA, without any Slavs, without any Eastern peoples, without Russians." Russell fully deserved then the nickname "philosopher of the atomic bomb," under which he is known to all progressive people. And in that period, Russell masked his warmongering activity with philosophy.

"Do you still believe in the importance of abstract philosophy?" a recent American journalist asked Russell in connection with his eightieth birthday.

"This is a difficult question," Russell answered thoughtfully. "Of course, I think that clarity of thought is important for humanity. But the world needs not philosophy, but physics, mass psychology, and political theory." Russell immediately explained what he understands by "political theory" and what kind of politics is in question. "It is necessary," he said, "...a world government with unlimited control of armies, it is necessary to adapt the economy of Asian and African countries to the US economy, it is necessary, finally, to stop population growth... Asia must learn from the West to control the birth rate, otherwise poverty and hunger will flood us... Our propaganda must be directed mainly to saying: Asians, Russians are white..." The laurels of Goebbels give no rest, apparently, to Russell. Propaganda of racial hatred, neo-Malthusianism, cosmopolitanism — such is the theory of Russell's politics.

Despite all the efforts of Russell and his associates, the philosophy of the working class — dialectical materialism — is spreading more and more, and the movement of working people armed with the scientific theory of Marxism is growing ever wider. This is forced to be admitted even by the unlucky "refuter" of Marxism. In August 1952, to a question from an American journalist for the magazine "Atlantic": "Who, in your opinion, is the most influential philosopher?" — Russell wrote: "If he can be called a philosopher, then it is Marx. I can hardly name him as such, but I suppose that he has to be included in the list of philosophers, and he certainly has more influence than anyone else."

Fifty-eight years ago, Russell definitively "refuted" Marx, then year after year dutifully "refuted" him, and Marx, as Russell is forced to admit, exerts more influence on minds than any other philosopher. Such is the pitiful result of Russell's activity. But the more hopeless the cause of the Russells, the greater the persistence with which they fight against Marxism-Leninism.

Bertrand Russell was originally an adherent of absolute idealism, fascinated by Plato, and then Hegelianism. But soon he put a cross over the requirement of integrity of world perception and plunged into subjective idealism and eclecticism: he lingered a bit on Leibniz, then on Berkeley, Hume, Kant, and Comte, gave Schopenhauer and Nietzsche their due, took a decent portion from Mach, and did not disdain to borrow even from such eclectics as James and the American "neo-realists" Perry and Holt. But none of them satisfied him. He criticized all of them, striving to make their reactionary

theories even more reactionary. Even the Machian "elements of the world" Russell considered dangerous.

In 1921, he declared that there is neither matter, nor spirit, nor "neutral" "elements of the world," but there are only "logical constructions." Russell "corrected" Machism in the direction of even greater evasiveness, even greater piling up of pseudo-scientific props. "If I say 'this is red,' this does not mean that there is some red object, and this does not even mean that there is some particular sensation possessing the quality of red. This means only that there is a certain logical construction — here there is redness" ("The Analysis of Mind"), asserts Russell in the spirit of the most vulgar subjective idealism. "To say that John hums is simply to say that humming, of which we are speaking, is part of a whole series, which (series) is John. There is no logical impossibility in humming being met as an isolated phenomenon, not forming part of any of the series called our personality... Matter is a convenient formula to describe what happens where it is not... It is necessary to throw away the term 'consciousness' and replace it with the term 'reactivity,' then disputes about idealism and realism will cease..." (ibid.). Humming without a hummer, action without matter, psyche without consciousness, thinking without a thinker — these are the "latest," but in fact long-obsolete achievements of idealism!

Russell's philosophy — logicism, logical atomism — is one of the varieties of modern positivism; it possesses the same characteristic features as "neo-realism," "neo-empiricism," "physicalism," and however else various neo-positivist schools may call themselves. Like them, Russell's philosophy proceeds

from the subjective experience of sensations. Like them, this philosophical movement considers the task of science to be not the explanation of phenomena, but only their "description." Like all positivist schools, logical atomism strives for the abolition of philosophy, to replace it with the so-called "logic of science," trying to replace content with empty form.

The inventor of this philosophy, copying without any constraint from Kant, declares that "logical analysis" introduces "order" into subjective experience, and this order does not reflect the objective order of nature, but is a construction of our thinking.

At a time when capitalism has irretrievably lost its autocratic sway over the whole world, when it suffers defeat after defeat, when both in economics, and in politics, and in the sphere of culture it suffers collapse, Russell covers up with pseudo-scientific phraseology his struggle against the progressive ideology of the proletariat and working people, the only class capable of saving humanity. To the aid of modern fascism, along with other idealist currents, comes positivism of various directions, which enjoys today the greatest respect among "respectable" bourgeois philosophers and natural scientists. It disguises itself as science, and is therefore one of the most dangerous forms of idealism.

When Machism, denying the existence of atoms and molecules, passing them off as functions, as "working hypotheses," was refuted by the development of physics, the Machians dressed up their philosophy in a "logical" outfit instead of a "physical" one. Here is the true motive that forced Russell to engage in

mathematical logic, to develop his method of "logical construction" and his philosophy of "logical atomism."

In this philosophy, juggling the words "facts," "reality," or "experience," a denial of objective reality, objectively existing laws, and causality is contained, while mathematical and mathematical-like abstractions are understood as "free" creations of the mind. If science ought only to describe phenomena, and not to cognize the laws of nature, as these idealists argue, then for this purpose mathematical functions are quite sufficient. Finally, if a worldview is a simple sum of individual scientific disciplines, then the method of the most abstract of them — the method of mathematics — becomes the universal method of cognition.

The social and political sense of this fetishization of mathematics, as well as the whole sense of neo-positivism, consists in the fact that "reality," which is a "logical construction," makes it possible to consider our ideas as just as "real" entities as the things and phenomena of the material world. Thus disappears the distinction between truth and falsehood, thanks to which in the end the possibility is obtained to "justify" the policy of the imperialists. This "philosophical" movement fulfills its function by reflecting the objectivity of scientific knowledge, widely spreading sophistry, and paving the way for anti-scientific views that poison the consciousness of working people.

Evaluating Russell's logical works, one should expose the self-advertising and genuine American bluff hugely blown up around them. Russell is passed off as the "creator" of symbolic logic, as a "reformer" of logic, even as a "revolutionary" in

logic. However, not to mention the rudiments with which we meet in ancient philosophy, and the numerous subsequent attempts, the symbolic method was developed in logic as early as Boole in his "An Investigation of the Laws of Thought" (1847). Everything essential that is in Russell's symbolic logic is entirely contained in the works of Gottlob Frege, in his "Begriffsschrift" (1879). As for the understanding of quantitative number as a class of equinumerous classes, this idea was entirely borrowed by Russell from G. Cantor (1851).

In his studies of the paradoxes of infinity, Russell is also not original. The outstanding Czech mathematician and philosopher Bernard Bolzano engaged in them as far back as Galileo, examining them in detail in his "Paradoxes of the Infinite" (1848). And to achieve what Russell was striving for — to eliminate the paradoxes of infinity from mathematics — he still failed to do. And he could not succeed, since the formal-logical method, representing motion in the form of a combination of states of rest, does not eliminate dialectical contradiction, but, in the words of Lenin, only "covers it up, pushes it aside, screens it, curtains it off." That is why logicism inevitably suffers collapse, as do other main schools of modern idealist philosophy of mathematics — intuitionism and formalism, an eclectic compromise between which logicism is.

Of course, we have no claims against logical analysis, against mathematical logic, and there can be none. To blame them for those tricks that every Russell performs with them, to hold them responsible for those "conclusions" at which all sorts of Russells arrive, would be simply absurd. It would be the same as if we took up arms against non-Euclidean geometry because,

"referring" to it, spiritualists "prove" the existence of a world of spirits. We have no grounds to object to the use of symbols in logic, just as we do not object to their application in mathematics, chemistry, etc.

When Lenin in "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" criticizes Helmholtz's "theory of symbols" and Plekhanov's "theory of hieroglyphs," he speaks not of the impermissibility of using symbols, but of the fact that it is wrong to consider our perceptions and representations as symbols, that is, arbitrary signs that have no connection with the world of real things, which they denote. And in the abstract of "The Science of Logic," Lenin, making notes of Hegel on symbols, notes that against them in general one can have nothing. But "against *any symbolism* it must be said that it is always a 'convenient means of getting by without comprehending, without grasping, without justifying the definitions of concepts.'" And precisely this is the point in philosophy.

Lenin speaks against those who replace philosophical concepts that reveal the essence of a given phenomenon with designations that obscure the essence of things and define nothing.

The epistemological "conclusions" that the Russells receive as if by means of symbolic logic, in fact date back to the 18th century, from Bishop Berkeley, from medieval scholastics, from the Platonists, and even from the Pythagoreans. These rotten ideas pass off a means of cognizing the real world — our thinking — as the essence of reality, as the sole object of science. And they persist only because they serve the

exploiting classes. These ideas cover up their low deceit with terminological gobbledygook taken on loan from logic.

Russell is guided by his principle: "Wherever possible, substitute logical constructions for unknown entities." This principle is intended primarily to replace such, according to Russell, "unknown" entities as matter and consciousness with his own, by his own admission, "logical fictions." With this goal, Russell builds his logicism. He tries to prove that mathematics is an integral part of formal logic. In doing so, he gives the following definition of mathematics: "Mathematics is the science in which we never know what we are talking about, nor whether what we are saying is true."

Indeed, if mathematics were, as Russell asserts, a system of formal identities in which nothing is stated about the material world, then mathematicians would not know what they are talking about, because the content would be uncertain. And if the statements of mathematics were, as Russell proclaims, unconditional truths about "universals" and "relations," incapable of being either refuted or confirmed by practice, then, of course, mathematicians would not know whether what they say is true. For truth is a consequence dependent on the truth of premises, which, in turn, would depend then only on the content assigned to them by the mathematicians themselves.

To derive mathematics from logic, Russell had to solve two tasks. First of all, to prove that cardinal numbers can be defined exclusively in terms of "pure logic." Then, that all mathematics can be reduced to arithmetic, to the mathematics of cardinal numbers. To solve the first task, Russell applies the "principle

of abstraction": instead of considering "the property common to given objects," he considers "a class consisting of elements that have a given relationship to one another." As you see, the trick is very convenient for a subjective idealist. The ill-fated mathematical objects and their properties have disappeared, leaving only logically constructed elements of a class and their relations, and in the future the very concept of "class" is dispensed with.

But even with the use of this trick, here is what the definition of the number 1 looks like:

$$(F = 1) =_{df} (\exists x) \cdot (x \varepsilon F) \cdot (y) \, [(y \varepsilon F) \supset (y = x)]$$

This reads like this: "Class **F** has the number **1**," means that there exists such an **x** that if class **F** has the number **x**, then any **y** is the number of this class **F**, then it is identical with the number **x**.

One needs only to reflect on this definition for its untenable nature to become obvious, despite all of Russell's artifices. We will not even quibble over the fact that here the simple is defined with the help of the complex. But after all, this definition of the number 1 presupposes that there exists **x** such that it has class **F**, that is, that class **F** is not empty, that is, that

the number **x** is at least equal to 1. If a matchbox must contain one match, it in any case must not be empty. Consequently, we must first define the concept "at least 1," but without the concept 1 it cannot be defined! Before us is the most ordinary vicious circle along which Russell leads us.

Thus, contrary to the boastful statements of Russell himself, he failed to cope with the "problem of the finite" — to construct the concept of cardinal number formally-logically. Even less did he succeed in solving the "problem of the infinite," reducing with the help of the proposed "theory of types" all mathematics to cardinal numbers, formally-logically substantiating continuity, the continuum. But thereby his attempts to reduce mathematics to logic, which would be a "universal logical calculus, independent of specific areas to which it is applied, suitable in all possible worlds," failed.

We have just seen in what sense (and with what stretch!) the concept of cardinal number can be "obtained" purely logically. Obviously, this path simply presupposes that we already have this concept, to which we arrived not by way of "logical experience," but derived it through abstraction from centuries-old material practice. Therefore, this "purely logical" path by no means gives the possibility to derive new mathematical concepts and discover new theorems. It is unable to explain why we chose for mathematical concepts precisely these, and not other combinations of logical concepts, nor why mathematical concepts are applicable to practice. For this is a purely deductive path, whereas mathematics, contrary to the assertions of idealists, is by no means a purely deductive

science. As in all other sciences, induction plays an extremely important role in it.

In his logical manipulations, Russell set the goal of "liberating logical analysis from ordinary grammar." Let us explain with one example what this means.

In language and in generally accepted formal logic, in full accord with the practice of everyday life and with scientific thinking, conditional judgments are used only in the case where the consequence inevitably follows from the condition on the basis of some general premise. But in Russell's logic, and with his light touch in all modern symbolic logic, we find the following types of conditional judgments:

1) "From the statement that two times two is four, it follows that horses eat hay";

2) "From the statement that two times two is five, it follows that horses eat hay";

3) "From the statement that two times two is four, it follows that horses eat meat";

4) "From the statement that two times two is five, it follows that horses eat meat."

Of all these four types of judgments, it is asserted that they make sense! The third judgment is considered false, whereas the other three are true! Hard to give a brighter example of the marasmus of bourgeois philosophy, which has reached in its contortions such complete emptiness!

However, in Russell's case this is not simply nonsense. Like other similar contortions, this is a calculated device. Driving formal logic to absurdity, Russell eliminates all sense from thinking, in order then to obtain the opportunity to juggle sophisms: between capitalism and socialism, between war and peace there is no difference.

But Russell does not stop at this. Having "liberated" language from grammar, he deals with the vocabulary of language, with language as a whole. In his article in the magazine "Mind" (vol. 40) he outlines a scheme of an "ideal language," consisting of logically corresponding names, although incomprehensible to the listener, but understandable to the one who pronounces them. An example can serve as a sentence in this language, which we are forced to quote verbatim, since in English too this "phrase" means absolutely nothing. "Words" of Russell's language resemble English demonstrative pronouns. Here it is: "This thet thot." This should mean: "That which the speaker knows, has some relation to that which the speaker knows, being acquainted with something else." This new emptiness of the "learned" lord resembles the abstruse word-creation of futurists — "nichevoks":

Dyr bul shchyl ubeshchur skum vy so buerlez

The "language" of Russell surpasses even the infamous "Basic English," the English language artificially simplified so that colonial peoples — Malays, Zulus, and others — would quickly learn to understand words of command from overseers and bosses without, however, gaining access to understanding the dangerous literature of white "sahibs."

Thus, language, which is a tool with which people exchange thoughts and achieve mutual understanding, is turned by Russell and similar obscurantists into the inarticulate mumbling of a solipsist-maniac who considers the world to be his "logical construction."

His method of "logical analysis" Bertrand Russell applies also to physics, cosmology, and psychology. As suits a Machian, and all the more a Machian of American minting, he cynically declares that "common sense imagines that when it sees a table, it sees a table. This crude misconception" ("ABC of Relativity," 1925). "Instead of saying 'I see a cat,' it will probably be more correct to say 'I perceive an area of energy tensor of matter in which known light processes occur'" ("The Analysis of Mind").

The method of "logical construction," all this poetry devised to "reduce reality" to "atomic propositions," all this "pure deduction," being through and through subjectivist, inevitably leads to the impossibility of cognizing the world, to the denial of objective reality, objective laws, to solipsism. However, no incantations and symbolic formulas are able to abolish Russell's laws of moving matter, just as they are powerless to abolish or change the laws of social development, toward which all his efforts are directed. And the only correct, truly scientific point of view on the laws of science is the point of view of Marxism, which understands the laws of natural sciences and the laws of social sciences as a reflection of objective processes occurring independently of human consciousness. Therefore, no matter how hard Russell tries, his

"pure deduction" will not help either him or his followers to create at least one scientific law.

Indeed, let us see how the "method of logical construction" looks in action. Not long ago, Lord Russell decided to gladden the world with the discovery of a new, his own principle of induction. In 1948 at the International Congress in Amsterdam, he delivered a report "Postulates of Scientific Inference," in which he overturned the one applied at every step, both in daily life and in experimental natural science, the principle of induction. Using a tested device, Russell, like a true student of Schopenhauer, simply cheated.

The principle of induction, as usually formulated, says Russell, is false. They say that if in **n** cases phenomenon **A** is accompanied by phenomenon **B**, and no cases are known when phenomenon **A** is not accompanied by phenomenon **B**, the probability that also in the **(n+1)**-th case phenomenon **A** will be accompanied by phenomenon **B** increases with the number of cases **n**. But suppose we observe several times in a row some quantity that for the x-th time takes the value y. "Then we," says Russell, "can construct a formula — and even an infinite number of formulas — **y = f(x)** such that they will be true for all cases **n**. Nevertheless, no one will expect that the quantity for **n + 1** times turns out to be that which is obtained by this formula" ("Proceedings of the Congress," Vol. 2).

In order to make it easier for himself to refute the principle, Russell replaced it with another, omitting a crucial circumstance, namely, that the set of conditions **C** under which in **n** cases phenomenon **A** was accompanied by phenomenon **B** must be preserved in the future.

With an increase in the number n, let it be by only one, the conditions for which formula **f(x)** was constructed change, and consequently, there are no grounds to expect that in the future **y** will satisfy this formula. Another matter, if formula **f(x)** was constructed not with the help of all **n** data, but contained only **p** parameters, where the number **p** is less than **m**. Then, the smaller this number **p** was relative to **n** and the smaller was in the interval from **1** to **n** the deviation of the calculated **y** from the observed, the with greater probability one could expect that in **n + 1** cases this deviation will not turn out to be large, but again, only then when conditions that existed before are preserved. Whether they will be preserved or not, this in each individual case must be clarified by concrete investigation. That is precisely how the principle of induction is applied in natural science, and everything dispenses nicely without invented by Russell comical postulates that ought to replace this principle.

Russell wanted to convince his listeners and readers that the principle of induction in natural science dispenses without finding and studying the real connection between individual observed cases, without investigation of causes giving rise to them, without clarification of their origin and development, that is, dispenses without reference to the material world.

Russell does all this with the help of crude sophisms. All of Russell's postulates turn out to be empty, and Russell himself realizes this. He declares that his postulates inevitably lead to solipsism, and with frantic cynicism adds that "if anyone starts to support solipsism, I am forced to admit that he cannot be

refuted, being extremely skeptical regarding the seriousness of his convictions."

In the sphere of social sciences, an ardent hater of Marxism, Russell, naturally, does not accept Marx's political economy. He preaches a hodgepodge of the reactionary theory of marginal utility of Jevons and various nonsensical economic ideas of guild socialism, syndicalism, and anarchism. He denies that capitalism led to the concentration of capital, on the grounds that the number of holders of shares increased; asserts that the root of evil lies not in capitalism, but in technology, in industrialism; praises craft handiwork and a backward agrarian system — in a word, offers the same rotten commodity that the "theorists"-economists of Hitlerism tried to sell.

And Russell acts as all eventually lied-out "refuters" of Marxism do. He does everything in his power to undermine in the masses the conviction of the inevitability of social progress, to shake their faith in the strength of organization, in the collective, to force them to doubt the possibility of scientific cognition of the objective laws of social development and mastering them for its radical restructuring.

As for historical materialism, Russell "destroys" it, substituting beforehand, again on the old pattern, vulgar economic determinism. What is, according to Russell, the determining, main cause of social development? Very simple — "blind instinct, the passion for power."

Speaking of "power," Russell understands by it allegedly biological, eternally inherent passion in man. Since for him, as a subjectivist, man moves society, Russell considers this

passion as the main social driving force. Of course, all this is nonsense; no such instinct exists. But what kind of power does Russell preach not without reason? For Russell and his class, power is an end in itself, for it coincides with private property, exploitation, accumulation of maximum profits. But why does he pass it off as an eternal, fatal principle of the very existence of the human race?

A heap of sophisms upon sophisms, Russell declares an all-embracing role for the "instinct of power." Nothing can be done to get rid of the fatal consequences of this "instinct," or, as Russell expresses it, "to achieve a more equal distribution of power." The meaning of this philosophy lies in the fact that power must eternally remain in the hands of a handful of exploiters.

All these are, of course, only new variations of the "will to live" of Schopenhauer and the "will to power" of Nietzsche, this philosophical gospel of Hitlerism. From there are borrowed the revelations of Russell about the eternity of war and exploitation:

"We cannot destroy the extraordinary power of the state and private property," writes Russell. "We must admit that the world is governed by a evil spirit, and wait until what now few think, many will think" ("Why Men Fight," 1930).

Do not dare to fight for the elimination of modern slaveholding, submit to the inevitable, preaches Russell to the peoples. What about war? With it, not only is it impossible to finish, but one should not finish. "I firmly believe," writes Russell, "that nature demands war and other destructive forms

of human struggle." Russell goes as far as monstrous lies and slander against the peoples: "The people love war," "...From the earliest days up to the present, war was the main engine of society," lies Russell. Right then and there he lets slip why he needs to falsify history and lie about the beneficence of war: "Only war can prevent an all-embracing victory of communism" ("The Impact of Science on Society," 1951).

The "theory" asserting the eternity of war is an arch-old fake. Depicting war as a phenomenon of a biological nature, allegedly caused by the animal nature of man, Russell pretends that it is unknown to him that wars are caused by the class division of society and that therefore with the disappearance of classes, wars will disappear too. That is why Russell, to "prove" that "even socialism will not put an end to war," goes deep into the "sociology" of ants. According to Russell, "people differ little from ants, since this concerns their instincts" ("Proposed Roads to Freedom," 1919). If Hobbes, generalizing the beastly nature of modern-to-him promoter bourgeoisie, painted man as a wolf, Russell, well acquainted with modern billionaire-octopuses, turns for comparison not to four-legged predators, but to arthropods located at a significantly lower stage of the biological ladder.

"We hate communists," says Russell, "and we have for this, of course, various grounds... Main, we hate them because we fear them, they threaten us" ("The Springs of Human Action," "Atlantic," March 1952). The fear of a class of parasites of losing its power fills its very heart with hatred for communism. This is understandable even without Russell's admission.

Russell boasts that he has "a lot of aristocracy" and that he is an adherent of the "cult of idleness" ("My Mental Development," 1946). Hence it is clear why Russell sheds tears over the "tragedy of the minority (i.e., exploiters — *E. K.*), oppressed by the majority."

Russell speaks out against socialist planning because it "restricts freedom"; he does not complete the thought, of course, whose freedom, but it is clear that it is about the notorious "freedom of enterprise," that is, about protecting the "rights" of exploiters. Russell directly states that he personally "does not accept the Bolshevik philosophy because of its attitude toward labor," since his ideal and the ideal of his class is, as he states with cynicism, "to force others to work for oneself."

Not surprisingly, such a "democrat," just as the German fascists did, tries in every way to slander genuine democracy.

Can one expect anything else from a propagandist of a "single military government of the USA," which will "establish white terror in the whole world"?

Russell, of course, is a cosmopolitan: he considers love for the motherland, patriotism, an "irrational emotion of the tribe," and the state a "geographical unit." It is understandable why for preaching the robber ideology of imperialism, Russell with one hand cooks up dithyrambs to Zionism (in the magazine "New Palestine," 1943), which is a tool of imperialist intelligence, and with the other — pogrom anti-Semitic pasquinades (in the book "History of Western Philosophy," 1945).

Russell previously spread quite a bit, as fits a colonizer, regarding the need for the Chinese and Indians (for example, in the article "International Significance of the Indian Problem," in the magazine "Free World," 1943) to abandon their national independence. As an ardent supporter of the policy of "appeasement," he, naturally, welcomed the seizure of Czechoslovakia by fascist Germany. Now he "theoretically" justified also the need for all small nations to abandon their national sovereignty:

"Small states cannot be independent in the economic sense of the word; neither reason nor virtue can prevent war, until one or another strong power dominates over the whole world" ("Values in the Atomic Age," 1950).

And into "small states" the Englishman Bertrand Russell, without batting an eye, now includes Great Britain: "We, the English, have no possibility, nor sense to resist the Americans, if we want to preserve civilization," writes Russell, covering up his servility with false references to "civilization." Here are the frank statements of Russell:

"As for politics, here the most important thing is to create an international government — a measure that, as I expect, will be accomplished by establishing the world domination of the United States of America." Or even more cynically:

"From now on, America has become the bulwark of capitalism, the main hope of those who fear the approach of socialism and communism, and most importantly, it promises stability among those kaleidoscopic transformations that shake the inhabitants of Europe and Asia" (ibid.).

Can there remain in anyone a doubt about the true nature of this subject, who with faith and truth served not out of fear, but out of pandering to the interests of Kaiser's Germany, British colonial regime, and finally, Wall Street, but invariably with deadly hatred for working people?

Naturally, his "philosophy of history" is deeply reactionary and vulgar. He declares that historical science does not exist, history is a chain of accidents, it is made by individual personalities, no historical laws exist and cannot be.

"The only thing that can be learned from history is that there are no historical laws that have force," he proclaims. This vulgar, decayed philosophy of heroes making history, chaos ruling history, long ago refuted by science, Marxism-Leninism. But it fully corresponds to the general "principle" of Russell, which states that "everything that cannot be derived deductively is uncertain," that the very existence of the external world is a "prejudice," that "any science is only a heap of paralogisms."

"History is not a science, and it can only be made to appear as a science through falsifications and omissions" ("Freedom vs. Organization"), cynically writes Russell. This is true, insofar as it applies to Russell himself and similar "philosophers of history." It is known that all spiritual brethren of Russell zealously engage in the falsification of history, and Russell tries to create a convenient philosophy justifying the activity of these falsifiers and counterfeiters of history.

"If Henry VIII had not fallen in love with Anne Boleyn, the USA would not exist. For thanks to this, England broke with

papacy and, consequently, could not recognize the division by popes of America between the Spaniards and Portuguese."

To this anecdote reduces the history of the emergence of the struggle of the American people for independence.

"I believe that if a hundred people in the XVIII century had been killed in childhood, the modern world would not exist. And among these people Galileo was the main one" ("The Scientific Outlook"). Had Galileo not been born, there would be no modern history. The same is said about Bismarck:

"I do not believe that if Bismarck had died in childhood, the history of Europe over the last 70 years would be at all like the one that actually took place." Here is what kind of, with permission, "history" Russell recognizes, what kind of "history" he would like to teach people!

This reactionary, having nothing in common with science, subjectivist conception has long been smashed. Society develops according to its objective laws independent of the will of people. And great historical personalities are precisely those who, having cognized or at least foreseen these laws, act in their direction. Only recognition of the objective regularity of social development, the decisive role in it of the popular masses, and not kings and generals, of the mode of production, and not social ideas, can yield a correct representation, corresponding to reality, of the laws of history of society, and this is the only scientific representation given by historical materialism.

Although we have already touched upon Russell's statements on the role of science, we have to turn once more to this

question, since, so to speak, in its most finished form it is set forth in the above-mentioned brochure "The Impact of Science on Society" — three lectures delivered by Russell in 1950 in the auditorium of Columbia University in New York for dealers and large bourgeois specialists. This is one of the most tricky, cleverly disguised works of Russell. Filthy attacks against Marxism, against socialism, against the labor movement, trade unions, and the right to strike, not to mention the slander against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy — all this reactionary propaganda is carried out in them surreptitiously. Posing as a champion of science, Russell preaches that science, displacing old superstitions and prejudices, allegedly replaces them with others. Thus, Russell strives to discredit science. For the calamities of unemployment, hunger, war, etc., asserts Russell, it is not capitalism that is to blame, but "industrialism," that is, science and technology. So Russell defends capitalism and again tries to discredit science. To save civilization, in Russell's opinion, it is necessary "to establish throughout the world the same even distribution of economic and political power as has already been achieved in the West." It is completely clear that the Russells would like to extend to the whole world capitalist orders of the American model and turn the whole world into a colony of English and American imperialists. But on this Russell does not limit himself. In the name of "saving civilization," he preaches outright cannibalism, demanding to "introduce birth control" and reduce population, primarily in Russia and South-Eastern Asia. Before us in all its repulsive nakedness is impudent preaching of neo-Malthusianism, the resurrection of filthy Hitlerite plans, propaganda of

misanthropy, a call for any crimes against the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, the peoples of India. Russell offers also "to destroy the sovereignty of nations and forcibly establish a world government."

Regarding the destruction of national sovereignty, Russell clearly lags behind. He presents the matter as if we were talking about a project that should only begin to be carried out. In fact, as is well known, the bosses of the Russells have labored quite a bit to deprive the West European countries of national sovereignty.

"The principle of unrestricted national sovereignty, guarded by nineteenth-century liberalism, and in our time cherished by the Kremlin, must be abandoned. Means must be found to subordinate relations between nations to legal rules, so that a separate nation would not be — as is the case now — a judge in its own cause," — thus Russell blabbed out here that the defense of national sovereignty is now the concern of the Great Soviet Union, that the bourgeoisie has openly broken with those principles of liberalism with which it united in the XIX century.

"Now not a trace remains of the 'national principle.' Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard," — said I. V. Stalin in his historic speech at the XIX Party Congress.

Getting carried away, getting confused, repeating endlessly his own old nonsense, Russell reveals also in these latest revelations of his all his ideological squalor, all the senile

helplessness of the thoughts of his doomed-to-perish class. But with all this, he still does not forget to hit his American colleague and competitor John Dewey. Russell criticizes Dewey for subjectivism (Russell of all people!), for non-recognition of the truth of fact, keeping silent, of course, about what Russell himself, like all Machians, understands by "fact" as "fact of experience," sensation. To slander Marxism once again, Russell accuses Dewey of a mortal sin: between the understanding of truth in the pragmatist Dewey and the Marxists there is allegedly no difference, since both here and there the criterion of truth is practice (that pragmatism understands "practice" just as subjectively as Machism understands "experience," about this, understandably, Russell is silent).

But the main thing in this filthy brochure is different. Russell step by step leads the reader to an alternative: in the world there are two forces — the USSR and the USA; either they will clash in an atomic war or the domination of the USA will save civilization. This is a typical "theory" of warmongers, which Russell obsessively repeats in his recent opuses — "New Hopes for a Changing World" and "Dictionary of Mind, Matter, and Morals," published in 1952 in New York.

As for the establishment of a world government, in the name of creating which nations ought to abandon national sovereignty, Russell admits that this government, that is, the power of Wall Street, can be established and can hold only by violence and deception, because nations voluntarily will not want to go into bondage to American monopolists. The magnates of imperialism have reason to fall into despair, remembering

Hitler's experience of establishing world domination. "One must not fail to take into account factors of the past. And facts say that as a result of the First World War Russia fell away from the system of capitalism, and as a result of the Second World War a whole number of countries in Europe and Asia fell away from the system of capitalism. There is every reason to assume that a third world war will cause the collapse of the world capitalist system."

These, so to speak, perspectives of war and its consequences, if it is forced upon nations by warmongers, aggressors (G. Malenkov, "Report to the 19th Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)").

Does it make sense to enter into an analysis of the remaining aspects of Russell's "worldview"?

The basis of his ethics is beastly bourgeois individualism. "Rules of morality must be tested by whether they lead to the goals we desire. I speak, to goals we desire, and not to goals we ought to desire." Thus, Russell only repeats the "morality" of the Jesuit fathers: the end justifies the means, and the end is everything that their imperialist masters desire.

This is the finished "morality" of extreme bourgeois individualism, an exposition of the rules of conduct of the "blond beast" of Nietzsche, and along with it of SS men, all the same with a swastika or with another, more modern stamp.

Slander against human nature, Russell endows people with traits inherent in representatives of his own class — the degenerating bourgeoisie:

"At the present time, the most malicious and most dangerous animal with which man has to fight is man..." Speaking of hatred, envy, malice, and all kinds of cruelty, Russell writes: "...our mind allows us to intensify these emotions to dimensions that wild beasts do not have" ("Authority and the Individual").

From this, Russell concludes that "the world needs a philosophy or a religion that would support life... It is necessary to introduce into our existence something eternal, something that can be imagined living in the heavens, far from discord and failures and the devouring-life maw of time. Contact with this eternal world — let it be only the world of our imagination — brings appeasement that cannot be completely destroyed by the struggle with the shortcomings of our modern life" ("Principles of Social Reconstruction"). Behind all these contortions and hypocrisy hides one thing: faith in God is necessary to Russell and his masters in order to keep millions of working people under the yoke.

The philosophy of Bertrand Russell — logicism, logical atomism, logical empiricism, neutral monism, logical neo-positivism, empirical liberalism, and whatever other nicknames it may take — belongs to the most reactionary varieties of subjective idealism. Not differing in essence from the priestcraft of Berkeley, it, following the Machism exposed by Lenin at the beginning of our century, tries to hide its true essence. However, in full accord with the horribly progressing economic, political, and cultural decay of capitalism, in this philosophy everything negative that only gave birth to the Berkeleyan-Machian current reached its limit.

In Russell's philosophy, subjective idealism is brought to the extreme line — to solipsism. It dressed its pathetic ideas in the most charlatan outfits of gobbledygook, scholastically refined formalism, and sophistical symbolism. Deceit and hypocrisy it made its law. Claiming "scientific nature," it preaches the unknowability of nature, helplessness before mysterious social forces, and declares the human soul mysterious, mystical. Pretending to be against metaphysics, it denies the absoluteness of truth, denies its concreteness and historicity, and worships fetishes of abstract "eternal" formulas created by itself.

The genuine task of this philosophy is the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, against dialectical materialism, against the movement of the popular masses for peace, for socialism, for national independence. It conducts this struggle without disdaining any means, selflessly applying lies, falsification of science, and slander against the Soviet Union. Masking this sole goal of its pseudo-scientific phraseology, it is incapable of giving anything positive to science.

Russell's philosophy declares the engine of human society to be animal instinct; war — the highest stage of development; unbridled egoism — the supreme moral principle. It calls for a new world war, to a war against the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp, to the use of the most inhuman means of mass extermination of people. It tries to inspire peoples with the need to abandon independent existence, strives to inspire them with the usefulness of voluntary self-surrender into slavery to magnates of capital eager for maximum profits. It justifies the violence and atrocities of aggressors, propagandizes their insane plan to establish a "world empire,"

covering its vile lie as if it were a "path to entering a period of peace and prosperity."

Bertrand Russell, an inveterate enemy of working people, an experienced and agile agent of imperialism, serves as one of the main restorers of these refurbished "theories" of Hitlerites. It is clear that Russell's philosophy has only one perspective — it will fall onto the dump of history along with that system which it serves. The only scientific philosophy of dialectical materialism helps and will help humanity to finally free itself from all forms of oppression, to build on scientific foundations its happy community, and to achieve ever more grandiose conquests over nature.

23. MATERIALIST DIELECTICS AS A CREATIVELY DEVELOPING SCIENCE

M. M. ROZENTAL

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have repeatedly emphasized that Marxism as a whole, and dialectical and historical materialism as its philosophical foundation, is a creatively developing science. Nothing is so alien to the Marxist worldview as dogmatism, as the notion of unchangeable truths given once and for all, petrified truths. From the very first days of its inception, Marxism waged a struggle against metaphysical ossification of thought—against Proudhon's detachment of concepts and categories from concrete, developing reality; against the Dühringian theory of "eternal truths"; against opportunists of all stripes who dogmatically deadened the living, inextricably linked-with-reality teaching of Marxism. Marx and Engels repeatedly warned their followers that Marxist philosophy should not be treated "after the manner of Hegelianism," as a means for artificially constructing "theories" and "systems" without regard for the changes undergoing in reality. *Our teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action*—this proposition the great founders of Marxism never tired of repeating.

Developing the teachings of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin also waged a fierce struggle against the misunderstanding of the creative character of Marxist philosophy and Marxism as a whole. Lenin considered the proposition that Marxism is not a dogma, but a guide to action, to be classic, expressing a vital aspect of Marxism with remarkable power. "...By missing it

(i.e., this aspect. — *M. R.*)," wrote Lenin, "we make Marxism one-sided, ugly, dead, we strip it of its living soul, we undermine its fundamental theoretical foundations—dialectics, the doctrine of all-sided and full-of-contradictions historical development; we undermine its connection with the definite practical tasks of the epoch, which may change with every new turn of history" (*Works*, Vol. 17, p. 20).

Like Lenin, Stalin from the first steps of his activity and up to his recent speeches fought against dogmatism. He called dogmatism the most dangerous enemy of Marxism. Waging a struggle against Mensheviks, Kautskyites, anarchists, Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and other enemies of the proletariat, Lenin and Stalin comprehensively developed Marxism, giving it the form that corresponds to the new historical conditions of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the construction of a socialist and communist society.

It goes without saying that a creatively developing character belongs not to one or another separate side of Marxism, but to all its sides, all its constituent parts forming a single, integral, inseparable whole—philosophy, political economy, scientific socialism. Engels pointed out that, for example, philosophical materialism assumes a new form, a new shape with every new epoch-making discovery in science in the development of human knowledge. This indication applies in full measure to the dialectical method—this powerful instrument of Marxist cognition and revolutionary practice. The dialectical method also cannot fail to take on a new form, a new shape in connection with new data of science, with new historical conditions for the development of society.

Of course, unlike other sciences studying particular concrete phenomena of nature and society and their laws, philosophy deals with the most general laws of reality. Therefore, it seems that its concepts and categories are unchanging in character. But this only seems so; in fact, even the most general laws of nature, human society, and thought investigated by Marxist philosophy do not appear and cannot manifest themselves identically, in the same way under any historical conditions. Therefore, major turning points in the development of society, as well as new achievements of science, give rise to the need to specify and develop the categories and concepts of philosophical science.

Speaking of dialectics, Lenin persistently emphasized that it is a living, developing doctrine, continuously enriched through creative contact with practice, with developing reality. In his famous fragment "On the Question of Dialectics," Lenin defines dialectics as "living, many-sided (with the number of sides eternally increasing) knowledge, with an infinite number of shades of every approach and approximation to reality..." (*Philosophical Notebooks*, p. 330. 1947). This definition is remarkable in that it reveals the necessity and regularity of the historical development of materialist dialectics.

The strength and power of the Marxist method of cognition are revealed not only in that it helps to correctly approach reality and, consequently, to correctly solve scientific and practical problems, but also in that, in living interaction with practice, it is itself continuously enriched, specified, and reveals its new sides and shades that make it an even more refined tool of cognition and practical activity.

The present article, attempting to show materialist dialectics as a creatively developing science, does not pretend, of course, to illuminate this problem in all its aspects. Its goal is more modest: to show the creative character of the Marxist method only in certain questions and especially to emphasize the significance of this problem under the conditions of socialism, when life itself demands a new approach to understanding the regularities of development.

1. Creative Development and Enrichment of the Content of Materialist Dialectics as a Science

Materialist dialectics was created by Marx and Engels on the basis of a critical reworking of all that was valuable in philosophical thought at preceding stages, based on the generalization of social development and the achievements of science. The creation of the Marxist dialectical method was an important element in that revolution in philosophy accomplished by the founders of Marxism, who elaborated the dialectical-materialist worldview.

Marx and Engels devoted exceptional attention to the elaboration and constant improvement of their method throughout their entire activity. Unfortunately, Marx did not manage to realize his wish to write a special work on dialectics. But every work of Marx is of invaluable importance for understanding the essence of his method. Of especially great importance is Marx's main work, *Capital*. This is a true encyclopedia of materialist dialectics. Not without reason Lenin pointed out that while Marx did not leave us a *Logic* (with a capital "L"), he left the logic of *Capital*, in which

dialectics is not only applied to the analysis of the capitalist mode of production, but is also developed on the basis of this analysis. All the basic propositions of materialist dialectics received brilliant expression in this work. Marx showed in *Capital* the fundamental difference between materialist dialectics and Hegel's idealist dialectics. Particularly deep development in *Capital* was given to the doctrine of Marxist dialectics regarding contradictions and the struggle of opposites as the source of development. Already here it is shown that the bedrock of dialectics is the proposition that contradictions are the source of development. Subsequently, this proposition received its development in the famous Leninist thesis that the doctrine of the struggle of opposites is the "kernel," the "essence" of dialectics.

In *Capital*, Marx, using the analysis of the capitalist mode of production as an example, elaborated the dialectical theory of knowledge, showing the path of cognizing reality. Unfortunately, Soviet philosophers have so far failed to fulfill Lenin's direct instructions on the necessity of utilizing all the philosophical richness contained in *Capital* on questions of materialist dialectics.

Tremendous credit for creating and developing the Marxist dialectical method belongs to Engels. Works of Engels such as *Anti-Dühring*, *Ludwig Feuerbach*, *Dialectics of Nature*, and others give a deep elaboration of materialist dialectics, showing its fundamental difference from metaphysics. Engels revealed the historical conditions and premises for the emergence of materialist dialectics, showing its importance for investigating phenomena of society and nature. Special mention should be

made of Engels's most fruitful ideas and directives on the importance of dialectics for natural science. Not Hegel, but Marx and primarily Engels were the first to elaborate dialectics as the only scientific method for natural science. Engels anticipated the path of development of natural science for many decades ahead on a whole series of fundamental questions of physics, biology, cosmogony, etc.

In his works, Engels sought to give a system of the basic principles and propositions of dialectics as a science, revealing the subject of dialectics. He owns the famous definition of the dialectical method as the science of the most general laws of development of nature, human society, and thought. By this definition, Engels revealed the specifics of dialectics as a constituent part of Marxist philosophical science: its task consists in investigating the *most general laws* of development, which makes it an irreplaceable method and instrument for cognizing reality.

Engels defined the main laws that constitute the essence of the dialectical method. In *Anti-Dühring*, he showed that these laws are the law of the struggle of opposites, the law of the transition of quantity into quality, and the law of the "negation of the negation." In many of his works he substantiates and develops his ideas regarding these laws of dialectics. This does not mean that Engels gave no attention to other sides and propositions of materialist dialectics, say, propositions on the connection of phenomena, content and form, etc. But he brought these three laws to the fore. He considered that these very laws constitute the main content of dialectics. That this is so is shown by an excerpt titled "Dialectics," included in

Dialectics of Nature. In this excerpt he writes regarding the laws of dialectics: "They can be reduced in the main to three laws: The law of the transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa; The law of the interpenetration of opposites; The law of the negation of the negation" (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 38. 1952).

It should be noted that the definition of these basic laws of dialectics is explained to a certain extent by the historical origin of the Marxist dialectical method. Marx and Engels did not create their new, materialist dialectics out of nowhere. In constructing it, they could not fail to make use of certain data on the basic principles and laws of dialectics that were present in their predecessors. They used the "rational kernel" of Hegel's dialectical method. Engels himself, in that same excerpt on dialectics, indicates that the above-mentioned three laws were developed by Hegel in an "idealist manner." Critically utilizing the valuable aspects of Hegelian dialectics, Marx and Engels created a qualitatively new and the only scientific dialectics. The basic laws of dialectics spoken of by Engels received a completely new, materialist interpretation. They acquired a revolutionary edge in Marxist dialectics, which Hegel had blunted in every way. Precisely materialist dialectics, as well as other constituent parts of Marxist philosophy, helped Marx and Engels create the theory of scientific communism, elaborating a consistent revolutionary strategy and tactics for the proletarian party.

The exposition of materialist dialectics given by Engels in *Anti-Dühring*, as well as in other works over the course of

many decades, served as a classic source for studying the Marxist method. It has not lost its significance to this day. However, the development of materialist dialectics could not and did not stop there. Nothing enriches and moves theory forward like the generalization of new practice. The epoch that began after Engels's death became an epoch of unprecedented movement of the revolutionary masses. Capitalism entered the final stage of its development—the stage of imperialism, which Lenin defined as the eve of the socialist revolution. Preparations began for the direct assault on capitalism. Into movement came the "heavy reserves" of the revolution—the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

The new period became simultaneously a period of rapid development in science, of new great discoveries in the field of natural science. Discoveries in physics caused a severe crisis in science, which idealists exploited to strengthen their positions.

In 1917, the greatest event in world history took place. In Russia, a victorious proletarian revolution was carried out, marking the beginning of the era of the collapse of world capitalism. Having defended its existence in the Civil War, the young Soviet Republic, under the leadership of the Communist Party, embarked on peaceful economic construction. The period of transition from capitalism to socialism began, the necessity of which had been prophetically foreseen by Marx and Engels.

Naturally, all the questions facing Marxists in this new, turbulent epoch could be and were solved from the standpoint of the only scientific philosophy—dialectical and historical materialism. The generalization of the practice of the

Communist Party and the discoveries of science on the basis of this philosophy immensely enriched Marxist dialectics. Therefore, we can speak with full reason of a new stage in the development of dialectical and historical materialism that began after Marx and Engels. This new stage is connected with the activity of our Communist Party, with the activity of its leaders Lenin and Stalin and their disciples and comrades-in-arms.

Lenin paid immense attention to questions of dialectics as a science. This is evidenced by such outstanding works of his as *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, *Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism*, *Karl Marx*, *On the Significance of Militant Materialism*, and many other works not directly dedicated to philosophy, but providing extraordinary material for the development of Marxist dialectics and materialist dialectics as a whole. This is also evidenced by Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks*, almost entirely devoted to working out questions of dialectics. An analysis of the *Philosophical Notebooks* shows that Lenin wanted to write a work on Marxist dialectics. One can imagine what this work would have been like had Lenin embodied in a finished work all those most brilliant thoughts and ideas contained in these unfinished notes, written not for publication, but for himself, for his own clarification of the remarks in the *Philosophical Notebooks*.

Lenin was a supreme master of revolutionary dialectics. His works represent a truly inexhaustible storehouse of dialectical wisdom. The dialectical approach to a complex and changing reality lies at the foundation of those great discoveries in Marxist science made by Lenin, generalizing the experience of

the class struggle and the development of natural science in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. In Lenin's works, a brilliant analysis of all aspects of the dialectical method is given.

Lenin did an extraordinary amount, first of all, for the further development and enrichment of the content of materialist dialectics as a science. Lenin reproached Plekhanov for not developing dialectics precisely as a science, for reducing it to a "sum of examples." Plekhanov, as Lenin pointed out, wrote about a thousand pages on philosophy, including on dialectics, but regarding "properly dialectics as a philosophical science"—nothing.

Lenin himself repeatedly returned to the question of the content of dialectics as a science, elaborated the question of its basic principles and elements, highlighted the main thing in them, raised the question of the necessity of working out a Marxist "logic with a capital 'L'", outlined ways to achieve this goal, etc.

Lenin demanded an understanding that Marxist dialectics as a science must be a generalization, a magnificent synthesis of the achievements of all fields of science. Outlining those fields of knowledge from which "the theory of knowledge and dialectics must be built," Lenin speaks of the history of philosophy, the history of individual sciences, the history of the mental development of the child, the history of the mental development of animals, the history of language, and the physiology of the sense organs. This Leninist directive contains a whole program for working out materialist dialectics as a science. Following Engels, Lenin defines dialectics as "the

doctrine of development in its most complete, deep, and free-from-one-sidedness form, the doctrine of the relativity of human knowledge that provides us with a reflection of eternally developing matter" (*Works*, Vol. 19, p. 4).

This general definition Lenin specifies in a number of his works, outlining the "elements," "features" of which materialist dialectics consists. He does this in works such as *Karl Marx*, *Once Again on the Trade Unions*, and others. He analyzes this question with special care in the *Philosophical Notebooks*. Here Lenin gives a detailed outline of the elements of dialectics. Along with the three laws named by Engels in *Anti-Dühring*, Lenin, setting for himself the task, as he himself says, to analyze dialectics "in more detail," notes such elements as the connection and interdependence of phenomena, the combination of analysis and synthesis, the endless process of deepening cognition of things by man, the struggle of content with form and vice versa, etc.

Not having the opportunity in the present article to consider the rich meaning of these and other Leninist propositions on the elements and features of dialectics, we wish to draw special attention to two directives of Lenin that are of paramount importance for the further development of the Marxist dialectical method. Enumerating the elements of dialectics, Lenin emphasizes with all his power the decisive significance of the doctrine of inner contradictory phenomena and the struggle of opposites. He points out that if dialectics is to be defined briefly, it should be reduced to the doctrine of contradictions. This element of dialectics he calls its "kernel," "essence," "pith," etc.

As noted above, Marx had already spoken of contradictions as the main source of all dialectics. But even more forcefully, brightly, and sharply was this source of dialectical development revealed in the new historical epoch, when the contradictions of capitalism reached the limit of their development and deepening, and when the period for the resolution of these contradictions arrived. In the Leninist proposition on contradictions as the "kernel" of dialectics, new historical conditions of the epoch of imperialism undoubtedly found their generalization. The struggle against opportunism, which smoothed over these crying contradictions and preached a policy of class peace, also required special emphasis on this aspect of dialectics. Together with V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin considered the struggle of opposites as the inner content of the process of development. It is known what importance this aspect of dialectics has for the policy of the proletarian party, for understanding the significance of the class struggle as the driving force behind the development of a society split into hostile classes.

Further, Lenin demanded with special insistence the understanding that dialectics includes epistemology, that dialectics *is* epistemology. This proposition of Lenin is of extraordinary importance for the further enrichment of the content of dialectics as a science. Of course, this side of dialectics found its deep reflection already in the works of Marx and Engels. It is sufficient to name *Capital*, which contains inexhaustible directives on this question. Engels's definition of dialectics as the science of the most general laws of nature, society, *and thought* includes epistemology in

dialectics. Works such as *Anti-Dühring* and others also contain most valuable thoughts and ideas on this question. But Marxist philosophy, like any other phenomenon, cannot develop evenly —that is, so that all its sides and problems at any given moment receive equally full development. The objective needs of the development of science and revolutionary practice bring to the fore now some, now other questions to which answers must be given. In the new epoch after Marx and Engels, the question of the dialectics of cognition, along with certain other questions, assumed paramount importance.

The objective conditions that posed for Marxists in the new era the task of working out problems of the dialectics of cognition consisted, first, in that due to a sharp turn of history in the period of imperialism, any inertia, any thinking with yesterday's, outworn concepts and slogans posed a great danger. Precisely this feature of thinking was characteristic of the opportunists and reformists, the leaders of the Second International, who sophistically utilized outworn slogans to combat the revolutionary organization of the proletariat. Second, the crisis in physics that began at the end of the 19th century was to a large extent connected with a failure to understand the dialectical nature of cognition by the majority of natural scientists. To generalize new discoveries in science and indicate a way out of the crisis was possible only by thoroughly elaborating questions of the dialectics of cognition. Plekhanov, for example, failed to understand this, for which Lenin reproached him, pointing out that Plekhanov paid no attention to this side of the matter (or rather, "side" of the matter, said Lenin, but the "essence" of the matter).

Lenin brilliantly developed this side of Marxist dialectics. Relying on Marx and Engels, Lenin showed that without applying dialectics to cognition, correct, scientific cognition is impossible. Lenin showed how human knowledge historically develops, revealing the dialectical relationship between relative and absolute truth gave a brilliant formula for the dialectical process of cognizing objective truth, etc

Lenin paid exceptional attention to the question of the concrete nature of truth. The elaboration of this aspect of the Marxist method responded to the vital interests and needs of the revolutionary working-class movement in a new period of historical development. Lenin chastised dogmatists from the opportunist camp for their inability and unwillingness to apply concrete general truths to the specific conditions of historical development. Following Marx and Engels, he considered concreteness to be the most important element of the dialectical approach to reality. In the preface to the second edition of his work *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, Lenin subjected the Mensheviks, led by Plekhanov, to sharp criticism for their "tendency to look for answers to concrete questions in the simple logical development of a general truth" (*Works*, Vol. 3, p. 10). Such an approach he characterized as a vulgarization of Marxism, as outright mockery of dialectical materialism. Lenin taught that a truly dialectical analysis of questions consists in the ability to apply the general truths of Marxism to concrete conditions, in the ability to find concrete truth.

To the eclecticism and sophistry of Kautsky and Vandervelde, to the vagueness and non-concreteness of their propositions, Lenin counterposed the concreteness and definiteness of

revolutionary dialectics. Dialectics achieves concreteness because it, as the best and truest barometer, takes into account changing historical conditions and does not for a moment abandon the soil of historical analysis of reality.

Lenin saw the strength of materialist dialectics in its fighting against any ossification and immobility, requiring maximum flexibility of humanly constructed concepts and categories. Without such flexibility, a true reflection of eternally developing life is impossible. He defined dialectics and the dialectical approach to questions as that flexibility of human thinking that reflects the all-sidedness and mobility of the material process itself.

Lenin was the founder of that great proletarian party which throughout its history has provided splendid and unsurpassed examples of flexible revolutionary tactics, examples of the ability to direct the movement of the proletariat in exact accordance with the changing situation. He pointed out that regarding past experience, speed, and diversity of changes in various forms of movement and struggle of the working class, the Bolshevik, Communist Party has no equal in the world. Leninist dialectics was a further creative development by Lenin of the Marxist dialectical method and was based on the generalization of the rich practice of the Communist Party.

The Communist Party, created and raised by Lenin, armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, was the only party capable of resisting the reactionary policy of the Second International and crushing its counter-revolutionary theories based on metaphysical, petrified dogmas.

Together with Lenin and after his death, materialist dialectics was developed and deepened by J. V. Stalin. Works such as *Anarchism or Socialism?*, *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, and others are classic examples of the creative application and development of the Marxist method, as well as Marxist philosophy as a whole. In his work on the further development and refinement of the Marxist method, J. V. Stalin relied on the rich theoretical legacy of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

Of particularly important significance for the development and specification of the content of materialist dialectics as a science is the definition of the main features of the Marxist dialectical method formulated by J. V. Stalin in his work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*. This definition is a known synthesis of more than a century of development of Marxist dialectics, a generalization of all the work done by Marxism-Leninism in this field.

As is known, J. V. Stalin reduced the essence of the Marxist dialectical method to four main features. As the first of these features, he put forward the proposition on the interconnection and interdependence of phenomena. Although in the classification of the laws of dialectics given by Engels in *Anti-Dühring*, the connection of phenomena does not feature as an independent trait of dialectics, it is easy to see that in emphasizing the huge importance of this trait, J. V. Stalin relied entirely on the statements of Engels himself, as well as the statements of Marx and Lenin. Suffice it to recall that Engels called dialectics the "science of connections" (see

Dialectics of Nature, p. 38). Engels spoke much about this in all his works. In those definitions of the elements and features of dialectics given by Lenin, he invariably included the thesis on connection, on the interdependence of phenomena. This is understandable, for without this aspect there is no dialectics. By putting forward the proposition on the connection of phenomena as one of the main features of the dialectical method, J. V. Stalin helped to more deeply understand and grasp the requirements of a scientific approach to reality.

The thesis on the connection and interdependence of phenomena reveals the regular character of reality, for law, as is known, is nothing other than the expression of an essential, necessary connection of phenomena. The proposition on the connection of phenomena, on the dominance of objective laws in nature and society, becomes all the more important because bourgeois ideologists spare no effort to "refute" regularities in the development of nature and especially society, to prove the "accidental" character of events and processes, their dependence on the will of people, etc. The doctrine of Marxist dialectics on the connection and interdependence of phenomena, on the laws governing processes in nature and society, deals a blow to all kinds of voluntarists, subjectivists, and metaphysicians interested in distorting the objective picture of the world.

The importance of this feature of dialectics also lies in the fact that from it flows the paramount requirement for a historical approach to reality—a requirement without the observance of which social science turns into a heap of absurd errors. Stalin continued the Leninist elaboration of the question of a

historical approach to reality. Like Lenin, he attached primary importance to this issue.

Without a historical approach to the new situation that developed at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, the discoveries made by Lenin in Marxist science would have been impossible. Taking into account the new historical conditions, Lenin with supreme revolutionary courage revised the proposition of Marx and Engels on the impossibility of the victory of socialism in one country, showed that it no longer corresponded to the conditions of the epoch of imperialism, and gave a new theory of the socialist revolution that inspired the working class of Russia to a victorious revolution. J. V. Stalin defended this theory and comprehensively developed it.

The spirit of dialectical historicism permeates the works of J. V. Stalin during the period of building socialism and communism in our country. For example, in *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, guided by the requirement of a historical approach to reality, J. V. Stalin gave a deep analysis of the specific character of commodity production under socialism as commodity production of a "special kind," showed the limited sphere of operation of the law of value under socialism, and called on Soviet economists to replace a number of economic concepts and categories taken from Marx's *Capital* that reflected the state of affairs in capitalist society with new concepts and categories corresponding to the laws of socialist production.

J. V. Stalin revealed the historical features of contemporary capitalism, showing that the basic law of modern capitalism, in

contrast to old, pre-monopoly capitalism, is the securing of maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation and ruin of the majority of the population of a given country, through the enslavement and robbery of the peoples of other countries, through imperialist wars, and the militarization of the national economy.

In light of all that has been said, it is easy to understand the importance of including the thesis on the connection and interdependence of phenomena among the main features of Marxist dialectics.

Further, J. V. Stalin highlighted as the second main feature of dialectics the proposition on movement and development. Specifying and enriching Marxist dialectics, Lenin and Stalin paid exceptionally great attention to the elaboration of a scientific understanding of development. There were historical reasons for this as well. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that starting roughly from the end of the 19th century "all agree" with the principle of development. But to such "agreement," Lenin added, they strangle truth through a backdoor. In other words, science and historical experience forced even the most ingrained metaphysicians to recognize that everything in nature and society is in a state of development. To deny development directly was no longer possible. Adapting to the demands of the times, metaphysics disguised itself, appearing in "fashionable" attire, recognizing development in words while denying it in deed. Development was understood purely metaphysically, without the main thing characteristic of actual development—that is, without the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new. In science, such a "recognition" of

development found expression, for example, in Weismannist-Morganist biology. In politics, this perverted notion of development was elaborated most fully by the opportunists and reformists of the Second International.

Creatively developing the ideas of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin in all their works persistently emphasized that movement and change must be understood as the replacement of the old by the new, as the destruction and dying away of the old and the emergence of the new. J. V. Stalin gave an exact dialectical formula for development, indicating that "the dying away of the old and the growth of the new is the law of development" (*Problems of Leninism*, p. 540).

J. V. Stalin owns a remarkably profound thesis that for the dialectical method what is important above all is not that which seems durable at a given moment but is already starting to die away, but that which arises and develops, to which the future belongs, even if it looks non-durable, for unconquerable is only that which arises and develops.

In this thesis, the main thing characteristic of the dialectical conception of development, in contrast to anti-Marxist theories, is expressed with great power: the inevitability of the victory of the new, the advanced over the dying away, which hinders further development. This thesis is aimed at educating figures of the Communist Party, builders of socialism, in a feeling for the new, which is a precious quality of every worker.

How much importance J. V. Stalin attached to a correct, genuinely dialectical understanding of development is evidenced by his last work—*Economic Problems of Socialism*

in the USSR. In this work, dedicated to solving fundamental problems of socialist economy and the transition from socialism to communism J. V. Stalin criticized the metaphysical approach to socialist relations of production as unchanging, non-developing relations. On the grounds that socialist relations of production are new compared to capitalist ones and contribute to an unprecedented development of productive forces, many Soviet economists and philosophers made the incorrect conclusion that they supposedly remain "eternally new" and do not lag behind the development of productive forces. Such an approach was fraught with dangerous practical consequences. It prevented seeing the perspective of our development in the transition from socialism to communism in time and taking necessary measures so that our relations of production do not in time become a brake on the further development of productive forces.

In the definition of the main features of the Marxist dialectical method given by J. V. Stalin, the law of the "negation of the negation," which featured in Engels, is absent. The concept of the "negation of the negation" Engels took from Hegelian philosophy, reworking it in a materialist spirit. The rational in this concept consists in that it fixes the progressive character of development, movement from lower to higher, the continuity in this development. Negation plays an important role in the process of development. Without the negation of the old, the obsolete, there is no development. In so doing, the new, negating the old, does not simply discard it, but utilizes and reworks all the valuable content that was achieved at preceding stages. In this sense Marx, Engels, and Lenin used the concept

of the "negation of the negation." In Hegel himself, the "negation of the negation" acted as a tool for speculative construction of the world. Hegel squeezed all development into "triads" (thesis, antithesis, synthesis), achieving in this way a series of reactionary political conclusions. He used the "negation of the negation" for the reconciliation, the "synthesis" of opposites.

Engels and Lenin subjected the Hegelian use of the "triad" to criticism. In the struggle against Dühring, Mikhailovsky, and other enemies of Marxism, Engels and Lenin noted that Marxism has nothing in common with the striving to artificially squeeze reality into "triads." In *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, Lenin wrote that the "negation of the negation" is "nothing other than the remnants of Hegelianism out of which scientific socialism grew, remnants of its mode of expression" (*Works*, Vol. 1, p. 147).

A step forward in the development of the dialectical method was that these and certain other unavoidable remnants of Hegelianism that hindered the assimilation of materialist dialectics were cast aside. Utilizing the rational content contained in the concept of the "negation of the negation," J. V. Stalin gave this rational content a clear, transparent materialist form, noting that development occurs not in a circle, but progressively, along an ascending line—from lower to higher, from simple to complex.

Formulating the understanding of development as the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones as the third main feature of dialectics, J. V. Stalin pointed out that development

is not a "simple repetition of the past," but "progressive movement," "movement along an ascending line."

In addition, the concept of the "negation of the negation" contains as a necessary moment of development a return to the initial point at a higher, third stage, but a return on a higher basis. Thus, the concept of the "negation of the negation" required fixing not so much how the new differs from the old, as their similarity. But if at a higher stage of development certain features of the old are sometimes repeated, the main thing in development nevertheless consists not in this, but in the difference of the new from the old. For example, modern communism is incomparable with the primitive communal system. Attempts to apply the "negation of the negation" to the development of the future communist society, undertaken in propaganda practice, led to absurd results, to fantastic constructions that had nothing in common with Marxism.

J. V. Stalin approached the formulation of the main features and aspects of the Marxist method as a revolutionary in science, not bowing before certain concepts created a century and a half ago, especially if these concepts do not contribute to a clear understanding of the essence of the matter.

It should generally be noted that in formulating the main features of the Marxist dialectical method, Lenin and Stalin sought to give them maximum clarity and an accessible form. This was caused by the fact that today the philosophy of Marxism is studied by millions of people who previously never studied complex philosophical questions, and that philosophical questions have never been so closely connected and intertwined with the practice of millions of people as in our

time, during the period of building socialism and communism. The indisputable merit of Lenin and Stalin in working out Marxist philosophy consists in that with their simple, clear, precise propositions they made it even more accessible to the numerous cadres of the socialist state.

Thus, for example, in formulating the fourth feature of dialectics—on development through the struggle of opposites—J. V. Stalin does not use the Hegelian concepts "unity of opposites" or "identity of opposites." Unfortunately, in our propaganda practice we did not take into account the meaning of setting aside these concepts. Meanwhile, here too was manifested the striving for maximum clarity and precision in formulating philosophical concepts and propositions. Of course, this by no means denies the internal interconnection of opposites—that is, the circumstance that in one and the same phenomenon the old and the new, the negative and the positive, etc., are combined. Without such an interconnection there would be no struggle of opposites. But the concepts "unity of opposites" and "identity of opposites" in the exact sense of these words fix not the contradictoriness of the old and the new, the dying away and the emerging, and the regularity of the struggle between them—which is the main thing in Marxist dialectics—but their "unity" or even "identity." This is all the more necessary to take into account because in Marxist terminology the concept "unity" has a completely different meaning. In our Soviet life, for example, the concept of the moral-political unity of socialist society has firmly taken root. We speak of the friendship and unity of the peoples of the USSR, etc. It should be noted that neither Marx nor Engels nor

Lenin in their works intended for publication used the concepts of "unity" and "identity" of opposites. Thus, Marx waged a struggle against bourgeois economists who consciously thrust into the foreground the moment of unity and crossed out the moment of the struggle of opposites in commodity relations, in the development of the capitalist mode of production. Speaking of such internally linked opposites in a commodity as use value and exchange value, Marx pointed out: "Both things represent everything except identity" (*Theories of Surplus Value*, Vol. III, p. 78. 1936).

Thus, the analysis of the definition given by J. V. Stalin of the main features of the dialectical method shows that here we are dealing with a further creative development of materialist dialectics as a science, a development that deepens our understanding of this instrument of knowledge and practice.

Each of these features of dialectics reveals an important side of the dialectical approach to reality, and all of them in their combination give a harmonious and profound doctrine of what the Marxist dialectical method is. The first feature shows us nature as a single, connected whole, in which not chaos, but a regular order independent of the will and consciousness of people reigns. The second feature shows that nature is in a state of continuous development, that the essence of this development consists in the dying away of the old and the growth of the new. The third feature shows why and by virtue of what law development has such a character; this law is the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones. Finally, the fourth feature—the struggle between the new and the old, the emerging and the dying away—reveals the

source, the driving force, the inner content of the process of development. Ignoring any of these features is impossible, for all of them are of fundamentally important significance for characterizing the essence of the Marxist dialectical method.

It goes without saying that these are only the "main" features of dialectics. In working out materialist dialectics as a science, it is necessary to take into account other features and elements of dialectics that are of huge importance. We are talking, for example, about such categories of dialectics as content and form, possibility and reality, chance and necessity, essence and phenomenon, the historical and the logical, analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, etc. Unfortunately, these categories and concepts of dialectics are poorly studied by us; meanwhile, the above-mentioned main features themselves do not exhaust the entire rich content of the Marxist dialectical method.

2. Specification of the Law of the Struggle of Opposites as Applied to the Conditions of Development of Soviet Society

The creative character of materialist dialectics is manifested not only in the continuous enrichment of its content, not only in that, based on the generalization of new data of science and practice, our approach to reality is refined and perfected, but also in that the general principles and laws of dialectics acquire a new form of manifestation under altered historical conditions. Lenin said that the dialectics of bourgeois society, which Marx revealed in *Capital*, is only a particular case of dialectics in general. It is clear that such a world-historical turn in the development of society as the transition from capitalism to

socialism, which occurred in our country, could not fail to give rise to new essential forms of manifestation and operation of the general laws of dialectics. The development of socialist society differs from the development of bourgeois society. The dialectics of socialist society is also only a particular case of dialectics in general.

The development of Marxist dialectics in our time takes place on the basis of solving the question of how the laws of dialectics operate in new ways under the conditions of socialist society. This question is not only theoretical, but like any truly theoretical question, it is of huge practical importance. On its correct solution in many respects depends the success of the practical struggle for socialism and communism. The elaboration of this question enriches dialectics with new facets, new sides and shades, the importance of which for the current historical epoch is difficult to overestimate. This can be traced through the example of considering such important laws of dialectics as the law of the struggle of opposites and the law of the transition from an old quality to a new one.

The slightest forgetting of the new that the epoch of building socialism gave, the simple transfer of certain old concepts of the struggle of opposites reflecting the struggle in an antagonistic society to Soviet society can bring huge practical harm.

Let us cite an example. After the restoration of the national economy, the question of the possibility of building socialism in our country arose in all its sharpness. The correct solution to this question depended on taking into account the specifics of those contradictions that had to be overcome within the country

on the path to socialism. It is known that the entire diversity of contradictions operating at that time reduced to two main groups—external and internal contradictions. While the final victory of socialism in the USSR was connected with resolving external contradictions (the contradiction between the Soviet country and the capitalist encirclement), building socialism was connected with resolving internal contradictions. Among the internal contradictions were the contradictions between socialist and capitalist elements, as well as the contradiction between the working class and the peasantry.

In so doing, of especially important, paramount significance was overcoming the contradiction between the working class and the peasantry. But the essence of this contradiction was distorted in every way by Trotskyites, Zinovievites, and other enemies of Leninism. They presented this contradiction as antagonistic—that is, as the same as the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—and drew from this the conclusion that it could not be resolved and, consequently, that it was impossible to build socialism in our country through internal forces alone.

The Communist Party thoroughly defeated the Trotskyites, comprehensively resolving the question of the specific character of the contradiction between the proletariat and the peasantry and the method of its overcoming, in contrast to the contradiction between socialist and capitalist elements. This was, in essence, a new question in Marxist philosophy—a question of antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions. Of course, this question was raised earlier by the founders of Marxism, but it was raised only in the most general form, for it

did not have the practical urgency before the epoch of building socialism. Main importance then belonged to the question of antagonistic contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In all its breadth, the question of the distinction between antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions was posed by the very course of social development after the October Socialist Revolution, during the period of building socialism. The question of the nature of non-antagonistic contradictions, in contrast to antagonistic contradictions, is also of huge importance for solving the most important tasks of the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

A brilliant elaboration of the question of the relationships between the working class and the peasantry, of the character of the contradictions between them and the community of their interests was given by Lenin and Stalin, who developed the ideas of Marx and Engels on this issue. They showed that one cannot confuse different types of contradictions, antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions. In famous notes on Bukharin's book *Economics of the Transition Period*, Lenin warned that antagonism and contradiction are not at all the same thing. Lenin and Stalin showed that while antagonistic contradictions between hostile classes are contradictions on fundamental questions, non-antagonistic contradictions between the working class and the peasantry are contradictions on current issues given a community of interests on fundamental questions. Hence flows the different regularity of development and overcoming of these contradictions. In *Letters to Comrade Ch—e*, J. V. Stalin notes that the contradiction between the working class and the peasantry is a

contradiction within the *smychka* [alliance], within the union between them; therefore, these contradictions can and will be smoothed over and favorably resolved. Contradictions between the proletariat and the kulaks, on the other hand, are contradictions outside the bounds of the *smychka*, and therefore they will grow and sharpen until the kulaks are liquidated as a class.

These propositions are of fundamental importance for understanding various types of contradictions. For antagonistic contradictions—precisely because these are contradictions on fundamental questions—the law is the deepening, sharpening of contradictions; they are resolved and overcome through violent methods of struggle. The Party smashed the kulak theory of the "extinction of the class struggle" and armed the popular masses with the understanding that the construction of socialism leads to a sharpening of the class struggle, for capitalist classes and elements resist the advance of socialism with all their might.

In contrast to antagonistic contradictions, the law of development of non-antagonistic contradictions is not their sharpening and deepening, but their smoothing over, softening, concluding ultimately in their full overcoming. The method and means for resolving these contradictions is not violence, but the liquidation of those conditions that give rise to them. Here, too, the contradiction is overcome in a struggle between the new and the old, the advanced and the backward, but this struggle does not reach conflicts and clashes, as in the case of antagonistic contradictions.

The elaboration of the question of the two types of contradictions overturned the counter-revolutionary attitudes of the Trotskyites and inspired confidence in the Soviet people in the possibility of building socialism in our country through internal forces. At the same time, it enriched the doctrine of Marxist dialectics on contradictions with a new proposition on the specific character of non-antagonistic contradictions and the ways to overcome them.

Further development this question received in our time, when the problem of overcoming contradictions arising on the path of the gradual transition from socialism to communism stands before us. Tremendous importance in this plan belongs to the elaboration by J. V. Stalin in *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* of the question of the dialectics of development of the socialist mode of production. J. V. Stalin showed the erroneousness of the point of view that was widely spread in our literature, according to which full conformity between productive forces and relations of production under socialism allegedly excludes the regularity of the emergence of a contradiction between them. In this was seen the distinction of the socialist mode of production from previous modes, where this regularity was obligatory. Thus, in revealing the specificity of the development of the socialist mode of production, the operation of the general dialectical law of the struggle of opposites was erroneously "cancelled" as applied to the development of productive forces and relations of production.

However, an analysis of the development of the socialist mode of production shows that the general law—precisely because it is a general law—remains in force under the conditions of the

socialist formation as well, but the whole point is that under new conditions it operates in a specific way. Both under capitalism and under socialism, contradictions regularly arise between productive forces and relations of production. But the character of these contradictions and tendencies, the regularity of their development are profoundly different. Under capitalism, the contradiction between productive forces and relations of production is a contradiction between the social character of production and private capitalist appropriation. It finds its expression in the fundamental opposition of interests between the capitalist class and the proletarian class. Hence the unusual depth and sharpness of this contradiction. With every new step in the development of productive forces, the social character of production grows, requiring socialist organization of production. Relations of production, the form of appropriation, remain private capitalist. Standing guard over these relations is the capitalist class, possessing full political power.

It is clear that by virtue of these conditions, the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production can and do have only one tendency: they sharpen, deepen, grow into full opposition, reaching a profound conflict that can be resolved only through a socialist revolution.

Thus, in this case antagonistic contradictions develop and are overcome in the way inherent to their nature: this is the path of sharpening, heightening of contradictions, the development of two sides of a contradiction into hostile opposition—a path concluding with the liquidation of one of these sides. Otherwise antagonistic contradictions cannot develop and be

resolved—this is an objective law of development under definite historical conditions.

A completely different character belongs to contradictions in the socialist mode of production. As is known, J. V. Stalin, outlining the perspective for the development of Soviet society, noted that in the process of transition from socialism to communism, certain contradictions arise between productive forces and relations of production connected with the presence of two forms of property—public and collective-farm/group property. At the present stage, collective-farm property and commodity circulation play the role of a powerful engine for productive forces, and therefore the Communist Party and the Soviet government take all measures to strengthen collective farms and develop commodity turnover. The further development of our society's productive forces will require raising collective-farm property to the level of public property, which will make it possible to fully encompass the entire national economy with state planning.

Contradictions between productive forces and relations of production in socialist society cannot and do not have such a deep and sharp character as under capitalism. The specificity of contradictions between productive forces and relations of production under socialism consists in that behind these contradictions we do not have hostile classes with their fundamentally opposite interests, as is the case under capitalism. We do not have such classes as would stand guard over obsolete relations of production and defend them. On the contrary, the vital interest of all classes of Soviet society—both the working class and the collective-farm peasantry—consists

in timely overcoming the contradictions arising between the two sides of the socialist mode of production.

It is clear that the new character, the new content of these contradictions under socialism cannot fail to determine a different path for their development and resolution than under capitalism. Unlike under capitalism, here contradictions do not have an objective, regular tendency to sharpen and deepen, turning into hostile opposition. Relying on objective laws of development, the Party and the state have every opportunity to timely overcome these contradictions, preventing the matter from reaching a conflict.

In this connection, mention should be made of the important significance of essential, distinctive shades of the concepts "contradiction" and "oppositeness." They are very important precisely for understanding the fundamental difference between the two types of contradictions—antagonistic and non-antagonistic. The concept of "oppositeness" expresses such a state when inner contradictions of an object or phenomenon in their development have turned into extremes, acting with all decisiveness against each other. Oppositeness means a contradiction of interests of two sides or tendencies on fundamental, main questions. In this sense, one cannot identify every contradiction with oppositeness[14]. For example, between the working class and the peasantry before collectivization there were certain contradictions. These classes were precisely

[14] It would be, of course, incorrect to draw from the fact that there is a certain difference between the concepts "contradiction" and "oppositeness" the conclusion that...

in a state of contradiction, but not oppositeness, for the latter, we repeat, means a fundamental divergence of interests.

In this sense, huge philosophical significance belongs to the analysis of the problem of liquidating the opposition between town and country, between physical and mental labor. The opposition between town and country, between physical and mental labor expresses an opposition of interests between classes. Therefore, this opposition could exist and exists only in the presence of antagonistic classes. It reached its highest development under capitalism. By virtue of this, the concept of "oppositeness" can no longer characterize the relationship between town and country, between physical and mental labor under socialism, for the main thing characteristic of "oppositeness"—fundamental divergences, oppositeness of interests—has disappeared. In Soviet society there still remains an "essential distinction" between town and country, between physical and mental labor, which at the higher stage of communism will turn into an inessential distinction.

Taking into account these subtle, but very essential distinguishing shades existing between the concepts "contradiction" and "oppositeness," it can be established that a characteristic feature of antagonistic contradictions, a regular tendency of their development is their growth and sharpening, transformation into oppositeness or, as Marx said, into "polar," "hostile" oppositeness. On the contrary, a characteristic feature of non-antagonistic contradictions, a regular tendency of their development is that here contradictions usually do not turn into hostile oppositeness, that here the matter does not reach conflict.

From this it becomes clear why, after the liquidation of antagonistic classes, the development of Soviet society is free from social upheavals and class conflicts, why the dominant feature of the development of Soviet society is the gradual smoothing over, softening, and non-sharpening of social contradictions. It goes without saying that, since in our country there are still individual renegades, hidden enemies of socialism acting with the support of the capitalist encirclement to the detriment of the Soviet state, the struggle against them proceeds according to the laws of development and overcoming of antagonistic contradictions.

It would be at the same time a most profound and harmful error on the grounds that non-antagonistic contradictions do not turn into oppositeness to underappreciate in any way the significance of these contradictions, the struggle for their overcoming. The whole point is that non-antagonistic the formula "struggle of opposites" as a general formula of dialectical development is inaccurate or even incorrect. This would be pedantry, not a serious approach to the question. "Struggle of opposites" is a broad concept encompassing diverse forms of contradiction between the old and the new, the dying away and the emerging, the backward and the advanced, counter-revolutionary and revolutionary, etc., as well as the struggle between them. Therefore, with full reason we can and must use this concept as a general concept expressing the internal contradictoriness of phenomena of nature and society and the struggle regularly occurring between opposite sides and tendencies of phenomena. The necessity of distinguishing between "oppositeness," "contradiction," "essential

distinction," etc., arises when we investigate different types of contradictions, such as antagonistic and non-antagonistic, when we trace the tendency of growth, deepening, sharpening of contradictions, etc. In such cases, as shown by the analysis of J. V. Stalin of the question of contradictions between productive forces and relations of production under capitalism and under socialism or the question of liquidating the opposition between town and country, between physical and mental labor, distinguishing these philosophical concepts is extremely important and necessary contradictions provide the possibility of development without sharpening of contradictions, without bringing the matter to conflict, but this possibility must be turned into reality by conducting a correct policy. Otherwise, these contradictions will grow and deepen.

Thus, for example, speaking in *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* about the contradictions between productive forces and relations of production under socialism, J. V. Stalin is not limited to indicating that they cannot turn into oppositeness, but adds: "given a correct policy." Another matter if we conduct an incorrect policy. "In this case, conflict would be inevitable, and our relations of production could turn into a serious brake on the further development of productive forces" (pp. 67–68).

This side of the question is all the more important to emphasize because some of our philosophers are inclined to think that, since in the nature of non-antagonistic contradictions there is no objective necessity for their sharpening, one need not particularly worry about overcoming them, as they smooth over almost by themselves.

Thus, for example, V. P. Chertkov asserts that the novelty of development under socialism allegedly "is manifested in the unhindered replacement of the obsolete by the new" (see coll. *Questions of Dialectical and Historical Materialism in the Work of J. V. Stalin "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics"*, p. 344. 1951). Of course, such a notion is alien to Marxist dialectics. Indeed, if one does not fight against remnants of a non-socialist attitude toward labor, toward public property, if one does not fight against manifestations of bourgeois nationalism, cosmopolitanism, and other remnants of bourgeois ideology, they will grow, multiply. To overcome non-antagonistic contradictions operating in Soviet society requires a daily struggle of the new against the old, of the advanced forces of society against backward, inert forces.

Tremendous importance for the further development of the Marxist dialectical method belongs to the elaboration of the question of criticism and self-criticism as that specific form in which the struggle between the new and the old, the emerging and the dying away, the advanced and the backward takes place in Soviet socialist society. Here it is impossible to give a special analysis of this important question. We shall only point out that previously, under conditions of a society split into hostile classes, the struggle of opposites necessarily took the form of a fierce class struggle, which was emphasized as the main thing in the works of the founders of Marxism. But already Marx prophetically foresaw this feature of the proletarian revolution: that it grows and strengthens itself by subjecting its mistakes and shortcomings to self-criticism. Lenin and Stalin, developing this idea of Marx, showed the

immense role of criticism and self-criticism, especially criticism from below, on the part of the masses, in the construction of the Soviet state, in the struggle for socialism and communism. Criticism and self-criticism is a method for revealing and overcoming shortcomings in the construction of a communist society, a method of struggle against everything obsolete that hinders the progressive development of Soviet society.

Thus, the generalization of those new historical conditions under which the law of the struggle of opposites operates under socialism has revealed new forms of action and manifestation of this law that did not have a place previously. In this is manifested the process of "eternally increasing the number of sides" of dialectics, of which Lenin spoke in defining dialectics as a living, developing doctrine.

3. Specific Character of the Operation of the Law of Transition from an Old Quality to a New One in Socialist Society

With the question of contradictions under socialism, the question of the operation of the law of transition from an old quality to a new one under the conditions of Soviet society is tied in the closest manner. The struggle of opposites constitutes the inner content of the process of development, the process of transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones. It is understandable, therefore, that certain new features characteristic of the operation of the law of the struggle of opposites under socialism could not fail to affect and find their expression in those specific forms in which processes of transition from an old quality to a new one are carried out after the destruction of capitalism.

Already the founders of Marxism foresaw that in conditions when class antagonisms are destroyed, social revolutions will lose the form of political revolutions. Marx developed this thought in *The Poverty of Philosophy*. But naturally, in that historical epoch when the capitalist mode of production dominated everywhere, and power was in the hands of the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes, the main attention of Marxists was paid to substantiating the thesis on violent political revolutions as the form of transition from one social formation to another.

The destruction of capitalism and the victory of socialism in the USSR created a new situation that required working out the question of how the action of the universal law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones is modified under these new conditions. In the works of Lenin devoted to questions of building socialism in our country and the further task of transitioning from socialism to communism, we find a number of most valuable directives on this problem. In the works of J. V. Stalin this problem received its special illumination. Of especially great importance in this respect are J. V. Stalin's works *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* and *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*.

In *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, J. V. Stalin subjected to sharp criticism the vulgarizing, dogmatic application of the law of transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones to the field of linguistics. On the example of criticizing the anti-Marxist doctrine on language of N. Y. Marr, J. V. Stalin showed that it would be a gross mistake to assume that this, as well as any other law of dialectical development, can have

identical forms of manifestation, given once and for all, independent of the specific nature of each phenomenon and historical conditions under which phenomena exist and develop. The so-called theory of stages and revolutionary "explosions" in the development of language, preached by N. Y. Marr and his disciples, proceeded precisely from such a notion of the operation of general laws alien to Marxism.

In his work, J. V. Stalin gave a brilliant example of how one must apply a general philosophical law to concrete, qualitatively specific phenomena. He showed that a general law, manifesting itself in the singular, concrete, cannot fail to acquire a specific form. Such an approach is a direct continuation and development of the idea expressed by Engels that the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones occurs "in a manner strictly determined for each individual case" (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 39). Taking language as a specific phenomenon, J. V. Stalin established that here the transition from an old quality to a new one cannot proceed in the same forms as, for example, in the case of a transition from one economic base to another or in the case of a revolutionary smashing of an obsolete social superstructure and its replacement by another superstructure corresponding to the new base. The specificity of the operation of the general law in the development of language consists in that here qualitative changes occur not suddenly and quickly in the form of an "explosion," but through the gradual and prolonged accumulation of elements of a new quality and the dying away of elements of an old quality.

In connection with this, J. V. Stalin expressed a most important proposition regarding the fact that in the development of other social phenomena as well, the law of transition from an old quality to a new one through an explosion is not always applicable, that it is obligatory for a society divided into hostile classes, but not obligatory for a society that does not have such classes. As an example of development through gradual transitions from an old quality to a new one, J. V. Stalin pointed to the revolution in the Soviet countryside that established the collective-farm system instead of the old, bourgeois economic system. J. V. Stalin showed also why such a major revolutionary turn was accomplished not through an "explosion," but gradually. The main reason here is that it was a revolution from above, with support for the basic masses of the peasantry from below. This proposition is of key importance for understanding why under socialism the law of transition from an old quality to a new one loses the form of explosions and is carried out in the form of the gradual dying away of elements of the old quality and the equally gradual accumulation of elements of the new quality.

In a society divided into hostile classes, non-ruling, exploited classes, not ruling, exploiting classes, are interested in fundamental socio-economic changes. The interests of obsolete classes are that force which hinders the implementation of these changes. Hence the law in all antagonistic formations was revolutions from below with desperate resistance from above, on the part of the ruling classes. Without violence, the new, advanced cannot replace the old, reactionary. Characteristic for antagonistic society, development through sharpening,

deepening of contradictions regularly concludes with a revolutionary explosion, a powerful blow destroying the old and clearing the way for the new.

A completely different state of affairs develops in a society where exploiting classes have been liquidated. Here there is no longer a class that would defend the obsolete, hindering movement forward. In Soviet society, power belongs to the people themselves. The plans outlined from above by the government and the Communist Party express the vital needs of the people themselves. The basic economic law of socialism —the maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural requirements of the working people through the continuous expansion and perfection of production—in a concentrated form reflects the entire novelty of the situation in socialist society compared to capitalist society.

The policy of the Soviet state and the Communist Party is directed at carrying out the requirements of this law. Therefore, in Soviet society there cannot be a situation where a conflict arises between the "top" and the "bottom" that would require a revolutionary explosion for its resolution. The state does everything to create scope for historically necessary qualitative changes in the country's economy, culture, etc. The masses from below take up the plans of the state, for they correspond to their vital interests. It is clear that for the transition from an old quality to a new one here no explosions are required—that is, the overthrow of the existing power and the replacement of it by a new power. It is clear that qualitative changes by virtue of this new situation can accumulate gradually, for there is no such serious social force that would keep them under cover,

suppress them, close the way for their development. And here, of course, the new, advanced is established in a struggle against the old, but the whole point is that the old in socialist society no longer acts in the form of a ruling class throwing all the power of its authority onto the scales to prevent the new from establishing itself in life. Fundamental economic changes aimed at building socialism and communism are incompatible with violence toward the working classes. The example of bringing the peasant masses onto the path of collectivization vividly shows that even the most grandiose economic transformations, equivalent in their significance to the greatest revolutions, can and must be carried out gradually, not in the form of a single act destroying the old and creating the new.

Collectivization meant a sharp historical turn in the development and fate of the multi-million working peasantry. The slightest attempt to carry out this sharp turn through violence would lead to results directly opposite. Indeed, the peasantry is vitally interested in leaving the capitalist path of development and taking the socialist path. But by virtue of the class position in which the peasantry finds itself, it does not immediately realize this vital interest. Private-property psychology firmly holds it in its grip. Only through experience, on the example of the first cooperative associations, thanks to the enormous friendly assistance provided to it by its loyal ally —the working class—thanks to painstaking and patient educational work does the peasantry realize the necessity of transitioning to a new path—the path of socialist agriculture. Thus, the very nature of this giant economic transformation requires gradual qualitative changes. The form of a violent,

revolutionary explosion here is in fundamental contradiction with the content of the process.

It is known that the Communist Party, Lenin, and Stalin decisively condemned any haste and compulsiveness in solving this question. Lenin in the very first year of Soviet power pointed out that in the countryside in relation to the peasantry one cannot act by the same methods that were applied in relation to capitalists in the city. Lenin noted that in the city it was possible with one decisive blow to "cut off" the capitalist "top." In the countryside, Lenin said, "one must go more gradually" and "in no case outpace the development of the masses, but wait until a movement forward grows out of the masses' own experience" (Vol. 28, p. 121). The same was emphasized with all his power by J. V. Stalin. Suffice it to recall his articles "Dizzy with Success," "Reply to Collective-Farm Comrades," and others.

The success of collectivization was ensured, among other things, by the fact that the Communist Party taught the specificity of action of the general dialectical law of transition from an old quality to a new one as applied to the tasks of transforming the peasantry, in contrast to the task of liquidating exploiting classes.

New forms of operation of the law of transition from an old quality to a new one can be traced also through the example of building a communist society. Two moments are of great importance for understanding the character and forms of transition from socialism to communism. First, this transition will be a giant leap in the development of economy, culture, and everyday life of Soviet society. The program of transition

in our country to communism shows that this will be a fundamental transition from the economy of socialism to a higher economy—the economy of communism.

Second, being a fundamental turn from an old quality to a new one, the transition from the lower stage of communism to the higher will be accomplished gradually. The gradualness of the transition from an old qualitative state to a new one does not mean that we are dealing here only with quantitative changes in the existing state. The concept of "gradualness" of qualitative changes answers only the question of the forms in which fundamental qualitative change proceeds. Under our socialist conditions, economic development proceeds not by way of upheavals, but by way of gradual changes.

Again, this form of transition flows from the fact that in Soviet society there are no such classes as would hinder the realization of the historical necessity of building a full communist society. Therefore, we have the opportunity gradually and systematically to introduce qualitative changes as necessary premises accumulate. The result of this gradual process will be a leap from one qualitative state—socialism—into another qualitative state—communism.

Consequently, through the example of the transition from socialism to communism we see that the specific concrete content of the process of qualitative changes regularly conditions the specific form of its action. Take even such an important part of this grandiose process as the transformation of labor into the primary requirement of life. Communism presupposes that a new, communist attitude toward labor, the obligation to work voluntarily for the good of society becomes

habitual to people. Naturally, the task of transforming labor into a habit, into a primary requirement of life cannot be solved through a momentary "leap." To think so would be adventurism of the worst kind. This task requires a long time, gradual changes in the psychology of people. No supernatural leaps are possible here. Before reaching the communist formula of distribution, one must pass through a number of stages of economic and cultural re-education of society, and this means qualitative change through gradual transitions.

The specificity of qualitative changes through gradual transitions by no means, of course, cancels the basic fact that qualitative changes arise as a result of quantitative changes. To, say, take a step forward in replacing commodity turnover with product exchange, definite quantitative changes are necessary —specifically, an increase, a growth in industrial output. Without such quantitative changes, the accumulation of elements of a new quality is impossible. To create the material basis of communism, a further and powerful growth of production and above all the production of means of production is necessary. To eliminate remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of people, systematic and daily educational work is necessary. And this applies to any qualitative changes, no matter how gradually they are carried out. It goes without saying that what has been said does not mean that rapid, sudden qualitative changes in particular fields of science, technology, etc., are impossible in our country.

Thus, the study of the question of in what forms the dialectical law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones operates in the epoch of socialism reveals new sides of

this law, enriches Marxist dialectics, and moves it forward. At the same time, the elaboration of this question is of huge importance for the sciences of nature. It points to seeing the diversity of forms of qualitative changes in nature as well, and not squeezing into the Procrustean bed of one scheme or another all the richness, all the complex shades of development in nature, applying the laws of dialectics to particular phenomena concretely, not standardly, not in a template manner.

***

Marxist philosophy from its very first steps was a theoretical weapon of struggle for the victory of the proletariat. In contrast to the old worldview, it put human revolutionary-transformative activity at the center of all questions of philosophy. An inexhaustible source of creative development of Marxism and its dialectical method is the unity of theory and practice. Without this unity there is and cannot be a creative development of philosophy. If materialist dialectics from the moment of its emergence has continuously developed and enriched itself, this is explained by the fact that Marxism strictly observes the great principle of the unity, the connection of theory with practice.

The works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin are a model of the living, creative application of the scientific method of research forged by Marxism to the most diverse questions of science and politics. Dialectics in their works was not a dead sum of rules and principles, but a combat weapon with the help of which they solved the most complex questions of the practical struggle of the working class with brilliant simplicity.

When the enemies of building socialism in our country—all kinds of Zinovievites, Trotskyites, and the like—clutched at Engels's old formula on the impossibility of the victory of socialism in one country, counterposing their dead scholasticism to the living and real practice of victorious socialist construction in the USSR, J. V. Stalin said: "Of course, if Engels were alive, he would not hold onto the old formula, but on the contrary, would welcome our revolution with all his heart, saying: 'To devil with all old formulas, long live the victorious revolution in the USSR!'" (*Works*, Vol. 8, p. 303). In these words there is no mention of dialectics, but they are a brilliant expression of true dialectics—that dialectics which, only when applied to practice, to living, eternally developing life, is capable of yielding great results.

Under the method of Marxism one must understand not a memorized sum of dialectical concepts and requirements, but the ability to apply these concepts and requirements to practice, to practical activity. In this sense, the works of the great leaders of the proletariat serve as a remarkable school for educating a dialectical approach to science, the ability to apply the method of Marxism in practice.

The strength of Marxist dialectics lies not in that living, real facts are brought under dialectical concepts, but in that dialectics and its concepts help to deeply understand and evaluate real facts, to see their present and future, to grasp the tendency of their development. One can, for example, repeat as much as one wants that dialectics requires seeing the new being born in life, but this important proposition of dialectics will remain a hollow phrase if one does not apply this requirement

to practice and in life itself fails to notice the new that still exists in embryonic form, but to which the future belongs.

Lenin, defining the essence of dialectical logic in his famous article on trade unions, included in it human practice "as a criterion of truth and as a practical determinant of the connection of an object with what a person needs" (*Works*, Vol. 32, p. 72).

This means that detaching philosophy from practice is fatal above all for philosophy itself; that only by taking into account the needs of the practice of communist construction, the needs of developing science, can and must we move Marxist philosophy forward, including materialist dialectics as a method of Marxism.

24. ON THE OBJECTIVE CONTETNT OF LAWS OF FORMAL LOGIC

P. V. TAVANETS

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have always emphasized that a correct, materialist understanding of the laws of thought presupposes the recognition that the laws of thought agree with the laws of nature. "...The laws of thought and the laws of nature," says F. Engels, "must necessarily agree with each other, if only they are correctly known" (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 178. 1950).

How is the fact explained that the laws of thought must necessarily agree with the laws of nature? This is explained by the fact that the laws of thought are a correct reflection of objective reality.

V. I. Lenin, setting forth the views of N. G. Chernyshevsky on the laws of thought, wrote that "for Chernyshevsky, as for any materialist, the laws of thought do not have a merely subjective significance, i.e., the laws of thought reflect the forms of actual existence of objects, completely agree, and do not differ, with these forms" (*Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 345–346).

That which Engels and Lenin wrote about the laws of thought also applies to the laws of formal logic. These laws must also necessarily agree with the laws of nature, for they reflect definite forms and relations of reality.

"The laws of logic," said V. I. Lenin, "are the reflections of the objective in the subjective consciousness of man" (*Philosophical Notebooks*, p. 158. 1947).

Proceeding from the cited statements of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, the present article sets as its goal to show:

3. What is the objective content of the laws of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle;
4. What significance does the disclosure of the objective content of the indicated laws have: a) for explaining that these laws have an all-human and durable character, that they cannot be altered or abolished at our will, i.e., arbitrarily, in the process of cognition of reality; b) for the critique of idealism in logic.

To avoid misunderstandings, it must be said at once that formal logic (and its laws) takes the forms of thought as given, unchanged, ready-made. This limits the sphere of application of formal logic (the sphere of its reflection of objects), and in this formal logic differs from dialectical logic.

****

The law of identity asserts: every thought, no matter how many times it is repeated in a given reasoning, must necessarily be considered as the very same thought, that is, as a thought having the very same content. In other words, in correct thinking (in thinking that correctly reflects reality) one cannot in the process of reasoning arbitrarily replace one thought with another thought having a content different from the first content.

This requirement of the law of identity fully corresponds to known forms of real objects. Indeed, every object of reality retains its qualitative determinacy in the course of a certain, more or less prolonged time. This also applies to the reflection of these objects in our consciousness. Consequently, when reasoning about anything, we must ensure that any of our thoughts, no matter how many times it appears in reasoning, retains the identity of its content.

If we arbitrarily alter the content of our thought about an object or replace it with another thought (a thought about another object), we will not be able either to prove anything or to make a correct inference from given premises.

Thus, the very task of a correct reflection of reality requires recognition of the law of identity.

Denying the law of identity, we would thereby be forced to deny either the fact that in reality there exists a relatively stable qualitative determinacy of objects, or that this qualitative determinacy of objects of reality is knowable, capable of being reflected in our consciousness. The law of identity has cognitive significance precisely because it reflects the fact of the relatively stable qualitative determinacy of objects of reality.

Let us now consider the law of contradiction and the law of excluded middle.

The law of contradiction requires that we, while affirming something about something, at the same time do not deny our affirmation.

The law of excluded middle requires that we, out of two contradictory judgments, consider only one to be true.

Both of these named laws are also connected with the consideration of objects of objective reality as relatively stable, possessing qualitative determinacy. In relation to objects so considered (and only under such an approach to them), the law of contradiction reflects that very obvious fact that if such a relatively stable object exists, then it exists at a given moment, and if it does not exist, then it does not exist at a given moment. The law of excluded middle reflects the fact that between the existence and non-existence of such an object at each given moment there is no third option.

From this it follows that in our reasoning about anything, while affirming that something exists, we cannot simultaneously deny that it exists. If it is considered true that something exists, then the simultaneous affirmation that this something does not exist must be considered false. If it is considered false that something exists, then the simultaneous affirmation that this something does not exist must be considered true.

By denying the necessity of observing the indicated requirements of the law of contradiction and the law of excluded middle for correct thinking, we would thereby be forced to deny either the fact that in reality itself there is a qualitative determinacy of objects, or the fact that this qualitative determinacy is knowable. Recognizing the presence of a qualitative determinacy of objects of reality and its knowability, we must necessarily recognize that the law of contradiction and the law of excluded middle, just like the law of identity, have objective content.

Thus, the considered laws of formal logic are subjective only in form, but objective in their content. To them applies that which was said by Lenin regarding logical forms and laws in general: "...Logical forms and laws," says V. I. Lenin, "are not an empty shell, but a reflection of the objective world" (*Philosophical Notebooks*, p. 155).

If logical laws did not have objective content, they could not be laws of thought that cognizes reality.

***

Proof that the laws of logic reflect forms of actual existence of objects is of decisive importance for explaining a number of other features of these laws.

J. V. Stalin in his brilliant work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, noting the objective character of the laws of science, which are a reflection of processes occurring in nature or in society independently of the will of people, wrote: "People can discover these laws, learn them, study them, take them into account in their activities, and use them in the interests of society, but they cannot change or abolish them. Still less can they form or create new laws of science" (p. 4).

The cited characterization of the laws of science can also be applied to the laws of logic, since the latter, as shown above, have an objective content independent of man and humanity. The laws of logic are also not created by the arbitrariness of people. People can discover these laws, learn them, take them into account in the process of cognizing reality. But they cannot change or abolish them, or "form" new laws.

From what has been said it follows that the assertion of certain logicians that Aristotle supposedly "created" the laws of logic is incorrect. Thus, for example, G. A. Kursanov writes: "...The basic laws of logic created by Aristotle as far back as the 4th century BC, for more than two thousand years have had a definite significance, and we in the middle of the 20th century accord necessary due to their study" (*Logical Laws of Thought*, p. 5. Leningrad, 1947).

Aristotle did not create and could not create these laws. For a correct understanding of Aristotle's merit in the field of logic, one must clearly distinguish the laws of correct thinking from the teaching about these laws. The laws of correct thinking existed before Aristotle as well. The thinking of people, insofar as it was correct, before Aristotle was also subject to the laws of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle. However, a more or less systematic teaching about these laws, so far as we know, did not exist prior to Aristotle.

Aristotle was the first to create a teaching on the laws of logic and pointed out the necessity of observing the laws of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle in correct thinking.

Certain followers of N. Y. Marr asserted that the laws of formal logic are necessarily connected with a definite ideology and therefore are "destroyed" or "abolished" in human thinking with a change in the economic structure of society. In their opinion, the laws of formal logic are characteristic only for the thinking of man living in class societies. In the thinking of man in a classless society, these laws supposedly had no place. There is allegedly no place for them in the thinking of man in socialist society either.

Reasoning of this kind has nothing in common with Marxism. Of course, among the laws of science there are also such laws that are determined by the economic conditions of a given socio-economic formation and therefore have a non-durable character; for example, the laws of political economy. Its laws, unlike the laws of natural science, are non-durable; they, or at least the majority of them, operate during a certain historical period, after which they yield place to new laws.

This non-durability of the laws of political economy J. V. Stalin explains by the fact that the laws of political economy lose their force by virtue of new economic conditions and depart from the scene to yield place to new laws, which are not created by the will of people, but arise on the basis of new economic conditions.

If the laws of logic, like the laws of political economy, were determined by economic conditions, then with a change in economic conditions they too would have to change. On the basis of new economic conditions, new laws of logic would also have to arise. But the whole point is that the existence of the laws of logic does not depend on the existence of these or those economic conditions.

Of course, the laws of logic are historical laws. However, the historical character of logical laws is expressed not in that these laws change and transform along with changes and transformations in the economic conditions of societal life, but in that they arise with the emergence of human thinking and exist only insofar as correct human thinking exists.

The laws of logic have an all-human character and operate at all stages of the historical development of society.

How is it explained that logical laws have a relatively durable character? This is explained by the fact that logical laws are a reflection of such forms of actual existence of objects (namely, the qualitative determinacy of objects) that are always inherent in the objective world. If the forms of existence of objects reflected in logical laws were not such regularities that are always inherent in the objective world, logical laws would not have a durable character. They would have to change following changes in the regularities of reality reflected in them.

Thus, only from the recognition of the objective content of the laws of logic can one correctly explain both the relatively durable character of the laws of logic and the circumstance that the laws of logic do not depend on the will of people.

From the recognition of the objective content of the laws of logic it also follows that these laws cannot be violated if we want our thinking to correctly reflect reality. This important property of the laws of logic should be considered in more detail.

At first glance it may seem that the requirement of the laws of logic can be violated (consciously or unconsciously) in the process of thinking. However, a deeper analysis of this problem shows that in correct thinking all laws of logic are steadfastly observed. Indeed, every law, as is known, operates in its sphere, that is, applicable to that circle of phenomena, objects, essential connections which it expresses. Thus, for

example, the law of value operates where there are commodities and commodity production.

Logical laws are laws of *correct thinking*. An analysis of the process of thinking shows that observance of the laws of formal logic is one of the necessary conditions for correct thinking, regardless of whether a given thinking subject wants or does not want to observe them.

Moreover, in correct thinking logical laws are observed even regardless of whether a given thinking subject knows about the existence of these laws or not. One who does not know about the existence of logical laws observes them just as steadfastly (insofar as he thinks correctly) as one who knows about the existence of these laws.

Whoever consciously or unconsciously violates the requirements of these laws thereby leaves the sphere of correct thinking. Let us show the correctness of what has been said as applied to each individual law of logic.

Let us take as an example two of the following judgments: "all metals are electrically conductive," "mercury is a metal." In these judgments the concept of metals occurs twice. It acts as the subject in the judgment "all metals are electrically conductive" and as the predicate in the judgment "mercury is a metal." To obtain a correct conclusion from these judgments, we must think one and the same content in the concept of metals both in the first and in the second case. Only under this condition can we affirm regarding mercury that which is affirmed regarding metals in the major premise of a given inference. If in the first judgment we mean one content under

metal, and in the second judgment another, then a conclusion from these judgments—"mercury is electrically conductive"—will turn out to be impossible.

Thus, in correct thinking the law of identity must necessarily be observed. But does this mean that we cannot, generally speaking, identify different thoughts, passing them off as one and the same thought? No, it does not mean that. However, in this case we will inevitably leave the sphere of correct thinking and arrive at false assertions.

Enemies of Marxism, striving by any means to discredit Marxism, often attribute to the classics of Marxism-Leninism false assertions, creating the appearance that these assertions allegedly flow from the basic tenets of the great teaching of Marx–Engels–Lenin–Stalin. However, such an appearance can be created only at the expense of violating the laws of logic. An example of what has been said can serve as the absurd assertion that "food determines ideology," which Georgian anarchists, violating the law of identity, attributed to Marx.

Exposing the falsity of this assertion, J. V. Stalin showed that it rests on a sophistical identification of such different concepts as "food" and "economic condition of people." "But tell us, gentlemen," wrote J. V. Stalin, "where, when, on what planet, and which Marx said that 'food determines ideology'? Why did you not cite a single phrase, a single word from the works of Marx in confirmation of your statement? True, Marx said that the economic condition of people determines their consciousness, their ideology, but who told you that food and economic condition are one and the same thing?" (*Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 325–326).

From the considered examples it is clear that one cannot think correctly while violating the requirements of the law of identity. Whoever voluntarily or involuntarily violates the requirements of the law of identity inevitably arrives at false assertions.

In exactly the same way, the requirements of the law of contradiction and the law of excluded middle cannot be violated in correct thinking. Non-observance of the requirements of these laws unfailingly leads to logical contradictions. The presence in reasoning of logical contradictions clearly testifies to its groundlessness.

"Logical contradiction," says V. I. Lenin, "under conditions, of course, of correct logical thinking—must not exist either in economic or in political analysis... Every analysis does not permit 'logical contradiction.'" (*Works*, Vol. 23, p. 29).

In confirmation of what has been said, let us consider two examples of contradictory reasoning. As a first example, let us take E. Mach's reasoning about the word "element." As is known, Mach preached a philosophy of subjective idealism, according to which in reality nothing exists except our sensations. Along with this, Mach attempted to cover up his subjective idealism with "objective" terms such as "elements of the world," "physical series," etc. However, these attempts by Mach led only to his becoming entangled in logical contradictions. Thus, for example, in his *Mechanics* Mach asserted that "all natural science can only depict (nachbilden und vorbilden) complexes of *those elements*, which we usually call *sensations*" (cited from V. I. Lenin's work *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, *Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 41–42).

From the cited statement of Mach it is clear that the judgment "element is sensation" is recognized as true. However, that same Mach in *Analysis of Sensations* wrote: "Elements are usually called sensations. In view of the fact that under this name a certain one-sided theory is already implied, we prefer to speak briefly of elements" (See ibid., p. 42. Note).

From this reasoning it follows that the judgment "element is not sensation" is also recognized as true. It turns out, thus, that two contradictory judgments: 1) "element is sensation" and 2) "element is not sensation" are declared to be true. The presence of a logical contradiction testifies to the groundlessness of E. Mach's reasoning about the word "element."

V. I. Lenin, in his crushing critique of subjective idealism of the Machists, noted also the logical contradictoriness of the Machists' reasoning about the word "element." V. I. Lenin wrote: "Either 'element' is sensation, as all empirio-critics say, including Mach, Avenarius, Petzoldt, etc.—then your philosophy, gentlemen, is idealism, vainly attempting to cover up the nakedness of its solipsism with a garment of 'objective' terminology. Or 'element' is not sensation—and then with your 'new' word no thought whatsoever is connected, then it is a mere empty wordlet" (*Works*, Vol. 14, p. 44).

As a second example of the groundlessness of a judgment by virtue of the presence in it of a logical contradiction can serve the following reasoning of the opponents of signing the convention at the Danube Conference in August 1948. During the discussion of the question of signing the convention, on the one hand, they asserted that a given conference was not empowered to sign the convention without the consent of those

states that signed the convention of 1921 and which were not participating in the given conference. On the other hand, these same persons proposed their draft conventions for approval and signing by those states participating in the conference of 1948.

It turned out, thus, that contradictory judgments: 1) "The Danube Conference of 1948 is not empowered to sign the convention" and 2) "The Danube Conference of 1948 is empowered to sign the convention"—were declared to both be true.

Soviet diplomats exposed the groundlessness of this reasoning, showing that it was logically contradictory.

The examples considered by us irrefutably testify that any voluntary or involuntary violation of the requirements of the laws of logic inevitably leads to incorrect thinking. If we think correctly, our thinking is necessarily subject to the laws of logic, and this occurs precisely because the laws of logic are a reflection of forms of actual existence of objects.

***

Elucidation of the objective content of the laws of logic is of great significance for the critique of idealism in logic.

In *Dialectics of Nature* Engels wrote: "The theory of the laws of thought is by no means a once-and-for-all established 'eternal truth', as philistine mind connects with the word 'logic'. Formal logic itself remains, starting from Aristotle and down to our days, an arena of fierce debates" (*Dialectics of Nature*, p. 22).

The correctness of this proposition of Engels becomes obvious for anyone who acquaints himself with the history of logic. One can without exaggeration say that in the problem of logical laws the struggle between materialism and idealism in logic manifests itself with the greatest force.

In contrast to the materialist understanding of the laws of logic, idealists of all stripes deny that the laws of formal logic have objective content. In so doing they either generally deny the cognitive significance of these laws, or deny the fact that these laws do not depend on the will of people, or, while recognizing that logical laws do not depend on the will of people, cannot give a correct, scientific explanation for this fact.

Let us consistently consider all three of these anti-scientific points of view of reactionary philosophy on the laws of formal logic and subject them to critique.

Those idealists who generally deny the cognitive significance of logical laws usually reason in the following manner. Reality, these philosophers say, is absolutely changeable. Neither identity nor constancy in reality exists. A completely different picture, in their opinion, is represented by the realm of logical thought, that is, thought subject to the laws of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle. This is a realm of identity and constancy. Here every thought is considered identical to itself, regardless of how many times it appears in consciousness in the process of reasoning in a given subject or in the consciousness of other thinking subjects.

But if, thus, logical thought is constant, while reality is absolutely changeable, this means that logical thought cannot

serve as a means of cognizing reality, for it is incapable of correctly reflecting reality.

"...Our thought, in its purely logical form," asserts one of these idealists, the alogist H. Bergson, "is incapable of presenting to itself the real nature of life, the deep meaning of evolutionary movement" (*Creative Evolution*. Coll. works. Vol. 1, p. 1).

A similar kind of views on logical laws is held also by representatives of pragmatism—one of the most reactionary trends of Anglo-American idealist philosophy. Thus, for example, W. James in his work *A Pluralistic Universe* asserted that logic is merely an unbinding "game." "As for me," declares James, "I considered myself in the end forced to *abandon logic*, to abandon it open, honest, and once and for all" (p. 117. 1911).

Another pragmatist, Schiller, asserts that logic and its rules paralyze human thought. Therefore, he proposes to throw out all formal logic and declare it nonsense.

What do alogists propose instead of logical laws? Instead of logical laws they propose to be guided by the laws of religion. "It will not be an exaggeration to say," asserts Schiller, "that *credo quia absurdum* is the basis of science just as of theology" (Schiller F. C. S. *Riddles of the Sphinx. A study in the Philosophy of Humanism*, p. 58. London. 1912).

Reasonings of alogists serve as a vivid confirmation of the correctness of V. I. Lenin's well-known indication that "the banishment of laws from science is in fact merely the smuggling in of laws of religion" (*Works*, Vol. 20, p. 182).

Sophistical reasonings that "intellect is characterized by a natural inability to understand life" (H. Bergson. Coll. works. Vol. 1, p. 145), that "truth and reality for each person is that which seems to him" (Schiller F. C. S. *Studies in Humanism*, p. 317. London. 1907), etc., are needed by alogists only in order to ultimately justify religious mysticism and obscurantism.

The main sophism in the reasonings of alogists consists in the fact that the actual existing fact of a certain coarsening of reality by thought is considered by them as evidence of the inability of thought to cognize reality. Meanwhile, how this fact testifies only to the fact that the reflection of an object by thought must not be considered by us as a mirror-dead act. Logic, based on dialectical materialism, does not assert this. Only metaphysics interprets the process of reflecting an object by thought as a simple, direct, mirror-dead act. As a result of this act, man, in the opinion of metaphysicians, immediately cognizes the entire object and masters eternal and unchangeable truth.

Dialectical materialism shows that such a understanding of the process of cognition is anti-scientific. "The coincidence of thought with the object," says V. I. Lenin, "is a *process*... Thought (= man) must not depict truth in the form of dead rest... Cognition is the eternal, endless approximation of thought to the object" (*Philosophical Notebooks*, pp. 167, 168).

The laws of logic do not contradict this proposition of dialectical materialism. For the laws of logic do not require that thought always retain the constancy of its content. The laws of logic prohibit only an arbitrary change in the content of thoughts. A change in the content of thought occurring by

virtue of a deeper cognition of the object of thought does not at all contradict these laws.

Further, it is completely incorrect also to fail to see, behind the facts of continuous changeability of objects of reality, the existence of a relative constancy of qualitative determinacy of these objects. And since we recognize that in reality there exists a qualitative determinacy of objects and that this qualitative determinacy of objects is knowable, we must necessarily recognize the cognitive significance of logical laws. For in logical laws it is precisely the qualitative determinacy of objects of reality that is reflected.

If alogists do not recognize the laws of logic at all, then representatives of so-called "semantic idealism" and "logical positivism" (A. Ayer, R. Carnap, and others) assert that the laws of logic have no objective content and are established by us arbitrarily.

In the opinion of A. Ayer, we think according to the laws of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle not because these laws have objective content, but because such is the structure of our language. "One or the other of two mutually contradictory propositions," writes A. Ayer on the law of excluded middle, "must be false not because the world is so structured. This is because we structure our language so that a combination of a proposition with a proposition contradictory to it has no application in description" (A. Ayer *The philosophy of science*. In the collection *Scientific thought in the twentieth century*, pp. 9–10. London. 1951).

Equating logical laws with laws of language, logical positivists further assert that by arbitrarily changing ordinary human language, they thereby build a "new logic"—a logic free from materialism. Very clearly this point of view is set forth by the logical positivist Rudolf Carnap.

In Carnap's opinion, the reason why in logic until now people still adhere to the materialist (Aristotelian) theory consists in the "widespread point of view" that "deviation" from classical logic needs to be "justified," that is, to prove that the new form of language conveys the "true logic." Carnap rejects this "outdated" view on logic. In the book *Logical Syntax of Language* he declares that "now, finally, this obstacle (that is, the requirement that logical theory convey "true logic"—*P. T.*) is overcome; before us stretches an open ocean of unlimited possibilities" (R. Carnap *Logische Syntax der Sprache*, S. VI. Wien. 1934).

"In logic," asserts Carnap, "there is no morality. Everyone has the right to build his own logic, i.e., his own form of language —as he wants" (ibid., p. 45).

Renouncing any morality, Carnap attempts to build in accordance with the social order of the imperialist bourgeoisie a subjectively idealist "theory of logic." For this he first of all requires the elimination from language (from logic) of all "universal words," that is, words indicating the existence of the

general in objective reality[15], and the existence of objective reality itself "behind our sensations."

Carnap requires also the elimination of the so-called "material mode of speech," that is, a mode that "speaks of objects, states of affairs, of the sense, content, and meaning of words." The use of the material mode of speech leads, in Carnap's opinion, to insoluble difficulties and contradictions, for in so doing endless disputes arise over "pseudo-questions" about what this or that thing in reality represents. Contradictions, however, according to Carnap, will immediately disappear if we renounce the use of the material mode of speech and apply the only correct—formal—mode of speech, which relates no longer to objects, not to sense, content, and meaning of words, but only to linguistic forms. The rules of this formal mode, that is, the rules of "constructing propositions," are established by logic or "logical syntax." They are established "completely arbitrarily."

The only thing Carnap requires from these rules is that they say nothing about the meaning of symbols (words), or about the sense of "combinations of symbols" (propositions). Logic, he asserts, should speak "simply and exclusively about the types

---

[15] To the class of "universal words" Carnap assigns such words as "thing," "object," "property," "relation," "fact," "condition," "process," "event," "space," "time," "spatial relation," "number," "whole," "function," "aggregate," "class," and many others. But since we are forced to use such words, says Carnap, this is the result of the imperfection of language. However, as Carnap thinks, "everyone can without detriment to expressiveness and conciseness translate in such a way that universal words will no longer occur in it" (p. 220).

and orders of symbols of which expressions are composed." The task of logic is "a systematic presentation of formal rules governing language, and also the development of consequences flowing from these rules."

It must be said that Carnap is not alone in his absurd attempts to destroy materialism in logic by way of "reforming language." Similar attempts were undertaken also by Alfred Whitehead (see A. Whitehead *Process and Reality*, 1949), Charles Morris (see Ch. Morris *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*. International Encyclopedia of Unified Science. Chicago. 1938) and other idealists. In so doing they all counterpose to materialism the long-bankrupt subjectively idealist idea that all-human knowledge of objective reality is a "fiction." In the opinion of these obscurantists, no other "reality" except the reality of our sensations exists. Therefore, all attempts to describe objective reality are devoid of sense.

"Not a single proposition relating to 'reality' exceeding the bounds of all possible sensory experience," asserts Alfred Ayer, "can have any exact meaning. From here it follows that the works of all those who strive to describe that kind of reality were devoted to the production of nonsense" (A. Ayer *Language, Truth and Logic*, p. 17. London. 1936).

To this, long since shattered by materialism, paltry idea reduces all the wisdom of the "teachings" of logical positivists and semantic idealists. Declarations of the dependence of logical laws on the will of people are needed by them only in order to drag into logical theory a subjectively idealist interpretation of the nature of thought and language.

The materialist teaching on the laws of logic as a reflection of the objective world reveals the complete groundlessness of the fabrications of logical positivists. Since the laws of logic are a reflection of the objective in the subjective consciousness of man, this means that there are not and cannot be a multitude of different logics, and there cannot be an arbitrary change or replacement of one set of logical laws by other laws. The assertion of the possibility of an arbitrary change in the laws of logic or replacement of one set of logical laws by another leads to the liquidation of logic as a science.

J. V. Stalin, criticizing the erroneous theory denying the existence of objective regularities in the economic life of our society, wrote: "Suppose for a minute that we took the standpoint of the incorrect theory denying the existence of objective laws in economic life under socialism, and proclaiming the 'creation' of economic laws, the 'transformation' of economic laws. To what would this lead? This would lead to our ending up in the realm of chaos and chance; we would find ourselves in a slavish dependence on these chances, we would deprive ourselves of the opportunity not only to understand, but simply to navigate this chaos of chances" (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, p. 85).

Logic also cannot live and develop without recognition of the existence of such regularities of correct thinking that do not depend on the will of people. If in thinking these regularities did not exist, the sphere of thinking would turn into a realm of chaos and chances, and we would deprive ourselves of the

possibility not only to understand, but simply to navigate this chaos of chances.

Logical "positivists" precisely strive to turn logic into a realm of chaos and chances. In other words, under the banner of struggle against "poverty of content and practical uselessness of old (Aristotelian—*P. T.*) logic" (R. Carnap *Abriss der Logistik*, S. 1. Wien. 1929), logical positivists attempt to liquidate logic as a science. In this fact manifests itself clearly the reactionary, anti-scientific character of their false teachings.

It remains for us to consider also the views of those logicians-idealists who assert that the laws of thought, although not a reflection of the objective world, nevertheless exist independently of the will of people. To the number of these logicians belong, firstly, so-called logicians-empiricists (Mill, Spencer, and others) and, secondly, apriorists (Kantians and Husserlians).

Logicians-empiricists, in order to show that logical laws have a character of necessity, refer to experience, understanding by this self-observation of the thinking subject. In the opinion of J. S. Mill, the law of contradiction "is a generalization of a constantly occurring mental act, and without which one cannot dispense in inference" (*An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy and of the Principal Philosophical Questions Discussed in his Writings*, p. 386. St. Petersburg. 1869).

The original foundation of the law of contradiction, asserts J. S. Mill, is "the fact that 'belief' and 'disbelief' are two different mental states excluding one another; this we know from the

simplest observation of our own mind" (*A System of Logic Ratiocinative and Inductive*, p. 250. Moscow. 1914).

A similar kind of views was expressed also by Spencer. The law of excluded middle, according to Spencer, "is merely a generalization of that all-embracing experience that certain mental states directly destroy other mental states" (see ibid., p. 251).

All laws of logic empiricists consider to be natural laws. They believe that given the present constitution of our nature we cannot think otherwise than we think. "Some assertion colliding with one of these laws," writes J. S. Mill, "some proposition, for example, affirming a contradiction... goes beyond the bounds of our trust. Trust in such a proposition, under the present constitution of our nature, is impossible as a fact of mind" (*An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy and of the Principal Philosophical Questions Discussed in his Writings*, p. 390. Department 4th—*P. T.*).

Apriorists, like empiricists, assert that the laws of logic are necessary laws of correct thinking. However, unlike empiricists, they consider that the laws of logic do not have an empirical origin. In Kant's opinion, understanding does not draw its laws from nature, but prescribes them to it. In logic, asserts Kant, "understanding has to do with nothing other than itself alone and its form" (*Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 6. St. Petersburg. 1902).

Apriorists sharply criticize empiricists for recognizing the empirical origin of logical laws. In the opinion of a prominent representative of apriorism in logic, E. Husserl, recognition of

the empirical origin of logical laws deprives them of their necessary character.

The only way for substantiating and justifying empirical laws, says Husserl, "is induction from individual facts of experience. But no induction substantiates the truth of a law, but only a greater or lesser degree of its probability... Therefore logical laws, and moreover all without exception, would have to possess merely probability. On the contrary, it is completely clear that all 'purely logical' laws are true *a priori*. They are substantiated and justified not through induction, but through apodictic self-evidence..." (E. Husserl *Logical Investigations*, Vol. 1, pp. 52–53. St. Petersburg. 1909).

Husserlian interpretation of the nature of logical laws finds many adherents among modern bourgeois logicians. Thus, for example, professor of Vienna University Victor Kraft in his book *Mathematics, Logic and Experience* (Victor Kraft *Mathematik, Logik und Erfahrung*. Wien. 1947), criticizing logical positivists and empiricists, completely repeats all the argumentation of Husserl. The conclusions at which Kraft arrives as a result of this critique are the same as Husserl's.

"Logical laws," writes he, "have nothing in common with the world of experience. They are not derived from the laws of nature by means of generalization and formalization; they are not laws of being, but rules for ordering thinking. As such, they do not depend on any experience whatsoever. Moreover, they themselves form the premises for any substantiation... the laws of nature do not substantiate logic, but rest upon it" (p. 101).

With all the apparent difference in interpreting the nature of logical laws by empiricists and apriorists, both of these points of view suffer from one and the same defect. Not recognizing the existence of objective reality or declaring it unknowable, empiricists and apriorists are not in a position to explain why observance of the requirements of the laws of logic is one of the necessary conditions for true cognition, that is, in other words, why the laws of logic have cognitive significance.

If one takes the standpoint of empiricists and apriorists, it is impossible to explain why thinking must obey precisely the laws of identity, contradiction, excluded middle, and not any other laws.

Indeed, from the fact that the laws of logic are natural and necessary laws of our thinking, one cannot infer their necessity for all thinking subjects. On the contrary, proceeding from this, one would have full right to assume that there may exist also such subjects in whom thinking obeys other laws, different from the laws of our "earthly" logic.

Not by chance, therefore, certain empiricists, for example Benno Erdmann (see B. Erdmann *Logik* I. 2-te Auflage. 1907, S. 527 and others), and Kantians, for example N. Vasiliev, quite definitely indicated such a possibility.

The Russian Kantian N. Vasiliev attempted even to build several different logics with different laws of thought. In the article "Logic and Metalogic," published in the journal *Logos* (Books 1 and 2 for 1912–1913), N. Vasiliev asserted that, besides the ordinary Aristotelian logic with its two forms of judgments (affirmative and negative) and the law of excluded

middle, one should recognize as legitimate the existence of: 1) "non-Aristotelian logic" with three forms of judgments (affirmative, negative, and accidental), which obeys no longer the law of excluded middle, but the law of excluded fourth, and 2) "metalogic or divine logic," which has only one form of judgment (affirmative) and obeys the law of excluded second.

The necessity of observing for any correct thinking precisely the given laws of formal logic—the laws of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle—can be explained only from the standpoint of materialism. Only formally interpreted formal logic, showing that in the laws of logic the qualitative determinacy of objects of reality is reflected, thereby proves their necessity for any correct thinking.

If we recognize that in objective reality there has always existed, exists, and will exist a relative qualitative determinacy and stability of objects, then we must recognize that in cognizing this reality thinking must always observe the laws of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle.

To change these laws or replace them with any other, invented laws is impossible, for the objective content of these laws (the qualitative determinacy of objects of reality) depends neither on man nor on humanity.

25. WHOM DOES CYBERNETICS SERVE MATERIALIST

Among modern bourgeois sociological theories directed at defending capitalism, a prominent place is occupied by "theories" that fetishize technology, attempting to depict it as the primary engine of social development. Some bourgeois scientists tend to attribute all social contradictions existing in capitalist society, all misfortunes and miseries, to technology. In the "mystical power" of technology, they see the causes of wars, unemployment, and crises. These "sociologists" call for the destruction of technology and a return to the idyllic times of primitive life, when there were neither machines nor social conflicts. Other "sociologists" from the same camp fetishize technology as a positive force capable of supposedly eliminating all contradictions of the capitalist system.

All these fabrications of scientists who are lackeys of imperialism have nothing in common with science and merely testify to the degeneration of modern bourgeois science.

The development of technology depends on the nature of the economic system and is determined by the needs of social production. Socialist social relations open up boundless scope for the development of productive forces, for the maximum perfection of production technology.

Only under the socialist social system did a grandiose technical revolution become feasible in all areas of the national

economy, thanks to which the Soviet Union in a short period far surpassed advanced capitalist countries.

The colossal successes achieved in the industrialization of our country, the steady progressive development of production technology, and the unprecedented history of creative activity and initiative of millions of working people—manifested in inventions and rationalization proposals numbered in the millions—testify to the fact that socialism, as the highest social system, has created all the conditions favorable to the flourishing of technology. All this is entirely conditioned by the operation of the basic economic law of socialism, aimed at ensuring maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural requirements of the whole society through continuous growth and perfection of socialist production based on the highest technology.

The perfection of socialist production fully answers the pressing needs of socialist society. The progress of science and technology is in full harmony with relations of production in socialist society.

In capitalist countries, where the development of science and technology is subordinated to the operation of the basic economic law of modern capitalism, technology develops in those sectors of production that yield the highest profit. In the pre-imperialist period, capitalism contributed to the development of technology in almost all fields. It is true that even then, due to deep-seated inherent contradictions belonging to the capitalist system, technical inventions and scientific discoveries that did not promise immediate profit to capitalists were hindered. This reactionary tendency of capitalism

manifests with particular force at the present stage of its development, conditioning an ugly, one-sided direction in the development of technology. In capitalist countries, expense is not spared on perfecting technology only in those branches of production that serve the interests of war—the most profitable business of capitalists.

The development of technology in the military industry of capitalist countries is something some bourgeois sociologists attempt to explain by mystical forces within technology itself, which allegedly dictate the spheres of its application, rather than by imperialist policy.

Thus, the invention of the atomic bomb was declared by scientist lackeys of imperialism to be the beginning of the "atomic age," requiring a new, "atomic sociology". According to this "sociology," the world is ruled by a "world dictator"—the atomic bomb, and people are powerless to resist it. It determines the direction of society's development, stimulates the development of certain sectors of production—military ones—and demands the reduction of others. In this way, capitalists are relieved of responsibility for war, unemployment, high cost of living, housing crises, and so forth.

An example of how latest achievements in technology are used for military purposes, in a one-sided manner, can serve the situation in the USA of a new branch of production—the industry of computing machines and other complex automatic devices having special applications.

Relying on the latest discoveries in radio engineering and telemechanics, American designers created complex computing machines that solve tasks automatically, using systems of transmitting mechanisms and signaling that employ feedback mechanisms. These machines are capable of altering the direction of mathematical operations depending on intermediate results.

The construction of computing machines has its own long history. Starting from the first adding machine invented by Leibniz, there goes a whole series of diverse calculating devices, each of which performed increasingly complex mathematical operations. In recent decades, the production of calculating machines has undergone a new reconstruction. It expressed itself in achieving full automation of calculating operations. Electronic machines represent enormous aggregates in which, thanks to the application of radio and telemechanics, calculating operations are performed with exceptional speed. Arithmetic actions are performed by them in thousandths of a second. More complex, integral and differential calculations requiring the expenditure of weeks of labor by highly qualified mathematicians are performed in minutes and seconds.

The application of such computing machines is of enormous importance for the most diverse areas of economic construction. Designing industrial enterprises, high-rise residential buildings, railway and pedestrian bridges, and many other structures requires complex mathematical calculations taking many months of labor by highly qualified specialists. Computing machines facilitate and reduce this work to a

minimum. With equal success, these machines are used in all complex economic and statistical calculations.

An enormous advantage of these machines is the complete error-free nature of their actions and received results, whereas in complex calculations performed by mathematicians, errors inevitably creep in.

Thanks to computing machines, modern mathematics can solve in short timeframes problems previously considered intractable due to the large number of required calculations. This led to the creation of a new branch of applied mathematics, so-called machine mathematics.

Recently, quite a few other complex, self-regulating machines used in various branches of production have been created.

Both computing machines and other automatic devices constructed using electronics have become widespread in many countries. They are successfully used in the Soviet Union as well, where massive construction is being carried out.

In the USA, computing machines and other devices equipped with servomechanisms received a one-sided application.

Computing machines performing extremely complex mathematical calculations in ultrashort timeframes are used to control long-range missiles or flying apparatuses. The possibility of military application of this invention provided it with wide practice in the USA.

In the article *"Giant Brains, or Machines That Think,"* Edmund Berkeley reports that the computing machine laboratory at Harvard University serves the Navy; the laboratory at the

University of Pennsylvania works on Army assignments; a machine constructed by it is located in the ballistics laboratory of the Department of Defense in Aberdeen (Maryland); machines invented by the laboratory of the Bell Telephone Company were purchased by the aeronautics committee and the ballistics laboratory of the Department of Defense.

There can be no doubt that in reality the scale of using computing machines in the US military industry is significantly broader than the sparse yet sufficiently eloquent information provided in Berkeley's article.

Around this new invention, which received such widespread application in the US military industry, American scientists raised an unimaginable stir. Professor of Mathematics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Norbert Wiener saw in it another "stage" in human development, a new "industrial revolution" fraught with enormous social consequences.

In Wiener's view, the activity of computing machines will provide a key to understanding the most diverse natural and social phenomena. This fundamentally flawed idea served Wiener as the basis for creating a new "science"—cybernetics.

During its brief existence, cybernetics gained quite a few adherents among bourgeois figures of science working in various fields of knowledge. It is symptomatic of scientists who are forced to cling to the dilapidated rags of idealist philosophy and even to such "novelties" of scientific fantasy as cybernetics.

The newspaper *New York World-Telegram* advertised Wiener's fabrications as a scientific exploit: "Dr. Wiener did for human

brain knowledge what Einstein did for knowledge of the universe".

Propaganda for cybernetics received wide scope in capitalist countries. Dozens of books, hundreds of journal and newspaper articles disseminate false ideas about the "new science". Starting in 1944, annual cyberneticist conferences take place in New York, in which research workers of the most diverse specialties actively participate. Cybernetics conferences were also held in France and England. American exporters even brought this rotten ideological commodity to India.

Apologists for cybernetics consider its field of application boundless. They assert that cybernetics has great significance not only for solving questions related to telemechanics, self-regulating devices, reactive mechanisms, and servomechanisms, but even to such fields of knowledge as biology, physiology, psychology, and psychopathology. Enthusiasts of cybernetics assume that sociology and political economy should also use its theory and methods.

What does this new science—cybernetics—represent? In ancient Greek, the word *cybernetes* means helmsman, and *cybernetikos*—capable of being a helmsman, that is, capable of managing. Defining the content of cybernetics, Norbert Wiener stated without undue modesty: "We decided to call cybernetics the entire theoretical field of control and communication, both in the machine and in the living organism".

Thus, first and foremost, cybernetics sets itself the task of proving the absence of a fundamental difference between a

machine and a living organism. A task, to put it mildly, thankless in the 20th century. But nevertheless, drawing an analogy between the operation of complex computing aggregates containing up to 23 thousand radio tubes that automatically switch, cyberneticists assert that the difference between the operation of such a "smart" machine and the human brain is only quantitative. Professor at London University John Young announced to the world with enthusiasm that "the brain is a gigantic computing machine containing 15 billion cells instead of 23 thousand radio tubes found in the largest computing machines constructed to date". And this is by no means a metaphor, but an assertion pretending to be scientific!

A more circumspect professor at Harvard University, Louis Ridenour, expressed himself on this score more cautiously: "The most complex modern computing machine corresponds to the level of the nervous system... of a flatworm".

What is essential in these statements is not that they note a difference between the quantity of "reacting cells," but that they ignore the qualitative difference between a living organism and a machine.

The founder of cybernetics is delighted by the ability of computing machines to self-regulate, although this whole process occurring in computing machines happens according to laws of that communication, with the help of that automatic signaling and those mechanical devices, which are all constructed down to the smallest screw by man and are capable of acting only according to his setups.

Casting aside this fundamental qualitative difference between a mechanism and an organism as allegedly non-essential, theorists of the new science define calculating machines as self-regulating mechanisms, as "thinking machines," as "giant brains," and assert that the activity of computing machines provides the key to understanding both biological and social phenomena, which cybernetics ought to study.

It is not difficult to establish that these pretensions of cyberneticists cast science back two hundred years, to the views of 18th-century French materialist La Mettrie. In his work *Man a Machine*, La Mettrie drew an analogy between man and machine. The organism of animals and man—according to La Mettrie—is subject to the same material laws as a clockwork mechanism, and is set in motion by external conditions acting through sense organs and the brain upon the whole organism. A machine is also set in motion by external force transmitted through a system of mechanisms.

The analogy drawn by La Mettrie between man and machine, despite its mechanistic character, had a progressive tendency. It was directed against concepts of special divine forces allegedly managing the organism, and proved that its vital activity is conditioned by the action of material forces. In contrast to the 18th-century French thinker, modern cyberneticists proceed from a desire to belittle man, to show that man can and should fully be replaced by a machine, but not just any man, only the surplus one, the one considered a "restless element". Cyberneticists deny such people the capacity for judgment, consciousness, and reduce all brain activity to mechanical connection and signaling. Of course, not all cyberneticists have

reached such sociological fabrications, but one way or another, they all serve one goal—to divide people into a "thinking administration," whose activity does not reduce to a signaling mechanism but is recognized as creative, and "workers with average capacities," who are equated to mechanisms. In this respect, cybernetics turns out to be merely a variety of the technocratic theory widespread in imperialist countries, which arose as early as the late 19th century alongside imperialism.

Modern technocrats—cyberneticists—have raised a dense, pseudo-scientific fog around their ultra-reactionary theory. They conduct a "comparative study of the functioning of computing machines and human thought," the nervous system, and transmitting mechanisms, and arrive at the conclusion that "a super-fast computing machine is an almost ideal model for understanding problems arising in the study of the nervous system".

Professor of Anatomy at Glasgow University George Wyburn, in an article published in 1952, writes: "Cyberneticists approach the problem of nervous activity from a purely functional point of view and view brain activity as a whole as electronic devices of modern communication systems and servomechanisms, trying to use them in terms of information theory and statistics".

Similar mechanistic concepts of the brain are expressed at a time when science, in the person of Russian scientists I. M. Sechenov and I. P. Pavlov, created the doctrine of higher nervous activity in animals and man, illuminating brain activity from consistently materialist positions and providing a genuine

solution to the question of the relationship between thought and being, consciousness and matter.

The most progressive doctrine of modern natural science meets furious resistance from reactionaries of science. Since they are unable to find scientific arguments against I. P. Pavlov's doctrine, they are left with taking the path of falsifying and perverting this doctrine. Without hesitating, they endow the computing machine with properties of the central nervous system. "Nothing prevents a computing machine from demonstrating conditioned reflexes," asserts Wiener, referring to a self-regulating machine invented by Grey Walter that can be set in motion by a whistle. This machine approaches a target if the latter emits weak light, and repels from it if the target emits strong radiation; it is capable of bypassing obstacles. And yet, all this is merely a mechanism controlled by sound, light, and mechanical signals, having nothing in common with human reflexes.

According to I. P. Pavlov's doctrine, the brain regulates all functions of the organism, all its vital activity. The brain is the organ of cognitive and creative human activity, the material substrate of his psyche. By I. P. Pavlov's definition, "the nervous system on our planet is an unspeakably complex and subtle instrument of relations, connection of numerous parts of the organism with one another, and of the organism as an extremely complex system with an infinite number of external influences" (I. P. Pavlov, Works, Vol. III, p. 559).

The cortex of the cerebral hemispheres represents a system of analyzers, that is, those complex instruments that perceive all phenomena of reality, analyze them, and synthesize them. All

functional activity of the cortex is correlated with its anatomical structure. The activity of the brain itself is conditioned by influences upon it through perceiving analyzer instruments—eye, ear, skin, and others—from numerous stimuli of the external world and internal environment of the organism. All this activity is strictly determined by influences on the brain and is a reflex, that is, a response to these influences.

The immortal merit of I. P. Pavlov is his creation of a harmonious doctrine of the brain's reflex activity, establishing essential differences between innate, unconditioned reflexes formed in the process of long species evolution, and acquired reflexes formed in the individual life of an animal, conditioned reflexes, formed in cases where the action of an external stimulus coincides in time with an unconditioned reflex or directly precedes it.

Every excitation perceived by peripheral nerve instruments and the central end of an analyzer causes excitement in it, which spreads to adjacent sections of the cortex, and then concentrates again in the initial area. Different stimuli, depending on their biological significance for the organism, can cause different processes in the cortex—excitation or inhibition—with an equal tendency of any of these processes to spread across the whole cortex and subsequently concentrate in the initial area. The interaction of excitation and inhibition processes, their alternation, and mutual induction are objective laws of higher nervous activity.

One of the most important discoveries of I. P. Pavlov is establishing the fact that in humans, to the activity of ordinary

numerous stimuli of the external environment acting directly on organs of sight, hearing, and other analyzers of the first signal system, there joins a second signal system of reality—speech, which introduces a new principle into human higher nervous activity. The word for a human is a stimulus of a special kind, all-embracing in its significance, standing in no comparison with any other stimuli of the first signal system common to human and animals. Thanks to speech, which gives humans the possibility of abstraction and simultaneously generalization of signals of the preceding system, human thought is clothed in the most flexible and expressive form. In this way, a principle is introduced into human higher nervous activity that "conditions limitless orientation in the surrounding world and creates human highest adaptation—science, both in the form of universal empiricism and in its specialized form" (I. P. Pavlov, Works, Vol. III, p. 476).

I. P. Pavlov's doctrine of higher nervous activity is the natural-scientific basis of materialist psychology. It places human psychology on the firm ground of objective natural laws, whereas idealist psychology shrouds it in a mystical veil. Relying on laws of higher nervous activity discovered by the great physiologist, materialist psychology provides a genuinely scientific explanation of human psychological activity, shows how brain operation conditions purposeful human activity—who managed to adapt to nature, create an artificial environment, that material and spiritual culture that raised him immeasurably high above the rest of the animal world. Man, thanks to the operation of a brain that reached the most complex structure, was able to penetrate the secrets of nature,

formulate its laws, and create industry on the basis of high technology.

This applies, in particular, to computing machines, which were also created by the human brain—this most perfect creation of nature.

We required a brief excursion into the field of physiology of higher nervous activity in order to show the complete groundlessness of analogies drawn by cyberneticists between a computing machine and the brain.

Scientist lackeys of capitalism find it difficult to deny the greatest achievements of Pavlovian physiology, but since it presents a serious obstacle to creating their pseudo-scientific phantasmagoria, they hurry to declare I. P. Pavlov's doctrine... surpassed. In the article *"The Hypothesis of Cybernetics,"* published in No. 5 of the *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* for 1951, John Wisdom writes: "Cybernetics is the science of feedback in animals... Neurology can now take a new step forward compared to Pavlov's fundamental work".

In what does this step forward consist? "All that we know,—writes the same author,—is that the brain is less like a system of levers and gears than a radar installation or a thermostat..." With the help of such sophistical tricks, Wisdom simply evades confirming his ignorant assertion.

In conclusion of his article, the author wonders whether he was carried away in his evaluation of cybernetics, and regretfully states: "True, cybernetics loses sight of the spiritual aspect of action... It does not resolve problems of the mind-body relationship, since it discards one of the correlated elements

and suffers from the one-sidedness of its predecessors (behaviorists, etc.)".

Thus, cybernetics "loses sight" of nothing less than consciousness. Wisdom vaguely calls it "one of the correlated elements". American behaviorists, for half a century prior to cybernetics, created an equally absurd concept. Throwing consciousness out of psychology, they view animals and humans as machines reacting to external stimuli.

While I. P. Pavlov applied the method of objective study of higher nervous activity he discovered for the natural-scientific substantiation of the origin and activity of consciousness as a brain function, cyberneticists, following behaviorists, discarded consciousness—"one of the correlated elements"—because with all the desire in the world, it cannot be attributed to a machine.

The famous French physicist Louis de Broglie soberly concludes: "Since it is impossible to attribute consciousness analogous to ours to these machines, the activity of computing machines, no matter how perfect they may be, cannot be identified with the activity of our thinking. One cannot expect cybernetics to give us a key to the entire set of biological phenomena".

Other bourgeois scientists, even those tempted by the prospects of cybernetics, express doubt about the all-embracing significance of this pseudo-science. Early last year, a session of the Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore specifically discussed the issue of cybernetics. To the credit of Indian scientists, it should be noted that at this session sober voices of

scientists (Govindaswamy, Chandy) were heard, subjecting the pseudo-scientific pretensions of cybernetics to criticism.

An uncompromising stance toward pseudo-scientific cybernetics is taken by Marxist scientists. In the April issue of the theoretical organ of French Marxists *La Pensée* for this year (No. 47), an article by André Lentin was published exposing cybernetic mystifications. The author outlines the main lines of scientific critique of cybernetic fabrications.

Correctly noting the positive technical and scientific significance of developing a new type of machine based on electronics, Lentin clarifies that "outside the realm of technology, cybernetics is merely a large-scale mystification," based on light-minded, unscientific analogies. In Lentin's view, cybernetics vainly attempts to transfer forms of motion characteristic of one type of matter to qualitatively different forms of matter where other, higher laws operate.

From this point of view, Lentin exposes the groundlessness of the anti-scientific, mechanistic constructions of cyberneticists who attempt to "surpass" the scientific physiology developed by I. P. Pavlov. Cybernetics, according to Lentin, is "a weapon of the cold war against Pavlov's doctrine". The journal of advanced scientific thought *La Pensée* warns against cybernetic mystifications and calls on French scientists of various specialties to take part in comprehensive critique of this pseudo-science propagated by American imperialism, which tries to penetrate into the most diverse branches of knowledge.

Cyberneticists strive to attribute universal significance to the operating principle of computing machines; they extend it not only to living organisms, but also to society.

"One of the lessons of this book,—writes Wiener,—consists in that any organism is preserved in its activity as a single whole thanks to the fact that it possesses means of acquiring, using, preserving, and transmitting information. In society... such means are served by: press, radio, telephone, telegraph, post, theater, cinema, schools, and church" (N. Wiener, *Cybernetics or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine* — Wiener Norbert, *Cybernetics or Control and communication in the animal and the machine*, 1949).

Wiener's judgments on social phenomena are unusually primitive. He propagates disbelief in the possibility of knowing them and in the reliability of data available to social sciences: "In social sciences, we cannot be sure that a significant portion of observed phenomena is not our own fabrication... These sciences can never provide us with reliable, verified information... One should not place exaggerated expectations on the capabilities of these sciences".

There is no need to dispute this assertion regarding social sciences in capitalist countries, where indeed subjective fabrications of figures in these sciences serve as the criterion of truth. Nor will we object to the idea that social sciences in capitalist countries cannot provide reliable, verified information. It is useless to expect this from sciences whose primary task consists in concealing the truth, glossing over crying contradictions of capitalism, and poisoning working masses with the venom of lies and deception.

However, cyberneticists objectively oppose any social science. Wiener denies the objective character of laws of social development independent of human will and consciousness. The "founder" of cybernetics expresses disbelief in social sciences and relies on the activity of computing machines of the latest designs, which are allegedly destined to introduce significant corrections into social life.

Wiener assures that society is set to undergo a new revolution, on which he places great hopes. "The current industrial revolution,—he proclaims,—leads to the devaluation of the human brain, at least in its simplest and more routine functions... A qualified scientist and a qualified administrator can survive this industrial revolution. But once it occurs, an ordinary person with average capacities, or with capacities below average, will have nothing left to sell for which it would be worth paying anything".

Such is the gloomy perspective that cybernetics opens up before working people, classifying them into the category of people of "average capacities". What will remain are computing machines of perfect technical construction, "giant brains" that will control all other machines thanks to circular processes of the feedback type. The need for workers will fall away, for regulating the activity of the computing machines themselves will be handled by qualified administrators and scientists, that very "technically qualified intelligentsia" whose dominance technocrats predicted in future society.

Cyberneticists do not stop to think where the mass of workers with "average capacities" or capacities "below average" will go. If they have nothing to be paid for, then who will buy what

industry and agriculture, managed by mechanical brains, produce?

Wiener, apparently, does not realize that in painting such a perspective, he cuts off the very branch of the tree of life on which capitalism still holds on, for it is impossible to destroy the working class without destroying capitalism.

However, not only workers will, according to cyberneticists, be displaced by computing machines. This fate threatens even... diplomats. Having gained sad notoriety in the diplomatic field, the former head of the American delegation at negotiations in Kaesong and Panmunjom, Rear Admiral Joy, in a speech delivered at Harvard University, declared: "Perhaps it will not be fantasy to predict that future development of mechanical brain production may lead to the creation of such a mechanism that will assist in analyzing problems of international relations".

In Rear Admiral Joy's view, in future international conferences and diplomatic negotiations, machines sitting at the round table will take part on the US side instead of living representatives. Joy places more hopes on mechanical brains than on the brains of currently acting American diplomats. Although this is merely a fantasy—and moreover a rather unflattering one for Joy's colleagues on the diplomatic front—it nevertheless testifies to American politicians' and ideologists' disbelief in the productive activity of the human brain. Otherwise, they would not have agreed to such unprecedented absurdity.

Yet this stupidity is entirely logical. It is a logical deduction from the "theoretical" foresight of the "founder" of cybernetics,

who saw the dawn of a coming industrial revolution in replacing workers with robots equipped with mechanical brains.

Fortunately for humanity, this danger does not threaten it. Cybernetics is one of those pseudo-sciences spawned by modern imperialism, doomed to perish even before the death of imperialism.

The theory of cybernetics, which attempts to extend operating principles of computing machines of the latest design to the most diverse natural and social phenomena without taking into account their qualitative uniqueness, is mechanicism turning into idealism. This is barrenness on the tree of knowledge, arising as a result of a one-sided and excessive inflation of one of the features of knowledge.

One should not close one's eyes to those deeply reactionary, misanthropic conclusions made by cyberneticists attempting to solve social problems.

Frightened by the labor movement, imperialists dream of a state of affairs where nothing will threaten their dominance. Robots, only robots suit them; let the rest of humanity perish, as long as they and the machines serving them remain. Pseudo-scientific drivel of cyberneticists reflects this fear before working masses.

The author of the article cited by us, Edmund Berkeley, writes: "It is doubtful that robot machines would in themselves be dangerous to people. But when people hostile to society gain the opportunity to control robot machines, the danger to society will be great..." Berkeley considers people dangerous to society

to be by no means his imperialist bosses, but communists and the working people going along with them, who can master the technology of controlling self-regulating machines just as they mastered it in the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, computing machines, or "giant brains," are closely tied to at least two types of weapons—atomic explosions and guided missiles. In this, according to Berkeley, lies danger, and therefore "it would be prudent if in the USA all activity in this area were under the control of the Department of Defense".

Here is what god cybernetics serves! All its indisputable practical achievements in constructing computing machines, together with deeply reactionary theories, it brings to the altar of war. In this respect, cyberneticists exhibit great activity.

Imperialists are powerless to resolve those contradictions tearing the capitalist world apart. They are unable to prevent the economic crisis inexorably advancing upon them. They cannot rid themselves of fear inspired by the victorious development of the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy. Their attempts to crush the growing national liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries prove fruitless. Wild terror plunges them into growth of revolutionary consciousness and resistance of the working class and the powerful mass movement of progressive humanity in the struggle for peace.

They seek salvation not only in a frantic arms race, but also in ideological weaponry. In despair, they resort to pseudo-sciences that give them at least a shadow of hope for prolonging their existence.

The production process carried out without workers, solely by machines controlled by a giant brain of a computing machine! No strikes, no walkouts, let alone revolutionary uprisings! Machines instead of brains, machines without people! What an alluring perspective for capitalism!

The great founder of Marxism brilliantly foresaw the possibility of such degradation of thought among scientist lackeys of the ruling classes, spawned by antagonism between productive forces and production relations of capitalist society. "Even the pure light of science cannot... shine except against the 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 is dulled to the level of material force" (K. Marx, Works, Vol. XI, part I, pp. 5–6).

The panic fear of imperialist ideologists before the active creative activity of human thought, before man conscious of his role and place in society, forces them to invent misanthropic pseudo-theories like cybernetics.

Into such a hopeless dead-end are driven the degreed lackeys of imperialism, obliged to please their masters by placing latest technical inventions in service of the mass extermination of people and destruction of the greatest achievements of material and spiritual culture of humanity.

25. CONTEMPORARY REACTIONARY AMERICAN-ENGLISH BOURGEOIS AESTHETICS IN THE SERVICE OF US MONOPOLIES

P. S. TROFIMOV

American contenders for world domination use all means for the spiritual decay and stupefaction of the broad masses of the people, subordinating them to their misanthropic goals. Monopolists of the USA and their henchmen in Europe use atomic blackmail and war hysteria, racism and corrupt cosmopolitanism, Trotskyism and Zionism, Catholicism and idealism, corrupt literature and decadent art. In the arsenal of world reaction is also contemporary Anglo-American bourgeois aesthetics, which has long thrown overboard the ideas of realism, national roots (*narodnost*), humanism, and national identity of literature and art.

The time has long since faded into eternity when the bourgeoisie, fighting against feudalism that had outlived its era, was the conqueror of progress not only in the field of economics, but also in the field of culture, art, and aesthetics. Under contemporary conditions, aesthetic theories created in large quantities by bourgeois aesthetes represent part of the capitalist superstructure, called upon to support and strengthen the thoroughly rotted basis of imperialism in general and American imperialism in particular. The role of these theories in no way differs from the role played by contemporary reactionary sociology, philosophy, and law: they all serve to

protect capitalist society, which is doomed to ruin. Such is the role of contemporary bourgeois pseudo-art. Today's Anglo-American "aesthetes" openly act as defenders of everything ugly and anti-artistic in art.

The decay of contemporary reactionary aesthetics in the USA and England is clearly expressed in the cultivation of formalist trickery, naturalistic physiologism, and mysticism. The main purpose of the philosophical and aesthetic inventions of reactionary Anglo-American aesthetes is to disarm the peoples in their struggle for the best ideals of humanity: in the struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism.

***

The leading place in contemporary Anglo-American reactionary aesthetics is occupied by various types of formalism—an anti-popular and anti-artistic trend that denies all real content in art. The most active proponents of formalist views are the late Santayana, Bell, Feibleman, and other Anglo-American "theoreticians." They all pursue the goal of destroying realistic art and ideologically disarming the working people, attempting to achieve this through the deliberate distortion of real life, leading artists, writers, and composers away from the tasks of truthfully depicting reality and exposing the vices of contemporary capitalist structure into the realm of pathological experiences and moods. "It is important to create and appreciate the greatest art as the most absolute abstraction from human affairs," says C. Bell (*The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. XLIV, No. 15, 1947, July, p. 393).

From the point of view of aesthetic-formalists repeating old Machian, idealist nonsense, art is not a figurative reflection of

the real world; it is merely a form of artistic human experience detached and isolated from surrounding reality. The value of art, as the formalists assert, consists in its ability to create such abstract forms that can arouse strange, unique visions in the human soul. "Contemplation of pure forms leads to a state of extraordinary exaltation and complete abstraction from contact with life," writes formalist C. Bell (see Morris Weitz, *Philosophy of the Arts*, p. 5, 1950, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts).

Between art and a dream, in the opinion of formalists, there is no difference: both art and a dream carry man away into an otherworldly realm, a world of reverie. Hence the definition of art typical for formalists as a reality that creates not works possessing a definite real content, but objects that are simply attractive to man.

A malicious enemy of progress, democracy, and socialism, the American philosopher George Santayana, who headed such an idealist school in contemporary Anglo-American philosophy as "critical realism," in his work *Reason in Art* asserts that any action that makes an object more attractive is called "art." Under this formalist proposition, which eliminates all living content from art, Santayana brings a corresponding philosophical "basis" aimed at criticizing and debunking the objective reality existing outside us (hence the name of Santayana's philosophy: "critical realism").

Santayana considers that the goal of art should be not the reflection of the real world surrounding us and the real person living in this world, but the expression of some mystical process of liberation ("criticism") of all earthly things and

phenomena from their material shell and bringing them closer to the world of ideas.

The main means of such "liberation," according to Santayana, is the artist's rejection of all realism or similarity to it. He understands art as a game of pure abstract forms, sounds, colors, etc.

Rejection of realism and the transition to abstractionism have long been implemented in the works of many contemporary artists, poets, and composers under the influence of Santayana and other Anglo-American formalists. Their "works" represent, as a rule, a meaningless collection of muddy spots, lines, and dots (in painting), sounds and sound combinations (in poetry and music), designed, according to the assertions of abstractionists, to express some feelings (?) and, above all, a person's feeling of "liberation" from everything that burdens them in real reality.

It goes without saying that there can be no talk of genuine art here. Thus, for example, the canvas of the American abstractionist Clyfford Still, covered with black paint with a white stripe in the upper right corner, or the canvas of another abstractionist, Pollock, representing a collection of images of huge spots resembling inkblots, contain not the slightest hint of an artistic reflection of any features of real life. A multitude of such "creations," devoid of any cognitive and educational value, fill the museums of America, primarily the "Museum of Modern Art," patronized and financed by the billionaires Rockefeller, Ford, and others.

The absence of any cognitive value in formalist pseudo-art is passed off by Anglo-American bourgeois aesthetes as the highest achievement of contemporary art. Akin in his views to Santayana, the American reactionary aesthete Feibleman decisively rejects the cognitive and social-educational role of art, babbling about the comprehension of certain "eternally beautiful objects" located outside the real world as the supreme goal of art. Artists who, with the help of various formalist tricks and stunts, make some resemblance of paintings, statues, etc., containing no grain of realism, but allegedly expressing a divine ideal of beauty, a "symbol of absolute perfection" (J. K. Feibleman, *A Study of the Fine Arts in Theory and Practice*, p. 45, 1949, New York), he calls "neo-realists" or simply "realists," since they also strive to comprehend a "higher" reality, genuine beauty located beyond the bounds of reality.

Art, according to Feibleman's assurance, is an emanation of some holy spirit, God, ideas, termed the "sphere of the eternally beautiful." In this emanation consists, as this follower of Santayana claims, the highest essence of art, linking it with religion and mysticism. In full accordance with his reactionary philosophy, Feibleman asserts further that the most important feature of artistic comprehension of the world is intuition and speculative reasoning relying on the realm of myths.

Thoroughly idealist theories of Santayana, Feibleman, and their followers, repeating in various ways the ideas of medieval obscurantists, with their poisoned point are directed against realistic art, convincingly showing that beauty and art have not a mystical-otherworldly, but an earthly source, and that the achievement of the beautiful by man is carried out not with the

help of scholastic reasoning, but on the basis of the social-historical activity of people and an ever deeper knowledge of the world.

All such "theories" serve to lead art workers away from the real struggle of the working masses against capitalist slavery, for beauty on earth into a world of invented, unreal pseudo-beauty representing an idealization of modern capitalist orders with their anti-human, hideous "art." They are directed at the destruction of the very foundations of art, since the stance of isolating art from social life and real reality means its detachment from that nourishing soil, from that vital source without which there is not and cannot be genuine art. The modern bourgeoisie does not need truthful art reflecting the real world and its objective laws in its specific forms, just as truthful knowledge of the world is hostile to the interests of capitalism, which is heading toward its inevitable doom.

***

In order to distract art workers from life, achieve their complete ideological disorganization, and subject them to the interests of Anglo-American monopoly capital, reactionary Anglo-American aesthetes wage a campaign against objective truth and against realism. In this campaign, such an enemy of science, peace, and democracy as John Dewey—the head of the most fashionable American idealist philosophy, pragmatism or instrumentalism—is particularly distinguished.

In the book *Art as Experience*, Dewey, in full agreement with his philosophy, which does not recognize the objective existence of nature, asserting that the world is merely a complex of human desires, states that a work of art reflects

nothing objective, but is merely an "organization of energy" (G. Dewey, *The Theory of Experience*, p. 191, 1935, New York, Van Rees), the result of certain adaptive human reactions to the world—that is, to human desires themselves.

The aggregate of all these desires forms, according to Dewey, the so-called aesthetic experience. In painting, literature, music, etc., only this subjective human "aesthetic experience" is expressed, according to Dewey, and not what "metaphysicians" (as he calls materialists—*P. T.*) call truth.

The function of the mind, as Dewey asserts, consists not in reflecting objects of the surrounding world, but in establishing ways in which the most advantageous relationships between man and these objects can be created.

The falsity of Dewey's aesthetic theory stems from his initial subjective-idealist thesis, which reduces the entire world to human subjective desires. All human practice and the entire history of science and art irrefutably prove that human knowledge, if correct, reflects and explains either in concepts (science) or in artistic imagery (art) real reality, and is not an adaptation of man to the world—which, according to Dewey, "is not objective, but subjective" (ibid., p. 287), but something third: that is, ultimately, the product of conscious activity.

Relying on Dewey's idealism, Anglo-American formalist aesthetes assure readers, viewers, and listeners in every way that the guiding philosophical principle in modern aesthetics and art should allegedly be eclecticism and subjectivism. The latter is declared by them to be a "normal phenomenon of taste in every field, in all times and periods" (*Magazine of Art*, Vol.

42, No. 3, 1949, March, p. 89). Along with this, they declare that genuine works of art should not and do not contain any objective content. Moreover, they question even the very fact of the objective existence of both works of art and their creators. "Neither you nor the object are realities," says formalist David Hare. "Reality exists in that unstable space located somewhere between the creator and his creation... Passion and love exist, but there is neither a true nor a false one... The only solid foundation on which an artist should stand is his enthusiasm..." (David Hare, "The Spaces of the Mind," *Magazine of Art*, Vol. 43, No. 2, 1950, February, pp. 49, 50, 52).

All the "enthusiasm" of this subjective-idealist stance, aimed at destroying the objective world and realistic art, can be defined as the blackest obscurantism, dissolving in a single mystical mist both the real world and people, including the subjective idealists themselves like Mr. Hare and his colleagues. If works of art and the artists who create them do not really exist, then it is permissible to ask: what can we even be talking about?

The "enthusiasm" of such meaningless idealist propositions as Hare's stance was brilliantly crushed in its time by V. I. Lenin in his monumental work *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, which demonstrated all the falsity and silliness of the subjective-idealist exercises of Machians and empirio-critics. Lenin called this kind of exercise nothing other than philosophical charlatanism.

Contemporary Anglo-American aestheticizing charlatans assure their readers that, from the point of view of the latest findings of science, the objective reality of the material world

is losing its significance today... There is no longer a conflict between man and the surrounding environment; "everything is possible for man" (Carol Seely, "On the Nature of Abstract Painting in America," *Magazine of Art*, Vol. 43, No. 5, 1950, May, p. 167). The creative activity of the artist is declared a realm in which there are "no restrictive laws of functioning" (David Hare, "The Spaces of the Mind," *Magazine of Art*, Vol. 43, No. 2, 1950, February, p. 51). It is asserted that in matters of taste and aesthetic judgments "man is the measure of all things" (H. M. Kallen, *Art and Freedom*, Vol. 2, p. 932, 1943, New York), and so forth.

Such subjective-idealist arbitrariness, voluntarism, and absolute disregard for objective laws—being highly characteristic phenomena in contemporary bourgeois aesthetics—form the theoretical foundation upon which contemporary bourgeois formalism, mysticism, and decadence have blossomed in full color, imbued with hatred for the common man, his healthy sense of artistic truth, humanism, and genuine beauty.

Proceeding from their subjective-idealist views, Anglo-American aesthetes attempt to prove that all forms of art contain no objective truth. According to such an American formalist as D. Parker, music is merely the expression of bare forms devoid of any content. It moves in its own private world, a world of pure feeling, embodying nothing (D. Parker, *Principles of Aesthetics*, p. 143, 1946, New York).

In the USA and England, overtly formalist music is widely cultivated. Reflecting the decay of all contemporary bourgeois culture and art, this music—coarse and vulgar, devoid of all

beauty and elegance—is designed to poison the consciousness and feelings of normal people with mysticism, eroticism, and formalist madness, weaken their will to fight for a genuinely human life on earth, and lead them into a world of subconscious animal instincts. An example is the "activity" of the Americanized Italian composer Gian Carlo Menotti, who in his opera *The Medium* combines contemporary formalist jazz music with coarse naturalism and mysticism. "Figures" of music like Menotti are numerous not only in America, but also in other bourgeois countries (Schoenberg, Stravinsky, and many others).

As for painting and sculpture, Anglo-American formalists consider themselves called upon to discredit the idea of the objectivity of content in art and establish absolute subjective arbitrariness within it.

American sculptor Seymour Lipton, for example, creates hideous combinations of stone and metal, giving them corresponding titles aimed at frightening the viewer: "Moloch," "Lethal Cage," etc. Archipenko's sculpture "Woman" represents a pretentious heap of various geometric shapes in which one can barely discern the outline of a humanoid creature. Such, if one may say so, art is termed by reactionary aesthetics the highest achievement of artistic creation, a renaissance in the field of sculpture (C. L. Brumme, "Contemporary Sculpture: A Renaissance," *Magazine of Art*, Vol. 42, No. 6, 1949, October, p. 217), the art of "supermen" who allegedly create, contrary to the objective laws of reality, by the power of their consciousness and will alone, "new realities" higher than the reality surrounding us.

In their work, reactionary Anglo-American aesthetes assert, the artist should strive not to reflect real reality, but to "create" the latter at their own discretion, in complete accordance with the power of their imagination. That is why bourgeois aesthetes in the USA and England note with unconcealed joy the disappearance of realistic themes from the works of many contemporary American and English bourgeois poets and the complete dominance of subjectivism, morbid fantasy, abstruse jargon, etc., in their verses. Thus, for example, one of the most popular contemporary American philosophers, Northrop, states that "the movement of contemporary poets away from the traditional stance (thus he calls the poetry of realism—*P. T.*) and their turn toward art self-contained and for its own sake represents a true and healthy movement" (F. S. C. Northrop, *The Logic of the Science and the Humanities*, p. 188, 1948, New York, Macmillan).

English art critic and aesthete Newton Arvin enthusiastically writes that the majority of American and English poets are interested primarily not in the depiction of the real world, but in a world of dreams, spectral and unreal. As the ideal of contemporary American poetry, he declares the "work" of extreme formalist T. S. Eliot, the abstruse verses of which are imbued with mysticism. This author's play *The Cocktail Party*, staged in 1951 in London, contains the mystical ramblings of a decadent about the "cosmic solitude of man," his tragic purpose and divine predetermination, the end of the world, hell, ghosts, and so forth.

Just like the entire ideology of contemporary Anglo-American bourgeoisie, the reactionary aesthetics of the USA and England

represents evidence of the extreme marasmus of an increasingly rotting bourgeois culture. It invents ever-new techniques and methods for the spiritual enslavement of working people by American monopolists, ever-new ways to erase objective content and the truth of life from art. One of these latest methods is so-called "semantic aesthetics," which in principle differs in no way from semantics as a variety of bourgeois subjective-idealist philosophy.

Contrary to genuine aesthetic science, which sees artistic development in concepts and categories as a scientific generalization of historical human experience, semantics declares all aesthetic concepts to be signs having no objective content into which different people can put the most varied meanings. One of the representatives of semantic aesthetics, B. Heyl, speaks openly: "Linguistic differences in aesthetics are purely terminological in the sense that they do not reflect true differences in experience" (B. Heyl, *New Bearings in Aesthetics and Art Criticism: A Study in Semantics and Evaluation*, pp. 20–21, 1943, New Haven). From the perspective of a veteran of semantic idealism like Heyl, aesthetic categories and concepts such as "beauty" and "art" express nothing definite in essence, but are merely emotional signs existing by themselves, without reference to anything real.

"We find," writes Ayer, "that ethical philosophy consists, simply speaking, of ethical concepts that are pseudo-concepts and therefore cannot be analyzed" (A. J. Ayer, *Language, Truth and Logic*, p. 168, 1936, London). And further he continues: "Our conclusions regarding the nature of ethics are

applicable to aesthetics as well. Aesthetic concepts are used in the same way as ethical concepts... Words of aesthetics like 'beautiful' and 'hideous' are used not to establish facts, but simply to express certain feelings and evoke a certain reaction" (ibid., p. 170).

According to Ayer, to say that something is good or bad, fair or unfair, beautiful or hideous, means saying nothing at all. Thus ignoring the objective meaning of aesthetic concepts, semanticists consider that "the subject of aesthetics is a certain kind of signs that mean nothing or mean only a kind of signs symbolizing merely themselves" (*The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. XLVI, No. 1, 1949, January, p. 6).

All these semantic inventions of Anglo-American bourgeois aesthetes have a purely utilitarian purpose. Proving that logical and aesthetic concepts such as "truth" and "beauty" or "falsehood" and "hideousness" are only signs of themselves and reflect nothing objective, semanticists strive to render human representations of truth and beauty meaningless as opposed to the false, hideous, and untrue. Thereby, they hope to instill in working people the idea of the futility of their struggle for the finest ideals of modern times—for peace, popular democracy, and socialism—against hideousness and all kinds of monstrosities characteristic of imperialism.

Semantic subjective-idealist pseudo-theories pursue the goal of discrediting realism in art, its ability to reflect objective truth and the reality of life in highly artistic forms. Attributing extraordinary power to various formalist tricks of all kinds of abstractionists, cubists, surrealists, and others in art, semanticists grant broad freedom to the creative imagination of

the listener, viewer, and reader, unburdened by connection to the real world. The true purpose of these tricks consists in the desire to lead ordinary people in capitalist countries far away from understanding real reality and from the struggle for their rights.

One of the semanticists, Lloyd Goodrich, states outright: "The dominance of abstract art in the period between two world wars can have another side as well. It helps escape troubling reality into a world of aesthetic order..." (*Art in America*, 1951, April, p. 59).

Semantic aesthetics is an expression of that senile marasmus reached by contemporary bourgeois culture, art, and aesthetics. It stands in the front rank of international reaction fighting against everything living, advanced, and progressive, against realism and the national roots of art.

***

Acting as sworn enemies of realism, Anglo-American formalists preach the complete subordination of art to religion, mysticism, and obscurantism. Reactionary aesthete R. Brownell and his followers assert that art is called upon to express instincts and the mystical nature of man, that it is an expression of a divine origin allegedly embedded in human nature.

"Art... is not a depiction of life," says mystic Brownell. "It is an inner expression... action beyond the limits of time, space, and matter... expansion of experience outside current forms of existence... It is central and, like religion, a main sector of life... Like religion, art is naive, uncritical, but deep" (W.

Brownell, *The Human Community: Its Philosophy and Practice for a Time of Crisis*, pp. 255–256, 260, 1950, New York, Harper).

The obscurantist of aesthetics Munro equates art with religion, declaring that "art coincides with religion in many respects" (T. Munro, *The Arts and Their Interrelations*, p. 74, 1949, New York, Liberal Arts Press).

The identification of art with religion and mysticism in Anglo-American aesthetics goes so far that some of its representatives declare theater and other institutions connected with art to be secular only in form, but religious in essence (Van Luyp, Anderson, and many others).

The crude lie of these arguments of Anglo-American aesthetes is easy to expose by turning to the history of world art, which shows that art has always achieved its significant development in those epochs when advanced social forces waged an active struggle against decaying, reactionary forces. Advanced figures of art have always strived for the most realistic, truthful reflection of social life, for the creation of works that actively participated in humanity's struggle for historical progress. In such an epoch of great artistic flourishing as the Renaissance, art achieved a brilliant flight not because it was connected with the Christian religion, as bourgeois aesthetes assure, but thanks to its connection with social life, with the life of the people, and thanks to artists' close study of nature and man.

In those cases when art was placed entirely in the service of religion, when it broke ties with living life, it inevitably turned into an abstract scheme and ultimately decayed. Attempts by

contemporary Anglo-American bourgeois formalists to subordinate art to religion and turn it into a handmaiden of obscurantism are nothing other than a special form of attack by contemporary imperialist reaction against art, a desire to eliminate realistic, deeply ideological art.

The purpose of all the arguments of Anglo-American aesthetes regarding the identity of tasks between art and religion consists in tearing artists away from a real earthly foundation, turning poets, painters, and composers into proponents of idealism.

Along with identifying religion and art, Anglo-American aesthetics strives in every way to oppose art to science. Characteristic in this respect are the following statements by some of them: "Science deals with causes and effects; art and aesthetic experience deal with things taken in isolation, regardless of cause or effect," asserts follower of Dewey, E. Gotshalk. "Science concerns fact; art and aesthetic experience concern values" (D. W. Gotshalk, *Art and the Social Order*, p. 8, 1951).

The falsity of this assertion by the American idealist is obvious. Art (meaning genuine, realistic art), as is known, differs from science not in what Gotshalk claims. The difference between art and science consists primarily in the figurative character of its cognition of reality, whereas science operates mainly with general concepts, logical deductions, and conclusions. But science and art are closely related to each other. Like science, art in its own way—in vivid, typical images—reflects not only individual facts and events and their interconnections, but also the general, regular patterns existing in reality.

The realistic artist depicts in their works not everything that catches the eye, but performs a conscious selection of facts, gives them a particular evaluation, and promotes definite ideas, etc. Great realists—Balzac, Tolstoy, Gorky, Dreiser, and others—in their deathless creations revealed deep connections and driving causes of many social-historical phenomena, exposing the essence of bourgeois-capitalist orders, thereby educating people in a spirit of hatred toward a world of oppression, in a spirit of struggle for social justice and progress.

Opposing art to science, Anglo-American aesthetes want to tear art away from science, convince artists and writers striving to reflect the truth of life that the true source of art's development is allegedly not the knowledge of objective laws of nature and society, but religion, mysticism, and subconscious, dark instincts.

In inseparable connection with this propaganda of obscurantism by Anglo-American bourgeois aesthetes is an equally extreme formalist trend, saturated with religious pathology and marked by total decay in contemporary American and European bourgeois pseudo-art: surrealism (super-realism). Surrealism, widely popularized as poetry by bourgeois aesthetes in the USA, England, and France as an art allegedly designed to reveal the secrets of the human soul, is in reality the fruit of the extreme decay of contemporary capitalist culture.

From the viewpoint of surrealists, life has two sides and must therefore be considered in two aspects: the aspect of the visible, real world, and the aspect of the mystical, super-real

world. The truly real essence of the world is allegedly not its visible side, but its mystical side. Therefore, as surrealists assure, art should depict the world doubled, with both its sides. Depicting certain features of real objects and immediately depicting all kinds of hallucinations and delirious fantasies, surrealists assure that they reflect the true reality located not in ordinary three-dimensional space, but in a space higher, inaccessible to the ordinary person. Trying to give their mystical drivel a scientific appearance, surrealists state that they rely on contemporary natural science, which has allegedly discovered four-dimensional space.

"Today scientists do not limit themselves to three dimensions of Euclid," says Apollinaire. "Artists are trying, quite naturally, using intuition, to master new possibilities of spatial dimensions which in the language of modern science are designated by the term 'fourth dimension.' Artists, like scientists, are trying to find a hidden order and balance that must exist in this new and ominous world (in a space with four dimensions—*P. T.*), different from our previous comfortable representations," repeats Blanc after Apollinaire (Peter Blanc, "The Artist and the Atom," *Magazine of Art*, 1951, April, Vol. 44, No. 4, p. 152).

However, it is well known that four-dimensional space is an invented space of spiritualists and madmen, mocked in his own time by Engels. Only people hopelessly lost, preoccupied with where to place devils, goblins, and spirits, can reason about four-dimensional space. Four-dimensional space is the fruit of wild fantasy; it really never was and is not. Equally the fruit of wild fantasy is all the art of surrealists. Saturated with morbid,

semi-religious, semi-erotic delirium, it should be the subject of study for a psychiatrist, not an art historian.

That is why there is nothing surprising in what the American newspaper *New York Post* reports: psychiatrist Professor Edgar Foltin from Pittsburgh, who collected one of the most complete collections of paintings by the mentally ill, noted that the paintings of his patients, mentally defective people, do not differ significantly from the works of surrealists and other formalist "normal" (in a psychophysiological sense) artists enjoying fairly widespread fame.

Here is a specimen of surrealist "art" taken from the "creative laboratory" of the ringleader of American surrealism, Salvador Dalí. Before us is a painting titled *The Soft Construction with Boiled Beans (Premonition of Civil War)* [referred to in text as *The Evening Spider Brings Hope*]. The painting depicts a hideous spot resembling a rag hanging from the branch of a dried tree. Upon closer inspection, it turns out that this is a living creature holding a violin in one hand and a bow in the other. The flattened head of a "person," hanging from a branch, flows like dough over the tree and ground. On the chest of the "person" are two inkwells, and on the cheek a huge spider of repulsive shape. From the mouth of a cannon depicted in the left part of the painting, a horse and an object resembling an airplane tumble out. In the lower corner sits a weeping angel. What this repulsive machine means is unknown.

Similar specimens of surrealist "painting," besides Dalí, are manufactured today in America by the notorious Zionist and

cosmopolitan Marc Chagall, who once stated that to create one of his "masterpieces" he spent eleven years, and it would take him ten times as much time to explain the content of this "masterpiece."

The purpose of all this surrealist delirium consists in instilling in the viewer the idea of the mystical character of reality, the absence of any regularity in it, the dependence of social life on the whim of half-mad subjects and the whim of Anglo-American imperialists, thereby plunging working people into fear of these imperialists.

Surrealists go so far as to openly declare the consciousness of a madman the most powerful force harmonizing the world. Here, for example, is what Salvador Dalí states: "I believe that the moment is near when, through paranoia (simultaneously with automatism and other passive states...), it will be possible to systematize confusion and thus completely discredit the world of reality" (*Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. IX, No. 3, 1951, March, p. 253).

Fawning before their ideological leaders from Wall Street, English surrealists went even further: they declared that the normal state of the world is "universal psychosis," that is, a psychosis of all people and animals, a universal madness expressing itself in the form of egocentrism, delirious hallucinations, and so forth.

All these "theories," of course, are no accident. They are highly characteristic of the era of decay and decomposition of bourgeois culture. The social function of surrealism as a tool of American and English imperialism consists in extolling

everything vile, filthy, and imbued with mystical ramblings of mentally abnormal people, stunning the common people, weakening their will to fight, and making them mentally defective, submissive subjects to any adventurers and political scoundrels for the achievement of their criminal goals.

***

Not only surrealism serves the disgraceful cause of degrading man, but also all contemporary Anglo-American bourgeois aesthetics, which degrades reason and extols instincts. All "theoreticians" of contemporary bourgeois pseudo-art unanimously assure that human reason, rather than instincts, is the guiding principle in understanding art and the beautiful. The American obscurantist Santayana, for example, says: "Art is no less automatic than instinct..." (G. Santayana, *Reason in Art*, p. 4). All art "serves the soul through instinct, not through intention, goal..." (G. Santayana, "Arts Liberate the Spirit," *The Atlantic*, 1951, March, p. 66).

Santayana in various ways echoes Gotshalk, who states that "instinct or the unconscious is that splendid yarn from which the whole history of artistic creation will be spun" (D. W. Gotshalk, *Art and the Social Order*, p. 80), as well as the obscurantist Ensor, who asserts that "reason is the enemy of art" (*Magazine of Art*, Vol. 42, No. 7, 1949, November, p. 269), and others.

The crusade of contemporary obscurantists of aesthetics against reason and the vocal praise and inflation of the role of instincts in artistic creation is a remarkable phenomenon characteristic of all Anglo-American bourgeois culture at its current stage of decline and decay. This crusade testifies to the

imperialist bourgeoisie's hatred of reason, which is capable of knowing the objective laws of the development of nature and society, and to the desire of reactionaries of all countries to cultivate animal instincts in the ordinary person and dull their mental abilities.

Significant in this connection is the fact that the overwhelming majority of Anglo-American aesthetes currently display a special interest in primitive art, perverting its essence and adapting it to the interests of their masters—the instigators of a new world war. Reactionary aesthetes and art critics of the USA and England publish books on the art of savages, praising non-realistic aspects of primitive art, its coarseness, primitiveness, and underdeveloped nature. Examples of such praise are the writings of well-known American formalist art critics Valentine and Underwood, who, choking with enthusiasm, pass off crude statues of wild peoples as the ideal for all contemporary sculpture.

Contemporary Anglo-American formalist artists fill exhibition halls and museums with works of "art" imitating the art of primitive peoples. Together with bourgeois aesthetes, they preach everything that can awaken base instincts in people, turn them into a dumb, blind tool in the struggle against advanced humanity, against the Soviet Union and the countries of popular democracy.

A major role in cultivating animal principles in man is played by the preaching of reactionary Anglo-American aesthetics of crude naturalism—a trend in contemporary bourgeois pseudo-art that distorts real reality through concentrating the attention of artists, viewers, and readers on the physiological aspects of

human life, on everything filthy, insignificant, and petty. John Dewey usually asserted that naturalism is necessary for any deep art, understanding by the latter primarily religious and formalist art. In the writings of contemporary Anglo-American aesthetes (D. Gordon and others), naturalism and religion represent an inseparable whole.

The entire current Anglo-American art market is flooded with products of naturalists. Here one can find the monstrosities created by "sculptor" Lipton, the repulsive daubs of surrealist Salvador Dalí, and the literary and musical "opuses" of many writers and composers serving the interests of various capitalist enterprises (newspaper and journal publishing houses, etc.), and Hollywood film trash. In all these "works" of art, brutality, murder, and sadism are praised.

Examples of such Hollywood film art include films listed with annotations by the newspaper *Christian Science Monitor*: *The Great Jewel Robber*—a sensational dramatization of the career of a famous thief; *Under the Gun*—a melodrama about a gangster's complex plot to escape prison; *The Marauder*—a filthy tale of seduction and murder; *The Hoodlum*—a depressing story about the crimes of a scoundrel, following one after another until he is killed, etc.

In the book *America Through the Back Door*, Soviet journalist N. Vasilyev describes one of Hollywood's "action films" he happened to see in New York. The film represents a terrible mixture of sadism and completely pathological fantasy. The "heroine" of the film, a bloodthirsty werewolf woman, possesses the ability to turn into a wolf and devour her victims

alive. The audience sees her torment at least half a dozen victims, howling wildly with fear and pain.

Action films of this character, designed to excite base animal instincts in American viewers and cultivate wild beast-like traits capable of any crime in the name of the interests of capital magnates, are released in America by the thousands.

And here is the content of a play that ran on the stages of American theaters for many years—*Arsenic and Old Lace* by Kesselring. In an old house in Brooklyn live two old ladies who rent a room to a missing nephew and to lonely men. Upon the expiration of the contract, the old ladies with sadistic passion murder the tenant using poisoned wine. In this manner, the god-fearing old ladies send twelve men to the other world. This sadism and obscurantism are advertised by US art criticism as works of art worthy of the attention of a wide audience.

Contemporary Anglo-American aesthetes preach ideas deeply alien to everything beautiful. The obscurantist Santayana, for example, writes that "beauty is an accidental, episodic product" (G. Santayana, *Reason in Art*, p. 5), while the pseudo-aesthete Kallen asserts that "beauty is the union of everything hideous" (H. M. Kallen, *Art and Freedom*, Vol. 2, p. 930, 1943, New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce). Declarations of this kind pursue the goal of total corruption of people and the cultivation of contempt for everything genuinely beautiful and refined.

In their disgraceful crusade against the beautiful, Anglo-American naturalists use all means at their disposal, up to the

crude falsification of classical art of the past. They banish from the classics everything great, beautiful, and human that is inherent in it. They disfigure Shakespeare and Schiller, Beethoven and Verdi beyond recognition. On Broadway in New York, a musical revue titled *Kiss Me, Kate* is performed, which is an American adaptation of Shakespeare's comedy *The Taming of the Shrew* as a pornographic spectacle. In Shakespeare's tragedies performed on English stages, all their life-affirming optimism and humanism, elevating representations of man and his rich spiritual world, are erased. These ideas are replaced by the preaching of pessimism and all kinds of human degradation, a call to abandon the struggle against capitalist slavery.

On the stages of English theaters, Sophocles' tragedy *Antigone* is performed in a vulgar adaptation by the French bourgeois Anouilh. From the tragedy, its entire social essence is extracted; the action is concentrated around the personal drama of Antigone, interpreted in a pornographic manner. The actors play their roles in modern costumes, accompanied by vulgar commentary.

The distortion of the classics reaches sacrilege. For example, works of the great Tchaikovsky are performed in America using "musical instruments" such as washboards, police sirens, etc.

The works of the remarkable American novelist Theodore Dreiser are distorted in the crudest manner. Film adaptations of his novels *An American Tragedy* and *Sister Carrie*, produced by Paramount, represent cheap detective romance stories

lacking the furious protest against capitalist America contained in Dreiser's novels.

In the USA, writings by followers of Dewey are widely distributed, arguing for the utility of art in everyday business while completely ignoring its high educational role. In the USA, fame is created for an artist not by viewers, readers, or listeners, nor by connoisseurs of art, but by stockbrokers and various patrons of art who have no aesthetic taste or understanding of genuine art.

In America, machines that "compose" musical works are widely advertised, along with handbooks promising to teach anyone (even a monkey) the art of painting (abstract and surrealist, of course) in two to three months; theoretical treatises like a paper by a certain A. Kraus with the intriguing title "Writing Plays as a Source of Earnings" are published. In the treatises of I. Schillinger, the necessity of talent and poetic inspiration for artistic creativity is completely denied. The latter is reduced to a mechanical combination of ready-made techniques devoid of any meaning.

Many Anglo-American business-aesthetes argue that art should be part of capitalist production. Its task, in their opinion, should include the creation of various items (tables, chairs, chandeliers, etc.), designing useful structures, etc. (constructivism, functionalism). It is completely obvious that theories of this kind held by bourgeois aesthetes and artists, speculating on the fact that art should also extend to the manufacture of household items, furniture, clothing, etc., essentially eliminate art, turning it from a means of knowledge and education into an appendage of capitalist industry, into a

tool for wringing maximum profits out of working people for capitalists.

***

Contemporary bourgeois aesthetics in the USA and England is a hotbed of imperialist ideology, racism, and rootless cosmopolitanism. Trampling on the ideas of brotherhood and cooperation among peoples proclaimed by great representatives of English and American realism (Shakespeare, Dickens, Twain, Dreiser, etc.), contemporary Anglo-American racist aesthetes demand that artists, poets, and musicians embellish the so-called American way of life in every way. American literary historian and aesthete M. Geismar promotes the work of only those writers who are characterized by special hatred toward Black people. He admires, for example, the writings of decadent W. Faulkner, distinguished by insane hostility toward all Afro-American and non-white peoples.

The anti-popular and anti-artistic "art" of formalism and naturalism is advertised by American and English aesthetes as the highest achievement of human genius, as a victory of American and English creative inspiration over everything nationally restricted. This corrupt pseudo-art of Anglo-American aesthetics and culture historians strives to impose itself on all peoples of the world. They lead a fierce crusade against any national form of culture and art, preaching demagoguery about the necessity of cosmopolitanism in art and literature—that is, the subordination of the cultures and arts of all peoples to the anti-human "culture" of American monopolists.

Anglo-American cosmopolitans of aesthetics and art (Eliot, Pound, Dewey, Santayana, and others) loudly yell about an allegedly historically matured necessity to create, under conditions of capitalism, a "world republic of literature and art," a single world culture whose content would have a "humanitarian" (read: cosmopolitan-political) sense and significance. They assure that the depth and richness of art "depends on various stimuli that are neither local nor national, but cosmopolitan" (W. Abell, *Magazine of Art*, Vol. 42, No. 3, 1949, March, p. 84).

The falsity of all these assertions by American and English cosmopolitans is exposed by the entire history of art and literature of all times and peoples. It is known that the true soil for the flourishing of genuine art, ever since nations emerged and developed, is the national soil, the concrete historical conditions of life and activity of a given nation. International, universal elements in art and literature do not reject, but on the contrary presuppose the national, developing on its solid foundation. "Internationalism in art arises not on the basis of the belittling and impoverishment of national art," said Comrade A. A. Zhdanov. "On the contrary, internationalism is born where national art flourishes" (*Conference of Soviet Music Workers at the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)*, p. 139, 1948).

A single universal human art, international both in its content and in its form, develops on the basis of worldwide communism. On the soil of capitalism this is impossible; for this, conditions under capitalism do not exist. Cosmopolitans' demagoguery regarding a universal, supra-national art under

capitalist conditions is needed by them to disarm progressive figures of art and literature in all countries fighting together with their peoples for peace, national freedom, sovereignty, and their national culture and art.

Fawning before their masters from Wall Street, imperialist "theoreticians" of art, together with notorious atom-mongers from the Pentagon, eagerly support and encourage writers and artists depicting the horrors of the atomic bomb and the consequences of its use in a future war against the USSR and the countries of popular democracy. In connection with this, the so-called "atomic aesthetics" has arisen and widely spread in the USA, endeavoring to present itself as the birth of the latest natural-scientific knowledge, while patronizing the formalist art akin to modern physics and chemistry.

"Atomic aesthetes" assert that in the works of American formalists it is easy to discover the implementation of the principles of relativity theory and quantum theory. They promote the notorious physical idealism according to which matter disappears and the true reality is not the material world, but conceivable energy, motion in general, motion as such. "Today nothing remains of matter," says Peter Blanc, "and every body becomes an illusion. Rocks, trees, houses, people—all this is only the shade of its original state of being. All that remains is energy and emptiness" (*Magazine of Art*, Vol. 44, No. 4, 1951, April, p. 152).

Anglo-American "atomic artists" fill the art market with their daubs depicting a heap of spots, lines, and dots designed to express motion, energy, and the disappearance of matter—that

is, everything "atomic aesthetes," following physical idealists, call "true reality."

With the active participation of "atomic aesthetes" in the USA and England, an atomic psychosis is cultivated in every way. In many cities, not only in England and America, but also in France and Italy, "works" of painting and literature have appeared depicting mind-boggling pictures of total destruction of all living things on earth, the disappearance of the earth due to the decay of atomic nuclei (*Three Sphinxes of Bikini*, *Melancholic Atomic Idyll*, *Atomic Age*, *Atomic Death of the Earth*, and many others).

American modernists in music attempt to express phenomena like electron motion, atomic bomb explosions, etc., using sounds produced from a piano by hitting the keys with fists and elbows.

Fanning war hysteria, frightening the "average" American with the threat of attack from outside and thereby justifying and encouraging a wild arms race carried out by monopolists from Wall Street, Hollywood resorts to incredible, delirious inventions. Thus, for example, the film *The Thing from Another World* tells of a fantastic creature that arrived from outer space with which Americans wage a long and bloody war, using all modern means of destruction. With dull persistence, the film imposes a moral on the viewer: arm yourselves! The fanning of war psychosis is also dedicated to the films *When Worlds Collide*, *The Day the Earth Stood Still*, and many others.

A whole horde of various formalists and naturalists in contemporary Anglo-American aesthetics and literature preaches contempt for life in the name of the interests of capitalists and instigators of a new world war as the highest ideal of beauty. Completely sold out to American bosses, the filthy slanderer of Soviet people Upton Sinclair, in his latest plays—*And It Has Come to Pass* and *The Enemy is Powerful*—openly attacks the USSR and the countries of popular democracy, calling on American monopolists to immediately unleash an atomic war against the democratic camp.

The direct purpose of corrupt misanthropic art and aesthetics in the USA and England consists in frightening peoples with the horrors of modern war, instilling the idea of "blessings in death," thereby weakening their will and determination to fight for peace and popular democracy, subjecting them to the dictate of imperialists from Wall Street.

***

Against the reactionary aesthetics and corrupt art of Anglo-American imperialism in the USA and England stand the progressive aesthetics and realistic art of advanced philosophers, writers, artists, and composers, truthfully reflecting reality and mobilizing peoples for the struggle for peace and democracy.

In America and England, there are advanced art figures (Howard Fast, Samuel Sillen, Jack Lindsay, James Aldridge, and others) waging a bold and persistent struggle for principles of realism, for patriotic traditions of American and English literature, for the heritage of Jack London, Theodore Dreiser, Shakespeare, and Bernard Shaw, against the propaganda of

war, obscurantism, and reaction pursued by despicable servants of Anglo-American war-mongers. In this struggle, they have achieved noticeable success. In America, the literary-critical journal *Masses & Mainstream* is published, leading the daily struggle against bourgeois corrupt art. Around this journal, a group of progressive literary critics has united, promoting the principles of advanced, realistic aesthetics and broadly covering the achievements of Soviet socialist art and literature. One of them is Samuel Sillen. In his articles on questions of art and aesthetics, he shows that the era of imperialism is an era of decline of national culture, an era of attack by dark, reactionary forces on everything advanced and progressive.

Samuel Sillen combines his persistent struggle against literature and art depicting murder, brutality, and cruelty with propaganda for the principles of truthful, realistic art and consistent defense of the best traditions of American realism. He correctly states that the classics of realistic art "with their humanism and desire for truth are a direct threat to the parasitic class, which sees the only benefit of reading not in opening the eyes of the people, but in clouding their vision" (Samuel Sillen, "The Reader's Crisis in the USA," *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, November 25, 1952).

The world-famous progressive writer of modern America, an advanced fighter for peace and democracy, Howard Fast, published the theoretical work *Literature and Reality*, in which he sharply and deeply exposes reactionary, misanthropic bourgeois aesthetics and art. Using a critical analysis of the novel *The Metamorphosis* by modern American decadent Kafka, Howard Fast shows that all current American literature

in the service of US imperialism is imbued with hatred toward man, detachment from life, and an apology of death. Fast correctly states that art of this kind is a "mirror of a dying society." "Bourgeois literature," writes Fast, "...has turned into a stagnant swamp; from this swamp rises such a stench as the world has not yet known. Never before in the history of capitalism has bourgeois literature fallen so low" (Fast, *Literature and Reality*, journal *Novy Mir*, No. 12, 1950, p. 238).

Critically analyzing the latest novels of Ernest Hemingway, imbued with a spirit of pessimism and doom, Fast shows how the poverty of ideological content in works of contemporary reactionary writers and artists inevitably leads to decay and artistic formlessness, to the complete degradation of art as a special form of human creative activity.

With his theoretical propositions directed against the literature and aesthetics of contemporary imperialist America in defense of the truth of life and realism in art, Howard Fast fights for progressive, scientific principles of art and literature. He says that "a writer who in our time wants to create a work of art must be able to comprehend the truth in all investigated areas of life" (ibid., p. 228). Fast emphasizes that there is no other method besides realism with which one can create genuine art that is useful and necessary to the people.

Guided by the principles of advanced aesthetics, Howard Fast created a number of remarkable realistic works exposing American fascism (*Thirty Pieces of Silver*), showing the struggle of progressive forces in the USA against the dark

forces of American imperialist reaction (*Peekskill, USA*), and others.

The journal *Masses & Mainstream* has published a number of books by progressive authors, including a novel by Black writer Lloyd Brown, *Iron City*. This novel was highly praised by International Peace Prize laureate Paul Robeson, who called the work a call to struggle for peace, freedom, and democracy.

The journal *Masses & Mainstream* and the newspaper *Daily Worker* systematically publish political cartoons by famous American artists fighting for peace and popular democracy—William Gropper and Fred Ellis—and popularize the work of progressive realistic art figures like painter Ralph Fasanella, Charles White, and sculptor Marion Perkins.

In America, there are several theaters and workers' clubs producing plays by progressive playwrights: Albert Maltz (*The Morrison Case*), Herb Tank (*49th Parallel*), Paul Peters (*Nat Turner*), and many others, exposing the persecution to which ordinary Americans (especially Black people) are subjected by fascist gangs inspired and financed by capital magnates. In these plays, the desire of ordinary people for peace and their struggle against US monopoly capital are expressed.

The United Workers' Chorus in New York and other creative collectives perform songs composed by advanced American, Russian, and Soviet poets and composers. The major progressive music critic of America, Sidney Finkelstein, in his book *How Music Expresses Ideas*, convincingly demonstrates the unbreakable connection between music and the life of peoples and class struggle. He decisively exposes the falsity

and flaws of bourgeois theories of music that sever it from reality and ignore all ideological content. Painting a picture of the decay of bourgeois music, Finkelstein broadly popularizes the great musical heritage of Russian and West European classics and the successes of musical culture in the USSR, inspired by ideas of peace and construction.

In England, progressive authors writing on aesthetic issues enjoy renown, such as Jack Lindsay, Patrick Goldring, and others united around the English Marxist journals *Modern Quarterly* and *Communist Review*, as well as members of the Authors' World Peace Appeal.

Jack Lindsay wages a systematic struggle for the national independence of England. In his article "The Position in Britain: What is Happening to Our Culture?" and in a number of other articles, Lindsay exposes the decadent, reactionary character of contemporary Anglo-American bourgeois culture, demonstrating its harm to the English, American, and other peoples. Lindsay speaks of attempts by American imperialists to destroy everything honest and human in English culture and imbue it with a spirit of war, national nihilism, and aggression. He calls upon advanced writers and artists of England to affirm everything progressive living in the people through their work, to participate in the popular struggle for peace and national independence, and to create opposition in the country to forces fanning war psychosis and promoting cosmopolitanism. In the collection of poems published by Lindsay, *Peace is Our Answer*, the image of a people leading the struggle for peace against the instigators of a new world war is revealed.

Progressive figures of literature and art in England criticize those writers and artists who, wishing to participate in the struggle for peace and thereby fulfill their civic duty, nevertheless believe that there is no place for artistic creation in this struggle.

Advanced figures of literature and art decisively expose contemporary bourgeois art in the service of US imperialists, who attempt to deprive Great Britain of its national independence. Speaking of Hollywood film productions arriving in large numbers across the ocean to the British Isles, critic John Alexander says that these films "clear the way for the arrival in England of an authoritarian fascist government, trying to deprive the people of the will to fight" (John Alexander, "Two Camps in the World of Films," *Modern Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Winter 1951–1952, p. 6).

Progressive English writers and artists have their own Unity Theatre, which, despite difficulties and obstacles created by the authorities, produces plays by advanced playwrights O'Casey, Ewan MacColl, and others, depicting the struggle of English working people for peace, national independence, and democracy. Thus, for example, in MacColl's play *Uranium 235*, not only is the criminal use of science by Anglo-American imperialists in the interests of warmongers exposed, but it is also shown that peace can be defended if the peoples of the world actively fight for its preservation.

Many facts testify to the constantly growing activity of English progressive figures of culture in the struggle for the interests of peace and democracy. As one of them, we can cite the exhibition "Artists for Peace," organized by advanced English

artists last year, which received high praise from viewers—workers, working intelligentsia, etc. Participants in this exhibition (artists Roy Ralph, Norman Alford, and others) made their contribution to the cause of the struggle for peace. They boldly raised the banner of realistic art capable of reflecting the truth of life in vivid images, educating people in high aspirations toward democracy and progress, and instilling in them love for their motherland. Their activity, like the activity of all other advanced artists and writers in England, finds serious support among ordinary people and progressive critics and art historians of the country.

Not only in England, but also in other countries, advanced culture figures speak out in defense of peace and democracy. In France, Fougeron, P. Dax, J. Kanapa, and others actively fight against reaction.

Great assistance in the struggle of progressive foreign writers for advanced art and literature is provided by the experience of Soviet art, developing on the basis of the method of socialist realism.

In articles and books by progressive literary and art figures and critics directed against contemporary decaying bourgeois aesthetics and decadent art, principles of realistic aesthetics are actively defended, helping writers and artists understand issues of art and literature, continue the best national traditions of realism and the national roots of art (*narodnost*), truthfully reflect life, and successfully fight for the cause of peace, democracy, and socialism.

26. ON THE PHYSICAL MEANING OF THE WAVE FUNCTION

G. P. DISHKANT (Dnepropetrovsk)

Recently, a debate has been carried out in print between Academician V. A. Fock and Prof. D. I. Blokhintsev regarding the question of whether the wave function characterizes an individual microparticle, or whether it characterizes only an ensemble of particles (a statistical set of independent particle copies, produced for them by identical macroscopic conditions) (see the journal *"Voprosy Filosofii"* No. 4 and No. 6 for 1952).

The latter point of view, advocated by D. I. Blokhintsev, seems to us progressive, as it allows for the possibility of studying the actually observed differences between the particles that make up the ensemble (see also the article by Ya. P. Terletsky in the journal *"Voprosy Filosofii"* No. 5 for 1951).

Below are presented some considerations from the field of theoretical physics that we feel are decisive in favor of this "statistical" point of view.

Let the particles of a mixed ensemble A be in a state characterized by the wave function

$$\Psi_1$$

with a probability of one-half, and in a state

$$\Psi_2$$

with the same probability. The full quantum-mechanical representation of the properties of this mixture is given by the statistical operator:

$$U(x,x') = \frac{1}{2}\Psi_1^*(x)\Psi_1(x') + \frac{1}{2}\Psi_2^*(x)\Psi_2(x'). \quad (1)$$

Let us now consider another mixed ensemble B, whose particles can with equal probability be in the states

$$\Psi_+ \text{ and } \Psi_-$$

where

$$\Psi_+ = \frac{\Psi_1 + \Psi_2}{\sqrt{2}}; \quad \Psi_- = \frac{\Psi_1 - \Psi_2}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (2)$$

It is easy to verify that ensemble B is characterized by the same statistical operator U.

Thus, ensembles A and B are identical in all their properties and must be recognized as identical:

$$A \equiv B. \quad (3)$$

From a statistical point of view, there is nothing surprising in this. It is clear that we can split our mixed ensemble

$$A\,(\equiv B)$$

into two sub-ensembles in different ways. With one method of separation we obtain two sub-ensembles characterized respectively by the wave functions

$$\Psi_+ \text{ and } \Psi_-$$

with another—characterized respectively by the wave functions

$$\Psi_+ \text{ and } \Psi_-$$

However, the above fact (3) becomes completely incomprehensible if one considers that the wave function characterizes not an ensemble of particles, but the state of each

particle individually. Indeed, from this point of view, ensemble A contains particles of two kinds: those in state

$$\Psi_1$$

and those in state

$$\Psi_2$$

Ensemble B does not contain such particles, but contains other particles in states

$$\Psi_+ \text{ and } \Psi_-$$

In other words, from this point of view, mixtures A and B must be considered completely different:

$$A \neq B. \quad (4)$$

The contradiction at which we have arrived forces us to abandon the assumption that the wave function characterizes an individual particle.

27. On the Existence of Trajectories in Microparticles

A. V. SAVICH

The statistical apparatus of quantum mechanics allows two different interpretations, formulated by A. Einstein in the form of two alternatives: a) a microparticle actually has both momentum and coordinate, but the readings of the instrument do not permit their simultaneous measurement (then quantum mechanics is incomplete, as it does not provide a way to measure what exists in nature); b) a particle is actually described by a **Ψ**-function and does not in reality have momentum or coordinate. These arise in a specific situation, for example, during measurement (see article by D. I. Blokhintsev in the collection *"Philosophical Questions of Modern Physics"*, p. 385). Until now, there is no experimental justification or refutation of either of these alternatives (see, for example, D. Bohm, *"Physical Review"*, Vol. 85, No. 2, 1952, p. 952).

The discussion on the question of the interpretation of quantum mechanics between A. Einstein and N. Bohr (see article by A. Einstein, N. Bohr, and others in the journal *"Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk"*, Vol. XVI, issue 4 for 1936, p. 436) did not lead to positive results. Both A. Einstein and N. Bohr in the course of the discussion made mistakes and departures of an idealistic character, with the former upholding alternative (a), and the latter alternative (b).

The mistakes and idealistic propositions of A. Einstein and N. Bohr were subjected to criticism in the works of Soviet authors (see articles by M. E. Omelyanovsky, Ya. P. Terletsky, and D. I. Blokhintsev in the collection *"Philosophical Questions of Modern Physics"*, pp. 396, 432, 358, as well as the article by V. A. Fock in the journal *"Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk"*, Vol. XLV, issue 1 for 1951). However, final positive statements on the question of trajectories in the discussion were not given in these works.

The attempt by D. I. Blokhintsev, proposing an experiment that refutes alternative (a), can currently be considered doomed to failure in advance, since in such an experiment phenomena should be observed that are not described by quantum mechanics. In the specified article, D. I. Blokhintsev refers to numerous experiments in the field of atomic physics in which it is found that the total energy of a particle is less than its potential energy. (As an example of such an experiment, he cites the distribution of electrons in an atom of hydrogen in the ground energy state).

D. I. Blokhintsev claims that from the relation

$$E = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V(x)$$

under **E < V(x)**, it follows that the momentum of the particle will be imaginary, and therefore, applying simultaneously the

concepts of momentum and coordinate to a single microparticle is deprived of meaning. But for a single microparticle, relation (1) is incorrect, as it is a consequence of Newton's law. A microparticle can have both momentum and coordinate, have a trajectory, but not obey Newton's law of mechanics. Applying relation (1) to a single microparticle, D. I. Blokhintsev violates the formulation of the correspondence principle in quantum mechanics.

Thus, the refusal from the assumption of the simultaneous existence in a microparticle of momentum and coordinate (the existence of a trajectory) cannot be considered scientifically justified. We will show that the refusal from the assumption of the existence of a trajectory in a microparticle leads to fundamental philosophical difficulties. For this, let us analyze the physical meaning of the statement "a microparticle does not possess momentum and coordinate simultaneously".

This statement means that under some physical conditions a particle possesses momentum, under others—a coordinate. In quantum mechanics, physical conditions under which a particle is located are fully determined by the Hamiltonian operator. But in a state with one and the same Hamiltonian it is possible to measure in a microparticle either momentum or coordinate —by choice. Consequently, the change in physical conditions occurs due to the action of different measuring instruments. Therefore, the criticized statement means that momentum and coordinate are properties of the microparticle *together with the measuring instrument*. According to this statement, without a measuring instrument a particle has neither momentum nor coordinate, and this is the subjectivist interpretation of the

wave function and the transition to the position of the Copenhagen school.

Further, for the criticized statement not to be purely formal, it should follow to define what the coordinate and momentum of a particle are. Defining (as in classical physics) the coordinate of a particle as the coordinate of a point where the mass and charge of the particle are concentrated, and momentum as the product of the mass of the particle by the speed of movement of this point in space, is impossible, as these definitions presuppose that momentum and coordinate exist simultaneously. Therefore, D. I. Blokhintsev defines the particle's coordinate as the coordinate of the point where the particle is detected (*"Fundamentals of Quantum Mechanics"*, p. 45, 1949). In such a definition, the particle lacks any objective properties. The particle can only be *detected*. D. I. Blokhintsev does not give a method for detecting the particle, and therefore it is deprived of physical content.

The momentum of a microparticle is defined by D. I. Blokhintsev from the relation

$$p = \hbar k$$

(ibid., p. 49), that is, through another physical quantity—the wave vector **k**, characterizing not a single microparticle, but a statistical ensemble of microparticles. This definition does not give a method for measuring the momentum of a single microparticle. We see that D. I. Blokhintsev is forced to bypass the question of defining momentum and coordinate in order not to come to the recognition of their simultaneous existence. All

of the above confirms that it is impossible to give an objective definition of momentum and coordinate of a microparticle without assuming that they exist simultaneously.

To understand why the proposition about the impossibility of the simultaneous existence in a microparticle of momentum and coordinate could be put forward, it is necessary to recall one of the causes of the crisis in physics accompanying the idealistic шатания (wavering) indicated by V. I. Lenin: "Reactionary attempts are born from the very progress of science. A major success of natural science, the approach to such uniform and simple elements of matter, the laws of motion of which admit mathematical processing, makes mathematicians forget matter. 'Matter vanishes, only equations remain' " (Vol. 14, p. 294).

Indeed, the proposition about the impossibility of the simultaneous existence of momentum and coordinate is in full agreement with all mathematical apparatus of quantum mechanics. But in mathematical derivations, momentum and coordinate are treated as certain abstract concepts. When we pass from mathematics to material elements, when it is necessary to determine what physically means momentum and coordinate of a particle, materialistically interpret the experiment on its measurement and the physical meaning of the wave function, then the divergence in interpretations inevitably turns up. Together with that, it turns up, as we saw above, the idealistic essence of refusing the representation of the existence of trajectories.

The materialistic interpretation of quantum mechanics requires that momentum and coordinate exist in a microparticle simultaneously.

In his book *"Fundamentals of Quantum Mechanics"*, D. I. Blokhintsev attempts to materialistically explain the refusal of trajectories in quantum mechanics. On page 554 he writes: "From the fact that the classical pair of quantities **(p, x)** is not a characteristic of the motion of microparticles, positivists draw the conclusion about the non-existence of particles in time and space. Here, they consider particles not as an objective reality, but merely as a picture serving to bring into a neat mathematical scheme the results of observation."

Meanwhile, in quantum mechanics, there is a simple expression of the fact that the particle exists independently of the observer, in space and time, namely the normalization condition:

$$\int |\psi(x,t)|^2 dV = 1$$

This condition means that at any moment of time **t**, the particle can be localized at one of the points of space **(x)**. In other words, a particle can always be found in a state of interaction, that it displays its corpuscular nature. At the same time, it passes into such a state in which momentum, as a physical characteristic of the state of particles, loses its meaning.

In this passage, all is correct, except the last sentence. From the standpoint of statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics, it is impossible to assert that after the coordinate of a particle is measured, the latter passes into a state such that its momentum loses physical meaning. One can only say that if before measurement the particle belonged to some ensemble **Ψ(x,t)**, then after measurement it began to belong to another ensemble, which is described by a **δ**-function. The concept of impulse (momentum) of a particle for the ensemble**Ψ(x,t)** and for the ensemble **δ(x - x_0)** has the same physical meaning as for any quantum-mechanical ensemble whose wave function is given in coordinate representation. No loss of physical meaning of impulse occurred during the transition from the ensemble **Ψ(x,t)** to the ensemble **δ(x - x_0)**. The ensemble changed. The wave function of this ensemble changed both in impulse and in coordinate representation. About the single particle, one can only say that measuring its coordinate, as changing the state of the single particle, is unknown.

As was to be expected, Blokhintsev, attempting "materialistically" to explain the impossibility of applying the concepts of impulse and coordinate simultaneously to a single microparticle, is forced to attribute particle properties to the ensemble, which gives the opportunity of idealistic interpretation of quantum mechanics.

In his latest article, D. I. Blokhintsev already refuses his assertion about the impossibility of the existence of trajectories in particles altogether; he speaks only about the impossibility of the existence of *Newtonian representation* of trajectories (see journal *"Voprosy Filosofii"*, No. 6 for 1952). With such a

formulation of the question, one can already speak of logical consistency in D. I. Blokhintsev's interpretation of quantum mechanics. However, despite the logical consistency, D. I. Blokhintsev's conception remains purely formal if physical definitions of concepts of impulse, coordinate, energy, and other quantities characterizing the motion of microparticles are not given. As shown above, the materialistic definition of these quantities and considering them as a property of particles (and not as a property of particles together with a measuring device) inevitably leads to the conclusion that these quantities characterize the state of a single particle simultaneously. In his response to V. A. Fock, D. I. Blokhintsev does not make this last assumption; therefore, as we will see below, his answer cannot be considered satisfactory.

In the article by V. A. Fock, published in the journal *"Voprosy Filosofii"*, No. 4 for 1952, a number of contradictions committed by D. I. Blokhintsev in setting forth the statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics are also pointed out.

V. A. Fock criticizes the definition of a quantum-mechanical ensemble given in D. I. Blokhintsev's book: *"An ensemble is a set of particles that independently of one another are in the same state, characterized by the wave function* Ψ*,"* as it contradicts another statement by D. I. Blokhintsev: *"The wave function does not refer to an individual microparticle"* (journal *"Voprosy Filosofii"*, No. 4 for 1952, p. 170). Seeking a way out of the contradiction, V. A. Fock points out the impossibility of defining a quantum-mechanical ensemble as a statistical collection of microparticles, as from quantum mechanics it is known that for an object in a given state a physical quantity has

a definite value only in the case where the wave function of the object in this state is an eigenfunction of the corresponding operator (ibid., p. 171). But this position is unfounded: it excludes in advance the possibility of the simultaneous existence of momentum and coordinate in a microparticle and attributes the wave function to an individual micro-object. V. A. Fock takes as the basis of his reasoning what he must subsequently prove: hence the refusal of the representation of the existence of statistical ensembles and the necessity to attribute the wave function to an individual micro-object. Consequently, V. A. Fock does not substantiate, but postulates the refusal of statistical ensembles in quantum mechanics.

Meanwhile, from the contradiction committed by D. I. Blokhintsev in defining a statistical ensemble and a wave function, two ways out exist. The way out proposed by V. A. Fock—refusal of the representation of statistical ensembles—in our opinion, can lead to the idealistic conception of the Copenhagen school. This was shown by D. I. Blokhintsev in his response to V. A. Fock. Another way out is to assume that impulse, coordinate, energy, etc., exist in a microparticle *simultaneously*, and on this basis give a different definition of a statistical ensemble and quantum mechanics.

Then a quantum-mechanical ensemble can be defined as a statistical collection of microparticles that are under the same physical conditions (under the action of one and the same potential **V(x, t)**). This is an essential property of a quantum-mechanical ensemble. Particles of the ensemble will have different values of physical quantities **L, M, N...** (generally speaking, measured simultaneously). The statistical distribution

of these quantities in the ensemble is given by one and the same function **Ψ**, but in different representations **L, M, N....** Another fundamental property of a pure quantum-mechanical ensemble is the equal state of all particles of the ensemble relative to one another. Before interaction (which, in particular, can also be a measurement), the particles of the ensemble cannot be distinguished by any criterion. A mixed quantum-mechanical ensemble will consist of particles of sub-ensembles possessing the above-mentioned property[16].

Proceeding from this definition, the possibility of attributing wave properties to a single microparticle disappears. In a number of works (see, e.g., the article by M. E. Omelyanovsky in the collection *"Philosophical Questions of Modern Physics"*), an attempt is made to resolve the problem of

---

[16] D. I. Blokhintsev in his response to V. A. Fock defines the wave function and statistical ensemble differently: *"The wave function (or their set, or rather to say, statistical operator in the case of a mixed ensemble) determines the belonging of particles to specific conditions of macro-preparation, and the set of particles belonging to one and the same macro-preparation forms an ensemble, pure or mixed"* (*"Voprosy Filosofii"*, No. 6 for 1952, pp. 172–173). But this definition is formally improper, as it defines the concept of ensemble and wave function through a new concept—"particle", and the definition of this last concept is not given. The macro-potential **V(x, t)** used by D. I. Blokhintsev for defining the concept of ensemble instead of the classic potential **V(x, t)** does not exclude the necessity to give a definition of "particle" as an element of this ensemble. But, as shown above, if one defines the concept "particle" materialistically, one has to assume that momentum and coordinate exist in particles simultaneously.

properties of a single microparticle by attributing to it simultaneously wave and corpuscular properties. But even the most trivial wave property—wave length—cannot be attributed to a single microparticle, as there is no method of measuring wave length for a single particle. Wave length is a characteristic of a statistical ensemble of microparticles with constant impulse **(h-bar)** (the reduced Planck constant-*Ed*) , related to it by the relation

$$\lambda = \frac{2\pi}{k}$$

To prove the existence of wave properties in a microparticle, the phenomenon of diffraction is usually cited. Undoubtedly, during diffraction, individual particles do not interact with one another, but this does not mean that each particle interacts with the grating as a wave. The diffracting particles are connected with one another by the fact that their coordinates are statistically distributed over the width of the beam. This unites them into a single statistical ensemble possessing the properties of a plane wave. A clear violation of the uniform distribution of particles in a beam means that particles will differ by their position. Such an ensemble will no longer be described by a de Broglie wave and possess properties of a plane wave. The usual diffraction pattern upon interaction of such an ensemble with a diffraction grating will no longer be observed.

This interconnection among the diffracted particles is usually not taken into account, and therefore erroneous conclusions are

drawn from the diffraction phenomenon regarding the presence of wave properties in a single microparticle (see, for example, the above-mentioned article by M. E. Omelyanovsky). In reality, however, the particle moves along a definite trajectory, but its law of motion is different from Newton's law. This new law of motion accounts for the wave properties of an ensemble of microparticles. It is impossible to measure a particle's momentum and coordinate simultaneously and determine its trajectory; momentum and coordinate remain "hidden variables." In foreign literature recently, a number of works have appeared (D. Bohm, *Physical Review*, Vol. 85, No. 2, 1952; de Broglie, *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, Vol. 234, No. 3, 1952; Renninger, Schatzman, Vigier, *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, Vol. 234, No. 4, 1952, etc.) in which attempts are made (uncompleted as yet) to provide a new law of motion for microparticles, distinct from Newton's law and not in contradiction with the wave properties of a statistical ensemble of microparticles[17].

The existence of fundamental differences between an ensemble of particles with a non-zero rest mass and an electromagnetic wave makes it impossible to fully extend the above reasoning to photons. However, a photon also cannot be identified with a wave packet. This was shown experimentally by S. I. Vavilov (see his work *Microstructure of Light*), who proved that during the formation of two coherent beams, a photon does not split into two parts like a wave.

[17] D. Bohm also considers that the rejection of the concept of trajectories for microparticles is, from a philosophical standpoint, positivism. However, in his articles, D. Bohm fails to consistently carry out a materialist interpretation of quantum mechanics.

The relationship between the corpuscular and wave aspects in electromagnetic waves requires special consideration.

Relativistic quantum mechanics and quantum field theory cannot lead to the abandonment of corpuscular concepts, since at the foundation of these theories—besides quantum mechanics—lie only the postulates of the theory of relativity, which do not contradict corpuscular concepts. The conclusion regarding the existence of trajectories for microparticles, derived on the basis of non-relativistic quantum mechanics, must therefore remain valid.

28. M. M. Rozental. *The Marxist Dialectical Method*. Gospolitizdat. 1952. 347 pp.*[18]

L. B. BAZHENOV

The reviewed book is a revised edition of a work previously published under the same title by M. M. Rozental, *The Marxist Dialectical Method*. The basis of the book is J. V. Stalin's classic work *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*. The author took into account to a significant extent the critical remarks made during the discussion of the first edition of this book at the Academy of Social Sciences and in the pages of the press.

In the new edition of his book, M. M. Rozental, striving (as evidenced by the structure of the book, the range of issues considered by the author, and the nature of the presentation) to achieve greater clarity and precision in explaining the issues of Marxist dialectics, to raise the theoretical level of the book, and at the same time to make it more accessible to a wide range of readers. To a certain extent, the author succeeded in achieving this.

In the introductory chapter "Marxist Dialectics as the Only Scientific Method of Knowledge," a brief description of the worldview of the Communist Party is given, the history of the emergence of dialectical materialism, criticism of Hegel's

[18] The review by L. B. Bazhenov was supplemented with critical remarks on M. M. Rozental's book derived from reviews by P. A. Brusentsov and the Department of Philosophy at the Leningrad State Pedagogical Institute named after A. I. Herzen received by the editorial board.

dialectics, and the author's point of view on the subject of Marxist dialectics are formulated. In the remaining chapters, the author examines the features of Marxist dialectics, and in the concluding chapter highlights the general significance of the Marxist dialectical method for the practical activity of the proletariat's party.

The author provides a detailed analysis of the most important issues related to the main features of the Marxist dialectical method in his book and reveals their essence. He extensively uses the classical literature of Marxism-Leninism. The book reflects the latest scientific discoveries and achievements of Soviet science.

By the nature of the presentation, the philosophical book is accessible to a wide range of readers.

Such are the indisputable merits of M. M. Rozental's book. But it also contains a number of shortcomings that significantly reduce its value. We are talking primarily about major methodological flaws.

In a book intended for a wide range of readers, the main problems should first of all be set out clearly and precisely. In accordance with this, in each chapter, in each paragraph, it is necessary to **highlight the most main propositions**, so that the essential, main point is not lost in a mass of examples, so that examples do not turn from a means of explanation into an end in themselves, replacing principal statements. Unfortunately, in M. M. Rozental's book, there are paragraphs in which the main statements are difficult to grasp.

Precisely as a result of the noted methodological shortcoming, for example, it was not possible to fully reveal the essence of the dialectical understanding of development as a process of continuous renewal, the emergence of the new and the dying away of the old. The second paragraph of the third chapter, "Dialectics on Movement and Development. Dying Away of the Old and Growth of the New is the Law of Development," is devoted to this issue. However, the problems formulated in the title received no clear and expanded presentation in the text. On page 126 we read: "In the work *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, J. V. Stalin reveals the **main point** (emphasis ours—*L. B.*) in the dialectical theory of development, showing that in nature 'always something is arising and developing, something is disintegrating and dying away.' Comrade Stalin says that 'the dying away of the old and the growth of the new is the law of development...'"

However, the proposition cited by M. M. Rozental on the dying away of the old and the growth of the new does not receive its justification in the presented material; it is lost in it. The examples provided by the author are not examined from the perspective of the **main point** in the dialectical theory of development.

Examples from physics, from the works of O. B. Lepeshinskaya on biology, etc., are analyzed from a completely different angle. The following picture emerges: a completely correct proposition is stated (which, moreover, is not highlighted in the text), followed by factual material in which this main proposition is lost and blurred.

Thus, for example, after the above-cited Stalinist proposition on the dying away of the old and the growth of the new as a law of development, four pages of material from physics follow, in which this proposition is not even mentioned. Then follow two pages in which O. B. Lepeshinskaya's works analyze biological content of her discoveries, but it is not shown that this discovery also serves as confirmation of the "main point in the dialectical theory of development"—the doctrine of the invincibility of the new.

Further follow two pages devoted to examples from social life, where the emergence of the new and the dying away of the old are shown quite convincingly. And, finally, on the last pages, the application of dialectical theory of development to knowledge is discussed, which in itself is of great scientific and practical interest, but where again almost nothing is said about development as the growth of the new and the dying away of the old.

The paragraph is written in such a way that the main point in the dialectical theory of development remains, in essence, unrevealed, because the presented factual material was not subordinated to the main idea that the author was supposed to reveal.

This inability of the author to clearly formulate the main point, what is most important, equally permeates all subsequent presentation, where this flaw stands out even more sharply in the presentation of the fourth feature of the Marxist dialectical method.

The author deserves a serious reproach for the fact that his book does not reveal the entire significance of the Stalinist treatment of the content of the development process as a struggle between the old and the new. Rozental, of course, cannot fail to speak in his book about the enormous contribution made by J. V. Stalin to the understanding of the "core of dialectics". In the first chapter, there is a completely correct statement: "Developing Leninist propositions on contradiction as the 'core of dialectics,' Comrade Stalin deeply revealed the nature of contradictions, the essence of the struggle of opposites as a struggle between the old and the new, the dying away and the arising, the decaying and the developing" (p. 47). But this correct thought does not permeate the explanation of the fourth feature itself and remains unrevealed. Having cited the classic Stalinist formulation of the fourth feature, the author says not a word about the main and crucial point in it and does not show the enormous вклад of J. V. Stalin in the development of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the struggle of opposites—this "core of dialectics".

Moreover, in the brief conclusions on the fourth feature of dialectics, M. M. Rozental generally does not emphasize that the struggle of opposites is a struggle between the new and the old, whereas emphasizing this in the conclusions was, of course, absolutely necessary. Here is how the corresponding conclusion is formulated: "Internal contradictions, contradictory tendencies and drives are in a state of struggle. The struggle of opposites is the source of development. In the process of the struggle of opposites, a disclosure, unfolding of contradictions occurs. The struggle of opposites ends with the

transition of one opposite into another, the death of the old and the emergence of the new. The struggle of opposites is absolute, every unity of opposites is relative" (p. 379).

The point, of course, is not only that the struggle of opposites ends with the dying away of the old and the emergence of the new. The main point consists precisely in the fact that **the struggle of the dying away, the old, and the arising, the new, is the law of all development**.

The author's inability to methodologically correctly present the material, to subordinate the presentation of the topic to the main and decisive point leads to a blurring of this main and decisive aspect, which is a very major flaw in the book. The presentation in a number of places becomes diffuse, the main point is lost in examples, and therefore by no means accidentally, remarks arose from many students, graduate students, and self-studying individuals learning Marxist-Leninist philosophy about the difficulty of grasping the main point when reading M. M. Rozental's book.

When reissuing the book, the author should pay the most careful attention to the method of presentation, since this book is used as a textbook.

When considering M. M. Rozental's book from the perspective of its content, it should be noted above all that its main shortcoming lies in the fact that the author did not reveal to a sufficient degree what J. V. Stalin contributed to the development of dialectical materialism through his work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*.

Outlining the issue of content and form, M. M. Rozental does not even mention this work. Considering the question of the law of the struggle of opposites, he says nothing about the immense importance for the correct understanding of this law that Comrade Stalin's critique of the primitive anarchistic view of society, classes, and language possesses.

The further development of the Marxist doctrine on the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones in J. V. Stalin's work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* is insufficiently disclosed in the book. The proposition regarding different forms of a leap—with an explosion and without an explosion—is formulated by the author only in brief conclusions from the third feature of Marxist dialectics. However, in the main presentation of the third feature, the author does not formulate this proposition on a general theoretical level, but merely mentions these forms when analyzing certain concrete examples. Speaking of various forms of transition from an old quality to a new one, the author writes about this as something long known, without even pointing out that the most profound solution to this issue was given by J. V. Stalin in his work *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*. The author characterizes the significance of this brilliant work for resolving the problem of transition from an old quality to a new one as follows: "In *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, J. V. Stalin showed how qualities changed during the transition from an old quality to a new one after the liquidation of hostile classes in our society" (p. 226). However, limiting himself to this statement, the author does not disclose in full measure the contribution made by Comrade Stalin to the

Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones.

Rozental's book as a whole is imbued with the spirit of Bolshevik party spirit. However, unfortunately, in a number of places, the author departs from this principle.

Thus, outlining the question of the preparation of Marxist dialectics, the author pays main attention to the development of natural science, relegating to the background the class roots of Marxist dialectics. Throughout seven pages (pp. 21–27), the transition from the metaphysical method of thinking to dialectics is depicted only as a result of the development of science, and only on page 28 is it stated that "only the ideologists of the proletariat could create a truly scientific dialectical method" (p. 29). But this completely correct proposition is not disclosed or substantiated in the text.

Insufficiently clear, in our view, is shown in the book the fact that Marxist dialectics is opposite to Hegelian dialectics in its class roots, as Marx showed in the postscript to the second German edition of Volume 1 of *Capital*.

The absence of a detailed analysis of the opposition of Marxist dialectics to Hegelian dialectics as an opposition of class nature, undoubtedly, testifies to a departure by the author in this matter from the consistent application of the principle of party spirit.

This departure is also manifested in the toothless characterization of metaphysics given by the author in the introduction and in the second chapter. Disclosing the causes of the origin of metaphysics and characterizing its essence (pp. 17

–21), the author says nothing about its class roots, completely failing to expose the reactionary role of metaphysics at the present time as a weapon of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Such a toothless critique of metaphysics occurs in the presentation of the second feature of the Marxist dialectical method. The author does not show how metaphysics serves the modern bourgeoisie in its main task—preventing development, renewal.

Insufficiently sharply, in a number of cases, prof. Rozental exposes representatives of modern bourgeois philosophy. Thus, on pp. 245, 246, and 315, analyzing the views of representatives of bourgeois philosophy (Bergson, Nietzsche, pragmatists, etc.), he insufficiently discloses the reactionary class essence of their concepts.

Subjecting sophistry to critique, the author completely bypasses the task of exposing sophistry in modern bourgeois philosophy. Instead of giving a sharp critique of the most reactionary concepts of modern bourgeois philosophy, M. M. Rozental limits himself to critical remarks on individual quotes.

At the 19th Party Congress, Comrade Malenkov emphasized once again that "our party is strong because it is guided in all its activities by Marxist-Leninist theory" (p. 77). Revealing the immense importance that the party's activity "soul of Marxism"—dialectics—possesses is one of the main tasks of a book devoted to the Marxist dialectical method.

M. M. Rozental attempted to reveal this significance of dialectics using examples from the history of the party. However, providing factual material to illustrate a given proposition of dialectics, he did not focus attention on how the party in its practical activity was guided by this proposition of dialectics, how dialectics helped and helps the party to correctly solve issues of strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle. Thereby, the author fails to reveal in full measure the revolutionary, transforming role of the Marxist dialectical method.

Extremely illustrative in this regard is M. M. Rozental's presentation of the proposition on the decisive, determining significance of content in relation to form. The author uses in his presentation of this issue J. V. Stalin's remarkable speech "On Work in the Countryside". This speech represents a most brilliant example of how the party, guided by the proposition on the decisive role of content, exposed one of the shortcomings in work in the countryside and outlined concrete ways to eliminate it. In the reviewed book, this essential side is blurred. Comrade Stalin's speech is disclosed only as proof of the decisive role of content. M. M. Rozental writes: "Concern for filling revolutionary forms with revolutionary content—here is what practical conclusion follows from this" (p. 325). But how the party fills revolutionary forms with revolutionary content and how the party guides this process is not shown in the book. Yet all this could be perfectly demonstrated using the example of J. V. Stalin's speech "On Work in the Countryside".

Characteristic in this respect is the sixth paragraph of the fourth chapter—"Law of Transition from Old to New in the

Conditions of Soviet Socialist Society". (We consider it necessary to note that highlighting the presentation of each feature of special paragraphs examining the manifestation of this feature in the conditions of socialism is an indisputable merit of Prof. Rozental).

In this paragraph, the author thoroughly describes the features of leaps in the conditions of our society, and limits himself to this. Meanwhile, he should have emphasized the other side of this issue as well, namely: how the Party is guided in its activity by the propositions of Marxist dialectics on leaps in the conditions of socialism. Unfortunately, this side is folded in the reviewed book.

Of course, what was said above should not be interpreted in the sense that the author nowhere in his book speaks about how the party is guided in its practical activity by the main propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory. In a number of cases, the author succeeds in showing this (for example, in the paragraphs "Interdependence of Phenomena," "Dialectics and Sophistry," "Concreteness of Truth," and several others). But far from always does the author reveal the immense creative importance of the Marxist dialectical method for both the activity of the party and the development of advanced science.

Such are the shortcomings of M. M. Rozental's book as a whole. We pass to remarks on individual chapters.

The second chapter, containing the presentation of the first feature of the Marxist dialectical method, begins with an interesting and important question—on the structure of Marxist dialectics. The author clearly and convincingly shows the

transition from the first feature of Marxist dialectics to the second, but, unfortunately, he does not do this in relation to the transition to the third feature, and then from the third to the fourth.

In the second chapter, the author mainly correctly reveals the content of the first feature of the Marxist dialectical method; however, the paragraph presenting the issue of the new nature of laws in Soviet socialist society requires serious revision in light of J. V. Stalin's classic work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*.

It is necessary to note in this chapter a number of shortcomings. Thus, a very careless definition of causality causes perplexity: "Causality is such an interdependence of two phenomena in which one phenomenon serves as the cause for the occurrence of another" (p. 69). One can hardly explain causality through the category of cause, for this is defining one unknown through another unknown. Why, indeed, M. M. Rozental considers that if the reader does not know what cause is, he knows what cause is? With equal right one can say the opposite, that cause is called a phenomenon that serves as a cause for another phenomenon.

In the subsequent presentation of the question of causality, the author gives a critique of the metaphysical understanding of causality, but he does not complete it. Thus, for example, position of physics in the book is considered only as position of teleologism. But this is incorrect. Relativism, as well as objective idealism (which the author does not criticize in this

section), follows the path of mystification of causal connections.

Generally, the critique given by the author to viewpoints hostile to Marxism on the question of causality is not carried through to the end.

A significant flaw was also made in the presentation of categories of necessity and chance. As is known, at the basis of metaphysical concepts on this issue (indeterminism and mechanical determinism) lies the identification of chance with uncausedness. The author should have clearly formulated that cause lies at the basis of both accidental and necessary phenomena, that the difference between these phenomena lies only in the nature of their causality.

An excessively soft and vague characterization is given by the author to eclecticism: "Clearly, that eclecticism is harmful to knowledge. Eclecticism with a roar breaks through the open door: it states connection and interdependence of various sides of an object, but does not see the main basis of interaction, is incapable to highlight in each given case the main, decisive link in the chain of events and tasks" (p. 95). In our view, such a characterization is incorrect. One cannot say that eclecticism breaks (even if with a roar) into open doors. It simply mixes up various sides and, purely mechanically, ignoring their real connections, piles them into one heap. At the same time, eclecticism is dangerous precisely because it creates the illusion (emphasized, only the illusion) of taking into account various sides of a phenomenon. Out of the same eclecticism grows "connection," as, for example, theories of development

"enter" contradictions or theory of "evolutionism"—transition from old quality to a new one.

The third chapter—"Movement and Development in Nature and in Society"—is written significantly worse than the second chapter.

Speaking of the general flaws of the book, we have already noted a major flaw in the first chapter, in particular, the absence of a sharp party analysis of the reactionary role of metaphysics at the present time and the absence of a clear characterization of Hegelian and dialectical understanding of development.

In the chapter, there are a number of other essential flaws. Thus, in considering the issue of the invincibility of the new, the author does not show how J. V. Stalin resolves this issue in his work *Anarchism or Socialism?* (see *Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 298–300). Outlining the question of possibility and reality, the author gives definitions of these categories and emphasizes the objective nature of possibility. The examples provided by the author illustrate the existence of concepts of possibility and reality rather than reveal how the party in its practical activity is guided by the propositions of dialectics on possibility and reality.

In the main, correctly presented is the question of main features of development in conditions of Soviet socialist society; however, unfortunately, it is presented insufficiently fully. Presenting the book, M. M. Rozental should take into account what is written in the work of J. V. Stalin *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, and alongside considering the main

features (accelerated tempo and continuity of development), necessarily show the uniqueness of the struggle of the new with the old in the conditions of socialism.

When considering the law of interdependence of mass and energy, the author uses inappropriate terminology, calling this law the law of equivalence of mass and energy.

A significant shortcoming of the fourth chapter —"Development as a Transition of Quantitative Changes into Essential Qualitative Ones"—is the failure, as already noted by us, to reveal in the presentation of forms of leaps. Completely unacceptable in a book of this caliber is the absence of an expanded theoretical analysis of the Stalinist proposition on two forms of development—evolutionary and revolutionary. The author does not even cite the Stalinist formulation regarding the relationship between evolution and revolution. In the reviewed book, there is no such objective-theoretical coverage of dialectical resolution of this issue, nor a critique of two metaphysical concepts.

The analysis of J. V. Stalin's errors of Kautsky and Lafargue is presented simply as an analysis of errors of two scientists; the author does not reveal the immense significance of this critique in a general theoretical plan as a critique of two metaphysical concepts of development. Therefore, the author fails to convincingly show that both currents hostile to Marxism in the labor movement—reformism and anarchism—have as their methodological basis metaphysical limitations regarding evolution and revolution.

In connection with this issue, it is necessary to note another very essential flaw committed by the author. Thus, on p. 211 he writes: "Indeed, if development passes through two indivisible stages, if evolution and revolution in their forms of manifestation are in tight dependence on each other and condition each other, then in practical activity primary significance assumes the ability to lead this interdependence of two forms of movement, the ability not to run ahead, when the evolutionary stage of the process has not yet ended and has not exhausted itself, patiently to gather and accumulate forces, not to engage in 'small work,' and, conversely, the ability to determine the moment when enough forces have accumulated to make the transition from one qualitative state to another and pass to decisive storming..."

First, one cannot count on success in revolution if the preparation was not conducted sufficiently, even if it is preceded by an evolutionary stage. But where in Lenin or Stalin is it said that the evolutionary stage of the class struggle process must be exhausted? It is in vain that the author refers to the works of Comrade Stalin "On Political Strategy and Tactics of Russian Communists" (draft outline of a brochure) and "On the Question of Strategy and Tactics of Russian Communists". There are no indications there that the evolutionary stage of class struggle must be "exhausted". The author should have treated with special care those formulations in which the discussion is about the revolutionary strategy and tactics of Bolshevism.

In the fifth chapter—"Development as a Struggle of Opposites,"—besides the indicated——major shortcomings, it is necessary to note the following.

In our view, Prof. Rozental incorrectly uses the terms "unity of opposites," "law of unity and struggle of opposites". In his classic work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, J. V. Stalin defines development as a struggle of opposites.

The term "identity," or "unity," of opposites, found in our literature, represents a remnant of the Hegelian mode of expression. In philosophical literature, one should use the term "struggle of opposites," which accurately expresses the essence of this law. In J. V. Stalin's work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, this law is characterized precisely as the law of the struggle of opposites. From the established Stalinist formulations, as the latest word in Marxist science, the author should proceed in outlining the fourth feature of the Marxist dialectical method.

Analyzing the question of contradictions of an object, M. M. Rozental says nothing about contradictions in the mode of production. J. V. Stalin's brilliant work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* shed full light on this issue. And in subsequent editions of his book, Prof. Rozental should eliminate this gap in his book and outline this issue in the light of J. V. Stalin's work.

M. M. Rozental also makes a mistake regarding contradictions of society with nature, essentially classifying them as internal contradictions. Outlining on pp. 295–297 the issue of contradictions between society and nature, the author on page

300 writes: "...up to now we were speaking about internal contradictions of Soviet socialist society". Thus, contradictions of our society with nature are completely impermissibly classified as internal contradictions.

Outlining the question of antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions, Prof. Rozental completely in vain gives no definition of them. In the presentation of this issue, another essential flaw is permitted. Speaking of non-antagonistic contradictions between the working class and peasantry under capitalism, he writes that "they in capitalist society are opposed by their class position..." (p. 269).

The assertion made by the author without any reservations that it follows to understand under "opposition by class position" appears to us to be inaccurate.

As already noted above, insufficiently deeply illuminated in the chapter is the issue of the struggle of the new with the old in Soviet society, as well as the problem of form and content.

Such are the main shortcomings of the reviewed book. It contains a number of minor formulations and stylistic inaccuracies, testifying to careless editing. Thus, for example, on p. 251 the author speaks about the struggle of heredity and variability as driving contradictions of organic development. This is a clearly careless formulation, as evidenced by the fact that the author himself a few lines below corrects himself, speaking now about the struggle of heredity and adaptability.

* * *

The work of M. M. Rozental, as noted above, possesses many merits. It is a popularization of J. V. Stalin's classic work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* and gives the reader a correct idea about the main features of the Marxist dialectical method. However, from a book published for the fourth time, readers are entitled to expect a deeper and clearer presentation of issues of the Marxist dialectical method and a bolder and more creative approach to the coverage of complex issues of Marxist dialectics.

J. V. Stalin's brilliant work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* raises to a new stage Marxist-Leninist science. This work of Comrade Stalin is a new outstanding contribution to the Marxist-Leninist dialectical method. The patterns of connection of phenomena, possibility and reality, content and form, specifics of qualitative changes in the development of our society, character of contradictions and features of the struggle of the new with the old in socialist society, concrete-historical approach to phenomena—this is far from a complete list of issues that received deep development in this remarkable work.

It is necessary to wish Prof. Rozental, when reissuing his book, to deeply and comprehensively use this outstanding contribution of J. V. Stalin to Marxist dialectics, in order to show with greater depth the great force of the Marxist dialectical method.

29. A New Book on the Theory of Knowledge

Adam Schaff. *Certain Problems of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of Truth*; 479 pp. General editing by Prof. S. A. Yanovskaya. M. Foreign Literature Publishing House. 1953.

D. P. GORSKY, M. S. IVANOV

The new book by the Polish philosopher Adam Schaff is devoted to current problems of Marxist philosophy. It acquaints us with the intense struggle of Polish Marxists against reactionary ideology in contemporary Poland and beyond its borders.

The intensity of the ideological struggle in Poland, as in other countries of people's democracy, is conditioned by the fact that in these countries a process of revolutionary transformation is taking place, the economic foundations of socialism are being laid. The six-year plan for the development of the national economy of Poland is being successfully carried out, with the fulfillment of which a "necessary economic foundation for building socialism" will be created. On the basis of the successes of economic development in the country, a new, socialist base is taking shape and strengthening, and together with it, and on its foundation, a new superstructure is being created.

People's Democratic Poland has existed for eight years. During this short time, from an economically weak country exploited by foreign capital, it has turned into a country of rapid

industrialization and rapidly growing economic power. Having eliminated landowner and capitalist property through agrarian reform and nationalization of industry, the people's power aroused the initiative and creative activity of the working masses, led the people to the struggle for the socialist transformation of Poland. Relying on the fraternal, selfless assistance of the Soviet Union, the Polish people are successfully solving a task of great historical importance—building socialism, transforming their country into a powerful socialist industrial power.

"Nationalized industry of Poland," said Comrade Bierut in his speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU, "gives today three times more production than before the war. On the basis of economic and technical transformations in the country, a deep cultural revolution is taking place. The Polish nation is rapidly turning into a new, socialist nation. A decisive role in these historical transformations, which awaken to life today the mighty forces and creative talents of the Polish working masses, is played by the fraternal assistance, friendship, and example of the Soviet peoples, who are led and victoriously guided forward to communism by the CPSU (b)" (*Pravda* of October 8, 1952).

The reactionary forces of old Poland, feeling their inevitable doom, are doing everything to delay the process of revolutionary transformation of the country, to postpone their inevitable demise.

The struggle against reaction, against the forces of old Poland is going on both in the field of economic and state construction, and in the field of ideology.

In old Poland, the dominant worldview was idealism; in Polish universities, institutes, complete stagnation, positivism, and other anti-scientific philosophical schools and trends reigned supreme. Representatives of these trends are still trying to exert influence on the youth. Polish neo-Thomists, who have their base in the Lublin Catholic University and theological faculties at other universities, publish their own printed organs that conduct propaganda for idealism. In Warsaw itself, the school of positivists, headed by Kotarbiński and Ajdukiewicz, is raising its head.

Polish Marxists expose all these reactionary, idealist "theories" propagated by these schools. The Polish philosophical journal *Myśl Filozoficzna*, edited by A. Schaff, held a successful discussion with Kotarbiński; in the course of the discussion it was proved that, in essence, Kotarbiński stands on the positions of agnosticism and subjective idealism.

However, the ideological struggle against all kinds of idealist schools is only just unfolding. Polish Marxist philosophers face a serious and honorable task of theoretically smashing all anti-Marxist, anti-scientific, idealist directions of philosophical thought in contemporary Poland.

The value of the reviewed book for the Soviet reader lies in the fact that it acquaints us with the ideological struggle that is currently taking place in Poland.

The book consists of two parts. Part one contains an exposition of the Marxist-Leninist theory of truth. The author sets forth the views of the classics of Marxism on questions of objective

truth, on the criterion of truth, on absolute and relative truth. Part two is devoted to the critique of idealist theories of truth.

In the course of setting forth the Marxist-Leninist teaching on truth, the author emphasizes that the classics of Marxism, critically reworking the past heritage, utilized all the best that was created by philosophical thought of humanity over all ages, starting with Aristotle. The author shows that the Marxist understanding of truth is the only scientific one.

Undoubtedly positive is the fact that the question of truth is considered by the author in organic connection with all other questions of the theory of knowledge: on the dialectical method and the role of practice in the process of cognition, on language and thought, etc. The Marxist teaching on truth is considered in the book in various aspects and everywhere counterposed to idealist conceptions. In the analysis of various questions, the author subjects skepticism, relativism, and dogmatism to criticism.

In the treatment of the Marxist understanding of truth, the author, relying on examples from the history of science, from the history of philosophy, from the practice of the modern struggle of peoples for socialism, expresses a number of original and interesting thoughts.

In the second part of the book, the author gives a sharp and convincing critique of the most reactionary bourgeois conceptions on the question of truth.

The author shows that all considered philosophical schools deny the objective nature of our knowledge, the objective

character of the laws of science, and strive to justify complete arbitrariness in science.

The class-reactionary sense of this kind of "theories" is completely obvious. Substantiating the subjectivist character of the laws of science, the ideologists of imperialist bourgeoisie strive theoretically to "substantiate" the eternity of capitalism, its "right" to exist, its "right" to conduct aggressive, predatory wars, its "right" to enslave and plunder other countries.

Asserting that everything depends on the subject, that the laws of nature and social life are created by the will and desire of people, the ideologists of imperialism strive thereby to prove that socialism is an accidental phenomenon, that capitalism can exist forever if people create new laws that can eliminate the ever-deepening contradictions of the imperialist camp. Hence the sharpest anti-scientific, reactionary character of trends directed against Marxism, which discovered and scientifically substantiated the objective character of the laws of science, the objective character of the laws of social development, and proved that the replacement of capitalism with necessity must lead to socialism.

Marxist teaching on the objective character of the laws of science arms advanced scholars in every way for the fight against all kinds of idealist, subjectivist perversions.

A. Schaff quite correctly directs the point of his criticism against neo-positivism—one of the most reactionary philosophical schools of modern subjectivist-idealist philosophy, which turned in the hands of Anglo-American imperialism into one of the weapons of ideological expansion.

Falsifying the data of special sciences (mathematics, logic, linguistics, etc.), neo-positivists try to substantiate the arbitrariness of the initial concepts of science, the arbitrariness of logical laws, and thereby try to transform science into a "free game of human intellect," creating or changing laws according to the desire of science at will.

In A. Schaff's book, the views of the Polish micro-biologist N. Lubański, who substantiated the thesis of empirio-criticism on the economy of thought, are subjected to substantiated criticism; he tries to prove that the main thing in a new scientific formula is not how well it corresponds to a real natural phenomenon, but how deeply new discoveries allow one to penetrate into real processes and natural phenomena, and how convenient and economic it is for explaining phenomena.

"The struggle against neo-vitalism, which was recently unfolded in biology," says Lubański, "is merely a manifestation of the desire for the maximum economy and simplicity of scientific explanation" (p. 275. Cit. from A. Schaff's book).

A. Schaff convincingly proves the complete scientific insolvency of the idealist constructions of Lubański and authors like him.

Linking the struggle against idealist directions in contemporary People's Democratic Poland with the tasks of propagating Marxist-Leninist philosophy, the author at the same time subjects reactionary theories of modern Anglo-American philosophy to sharp criticism. Therefore, A. Schaff's struggle against various pseudoscientific "conceptions" and schools of

idealism is a valuable contribution to the common struggle of advanced materialist philosophers of all countries against anti-scientific, idealist philosophy.

The struggle of philosophical parties and directions is considered in the book from the standpoint of the Marxist-Leninist principle of party-mindedness (*partiinost'*). The author shows that behind the struggle of philosophical directions, behind the struggle of idealism and materialism, lies an irreconcilable class struggle of the proletariat and the modern reactionary bourgeoisie.

Along with the above-mentioned merits of A. Schaff's book *Certain Problems of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of Truth*, it is necessary to point out a number of shortcomings.

In A. Schaff's book, the question of the revolutionary leap that was accomplished by Marxism in solving the question of truth is not considered with sufficient thoroughness. This essential shortcoming is aggravated by the fact that the author throughout the first two chapters emphasizes mainly what is common to Marxism and pre-Marxist materialist teachings on truth. A. Schaff should have, in our view, thoroughly covered the question of the qualitative difference of Marxist philosophy from all preceding philosophy in solving the question of truth, showing that this solution for the first time received a scientific character in Marxism. In this connection, it should have been emphasized that, proceeding from the recognition of the primacy of matter (in relation to consciousness) and the knowability of the world, Marxism for the first time applied materialist dialectics to the question of truth, including practice in the theory of knowledge both as a criterion of scientific

knowledge and as its source (the latter throughout the whole book is emphasized to an insufficient degree).

When considering the most important question of the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge—the question of truth—the author does not show its significance for historical materialism, for the practical activity of the party of the proletariat.

This gives the work a somewhat abstract, one-sided character.

The author does not illuminate to a sufficient degree the question of how reactionary pseudo-scientific speculations of modern subjectivist idealists on the problem of truth are used by them in their fight against Marxism, in their fight against the champions of peace and socialism. Exposing the anti-scientific nature of all these "theories," A. Schaff does not reveal to the end their serving role as a class tool of anti-Marxist philosophy.

The connection of all these "theories" with questions of international politics, class struggle, will become completely obvious if one examines the works of Landsberg, Chase, and other semanticists who try to prove that the source of contradictions in society, the source of struggle and disagreements among various social groups, is the fact that people allegedly "have the habit" of assigning and attaching arbitrary meanings to certain words. We are talking about words expressing such concepts that from the standpoint of semanticists cannot be subjected to "experimental" testing: matter, cause, space, capitalism, exploitation, private property, class struggle, etc. Since people, in their opinion, "at will" put diverse meanings into such words that are incompatible with

each other, the use of these words gives rise to ground for disagreement. Therefore, semanticists propose to eliminate these words from the language. After such purging, the language will be cleaned, and in their opinion, social contradictions too. Chase, for example, declares that "endless political and economic difficulties arose and developed due to language abuse" (S. Chase, *The Tyranny of Words*, p. 14. London. 1943).

Many ideologists of imperialism try to find the reason for the unsatisfactory work of the UN in the incorrect use of various concepts. Thus, in their opinion, the cause of constant disputes between delegates of the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy, on the one hand, and countries of the American-English block, on the other is the use during UN meetings of words into which different meanings can be put. Words like "aggression," "imperialism," etc., cause special anger among semanticists. For a radical improvement of UN operations, they propose to eliminate words of this kind from usage.

The class-reactionary sense of this kind of "theories" is completely obvious: ideologists of imperialism try to deceive public opinion, to mask the true causes of the contradictions of imperialist capitalism, which under the operation of the basic economic law are constantly deepening and sharpening. They try to justify the aggressive policy of American imperialists.

It would not be difficult to show the anti-scientific nature and sophistry of assertions of semanticists that some words can be loaded with arbitrary meanings, since they cannot be subjected to the kind of "experimental" testing that is applied, for

example, by a chemist when he uses litmus to determine whether a solution is an acid or an alkali. The sophistry of such "argumentation" becomes completely obvious in light of the following propositions confirmed by historical practice:

1. Lexical meanings of words of any historically formed language are not arbitrary, but have an objective character, since their formation does not depend on the will and desires of individual people; entering life, a person finds the word with its established lexical meaning.
2. Lexical meanings represent the reflection of objects on the part of their essential and distinctive features.
3. All words denoting extremely broad scientific concepts are tested not in the course of any single experiment, but in the process of the development of all science, all socio-productive practice.

Unfortunately, in the content-rich, interesting overall chapter on neo-positivism (chapter VIII), questions related to the exposure of pseudo-scientific concepts of semanticists received insufficiently full coverage.

Among the shortcomings of the book should also be included the fact that the author, criticizing modern bourgeois idealist conceptions on the question of truth, does not show how the search for "arguments" for their subjectivist-idealist conceptions by bourgeois philosophers speculates on those difficulties that arise in the course of the development of

science. It should have been shown that facts established by science (for example, the fact of the existence of non-Euclidean geometries, the fact of the possibility of building logic systems from axioms for one and the same group of objects, the fact of the existence of a multitude of interpretations for one and the same axiom system, etc.), in no way can serve as a substantiation for these idealist "theories," but, on the contrary, the development of science confirms dialectical materialism, constantly refuting all kinds of subjectivist-idealist "constructions." For nothing else can explain the diversity and multiplicity of schools of modern positivism, constantly replacing each other, except that the development of science, knocking "arguments" out of their hands, forces them to resort to ever newer falsifications.

V. I. Lenin, exposing Machism, showed that "the connection of new physics or, rather, a definite school in new physics with Machism and other varieties of modern idealist philosophy is beyond the slightest doubt" (*Works*, Vol. 14, p. 238), but that the results obtained by new physics not only do not refute materialism, but, on the contrary, give new confirmation in favor of materialism. V. I. Lenin emphasized that when criticizing Machism, one must not ignore this connection between the development of natural science and idealist tendencies in philosophy.

The author, considering various "conceptions" of idealist philosophy, does not make it his special task to clarify the connection between the development of natural science and anti-scientific speculations of modern neo-positivism, which claims, as Mach did in his time, to generalize the "latest

achievements of exact sciences (in particular mathematics and logic)". For the critique of neo-positivism, for example, the exposure of those sophisms that represent a crude distortion of scientific propositions related to axiomatic methods of constructing various mathematical disciplines, the exposure of the mechanical identification of "language" with mathematics, which turned from an auxiliary tool of science into actual science, is of great importance.

In our view, the author acts incorrectly by excessively bringing the Marxist-Leninist teaching on truth closer to the Aristotelian. Thus, raising the question of the definition of the concept of "truth," A. Schaff considers the Marxist-Leninist definition of truth a simple refinement, clarification of the Aristotelian definition. He writes: "This standpoint of dialectical materialism leads in the theory of truth to a consistently materialist conception, according to which truthfulness is a property of a judgment that gives us a correct reflection of objectively existing reality. If it is correctly asserted that this definition is a development of the classical (that is, Aristotelian—*D. G. and M. I.*) definition of truth (since it also presupposes the objectivity of reality and its knowability), then it must be emphasized at the same time that dialectical materialism is a new, higher stage in the development of materialist theory of truth" (p. 31).

First of all, it is necessary to note that the definition of truth contained in the cited excerpt is not Marxist. Such a definition of truth (or "truthfulness")[19] is found in the majority of

[19] The author understands by truth a true judgment, and by truthfulness—the property of this judgment correctly to reflect

textbooks on formal logic. In the works of the classics of Marxism we do not find a definition of truth in the form of the above formula.

The emergence of Marxism was a revolutionary leap in philosophy in general and in the theory of knowledge in particular. This was expressed primarily in the fact that, in contrast to all preceding philosophy (including pre-Marxist materialist philosophy), the classics of Marxism substantiated the role of practice in the process of cognition. Practice, as the classics of Marxism showed, acts as the foundation of our knowledge and as its criterion.

"The standpoint of life, of practice, should be first and fundamental in the theory of knowledge" (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 130). The inclusion of the criterion of practice in the foundation of the theory of knowledge, notes V. I. Lenin, inevitably leads to materialism, means that all questions of truth, including the question of defining truth, are solved by Marxism on the basis of practice. It is not difficult to notice that the above definition of truth, presented by the author as Marxist, represents a tautology: the concept of truth here is defined through the concept of correct reflection, and a correct reflection, in its turn, cannot be defined independently of the concept of truth. Thus, a vicious circle in the definition is obtained (this flaw, in fact, affects all formal definitions of truth).

Marxism develops a fundamentally new approach to the question of truth, and consequently, to the question of defining

---

objective reality.

truth. In Marxism (in contrast to all pre-Marxist attempts to define truth) truth is defined through its relation to practice. "If that which is confirmed by our practice is the sole, ultimate, objective truth..." (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 130), then from this stems the necessity to consider truth from the standpoint of the practice of a person standing on the materialist point of view.

"...Our knowledge of the laws of nature," points out J. V. Stalin in this connection, "tested by experience, practice, is reliable knowledge having the significance of objective truths..." (J. V. Stalin, *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 582, 11th ed.). In these propositions, the classics of Marxism give an answer to the general question of what objective truth represents. Truth is reliable knowledge of an object of reality that is confirmed by practice. Truth as reliable knowledge of an object of reality has an objective character.

This means that in human thoughts that objective content is reflected which does not depend on the subject, does not depend on man, nor on humanity, as V. I. Lenin wrote.

All laws of science correctly reflect reality and its regular connections, and represent objective truths.

Erroneous, in our view, is also the assertion of A. Schaff that the property of truthfulness belongs only to judgments. On page 10 we read: "Thus, we have arrived together with the greatest authority in the history of philosophy, starting with Aristotle, at the point that truthfulness is a property of judgment."

It is well known that the classics of Marxism-Leninism spoke about the truthfulness of representations, and about the objectivity of concepts, etc. This is well known to the author as well. Trying to reconcile his definition of truth with statements of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, the author writes: "...Analysis of corresponding texts shows that the classics of Marxism-Leninism, speaking of representations or concepts, understood them broadly—as judgments or knowledge expressing thoughts, bringing them to true judgments when they correspond to objective reality. Indeed, we are talking in these cases about concepts or representations not in the narrow, but in the broader sense of the word, coinciding with knowledge in the form of thought, with judgments" (p. 13).

The erroneousness of this assertion of the author becomes obvious as soon as we try to answer the following two questions:

5. Are there such forms of reflection of reality (we are talking about sensation, perception, representation, concept, judgment, etc.) in which truth or falsity (incorrect reflection of reality) is not contained?

6. In what form in the practice of our everyday and scientific thinking is our knowledge about an object of reality revealed, which is a form of expressing truth?

It is completely obvious that to the first question one must give a negative answer. In *any* of the listed forms of reflection of reality, truth or falsity is always contained. Every reflection

always either corresponds to objective reality or does not correspond to it (which is determined in the final analysis through practice).

Answering the second question, it should be pointed out that the form of revealing our knowledge about objects of reality, the form of expressing truth in the practice of our everyday and scientific thinking, is *always* a judgment clothed in the form of a grammatical sentence. This is explained by the fact that only in a judgment is the object indicated to which a given thought refers, and it is in a judgment that the essential properties and relations between objects, reflected in a given concept, are revealed. This makes possible a test in practice of the reliability of a given thought and makes possible the process of proof.

Thus, for example, to judge whether a given representation in a person is a true reflection of an object, we can only after we learn to which object it refers. The reference of a representation to a given object is always accomplished through a judgment. Hence the author makes an incorrect conclusion that such forms of reflection as representations and concepts are inapplicable from the standpoint of truthfulness or falsity. In fact, they are either true or false, but their character from the point of view of truthfulness or falsity can be revealed only through a judgment.

In this connection it should be pointed out that in the preface from the publisher to A. Schaff's book an inaccuracy is contained. In the preface the thought is expressed that, defining truthfulness as a property of sensations, the author joins Aristotle in this question (see pp. XIII and XIV). But, as is known, Aristotle believed that sensations are always true and

that falsity arises only when we begin to think, connecting representations with each other... "For sensation of special objects... is true, but thinking is capable of being false as well..." (*On the Soul*, III, 3, 427, b, 12–14).

In Chapter IV of A. Schaff's book, "On Absolute and Relative Truth," there are a number of controversial and insufficiently substantiated propositions.

Relative truth the author defines as a judgment that gives such a correct reflection of reality that it "satisfies practice at a given stage of its development. A. Schaff writes: "Relative truth must be inherent in those judgments that contain inaccurate, incomplete knowledge, that is, those that reflect reality in a way that satisfies practice at a given stage of its development, but must change and undergo correction in the course of further development of practice and on its basis" (pp. 162–163).

To confirm his point of view the author refers to F. Engels, who shows that on the basis of the theory of caloric a whole series of laws of heat was discovered. Besides, the author gives an example from optics, where "a correct view on the nature of light was the result of the synthesis of two long competing theories—the corpuscular and wave theories" (p. 160).

Attention is drawn to the fact that speaking about relative truths, the author speaks about judgments, and as examples of relative truths brings whole theories. From our point of view, such a formulation of the question is incorrect. In science, the question is always about the relative truth of whole theories, concepts, etc. When we talk about individual judgments considered in isolation from a given theory and system of

knowledge, we can state the question (naturally, clarifying the formulation of the question from the standpoint of the Marxist principle of the concreteness of truth) only on their truthfulness or falsity .In science, one can also speak about the relative truth of scientific concepts, since each of them represents a certain system of knowledge about a given object, about the diverse aspects of its development, about its interrelations with other objects (for example, the concepts "elementary particle," "atom," "integral," etc.). Therefore, the content of such concepts can be fully revealed through many judgments.

The incorrectness of the very formulation of the question about the relative truth of individual judgments becomes clear as soon as we formulate a number of judgments entering into the composition of theories considered by the author. Indeed, the propositions "caloric exists," "light represents corpuscles" are false, while the theories into which they entered (the theory of caloric, the theory of the corpuscular nature of light) were relatively true. This is explained by the fact that theories include a set of judgments, part of which turned out to be true and were preserved in the theories that replaced them, giving a fuller, more correct reflection of reality. The refutation of an outmoded scientific theory does not mean the refutation of all judgments entering into it.

Surprise is also called forth by the fact that among absolute truths the author includes some truths obtained inductively. The author writes: "...The character of absolute truth belongs to general judgments obtained by inductive generalizations of the type 'all people are mortal' or 'motion is an inalienable property of matter'" (p. 231). These truths are absolute truths not

because they are the result of induction, but because they were then confirmed deductively. A. Schaff does not write about this. Recognizing these truths as absolute, the author then writes that in this case we are talking "about an incomplete generalization that is in the process of endless testing and subject to all accusations brought against judgments relying on induction" (p. 231).

V. I. Lenin wrote: "The simplest truth, by the simplest inductive path obtained, is always incomplete, for experience is always unfinished" (V. I. Lenin, *Philosophical Notebooks*, p. 156). Any proposition obtained by an inductive path always requires testing, substantiation, which is accomplished by comparing it with other propositions of science, the truth of which is established. This process of comparing a given proposition obtained by an empirical inductive path with other judgments, the truth of which is established, represents deduction. The truth of any proposition obtained by an inductive path can be substantiated besides deduction. A proposition obtained in the course of induction, as a result of its comparison with other propositions of science, as a result of its testing in practice, may turn out to be false.

Therefore, it is incorrect to include among absolute truths truths obtained by an inductive path.

Unfortunately, such vague and controversial propositions in Chapter IV occur quite often.

The main flaw of the whole analysis revealing the correlation of absolute and relative truth is that the author tries to examine them on the example of separate individual judgments.

Meanwhile, the classics of Marxism-Leninism always emphasized that the correlation of absolute and relative truth can be clarified and specified only when we examine whole scientific theories, taking them not in isolation, but in development, within a certain system of knowledge, in inseparable connection with that range of objects that is the subject of scientific study.

Unclearly set forth by the author are a number of private specific questions.

Thus, considering the question of negative judgments, A. Schaff does not distinguish negation as the formation of a complement (when, denying belonging to an object of a red color feature, we thereby affirm that to this object belongs a feature of another, non-red color, that is, a feature that is a complement to red color) and negation as the assertion of falsity of a judgment as a means of forming a new judgment (in this case, denying the judgment "not a single perennial plant grows more than once in a lifetime," that is, asserting its falsity, we obtain from it a new true judgment—"there exist such perennial plants that flower only once in a lifetime").

Confusedly set forth is the point of view of A. Tarski (see pp. 98–113). Critique of his views bears a somewhat foggy character and is not convincing. In the analyzed excerpt Tarski points to the fact that, without turning to reality, it is impossible to give a purely formal definition of truth, that is, to give a definition, comparison with which of every concrete judgment would give the possibility to determine whether it is true or false. A. Tarski shows that this is possible only for poor-in-content deductive theories (that is, formalized,

axiomatized systems of constructed scientific disciplines). For example, it is possible to build for the calculus of propositions a mathematical logic where, giving every proposition a certain canonical form, we, without turning to the study of its concrete content, can determine whether it is true or false. Such, for example, a judgment having the form

$$A \vee \neg A$$

in classical logic all judgments having the indicated form are always true, as one of two mutually excluding judgments (

$$A \wedge \neg A$$

) is necessarily true (according to the law of the excluded third). This question Tarski poses here in connection with the so-called problem of decision in mathematical logic. The elaboration of this problem has great significance in mathematics, as it constitutes an essential part of the theory of algorithms (an algorithm is a mathematical method allowing strictly defined steps to realize the solution of a certain type). The essence of the problem of decision in mathematical logic consists in creating such algorithms that by one form of a proposition alone would allow determining its truth or falsity.

Tarski as an idealist-positivist must be criticized for formalism, for non-verifiability of his theory, for detachment of auxiliary "languages" of science from ordinary everyday, historically formed language, for defense of the conventionalist treatment of deductive theories, etc., which, unfortunately, is not done by

the author. But one should not criticize Tarski, as A. Schaff does, for the fact that he quite correctly denies the possibility of obtaining such a definition of truth, comparison with which (without turning to practice) of every concrete proposition would give the possibility to determine whether a given judgment is true or false. Tarski in this case asserts an obvious thing, namely, that it is impossible forever to invent such a "magic wand" that would give the possibility to determine in a purely formal way (without turning to practice) the truth or falsity of individual judgments that were, are, and will be.

In a number of other places some questions are set forth too complexly and insufficiently clearly. Such, for example, is the exposition by the author of the question of judgments in the logical sense and judgments in the psychological sense (see pp. 15–20).

Sometimes the author sets forth his thoughts so vaguely that the character of the exposition makes reading the book difficult. At the same time it is not always clear what content he puts into certain terms and expressions. Thus, in some places of the book the term "language" is used, by which in some cases historically formed everyday languages are denoted, in others—"languages" of formalized scientific theories, auxiliary language tools of science. The latter in no case should be confused with ordinary "languages."

In a number of other places terms also occur, the meaning of which the author does not clarify.

Such are the most essential shortcomings of the reviewed book.

However, despite these shortcomings, the content-rich book by A. Schaff presents significant interest for the Soviet reader and on the whole can be evaluated positively. It, undoubtedly, will play a positive role in the struggle against idealist philosophical schools in Poland.

30. “LITERATURE AND NATIONAL LIFE” ANTONIO GRAMSCI[20]

E. YA. EGERMAN

The work of the founder of the Italian Communist Party, Antonio Gramsci, “Literature and National Life,” is part of his “Prison Notebooks”—theoretical works written in fascist dungeons in 1929–1935. The publication of Gramsci's “Prison Notebooks,” undertaken by the Italian Communist Party in 1947, was completed in 1951.

A. Gramsci, “the first genuine, thorough, consistent Marxist in Italy” (Togliatti), creatively applying to Italy the great revolutionary ideas with which the leaders of the working people of the whole world, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, enriched Marxism. On the basis of the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine of hegemony and the dictatorship of the proletariat, Gramsci determined the concrete tasks and role of the Italian working class, led by a revolutionary party of a new type, in the national life of the people, calling it the “protagonist” (that is, the main actor.—*E. E.*) of modern Italian history. Italian Communists tied the resolution of all fundamental problems of Italy's national life—economy, politics, and culture—to the struggle of the working class against capitalism. In the “Prison Notebooks,” Gramsci gave a comprehensive Marxist analysis of modern Italian society and developed a Marxist concept of Italian history, the foundations of which were laid in the works

[20] A. Gramsci, Opere, v. 6. Letteratura e vita nazionale, Einaudi, 1950, pp. XX + 400.

of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Guided by Marxist-Leninist teachings on society, Gramsci pointed out the core problems facing the Italian nation, the independence and progress of which were put at risk by the rule of monopolistic groups of the bourgeoisie and their political henchmen—the fascists—during the period when Gramsci was writing his "Notebooks."

In the "Prison Notebooks," Gramsci scientifically substantiated his statement made in 1928 before the fascist tribunal: "You will lead Italy to ruin; we, the Communists, will save it." In the "Prison Notebooks," Gramsci investigated the question of the formation of the Italian nation and the unified Italian state. He showed that the Italian bourgeoisie, pursuing its narrow class interests, failed to resolve during the decisive period of nation and state formation the historical tasks associated with unifying the country into a single economic and political whole. It unified Italy not on the basis of equality, but on the basis of the dominance of the North over the South [21], and created a political bloc of industrialists and large landowners; the bourgeoisie did not eliminate the remnants of feudalism and failed to organize national production along modern bourgeois lines (as Engels pointed out in his time). "Risorgimento failed to lay down a basis for durable national democracy" [22], Gramsci emphasizes. The bourgeois-democratic revolution in Italy remained incomplete. This significantly complicated the struggle against fascism, which flared up under imperialist conditions. To fight fascism, which acutely exacerbated all

---

21 A. Gramsci, Il Risorgimento, Einaudi, 1949, p. 79.

22 Journal «Quaderno dell'attivista» for April 1947, p. 209.

national problems, putting the very national independence of the Italian people at risk, it was necessary to organize a movement for broad democratic unity of all healthy, vital forces of the nation, and above all, a movement for the unity of the working class and the working peasantry. Leading this movement could only be the working class, led by the Communist Party.

The struggle for consistent, progressive democratization of the country became one of the paramount tasks of the Italian working class. It had to exercise leadership not only in the economic and political, but also in the ideological struggle in the process of this democratization.

A major role in the development of democratic national consciousness was to be played by Italian literature.

Armed with an exceptionally deep knowledge of Italian culture, Gramsci poses the question of the social function of Italian literature in his work “Literature and National Life.” In the foreground, he places the problem of popular character in Italian literature.

To the Italian bourgeois literary studies, Gramsci writes, “lacked the courage to give an exhaustive formulation of the question, as there was a subconscious fear that a strong critique and a consistent formulation might directly pose a dangerous question for the unified national life” (p. 57). The question of popular character in Italian literature could not be posed with all clarity except from the position of the working class, whose interests coincide with the interests of the vast majority of society, that is, with the needs of social-economic and cultural

progress of society. Gramsci poses the question of popular character in a "strictly critical and sequential form" and not abstractly, but specifically in connection with the needs of societal progress. The problem of a unified national language in Italy receives a similar treatment in his work.

Gramsci notes that in Italy "these problems were never posed in their full scope and interconnectedness, although each of them, from time to time, depending on immediate, not always clearly expressed, polemical interests, without a desire to delve deep into them. Hence, the treatment of these problems took an abstract-culturalist and often speculative form, lacking precise historical perspective and, consequently, not offering a concrete and coherent social-political solution" (p. 57).

Gramsci examined the history of Italian literature Marxist-style, primarily as the history of the Italian people, broad masses—direct producers of material wealth, noting "a heavy trace of centuries-old imperiousness on the part of ruling groups" (p. 1). In the work "Literature and National Life," as well as in other sections of the "Prison Notebooks," he traces all manifestations of popular character, national-popular character in Italian literature. Gramsci talks about Dante, through whom passed the path along which the formation of national consciousness of the Italian people proceeded, —"overcoming municipal provincialism and Catholic cosmopolitanism, which were closely interconnected, representing the most characteristic Italian form of medieval feudal heritage" [23]. In the poetry of the 16th century, he

[23] Ibid., p. 167.

highlights a “genuinely popular-national trend (in dialects, as well as in Latin verse), associated with short-story prose of the period—an expression of the spirit of the bourgeoisie” (p. 71). Gramsci notes the popular content of Goldoni's comedies, “democratism before Rousseau and before the French Revolution” (ibid.), anti-clerical and patriotic 19th-century romance, the period of “emergence and growth of national-democratic forces across Europe” (p. 22), the historical novel of Guerrazzi, who in a republican-democratic spirit exposed tyranny, popes, and emperors, and Giovagnoli, author of the famous novel “Spartacus.” A series of observations in this plan Gramsci made regarding individual writers of the 20th century, such as Verga with his novels about the life of the Sicilian peasantry, Deledda, whose work is steeped in love and struggle of Italian peasants.

However, as Gramsci points out, specific conditions of development of Italian society, Italian nation, were unfavorable for the development of popular-national elements in Italian literature. The narrowness of municipal city-states, disunity and fragmentation of Italian territory, absence in the Middle Ages—the era of formation of absolutist monarchies—“in essence, based on nationality (Engels),—a single centralized state, without which, as Comrade Stalin teaches, ‘not a single country in the world can count on preserving its independence, on serious economic and cultural growth’ [24], Catholic cosmopolitanism of the papacy, having its residence in Italy, and absence of a broad Protestant movement during the period

[24] Newspaper «Pravda» of September 7, 1947. Greeting from Comrade J. V. Stalin to Moscow on its 800th anniversary.

of ‘nascent bourgeoisie creating new political elements lying at the core of modern states’ (p. 58),—all this created an ‘historical situation compelling the carrier of Italian culture away from the popular masses, from real life, slowly and agonizingly forming a nation.’ Gramsci specially considers this issue in another part of the ‘Notebooks’—‘Intellectuals and Cultural Organization.’

“In Italy, the term ‘national’,” writes Gramsci, noting one of the characteristic features of old Italian bourgeois culture, “has a very narrow ideological meaning and, in any case, does not coincide with the concept ‘popular,’ because Italian intellectuals are far from the people, that is, from ‘laity,’ and, on the contrary, bound to a caste tradition that has never been broken by a powerful popular or national political movement from below.”

This tradition is “literary” and abstract, and a typical modern intellectual feels connected to a larger degree with Annibal Caro or Ippolito Pindemonte [25], than with an Apulian or Sicilian peasant” (p. 105. Spacing mine.—*E. E.*).

In the article “Unity of Thought and Action,” Antonio Gramsci's successor Palmiro Togliatti emphasizes the key importance of this indication of the traditional “gap between intellectual trends of the country and national life, that is, real life of the masses,” discovered and noted by Gramsci as a characteristic feature of Italian history, almost a hereditary defect, which must be overcome [26].

---

25 Italian poets who idealistically romanticized rural life.

26 Journal «Unità» (ed. piemontese) of May 1, 1919.

Italian literature at various stages of its development produced quite a few significant progressive writers who introduced national-popular elements, strengthening the principles of popular character and realism; however, unfavorable conditions for the formation of the Italian nation. The participation of popular masses in the national-liberation movement of the 19th century brought to life a number of progressive phenomena in Italian literature, such as, for example, anti-clerical and patriotic romance, as correctly pointed out by Gramsci. However, realism and popular character could not establish themselves during this period. Risorgimento did not develop into a popular revolution. Although in the political arena operated active bourgeois democrats, who were, as Gramsci put it, "the genuine national element," (Mazzinian "Party of Action"), they failed to include in their program the key popular demand, the demand for agrarian reform, which answered the interests of the multi-million peasantry. Peasant masses were not drawn to a sufficient degree into the struggle for reunification, and in Italy a popular revolution did not occur. Moderate bourgeois liberalism in Italy inevitably took the upper hand over bourgeois-democratic trends.

In the work "Liberalism and Democracy," V. I. Lenin pointed to the dual bourgeois-democratic nature of Western European parties of the transition period from feudalism and absolutism —"attempts or потуги to unite different classes of 'one party' " [27]. In Italy, these attempts placed left-wing democrats in dependence on bourgeois liberals. "The Party of Action," wrote

[27] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 17, p. 515.

Gramsci, “did not rely in particular on any specific historical class, and fluctuations experienced by its executive organs were ultimately determined by the interests of moderates, i.e., historically the ‘Party of Action’ was led by moderates” [28].

Moderate liberalism was hostile to political reorganization of Italy in a democratic direction, to the development of national-popular elements in Italian culture. V. I. Lenin pointed out that the development of independent political thought of the peasant masses, the development of their self-activity, to liberals is not only unnecessary, but directly dangerous [29].

Bourgeois democracy also could not give the necessary impetus to the development of national-popular elements in Italian literature, to make it an effective weapon in the struggle for the transformation of society. “The Action Party,” wrote Gramsci, “was captivated by the traditional rhetoric of Italian literature; it confused existing on the peninsula cultural unity (moreover, belonging to a very insignificant layer of the population...) with political and territorial unity of that vast mass of the population who stood aside from this cultural tradition and did not know its value, if only because they knew nothing about its existence” [30].

All this could not fail to affect the state of Italian literature.

Even such a major writer of the first half of the 19th century as Manzoni does not demonstrate, as Gramsci points out, a democratic attitude toward the people. Gramsci contrasts him

---

28 A. Gramsci, Il Risorgimento, p. 70.

29 V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 17, p. 512.

30 A. Gramsci, Il Risorgimento, p. 148.

in this respect with great Russian novelists, in particular L. N. Tolstoy, and the advanced Russian literature of the 19th century.

“In Tolstoy,” he writes, “it is characteristic that the direct and naive wisdom of the people, expressed in a randomly dropped word, captivates and enslaves the mind of an educated person” (p. 76). In his “Letters from Prison,” Gramsci also highlights the deep democratism and artistic power of L. N. Tolstoy's creative work.

“Tolstoy was,” writes Gramsci, “a world writer, one of the few artists of the world who achieved supreme perfection in art, who brought about and continues to bring about in human souls deep streams of emotion, even in those people who are far from intellectual work and possess elementary culture. Tolstoy was a non-ephemeral carrier of civilization and beauty, and in modern world literature there is no one to compare with him. To find someone similar, one has to recall Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Goethe, Cervantes, and a few, very few others” [31].

Despite the fact that the 19th century was one of the most intense periods in the development of Italian literature, popular character and realism did not become its defining principles. Moreover: at the end of the 19th century, trends of an opposite nature became clearly visible in it. And this reflected upon its development with particular force during the period of imperialism, as pointed out also by P. Togliatti in his letter to the writer Elio Vittorini.

---

[31] A. Gramsci, Lettere dal carcere, p. 252. Einaudi, 1947.

“Do you remember,” wrote Togliatti, the various trends of Italian culture in the first decade of this century? How promising, how many hopes associated with each of them! But, looking closely, you realize that at a certain point they exhaust themselves and all, or almost all, end up the exact same way. Lacking consistency in pursuing the outlined goal. Rapidly begins the process of fossilization, superficial searches for novelty. The attractive force is lost. Remains in best case some personality who manages to establish oneself by virtue of individual qualities, and all this, meanwhile, prepares the ground for and facilitates the triumph of, encountering no obstacles on its path, fascist barbarism, which our culture received as its destructive payload” [32].

In order to successfully fulfill its role in the development of social consciousness of the Italian people, Italian literature, says Gramsci, must systematically develop national-popular elements, overcoming negative traditions and utilizing everything undoubtedly valuable and progressive that was achieved by it in the past. Popular character of literature consists, according to Gramsci, in a “certain intellectual and moral content, which must be the digested result of expressing the deepest feelings of the popular nation—of a nation at every specific phase of its historical development” (p. 81). As for national culture, there are two cultures, as V. I. Lenin pointed out,—the culture of ruling classes and the culture of the broad masses of people. Therefore, Italian literature must break with the outdated tradition imposed by bourgeois liberalism, and develop traditions of popular character and realism. Italian

[32] Journal «Rinascita» No. 10 for 1946, p. 283.

literature must be imbued with the spirit of international democratic culture and the world labor movement. Along with this, taking into account that "development proceeds in the direction of internationalism, but the starting point is national," Italian literature must develop democratic and socialist elements of the culture of the Italian people. "Premises of new literature," says Gramsci, "cannot fail to be historical, political, popular; new literature must strive for expressing what already exists, politically or otherwise—it doesn't matter; what matters is that it takes deep roots in the everyday life (prassi.—*E. E.*) of popular culture" (p. 14).

Italian literature must be connected to the life of the people, develop on the basis of the fight for new social relations, for "genuine national unity," toward which Gramsci called.

A. Gramsci pointed out that the struggle for popular character of literature must become one of the tasks of the Italian Communist Party. Progressive critique must lead this struggle, not confining itself to a narrow literary-artistic sphere, but directly breaking into public life, contributing in every way to the development of a new worldview, a new culture. "Art always remains bound to a specific culture and civilization," writes Gramsci.—"Only by fighting for the transformation of culture can one change the 'content' of art... not only content, but also form, for these concepts are identical, since feelings change, thoughts and social relations change, necessary expressions of which it is" (p. 50). Literary critique must "solder into a single whole the struggle for a new culture, that is, for a new humanism, critique of feelings, passion, and worldview with aesthetic critique of artistic creation" (p. 71).

Gramsci emphasizes the importance of a correct, Marxist understanding of the unity of form and content, with which connected is the fight for new content in literature. Priority of content over form should be understood in the sense that "a work is a process and its changing content is at the same time a change in form..."

The fight of literary critique against traditional rhetoric, mannerism, "stylistic mannerisms," which "ruin a large part of Italian culture and in literature, which drown out in Italian writers the very sources of popular inspiration" (Togliatti) [33], Gramsci directly connects to the fight for new content in literature.

"Creation of new and original and at the same time restrained and measured prose," writes Gramsci, "constitutes one of the cultural tasks that must be set. And in this case form and expressed content are identified, and insisting on 'form' will mean nothing other than practical capability to work over content, with the goal of achieving destruction of traditional rhetoric..." (p. 62)[34]. On various formalist tricks and ploys, Gramsci speaks in his notebook in an exposing, scathingly sarcastic tone.

Following V. I. Lenin, Gramsci points to the special importance for Italian literary critique and artistic creation of the principle of party spirit. Literary critique, says he, leading the fight for new content in literature, must be partisan,

---

33 «Gramsci», Scritti di Togliatti [e. a.]. Roma, 1947.

34 «Gramsci», Scritti di Togliatti [e. a.]. Roma, 1947.

uncompromisingly fighting against all manifestations of bourgeois and clerical ideology, nationalism and cosmopolitanism. From among Italian literary critics of the past, Gramsci focuses on Francesco De Sanctis (1817–1883). In Gramsci's view, De Sanctis stands close to that type of literary critic needed by modern Italian literature. De Sanctis fought for new, democratic conception of "national," for fighting, militant literature, firmly bound to the life of the people. In the last period of his activity, De Sanctis paid great attention to "Verismo" (Italian realism). Gramsci values this manifestation of sensitive criticism as a weapon of national life, since "after the fall of the democrats of the 1870s and the emergence of large working masses as a result of the development of large urban industry" (p. 5), De Sanctis saw at the end of the last century in Italy "a form of expressing popular feeling (or rather, feelings of certain groups of intellectuals)" (p. 5).

Gramsci highly values the partisan passion of De Sanctis: "One feels in him a passionate man of partisan character, having firm political and moral convictions and not striving to hide them" (p. 7). Along with this, Gramsci points out the historical limitations of theoretical and ideological views of De Sanctis (in the best case, transition from speculative idealism and translation to position of positivism with a nuance) and emphasizes that a modern progressive critic-literary scholar in Italy, undoubtedly, must stand on new ideological positions.

One of the vital sectors of work of progressive Italian literary study must be, says Gramsci, "the sphere of popular literature (dime novels, serials, etc.)". Over a long period, in this field

reigned complete commercial literature, serving primarily sales goals. Popular literature in Italy was low in quality, far from the needs and demands of the people, colorless. It did not educate the Italian reader in the spirit of patriotism, did not raise social consciousness, could not contribute to the development of Italy in a democratic direction. The Italian reader was not satisfied with it, often turning to translations of French literature, in particular to historical adventure novels. As a result, he knew the popular figure of Henry IV better than Garibaldi, the revolution of 1789 better than the Risorgimento, novels of Victor Hugo against Napoleon III better than pamphlets of Italian patriots against Metternich, admired the past not of his own country, used in his language and thoughts French metaphors and cultural orientations, etc. (p. 17). The question of popular literature, emphasizes Gramsci, constitutes "the largest problem of new literature as an expression of intellectual and moral renewal, for only among readers of 'popular' literature can one select an audience necessary and sufficient for creating a cultural base of new literature" (p. 14).

The work of Gramsci "Literature and National Life" represents a document of the struggle of the Italian Communist Party for realistic literature in Italy, which must serve the Italian people and their struggle for national independence, peace, social-economic, and cultural progress.

An analysis of Italian culture, performed by Gramsci, arms the working class of Italy with an effective Marxist weapon.

A. Gramsci, a loyal and consistent follower of Lenin and Stalin, who fought throughout his life against various kinds of fatalistic "theories" of Italian opportunism, firmly believed that

the detachment of Italian culture and intellectuals from real life of the nation would be overcome on the path of liberating the people from capitalist oppression, indicated to working people of all countries by V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin Gramsci proved that the development of new realistic Italian literature will proceed at rates corresponding to how resolutely and consistently the working class of Italy, led by the Communist Party, exercises its function as leader of the national life of the country; he expressed firm confidence that the working class of Italy will advance from its midst outstanding writers.

"A new social group entering historical life with a position of hegemony, with a self-confidence it did not possess before, cannot fail to advance from its midst outstanding personalities, who previously did not find in themselves necessary forces to fully express themselves (in a artistic sense as well)" (pp. 9–10).

Since the writing of the "Prison Notebooks," fifteen years have passed. The development of Italian society during this period confirmed the correctness of the analysis made by Gramsci. Confirmed was the significance of this analysis for the struggle of the working class of Italy for national independence and progress of the Italian nation. The Italian people passed through the school of World War II, through the school of liberation struggle against fascism and German-fascist occupiers.

Revolutionary forces of Italy, relying on the support of American imperialism, managed to come to power and place under threat freedom and national independence of the Italian people. But democratic forces of Italy grew immeasurably

during this time. The Italian people, uniting 16 million signatures under the Appeal for concluding a Peace Pact, thanks to the Soviet Union for selfless assistance and exposing American occupation, well knows now who its friends and who its foes are. Led by the working class and the Communist Party, the struggle for peace and democracy manifests the unity of all healthy, vital forces of the Italian nation, capable of preventing war and neo-fascism. In this struggle participate the best representatives of the Italian intelligentsia, who are beginning to realize that only the policy of the working class corresponds to the interests of the nation, that only the proletariat as a leading class is capable of saving Italy from a new catastrophe and leading the country along the path of progress. Progressive Italian literature, inspired by noble figures of Soviet literature, strives to follow the path of socialist realism, the path of serving the core interests of the Italian people. Well-known Italian writers Renata Viganò, Libero Bigiaretti, Italo Calvino, and many others create works vividly reflecting the life of the Italian people, their needs, and leading an active struggle for peace and democracy.

Italian Communists, armed with Marxist-Leninist teachings, fight for the resolution of the problems posed by Gramsci in Italian literature, realizing their importance for the development of Italian society.

The Italian communist journal “Rinascita” wrote in this connection that “the formulation of the question of popular character in Italian literature means in reality nothing other than the possibility to critically survey the path traversed by the working class and its allies over the decades from 1921 to the

present day, bursting dynamically into the history of the country and affirming itself as a leading force of the entire nation in the fight against fascism, war, and imperialist obscurantism" [35].

In his work, Gramsci posed the question of a single national Italian language. Here, the teachings of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, standing on the position of recognizing the necessity of a single national language, which, as Lenin pointed out, is one of the most important conditions for genuinely free and broad, corresponding to modern capitalism, trade turnover, free and broad grouping of the population across all individual classes...[36] The interests of national-historical development of Italian society demanded tight state cohesion, unification of the peoples of Italy speaking different languages, creation of favorable conditions for the development of a literary language.

These were necessary premises for broad deployment of the struggle of the Italian proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

"Other conditions being equal," teaches Lenin, "the conscious proletariat will always defend a larger state against a small-state system. It will always fight against medieval particularism, always welcome the closest economic cohesion

---

35 Journal «Rinascita» No. 5 for 1951, p. 249.

36 V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 20, p. 368.

of large territories, on which the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie could broadly unfold" [37].

Examining the development of the Italian language in connection with the history of the Italian people, in connection with the formation of the nation and unified state, Gramsci showed the slow development of a common literary Italian language in modern times, its detachment from living, spoken language, as well as the weak development of the process of absorbing individual regional dialects into a common national language. In Italy, writes Gramsci, "to this day the spoken language of the population is a dialect, cross-bred with an Italianized jargon, which in its larger part is a mechanical translation of dialect. There exists, moreover, a strong influence of various dialects on written language, because even the so-called educated class speaks national language only in solemn moments and in dialect—in everyday conversational speech, i.e., in the language that is more living and directly connected with reality; on the other hand, reaction to dialects occurs in such a way that national language continues to remain bookish and archaic, and when it wants to become conversational, it breaks up into numerous dialectal reflections" (p. 167).

The development of the Italian national language, which arose on the basis of the Tuscan dialect during the era of Dante, and its reinforcement in literature, was completed by the 16th century. In Florence, writes Gramsci, "proceeded a double linguistic development: from the people to educated people,

[37] Ibid., p. 28.

development enriched by lively Florentinisms and Tuscanisms by writers. After the fall of Florence, the Italian language (Gramsci speaks here of literary language.—*E. E.*) becomes a bookish, closed language, lacking living contact with historically developing spoken speech...” (p. 168).

This gap was slowly overcome in the subsequent process of development of the Italian nation—a process that started later than in other countries of Western Europe, proceeded under unfavorable conditions, and with a significantly delayed tempo.

The question of a single national language as a tool of struggle and development of society is currently very acute in Italy.

“In Italy,” writes Gramsci, “there exist many ‘jargons’ of languages, representing local regional dialects, used in everyday conversational speech, in which is expressed the most general and widespread feeling and opinion” (p. 139). The presence in Italy of many dialects and weak development of a single national language cannot but impede the development of social consciousness of the Italian people. About this, Gramsci wrote also in the work “Historical Materialism and Philosophy of Benedetto Croce”:

“Whoever speaks a dialect or understands national language to an insufficient degree, will inevitably be connected with a worldview more or less limited and provincialist, narrow, anachronistic in comparison with great currents of thought that rule world history. His interests will be limited, more or less corporate or ‘chauvinistic,’ not universal. If it is not always possible to utilize the capability of learning foreign languages to become acquainted with various cultures, in any case, it is

necessary to thoroughly learn national language. A various culture can be translated into the language of another culture... But in dialect it is impossible to do this" [38].

Gramsci correctly emphasizes that the question of the development of a single Italian national language, of overcoming the gap between literary and spoken language, of creating a single language and the gradual absorption of fragmented dialects by it has a political aspect, being connected with the political leadership of the national working class.

"Every time," writes Gramsci, "when surfaces on the top (in Italy.—*E. E.*), in one form or another, the question of language, it means that simultaneously arises a whole series of other problems: emergence and growth of leading class, need to establish tighter and firmer relations between leading groups and popular-national mass, i.e., reorganizing cultural hegemony" (p. 201). Precisely why the question of a single national language, similar to the question of popular literature, could not be posed with such clarity and consistency by bourgeois philosophy, as it was posed by the Italian Communist Party in the works of Gramsci. Italian bourgeoisie could not and did not want to deal with this question (Manzoni, Ascoli), especially during the period of national-liberation struggle, for the leadership of which it tried to hold power in its hands, but by virtue of its narrow class policy did not care to create favorable conditions for its development. Gramsci's formulation of this question from the position of the Italian working class, called upon historically to become the leader of

[38] A. Gramsci, Il materialismo storico e la filosofia di B. Croce, p. 5. Einaudi, 1948.

broad working masses of the people, is most decisive and consistent precisely because it points to practical means of solving the problem of language, to necessary conditions under which it can be solved. Marxist-style approaching the question of the nature of language, taking into account specifics of its development, Gramsci points to the limits of active intervention in the process of language development with the goal of accelerating this process.

"Since the process of formation, expansion, and development of a single national language," writes he, "proceeds as a complex of separate molecular processes, it is necessary to realize this process in all its complexity in order to be capable of intervening in it with maximum results. One should not view this intervention as 'decisive' or imagine that predetermined goals will be achieved in all details... in other words, that it will be possible to obtain a predetermined unified language. A single language will be created if it is a necessity, and organized intervention will accelerate the already existing process. What the outcome of this will be, cannot be foreseen or set. In any case, if intervention is to be 'reasonable,' it will be organically connected with tradition, which has no small significance for cultural development" (p. 201). Gramsci poses in connection with this problem the struggle against illiteracy in Italy, where the percentage of illiteracy is extremely high.

A whole series of statements by Gramsci is dedicated to normative grammar of the Italian language. Gramsci exposes the hostile-to-cultural-progress attitude of fascist circles toward normative grammar of the Italian people, to which belonged the philosopher-idealist Gentile and his "students," insisting on

excluding normative grammar from school education. The development and dissemination of a single national language was not in the interest of fascism. With the exclusion of normative grammar from elementary education, as Gramsci points out, “one of the largest capabilities of organized education in the general plan of intervention in language study and actual protection from study of cultural language of popular-national masses” was eliminated (p. 204). Exposing the absurd and harmful view on normative grammar as a collection of rigidities, arbitrarily accepted rules, and noting that it “can be considered detached from living language only in abstraction,” Gramsci pointed to the enormous significance of normative grammar. Normative grammar, writes Gramsci, “strives to make accessible to comprehension the organism of a specific language” (p. 201).

Among the means that could contribute to accelerating the process of language unity (the “filter,” which was never systematically or consistently created in Italy), Gramsci also names “foci of spreading linguistic novelties, such as school, newspapers, radio, theater, and sound cinema. Gramsci notes the necessity of studying various kinds of linguistic novelties and processes occurring in Italian dialects, both in ‘more localized’ and in those that embrace broader regional complexes, like Neapolitan in Southern Italy or dialect of Palermo and Catania in Sicily” (p. 200).

In light of the brilliant works of Comrade J. V. Stalin on linguistics, in particular his teaching on a single national language, it becomes clear what significance Gramsci's work “Literature and National Life” has for Italy, interpreting

problems of development of Italian literature and national language.

At the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, held in November 1952, the question of the struggle for national culture in Italy was specially posed. The Plenum of the CC once again emphasized the importance of studying the cultural front from the position of Marxism-Leninism, and also pointed to the value of the works of Antonio Gramsci.

31. TASKS OF SOVIET PHILISOPHERS IN LIGHT OF THE DECISIONS OF THE SEPTEMBER PLENUM OF THE CC CPSU

V. M. KAIRYAN

In November of this year, an expanded meeting of the Department of Dialectical and Historical Materialism and the History of Philosophy was held at the Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU, dedicated to discussing theoretical problems arising from the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU.

A report titled *"The Resolution of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU and Certain Questions of Marxist-Leninist Theory"* was delivered by A. F. Okulov.

We publish a brief summary of the report and statements by the participants of the meeting.

The Soviet country is experiencing a new important stage in building a communist society, said A. F. Okulov. Implementing the historical decisions of the 19th Congress of the CPSU, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government are ensuring the rapid development of industry and agriculture, a sharp surge in the production of consumer goods for the further improvement of the material well-being of the working people.

In fulfilling this great and noble task, an enormous role must be played by the resolution of the September Plenum of the CC

CPSU *"On Measures for the Further Development of Agriculture in the USSR,"* which gives a genuinely scientific, Marxist-Leninist analysis of the most pressing economic problems of our time. In this outstanding party document, based on a comprehensive analysis of the laws of social production and distribution of material goods in a socialist society, prospects for the development of socialist economics are revealed, and programmatic scientific propositions regarding the paths of development for our country in the coming years are defined. A deep scientific analysis of our country's economy allowed the Central Committee to determine with absolute clarity not only the overall direction of the development of our national economy, but also a system of concrete measures providing a powerful surge in the production of agricultural products in our country.

The resolution of tasks set forth in the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU is currently directed towards the efforts of the whole Soviet society. The decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU also set serious tasks for theoretical workers of our country. Soviet philosophers must seriously restructure their work, primarily developing scientific problems closely linked with life, and thereby helping the Soviet people successfully fulfill the battle program outlined by the party.

Programmatic propositions regarding the ways to achieve an all-out surge in socialist agriculture, set forth and scientifically substantiated in the resolution of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, are inextricably linked with the fundamental tasks of communist construction in the USSR and are an integral part

of the grand plan for building communism. The grand tasks posed by the Plenum of the CC CPSU testify to the fact that the Soviet country is in full bloom and is confidently moving forward along the path to communism.

The measures of the party and Soviet government contributing to a sharp surge in all sectors of agricultural production, as well as expanding the production of consumer goods, stem from the basic economic law of socialism, the essential features and requirements of which consist, as is well known, in ensuring maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural requirements of the whole society through continuous growth and perfection of socialist production. Continuous growth of the living standards of the people is the most important distinguishing feature of the socialist system.

"Socialism,—said I. V. Stalin,—can be built only on the basis of a rapid growth of productive forces of society, on the basis of an abundance of products and goods, on the basis of a prosperous life for the working people, on the basis of a rapid growth of culture. For socialism, Marxist socialism, means not the restriction of personal needs, but their maximum expansion and flourishing, not the limitation or refusal to satisfy these needs, but the comprehensive and full satisfaction of all needs of culturally developed working people" (Works, Vol. 13, p. 360).

Adopted by the Plenum program of a sharp surge in all branches of agricultural production also stems from the law of planned, proportional development of the national economy, which requires that national economic planning be strictly coordinated in every aspect with the requirements of the basic

economic law of socialism; that the production of the means of production and the production of consumer goods, extractive and processing industries be properly linked; that proper proportions between the development of industry and agriculture, between money income of the population and commodity turnover, etc., be observed.

Scientific knowledge of objective economic laws constitutes the basis of the economic policy of the Communist Party, which is deeply substantiated policy reflecting the needs of the development of the material life of society and the vital interests of the people. Neglecting the law of planned (proportional) development of the national economy inevitably leads to a violation of the principle of scientific leadership over industry and agriculture. To successfully plan the development of the national economy, it is necessary to study this economic law, master it, and compile plans in full accordance with its requirements stemming from the basic economic law of socialism. This will allow timely detection of emerging imbalances in particular sectors of the economy and outlining ways for their timely prevention.

Deeply penetrating into the essence of objective laws governing the development of socialist society, the Communist Party in time detected the emerging contradiction in the development of the socialist economy—the imbalance in the growth rates of two major spheres of the national economy: industry and agriculture.

It is clear from the resolution of the Plenum that at the current stage of communist construction in our country, the development rates of agriculture have begun to lag behind the

growth rates of industry and the growing needs of the population for consumer goods. "Over the last 28 years,—as G. M. Malenkov pointed out,—the production of the means of production as a whole in our country grew approximately 55 times, while the production of consumer goods over this same period increased only approximately 12 times". Over the same period, state funds allocated to capital construction and equipment purchases—recalculated to current values—totaled: in heavy industry — 638 billion rubles, in transport — 193 billion rubles, in light industry — 72 billion rubles, and in agriculture — 94 billion rubles.

Gross agricultural production from 1940 to 1952 increased by only 10% with an overall growth of industrial production by 2.3 times.

The Plenum of the CC of the party gave a deep scientific analysis of the causes of the insufficient level of agricultural production as a whole and the lagging of a number of agricultural sectors. The Plenum pointed out both objective and subjective reasons for this phenomenon.

Objective reasons for the insufficient level of agricultural development consisted in the fact that we lacked the ability to ensure simultaneously high growth rates of heavy industry, agriculture, and light industry. For a long period, the Communist Party, taking into account the international and internal situation of our country, directed capital investments primarily into the development of heavy industry and transport. The Party proceeded here from Lenin's famous dictum that saving the Soviet Republic lies in heavy industry. "And to put it in good condition,—said Lenin,—many years of work will

be required. Heavy industry needs state subsidies. If we do not find them, then we, as a civilized state,—I'm not even talking about a socialist one,—have perished" (Works, Vol. 33, p. 389).

Socialist industrialization was the main link from which it was necessary to begin expanding the construction of the socialist national economy. Industrialization secured the economic independence of our country, strengthened its defense capability, and created the necessary conditions for the victory of socialism in the USSR.

Such are the objective causes that conditioned a higher level of industrial development compared to agriculture.

Subjective reasons for the insufficient level of agricultural production, as the Plenum of the CC pointed out, are rooted in shortcomings of our work, in shortcomings of leadership in agriculture.

Having deeply examined objective and subjective causes of the insufficient level of agricultural production, the Plenum of the CC outlined a comprehensive program of activities for the Soviet people to—on the basis of an advanced technological foundation—ensure a sharp surge in all branches of agriculture and within two to three years significantly increase the supply of food goods to the entire population of our country, while simultaneously elevating the whole mass of collective farm peasantry to a higher level of material well-being.

One of the merits of the political strategy of our party lies in the fact that it knows how to select the main link in the overall chain of events at each given moment, seizing which it pulls

the entire chain to achieve a single goal, to achieve success. From the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, we see that such a link, which has enormous importance for building a communist society in our country, is currently the task of creating an abundance of agricultural products on the basis of a powerful growth of socialist industry as the leading force in the national economy. This task has emerged before the party and the Soviet people as the most urgent; its successful solution will contribute to an unswerving surge in the well-being of the people.

The main concern of the Communist Party is aimed at further strengthening the alliance of the working class and the collective farm peasantry—the source of strength and power of the Soviet state.

Formulating the question of the main link in the overall chain of events has enormous theoretical and practical value for building a communist society in our country. "It is not enough to be a revolutionary and a partisan of socialism or a communist in general," wrote V. I. Lenin in his work *'The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government'*. "One must be able at each particular moment to find that particular link in the chain which must be grasped with all one's strength in order to hold the whole chain and to prepare firmly the transition to the next link..." (Works, Vol. 27, p. 244).

Our party has always selected the main links, and this helped it successfully resolve current tasks of socialist construction in our country.

The task of overcoming the lagging of individual branches of agriculture and boosting all agricultural production to a new, higher level is paramount. The successful realization of this task will be of enormous importance in further strengthening the indestructible alliance of the working class and the collective farm peasantry.

It must be noted that this most important topic of Marxist philosophy in recent years has attracted little attention from philosophers. In the post-war years, not a single master's or doctoral dissertation, nor any major monographic studies, were devoted to this topic.

What is the reason for such an approach to this vital topic?

First, in a certain detachment of our philosophical thought from life. If we knew life well and studied it as it should be, this problem would inevitably arise before us. Poor knowledge of life inevitably led some of our philosophers to a speculative consideration of this topic, where main attention was directed not at the problem of strengthening the alliance of the working class and the peasantry—as the essential vital foundation of the Soviet system—but at liquidating class differences between them.

Secondly, in misunderstanding that vital proposition that the problem of inter-class relations remains a key problem now and in the future. The issue of strengthening the alliance of the working class and the peasantry does not belong to the category of already passed and archived issues; it is a contemporary, active topic. Enemies of the Soviet system have repeatedly attempted and will continue in the future to attempt

to drive a wedge between these classes, turn workers and peasants against each other, and break the union of workers and peasants—the foundation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

All-around strengthening of the alliance between these two friendly classes constitutes the main line of policy of the Communist Party. Measures carried out by the party and government are directed at further strengthening the Soviet socialist system, at further strengthening the alliance of the working class and peasantry—this unshakeable foundation of the power and strength of the Soviet state. Therefore, theoretical development of problems associated with strengthening the alliance of the working class and peasantry, with further strengthening the socialist state as the main tool for building communism and protecting socialist achievements, should be at the center of attention of Soviet philosophers.

The Plenum of the CC CPSU, through its resolution *"On Measures for the Further Development of Agriculture in the USSR,"* made a major contribution to the development of scientific communism. In this resolution, a deep Marxist analysis of such essential problems of scientific communism theory was given, such as the principles of labor remuneration, material interest of workers, as well as principles of properly combining public and personal interests of collective farmers. Based on this analysis, the Plenum of the CC gave a comprehensive program of party action in this direction.

The resolution of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU is all the more important because in illuminating these key issues regarding socialist construction in our country, Soviet

economists and philosophers until recently showed serious shortcomings. The main shortcoming was that in these matters they essentially spun around general abstract propositions contained in the works of Marxist-Leninist classics without utilizing these propositions as a method for analyzing concrete reality. Instead of deeply studying phenomena of life, showing the difficulties of the struggle of our party and people for the victory of communism, some economists and philosophers engaged in a superficial description of facts, constructing speculative rather than life-derived schemes. This explains the hasty, ill-conceived formulations in our print of certain questions related to communist construction in our country. The main trouble here was that we jumped over steps of development towards communism through uncompleted stages of development of our society. We forgot the instruction of Marxist-Leninist classics that one cannot accelerate what is not yet ripe historically.

The most vivid example of scholastic, far-fetched concepts about the transition from socialism to communism can serve the theoretical conference organized by the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences in 1950 (see journal *"Voprosy Ekonomiki"* No. 10 for 1950). At this conference, two questions were discussed: 1) on the methodology of studying the problem of gradual transition from socialism to communism; 2) on the transition to the communist principle of distribution.

The very agenda of this conference speaks to how far its organizers were from life and those tasks currently being solved by our party. Instead of investigating concrete

phenomena of life and focusing the primary attention of Soviet economists on resolving urgent tasks of sharply increasing food production, expanding consumer goods production, bread, meat, milk, participants of this conference engaged in fortune-telling, trying to speculate on all sorts of guesses as to when communism would start with free city transport, free mail, free telephone, or free bread supply, etc.

This so-called "theoretical" conference demonstrated the inability of some of its participants to understand major theoretical problems related to communist construction in our country, and their ignorance in practical issues. Suffice it to point out that at this conference it was asserted that creating the material and production base of communism has the peculiarity that it does not require changes in the relationship between departments I and II of social production; that the growth rates of consumer goods in our country are almost as high as the growth rates of heavy industry, and in some sectors of consumer production even higher than in sectors producing means of production. The erroneousness of these assertions is all the more obvious in light of the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU. The party put forward the task of sharply boosting consumer goods production as a paramount, urgent task, upon the resolution of which depends the further successful movement of Soviet society to communism.

We often in our theoretical forecasts jumped ahead through uncompleted stages of development. It is no secret that in some of our works the view was expressed that kolkhoz property and the commodity economy wholely based on it are already acting

as a brake on the development of productive forces. It is not difficult to understand where such an assertion leads.

Simplistically and dogmatically, we interpreted the question of product exchange when stating that at the present stage product exchange is turning into the main tool, into a decisive force for improving production relations in the village, and therefore, in the entire society.

Speaking of the obsolescence of the artel form, many of our authors did not think about the fact that we have far from utilized all possibilities of this form for boosting agriculture, for raising the well-being of the collective farm peasantry. Therefore, to speak of the obsolescence of the artel form means taking an incorrect position, straying off path.

Decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU put an end to these harmful statements about the artel form of economy and with all force emphasize the necessity of all-around strengthening of the agricultural artel as the main form of collective farm structure.

The Plenum of the CC mapped out a concrete program of activity in this direction. A new law on agricultural tax was passed, creating conditions for increasing the interest of collective farmers in holding livestock, and reduced norms of mandatory deliveries from collective farmers' households.

Such are only a few theoretical problems arising from the resolution of the September Plenum of the CC *"On Measures for the Further Development of Agriculture in the USSR."*

The decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU are a major contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory. These decisions serve as a combat program for Soviet philosophers.

In light of the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC, it is necessary to self-critically review and re-examine many aspects of the work of our philosophical departments and identify existing serious shortcomings in research topics and especially in the content of scientific research work. Suffice it to point out that out of 119 defended candidate dissertations in the Department of Dialectical and Historical Materialism at the Academy of Social Sciences under the CC CPSU, only 7 dissertations were directly and immediately related to agricultural topics: *"Overcoming Differences Between Town and Country," "On Paths of Transition of Peasantry to Socialism," "Personal and Public Interests Under Socialism," "Victory of Collective Farm System — Revolutionary Leap in the Development of Society," "Overcoming Oppositions Between Town and Country," "Changes in the Social Nature of Peasantry in the USSR," "Role of Bolshevik Ideology in Re-educating Peasantry."* In the Department of History of Philosophy, even fewer dissertations were defended related to the development of Marxist-Leninist theory on the peasant question.

In light of the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, it is necessary to thoroughly review and significantly expand the topics of candidate dissertations and scientific research work. The party expects active work from Soviet philosophers on theoretical issues corresponding to the tasks set by the September Plenum of the CC.

Special attention must be paid to raising the ideological and theoretical level of our research, to linking them with life, with practice, with those urgent tasks currently being solved by our party.

Decisive measures must be taken to strengthen research work in departments. Through joint efforts of two departments, work could be prepared and published on topics such as: *The Role of the Party in Building Communist Society in Our Country*, *The Alliance of the Working Class and Peasantry*, *On Combining Personal and Public Interests Under Socialism*, and other topics.

"The Resolution of the September Plenum of the CC of our party was met with tremendous satisfaction by the whole Soviet people," said A. F. Okulov in conclusion.—"Soviet people are applying all their efforts to successfully resolve the grandiose tasks set before our country in this resolution.

Soviet philosophers must also apply all their efforts to take an active part in propagating the decisions of the Plenum of the CC, in bringing them to life and in developing important and urgent theoretical questions related to the successful construction of communist society in our country".

Following the report of A. F. Okulov, lively discussions unfolded. Taking part in them were Professor Ts. A. Stepanyan and M. A. Naumova, docents M. D. Tsebenko and I. S. Sharikov, postgraduates V. S. Molotov, N. S. Perelegin, N. M. Poletaeva, P. V. Tuzikov, and I. I. Tsekov, among others.

Docent **I. S. Sharikov** focused in detail on the question of how concrete tasks facing theoretical workers of the philosophical

front in light of the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU—grandiose in significance and volume, set by the Plenum of the CC—to increase 2–3 times the production of consumer goods and food items—give possibility to deeply develop the question of advantages of the socialist system and show what enormous objective possibilities this system possesses, how they must be utilized and brought into action. These possibilities consist primarily in gigantic technology, which our industry has supplied to the entire national economy, and in major successes of science.

We have accumulated an unprecedented history of large socialist production experience. We developed our new style of work, combining Russian revolutionary sweep with American businesslikeness. Our successes are inextricably linked with the activity of masses. That is why such huge importance attaches to the question of directing this activity, the ability to utilize reserves to the end. The Party calls upon Soviet philosophers to show the sources of strength of the Soviet state and mobilize the people for the most complete utilization of these sources.

Enormous theoretical significance attaches to the question of the role of production relations as the main driver in developing productive forces, possessing paramount importance for agriculture. Measures of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU are directed at all-around strengthening of socialist relations in collective farms and through them at developing and boosting labor productivity, developing productive forces in agriculture.

"Here is a concrete example of how the superstructure affects production—the base," said I. S. Sharikov. In connection with

this, a whole series of interesting theoretical questions arises that must be resolved. For example, what is the characteristic feature of interrelations between productive forces and production relations, and what are the laws of development of production relations in land tenure, what specifically manifests contradictions in these relations, what is their character, what are the ways and methods of overcoming them.

In connection with the decision of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, the question of concrete ways and methods of stimulating labor arose in a new way. We have not seen all possibilities embedded in the collective farm system. And the party revealed these possibilities and huge advantages of the collective farm system. In the Plenum resolution, an example of deep analysis of advantages embedded in collective forms of property is given, showing concrete paths and methods of organizing labor in collective farms, setting the question of improving social incentives for labor. This is a philosophical problem on which our philosophers hitherto have not stopped or have stopped in a dogmatic manner.

I. S. Sharikov noted that many shortcomings in the work of Soviet philosophers stem from insufficient knowledge of Soviet reality, poor connection with living people, inability to see new processes in production relations of society. Philosophers rarely step out before workers, collective farmers, whereas in such an audience they could gain much for themselves. Soviet philosophers should remember Lenin's instruction that in building socialism and communism, what decides is the living creative mass activity of millions, living experience and generalization of this experience; the ability to

listen to the voice of the masses is a major source of correct, scientific problem solving.

Postgraduate **N. S. Perelegin** in his speech spoke of how, among problems receiving further development in this historical resolution of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, the following deserve attention: on the role of Machine and Tractor Stations (MTS) in the development of collective farm production, on the agricultural artel as the main form of socialist agriculture in rural areas during the entire period of socialism, on socialist trade as the main form of consumer distribution between members of socialist society, and several others. All these problems are posed by life itself, by the practice of socialist construction. They require close attention from Soviet scholars.

N. S. Perelegin subjected to criticism Professor Ts. A. Stepanyan for insufficiently deeply illuminating issues of transition from socialism to communism in his works, and Professor M. M. Rozental for not speaking on issues of practical building of socialism and communism.

A detachment from reality, pointed out postgraduate **I. I. Tsekov**, led to the fact that among dissertations of the Department of Dialectical and Historical Materialism, there is not a single topic developing the question of the alliance of the working class and peasantry in our country, showing on what basis cooperation, cohesion, and friendship of these classes are strengthened, and what tasks face theoretical science in this context.

The decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU are aimed at further strengthening the alliance of the working class with the peasantry on a firm material foundation. Our philosophers need to show how socialist production relations in rural areas historically developed and expanded. Based on a deep study of Soviet life, Marxist-Leninist philosophy must be further developed, enriching it with new facts and data from our socialist life.

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences **M. A. Naumova** in her speech spoke in detail about tasks of restructuring pedagogical and scientific-research work based on decisions of the September and July Plenums of the CC CPSU and materials for the 50th anniversary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. These new historical party documents point once again to the necessity of close ties between Marxist-Leninist theory and practice of socialist construction, connecting educational and research work with party policy, with decisions of its congresses, conferences, and CC Plenums, which express the strategy and tactics developed over years of revolutionary struggle by our party. These historical documents put forward tasks of combating dogmatism and scholasticism, tasking scholars with creative application under concrete historical conditions of basic principles of Marxist-Leninist theory, combating bourgeois ideology, especially manifestations of bourgeois nationalism, etc.

Postgraduate **N. M. Poletaeva** in her speech focused on the significance of the resolution of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU for raising the level of socialist consciousness and

culture among the Soviet people, especially the collective farm peasantry.

Postgraduate **V. S. Molotov** criticized journals *"Voprosy Filosofii"* and *"Scientific Notes"* of philosophical departments at the Academy of Social Sciences, on whose pages articles on the alliance of the working class and peasantry rarely appear. Meanwhile, philosophers must deeply reveal the famous Marxist proposition that the alliance of the working class and peasantry is a decisive social force, showing the role of this alliance in creative activity of popular masses.

At the end of his speech, V. S. Molotov spoke on how important the theoretical development of the alliance of the working class and peasantry is in connection with international events—for example, in connection with the historic victory of the great Chinese people, achieved on the basis of the alliance of the working class and peasantry. Exposing right-wing socialists who strive to split the alliance of the working class and peasantry, to sever the working class from peasantry, should be a focus of attention for theoretical front workers, especially philosophers and economists.

Deputy Head of the Department of History of Philosophy, Docent **M. D. Tsebenko**, in her speech analyzed in detail shortcomings in dissertation works of postgraduate students. She pointed out that one of the defects of many dissertations was that advantages of the socialist system and state were not deeply revealed. In dissertations, said M. D. Tsebenko, it is necessary to focus attention on this issue and, taking into account the specifics of dissertation topics, deeply illuminate advantages of the Soviet system, showing the operation of the

basic economic law of socialism, the guiding role of the Communist Party, and finding room for creative illumination of issues arising from decisions of the September Plenum of the CC.

A second defect of most dissertations is insufficient critical analysis of modern sociological views of bourgeois imperialist ideologists, including right-wing socialists, and primarily their reactionary views on worker-peasant relations.

More attention should be paid to exposing lies and demagogic maneuvers of bourgeois ideologists. Bourgeois parties and their ideologists currently act under slogans of raising production levels allegedly for raising living standards of popular masses, liquidating unemployment, etc. However, in reality, this crusade for raising production, inspired by bourgeois monopoly ideologists, is directed at intensifying speed-up systems in factories, extracting maximum profit for monopolies, and subjecting all production to war needs.

It is necessary to actively oppose the fetishization of technology in works of bourgeois sociologists who claim that in the issue of which system will win—socialism or capitalism—the decisive role will belong to technology and technocrats.

All these demagogic maneuvers of bourgeois sociologists and their pseudoscientific theories must be systematically exposed in our articles, scientific works, and dissertations.

Decisions of the September Plenum of the CC give brilliant material for demonstrating the advantages of the socialist system over capitalism and for deeply exposing modern bourgeois sociology.

Professor **Ts. A. Stepanyan** spoke on how decisions of the September Plenum of the CC serve as an example of creative application of Marxism for solving programmatic questions of communist construction. These documents state that in accordance with the basic economic law of socialism, the party considers its main task to be the maximum satisfaction of material and cultural needs of Soviet people through a sharp surge in consumer goods production. These historical documents, developing and concretizing decisions of the 19th Congress of the Party, give a clear program for communist construction at the present stage. They speak of the necessity for all-around development and strengthening of socialism as the first phase of communism, as a necessary condition for a successful transition to communism. This formulation is in full accordance with programmatic tenets of Lenin's genius that communism will arrive when socialism is strengthened and developed. Meanwhile, many philosophers in pedagogical and research work often ignored tasks of comprehensive development and strengthening of socialism, jumping ahead and giving main attention to higher forms of economic development. "Such an incorrect orientation was inherent to many philosophical works, including my own," said Ts. A. Stepanyan.

An example of such jumping ahead is the assertion of some economists and philosophers that product exchange is allegedly the main practical task of our economic development. These philosophers and economists forget, apparently, the necessity for all-around strengthening and development of two forms of property, development of the agricultural artel as the sole form

of collective farm throughout the entire period of socialism, and development of Soviet trade.

"These errors must be taken into account," said Ts. A. Stepanyan, "in order to focus attention of scientific workers and postgraduates on developing those questions that must be resolved under socialism and the solution of which is an indispensable condition for successful advancement forward to communism.

In our pedagogical work and development of the theory of scientific communism, we must not forget that socialism is a specific historical stage in the development of our society, and that we can transition to communism only when all possibilities of socialism are fully developed, on the basis of which all prerequisites for transition from socialist economy to communist economy will be created".

Socialism requires a sharp elevation of cultural and living conditions for Soviet people, and we must end the dismissive attitude toward issues of everyday life, which have not only theoretical, but also tremendous practical significance.

Professor Ts. A. Stepanyan in his speech illuminated concrete tasks of the department in connection with decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU: "Deep study of these decisions has huge importance for theoretical study of Marxism-Leninism as a whole".

Big attention must be given to theoretical development of the Leninist principle of alliance between the working class and peasantry. On the basis of this great Leninist principle, we won in the October Socialist Revolution, won in the struggle for

socialism, won in the Great Patriotic War, and are winning now in the struggle for communism, because our party attached huge importance to this central question of development of our state.

By undertaking decisive measures for a sharp surge in agriculture, the party thereby further strengthens the alliance of the working class and peasantry. There is no force that could break the indestructible alliance of the working class and peasantry. That is why our country needs works illuminating the history of development and strengthening of this alliance. Meanwhile, we still do not have a single monograph on this topic. In light of the decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, philosophers must give a synthesis of objective processes of our development, reveal real contradictions of our life and ways to overcome them. We must admit that our philosophers still ignore the study of objectively existing contradictions in the development of Soviet society. Yet decisions of our party, including the resolution of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU, focus attention on this problem, giving us an example of bold and deep disclosure of contradictions under conditions of communist construction and pointing out correct ways to overcome them.

Unfortunately, to this day, some of our philosophers hold a metaphysical understanding of social phenomena, attempting to deny or ignore real contradictions of life.

We do not have a single monograph in which real contradictions of our development were comprehensively analyzed and considered.

Professor Ts. A. Stepanyan further stopped on statements of certain scientific workers and postgraduates of the department. Noting that speakers correctly emphasized the huge importance of developing the question of alliance between the working class and peasantry, Ts. A. Stepanyan said that in this process many philosophers allow significant errors.

In the *'Short Course on History of the CPSU(b)'*, there is a clear indication that in conditions of transition from socialism to communism, economic and political contradictions between the working class and peasantry are erased. This process is weakly illuminated in works of our philosophers and economists.

Analyzing errors of certain philosophers, Ts. A. Stepanyan pointed out that they confuse different stages in development of contradictions. I. V. Stalin repeatedly pointed out that within the framework of the alliance between the working class and peasantry, contradictions exist between them, but these contradictions are not antagonistic; they smooth out thanks to correct party policy, unlike antagonistic contradictions between the working class and bourgeoisie that do not smooth out, but are liquidated through class struggle. When fundamental differences between the working class and peasantry were overcome in our country, those contradictions between them that existed prior to socialism were liquidated. Now we have two forms of property, between which there is commonality and difference; there is a significant difference between town and country. All this gives rise to certain remnants of contradictions between the working class and peasantry.

Theoretically, it would be wrong to deny the presence of remnants of contradictions between the working class and peasantry, because this would mean a metaphysical approach to real reality, giving no possibility to correctly analyze social phenomena. Politically, it is wrong to deny the presence of remnants of contradictions because that would lead to dulling vigilance in the struggle for further development and strengthening of the alliance between the working class and peasantry. There will be no differences or contradictions between the working class and peasantry only when they turn into workers of a classless society. Those who attempt to deny the presence of remnants of contradictions between these classes under present conditions of socialism do not understand the spirit of decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU. Our party through its decisions mapped out a policy that smooths out existing contradictions by all-around strengthening of the alliance of the working class and peasantry, all-around strengthening, development, and multiplication of collective farm property, further strengthening of the guiding role of state property, and liquidation of essential differences between town and country.

In conclusion, Professor Ts. A. Stepanyan once again emphasized the significance of the historic resolution of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU. He pointed out that vital necessity requires deep study of party decisions in combination with works of Marxist-Leninist classics. Relying on them, Soviet philosophers must creatively develop new theoretical problems and thereby contribute in every way to communist construction in our country.

Regrettably, it must be noted that discussion of tasks facing philosophers was insufficiently concrete. In a number of speeches, it was strongly emphasized that philosophers must develop such-and-such problems, illuminate such-and-such questions, etc. Many speakers limited themselves to general wishes and did not give positive, creative illumination of raised issues, which constituted a serious shortcoming in most speeches.

32. On the Results of the Conference on Psychology

A. V. PETROVSKY

In the work of the second conference of psychologists, which took place in July 1953, psychologists from Moscow, Leningrad, Kyiv, Tbilisi, Kharkiv, and other cities of the Soviet Union took part. At the conference, 31 reports were heard. More than 50 scientific workers participated in the discussion of the reports and the draft of the psychology textbook for pedagogical institutes.

The reports presented at the conference were mainly dedicated to three problems: language and thinking, sensation and perception, typological differences in human higher nervous activity. In contrast to last year's conference, where the reports were solely theoretical in nature, the reports at this conference reflected specific psychological research conducted experimentally. Thus, some preliminary results of the restructuring of psychological science on the basis of I. P. Pavlov's teachings, which Soviet psychologists were called upon to carry out, were summarized.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that the reports were distributed into three groups, each of which was united by a common problem, almost no references to the works of other scientists or criticism addressed to them were contained in these reports. This applies, in particular, to the reports of N. A. Menchinskaya, P. Ya. Galperin, M. N. Shardakov, and some others, which, while united by a common theme of studying the

formation of thinking in schoolchildren, differed significantly from one another in their initial fundamental positions. This fact bears witness to a certain insulation in the work of some scientific institutions, which hinders the deployment of criticism and self-criticism, creates an atmosphere of complacency, and thus opens loopholes for the penetration of views alien to psychology.

The conference took place under the banner of restructuring psychology on the basis of I. P. Pavlov's teachings. If at last year's conference the confusion of many psychologists in the face of the need for such a restructuring was noticeable—expressed either in liquidationist attitudes toward the subject of psychological science, or in attempts to somehow wall off Pavlovian teaching, isolate themselves, and wait out until this restructuring is carried out—at the present conference, in the reports and speeches of almost all participants, a desire was revealed to find concrete paths for a genuine restructuring of the whole system of psychology on the basis of I. P. Pavlov's teachings on the physiology of higher nervous activity. Of course, not all these attempts—for all their conscientiousness—can be recognized as successful and correct, but their presence objectively testifies to a definite progress compared to the 1952 conference.

The question of restructuring psychology on the basis of Pavlovian teaching was naturally connected with the clarification and refinement of concrete methods for researching mental activity. The first conference on questions of psychology was marked by the theoretical exposure of all kinds of attempts to use the "subjective method" in psychology.

However, last year's conference did not give proper theoretical substantiation for the delimitation of the specific methods of psychology and the physiology of higher nervous activity. This did not fail to affect the results of the current conference. A serious shortcoming of many heard reports was the insufficient organic synthesis of concrete research carried out by the method of objective physiological analysis with psychological problems. In many cases, this led to the loss of the specifics of psychological research. Questions of physiological analysis acquired self-sufficient significance. A certain group of reports (E. N. Sokolova, L. A. Shvarts, D. G. Elkin, and others) relied exclusively on proper physiological, neurodynamic research methods of higher nervous activity, which essentially completely coincided with analogous works performed in the laboratories of physiologists. At the same time, a number of reports (M. N. Shardakov, A. N. Turpanov, N. G. Morozova, and others) were built on the basis of insufficiently critical use of old psychological methods, while I. P. Pavlov's teachings were drawn upon only for the physiological "interpretation" of mental processes. The question of proper psychological research methods at the present time cannot be considered satisfactorily resolved.

Undoubted interest is presented by the proposition put forward by Prof. H. S. Dobrynin in his report on "The Problem of Significance in the Formation of Temporary Connections in Man". Stimuli vital to man become socially significant in social life. On the basis of this social significance, systems of temporary connections in man are formed. In this way, the nature and character of the activity and selectivity of the

reflection of the objective world in the human brain are clarified.

Among other psychological works, conference participants noted the report by A. V. Zaporozhets devoted to the question of changing the interaction of the two signal systems in preschool age. In addition to clarifying age dynamics in the changing interaction of the two signal systems, A. V. Zaporozhets managed to establish experimentally the structure of reactions, including second-signal components. Experiments showed that upon the child's successful execution of a verbal instruction, the latter revives first the traces of previous direct impressions, causes in the child an image of the known circumstances in which they are to act, and only then is the corresponding motor reaction carried out. If such an image does not arise, the action does not occur or is performed incorrectly.

At the conference, reports were heard on a series of experimental investigations conducted mainly at the Institute of Psychology of the APN RSFSR under the direction of Prof. B. M. Teplov, clarifying the typological differences in human higher nervous activity.

In his report "An Attempt to Develop a Method for Studying Typological Differences in Human Higher Nervous Activity," B. M. Teplov emphasized that individual psychological differences in human makeup are formed under the influence of conditions of life and activity. The physiological basis of these differences is a "fusion" of peculiar features of the type of higher nervous activity and complex stable nervous connections that were developed as a result of upbringing in

the broad sense of the word. In this connection, traits of the type of higher nervous activity, as B. M. Teplov states, are not unchangeable, but, on the contrary, change in the process of human life and activity. The study of traits of the type of higher nervous activity has essential significance for determining the paths and means of educational influence on a given person in order to achieve the fullest development of their mental and physical abilities, in order to form the personality traits most necessary for society. The speaker pointed out the need for a more detailed development of the method of objective study of types of higher nervous activity in man and the mandatory combination of them with other methods of studying man in their everyday life and activity.

The study of types of human higher nervous activity can be carried out experimentally and non-experimentally. At the conference, properly experimental methods of studying the typology of higher nervous activity were presented (reports by B. M. Teplov, N. I. Maizel, M. N. Borisova, B. B. Kossov, and two employees of the Institute of Psychology of the Ministry of Education of the USSR: P. G. Saprykina and E. A. Mileryan).

The basis of the research by P. G. Saprykina and E. A. Mileryan (Institute of Psychology USSR) on "An Attempt to Develop a Method of Experimental Investigation of Typological Features in Man" was laid by the development of diverse systems of temporary connections and their reconditioning. Individual features in human traits regarding the speed of formation of dynamic stereotypes, one or another adaptability to work under conditions of external stimuli served

as a basis for drawing conclusions about individual-typological differences.

At the same time, one should not remain silent about certain shortcomings that emerged in the speeches of some conference participants regarding typological works. Speakers were confused by the purely physiological methodology of individual studies (for example, the methodology of photochemical conditioned reflexes). Fears were expressed that the study of the type of higher nervous activity on the basis of solely physiological methodology might obscure the study of the orientation of human personality, its social essence.

Participants of the conference also heard reports by staff members of the Institute of Psychology of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian SSR named after D. I. Uznadze: R. G. Natadze, I. T. Bzhalava, and 3. I. Khodzhava.

D. I. Ramishvili familiarized the conference with her works in the field of studying the psychological nature of pre-concept notions.

The work of D. I. Ramishvili showed that the use of a word is determined by the role that the object designated by the word plays in the practice of the surrounding social environment. People quite naturally apply words in a specific context in relation to specific objects. They can accurately apply the words "garden," "grass," "dog," and others without always being able to define these concepts.

In her report "On Factors of Spatial Perception," R. G. Natadze disproved the conclusions of traditional psychology regarding factors of perception of the right and left sides.

Georgian psychologists put forward as an explanatory principle for materialist psychology the so-called "set theory" (*ustanovka*). This tendency found its clearest expression in the reports and speeches of Comrades Bzhalava and Khodzhava.

What in essence is the concept of "set"? First introduced by German psychologists, the concept of "set" (*Einstellung*) was used in the works of Prof. D. N. Uznadze and his colleagues. The essence of the concept of "set" reduces mainly to the emergence of a state of "readiness" of the nervous apparatus for action. Most vividly, this phenomenon manifests itself in the so-called "set illusions". Staff members of the Institute of Psychology in Tbilisi experimentally study "set illusions" and attempt to explain them in the light of Academician I. P. Pavlov's teachings. A number of speakers at the conference raised doubts about the validity of using the concept of "set," pointing out that the content of this term is completely covered by the concept of dynamic stereotype, the known recognition of the role of past experience in the perception process. The all-encompassing significance of the explanatory principle in psychology attributed to the concept of "set" at the Tbilisi Institute cannot but cause serious concerns. According to I. T. Bzhalava, only the concept of "set" and the methods of its study base the investigation of human mental activity on actual scientific ground (see abstracts of reports at the conference on psychology, p. 51. M. APN RSFSR). Undoubtedly, Soviet psychological science standing on "actual scientific ground" is provided not by the concept of "set," but by Pavlov's reflex theory. The concept of "set," even if it reflects something, is only a specific psychological regularity with a limited sphere

of application. Attempts to elevate such specific regularities to the rank of general laws can turn into a brake on the development of scientific thought, preventing its forward movement.

The problem of "set" is not being raised for the first time as a subject of discussion and criticism at psychology conferences. Therefore, conference participants met with satisfaction the informational message of the Chairman of the Scientific Council on Psychology under the Presidium of the APN RSFSR, Prof. S. L. Rubinstein, about an upcoming discussion on the problem of set theory.

Sharp debate was also caused by some other reports, including the report and paper of P. Ya. Galperin "An Attempt to Study the Formation of Mental Actions in Schoolchildren". Studying how a schoolchild learns to act "in the mind," that is, solve various problems, and primarily arithmetic ones, P. Ya. Galperin comes to the conclusion that every mental action in the process of its formation passes through five main stages: 1) mastering the task; 2) mastering the action with objects; 3) mastering the action on the external-speech plane; 4) transferring the action into the mental plan; and 5) the final establishment of the mental action. Speakers in the debates expressed doubts about the validity of such schematization of mental actions.

In many reports presented at the conference, a pedagogical focus of psychological research was noticeable (reports by N. A. Menchinskaya, P. Ya. Galperin, L. V. Zankov, T. A. Korman, P. I. Zinchenko, O. M. Kontsevoy, and others). Thus, N. A. Menchinskaya, studying the interaction between word

and image in the process of acquiring knowledge by schoolchildren, believes that the so-called principle of visuality should be revised and that instead of it, the principle of coordinated influence of word and image, with the leading role of the word, should actually be put forward. The conclusions from the study by L. S. Slavina "On Certain Features of the Mental Activity of Underachieving Schoolchildren" have a certain significance for overcoming the consequences of pedological distortions in the interpretation of the problem of abilities. However, there is no basis to claim that the reports dedicated to problems of pedagogical psychology quantitatively and especially qualitatively correspond in full measure to those serious demands placed on it by pedagogical practice.

The overburdening of the conference with a large number of reports was one of the reasons why debates on the reports were not sufficiently broad and in the majority of cases did not bear the character of creative discussion.

Participants of the conference presented demands to the Presidium of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences RSFSR, pointing to the delayed organization of a specialized psychological journal.

The task of the conference also included consideration of the draft psychology textbook for pedagogical institutes. The clearly unsatisfactory situation with textbooks and manuals on psychology is one of the evidences of psychological science lagging behind the needs of practice, as the party press and Soviet public have repeatedly pointed out. Higher education students to this day use a psychology textbook published in

1948, containing serious methodological and factual errors. The publication of a new, high-quality textbook would be a significant indicator of the success of the cause of restructuring Soviet psychological science.

At the present conference, a prospectus of the textbook prepared under the editorship of Corresponding Member of the AN USSR Prof. S. L. Rubinstein and Full Members of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences RSFSR Professors A. N. Leontiev, A. A. Smirnov, and B. M. Teplov was presented for discussion.

The structure of the prospectus has the following character: the first part is devoted to setting out the subject, methods, and tasks of psychology; the second part characterizes cognitive processes; the third—motivations and feelings; the fourth—volitional actions and habits. The fifth part considers concrete types of activity (labor, study, and play). The sixth part contains a psychological characteristic of personality. The seventh part characterizes age stages of mental development.

Almost all conference participants who took part in the discussion of the textbook noted the unquestionable success of the prospectus authors. They pointed out that the authors stand on correct positions, considering the psyche as a process reflex in origin and reflectionist in content. The basis of the work on the prospectus was laid by the Marxist-Leninist theory of reflection and I. P. Pavlov's teaching on the physiology of higher nervous activity. The authors attempted to show the effective, active nature of reflection and the role of language in human reflectionist activity. They attempted to show in a genetic aspect the formation of consciousness, which found

expression both in the content and in the structure of the prospectus chapters. In it, attention is drawn to questions of child and pedagogical psychology, thus taking into account the specifics of higher pedagogical educational institutions for which the future textbook is intended.

However, the prospectus of the textbook—and this was noted by all speakers in the debate—is not free from a number of very significant shortcomings.

At the conference, Prof. K. N. Kornilov spoke, subjecting the methodological foundations of constructing the future psychology textbook to criticism, pointing out that on the pages of the prospectus, as well as in the reports featured at the conference, the issues of psychology of the Soviet person did not find proper reflection.

Speakers in the debate noted that the prospectus insufficiently strictly maintains a reflex interpretation of mental processes, and there are remnants of subjectivism and introspectionism.

In speeches, it was pointed out that the structure of the prospectus is still far from perfect. Justified surprise is caused by the fact that the textbook authors did not deem it necessary to include in the prospectus a section or chapter devoted to the history of psychology and the fierce struggle between materialism and idealism in psychological science. Subjected to criticism were individual formulations proposed by the prospectus authors (definition of attention, habits, memory, etc.). It was noted that one cannot recognize as successful the formulation of the definition of the subject of psychology science contained in the prospectus: "Psychology is the science

of mental activity as a reflection of reality carried out by the brain, arising in the process of human interaction with the objective world and playing a necessary (?) role in life and activity" (*Prospectus of a psychology textbook for pedagogical institutes*. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, p. 3. 1953).

The prospectus authors were rightly reproached for a certain vagueness of language that makes understanding and mastering the text difficult. A number of other comments were made regarding the content, composition, and presentation style of the material in the future textbook.

Unfortunately, it must be noted that in speeches, critical remarks were mainly made regarding particular, unsuccessful definitions contained in the prospectus, the composition of sections and chapters, etc. As for fundamental methodological questions, they were little reflected in the speeches of conference participants.

President of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences I. A. Kairov delivered the closing speech, noting that the psychology conference proceeded actively and at a fairly high ideational-theoretical level. Having characterized the extensive work being carried out by the collective of Soviet psychologists, he pointed out that, despite individual errors of some comrades, psychological research in its majority is built on the basis of a Marxist worldview. At the same time, scientific workers in the field of psychology have not yet been able to rid themselves of a dogmatic, Talmudic approach to the study of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, of attempts to cover themselves with quotes; I. A. Kairov called for significantly raising the level of criticism and self-criticism, which is still low among

psychologists. Soviet psychologists have all the necessary conditions and all possibilities for the successful resolution of the most important tasks facing them.

The conference adopted a comprehensive decision on a number of essential and urgent issues raised in the reports and speeches.

33. On the Results of the Discussion of the Philosophical Views of Academician L. I. Mandelstam

A. A. SEMENOV

The XIX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union set before Soviet scientists the task of further strengthening the struggle against various manifestations of hostile ideology and vulgarizing distortions in science. In the report of the XIX Party Congress, Comrade G. M. Malenkov said: "The Arakcheev regime existing in many sectors of the scientific front has been smashed. However, in a number of branches of science, the monopoly of individual groups of scientists who shield themselves from criticism and attempt to solve scientific questions by administrative decree has not yet been fully liquidated. No branch of science can develop successfully in a suffocating atmosphere of mutual praise and hushing up of errors; attempts to establish a monopoly of individual groups of scientists inevitably breed stagnation and decay in science".

The newspaper *Pravda* on November 17, 1952, correctly noted the abnormal situation that had arisen in physics, where there are groups of scientists who evade discussions and ignore any attempts to subject critical idealist tendencies in modern physics to critique.

In light of these most important directives, the development of methodological problems of modern science, in particular the

active work of philosophical seminars at universities, institutes, and research institutions, acquires special significance.

***

On February 9, 1953, at the P. N. Lebedev Physical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, an expanded meeting of the Scientific Council was held jointly with the philosophical seminar of the Institute, dedicated to a critical analysis of the philosophical views of Academician L. I. Mandelstam. The discussion was conducted in connection with the publication of Volume V of the Complete Works of the scientist.

Academician D. V. Skobeltsyn, in his introductory speech, noted that L. I. Mandelstam, in his works and his lectures collected in Volume V, tried, according to his own statements, to refrain from philosophical evaluation of the questions treated. This led to the fact that this capital work does not satisfy all the requirements that must unconditionally be imposed on fundamental works of this kind, and suffers from serious shortcomings. As a result of refusing to consider the philosophical questions of physics, in the absence of an in-depth analysis, the works of L. I. Mandelstam contain erroneous formulations and constructions that lead his conclusions to incorrect, idealist results.

The possibility of the penetration into our literature of alien, reactionary ideology requires increasing the vigilance of scientists, the broad development of criticism and self-criticism in science, and an uncompromising struggle against attempts at aggression on the ideological front. Therefore, declared declarations by Mandelstam on "abstracting" from

philosophical evaluation of treated questions, on departure into the realm of purely physical problems without connection to a general worldview, should be qualified as harmful to our science.

Academician D. V. Skobeltsyn reported that for a comprehensive evaluation of the philosophical views of L. I. Mandelstam a commission had been created, the conclusion of which was submitted to the Scientific Council and the philosophical seminar for discussion.

Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences B. M. Vul, speaking on behalf of the commission, dwelt on major mistakes of L. I. Mandelstam in the field of modern physics, emphasizing that in the majority of scientific research L. I. Mandelstam acts as a spontaneous materialist, but nowhere does he rely on the only correct scientific worldview—dialectical materialism—and permits in his works, mainly related to the fifth volume of his works, philosophical errors of a subjectivist-idealist nature.

In his lectures on relativity theory (Vol. V, pp. 90–305), L. I. Mandelstam repeatedly pointed out that he did not set as his goal to touch upon philosophical problems of physics. "I especially tried to emphasize (I think that this is my desire, and my very opinion you learned)," says he, "that all questions related to relativity theory are primarily questions of physics. Its philosophical significance is a special question; we were interested in its physical significance" (Vol. V, p. 303).

However, it is obvious that the content of relativity theory—questions of space, time, and motion—is closely linked with

general philosophical problems. Such connections, naturally, L. I. Mandelstam could not avoid. Among the philosophical questions touched upon in his lectures, considerable attention is paid to the definition in physics, the "structure of concepts with which physics operates" (p. 177).

L. I. Mandelstam equates the measurement of physical quantities with their definition. He asserts, for example, that "we define time with the help of some physical process, for example, the rotation of the Earth" (p. 183). What the author understands by "help" of such a physical process is clear from the following example. "Let us take for simplicity," writes he, "the definition of time chronometer. Thus, time t, i.e., that which I substitute into Newton's formulas instead of t, is what the clock hand shows" (p. 185). But from the physical process of measuring time with the help of any periodically occurring phenomenon, it does not follow at all that time "is" what the clock hand shows. Such a rigid identification of time with clock readings reduces, in essence, the problem of studying time as a form of existence of matter to the establishment of these or those "recipes" of measurement. A similar view is advocated by Mandelstam regarding the problem of measuring space. "Physics must give a recipe on how to find length," asserts L. I. Mandelstam.—"It must give such a recipe that he who does not know it, will define length" (p. 178).

L. I. Mandelstam links the definition of physical quantities only with measurement recipes. Such a treatment of the question, in which science deals only with results of measurements, leads to agnosticism. It is completely obvious

that measurements serve as a tool with the help of which natural phenomena and regularities existing independently of people, in particular, by physicists and measurements performed by them, are studied.

Therefore, Mandelstam's assertion that "the concept of simultaneity is a recipe-based definition" (190) and other similar assertions are deeply erroneous and, as is known, are used for propagating Machism. There was a time when there were no such concepts as length, simultaneity, etc., and consequently, there could not be definitions of these physical concepts; however, spatial-temporal relationships existed and exist independently of our definitions. The development of physics showed that simultaneity is not absolute, as classical physics asserted, proceeding from metaphysical representations of space and time. However, simultaneity exists objectively and does not depend on our definitions, which are perfected and refined in the process of development of science. Classical physics considered that time is not linked with matter and motion, and assumed, in particular, that the simultaneity of events does not depend on the motion of material objects. Relativity theory established that time and space are linked with the motion of matter, and by concrete material of science confirmed the proposition of dialectical materialism that time and space are forms of existence of matter.

Analyzing the question of establishing a single unit (etalon) in systems moving relative to one another, L. I. Mandelstam reduces this problem to the establishment of a "single language." "We must," considers he, "select a clock such that an etalon measured in one and in the other system would be the

same" (p. 223). "The principle of relativity," says he, "asserts or assumes... that I can choose a language in which phenomena in the other system are described in the same way as in the first" (p. 212). Such statements, in which the establishment of objective properties of phenomena is reduced to the "choice of language," show the Machist nature of L. I. Mandelstam's views on the essence and role of physics as natural laws independent of these or those agreements between scientists.

When L. I. Mandelstam poses questions of epistemology, he solves them in the spirit of the subjectivist worldview of foreign idealist physicists. Thus, in additions to lectures on the foundations of quantum mechanics, he attempts to give a characterization of principles of epistemological nature that lie at the foundation of constructing physical theories.

"Every physical theory," writes he, "can be divided into the following stages.

First of all, they introduce, depending on this or that area of physical phenomena to which they belong, these or those mathematical quantities. For example, in mechanics such quantities are coordinates, velocity, time, etc.; in the theory of heat—temperature, quantity of heat, entropy, etc.; in electrodynamics—electric and magnetic fields. Between these quantities mathematical relationships are established, for example, in the form of differential equations: Newton's mechanical equations, Maxwell's electrodynamic equations. This stage, which sometimes in itself carries the title of physical theory, is not in any case such, since it does not contain any statements relating to physical phenomena.

The second stage consists in matching mathematical quantities with physical objects. This is achieved by giving each quantity a definite recipe indicating by means of what experiment we can correlate a given physical object to this or that numerical value of this quantity. We call this recipe the measurement recipe of a given physical quantity. Finally, the same recipes serve for the reverse transition from new values of quantities obtained from the first with the help of the above-indicated formal mathematical apparatus back to physical objects.

An example best of all explains what has been said.

We measure, for example, the position of a planet at a given moment of time. By measurement recipe we mark corresponding divisions on the tube of a transit instrument when the intersection of crosshairs coincides with the given planet, and simultaneously the position of clock hands, i.e., we determine the value of angular coordinates at a given moment of time. Then we substitute the values obtained in this way into corresponding equations as initial conditions. The equations 'give' us new combined values of coordinates and time (**l**, **Ψ**). The statement of theory consists in the assertion that, having set the transit instrument in accordance with the values of coordinates obtained from these equations, we will observe the planet at the intersection of crosshairs simultaneously with the passage of the clock hand through the number on the dial equal to **t**. The totality of all indicated stages and constitutes a theory" (p. 408).

The cited example is typical, as it reveals the author's desire to limit physics as a science, referring only to measurement results. This common feature for idealist statements on

questions of physics, reducing to the assertion that not the objective world and its regularities are the subject of science, but instrument readings. Of course, without instruments and measurements one cannot engage in physics, but they serve merely as auxiliary tools for studying phenomena and laws existing objectively and independently of instruments and measurement recipes. If we reduce science only to measurement results, to observations, then science will have to be considered not as an objective world, but as a "complex of sensations."

Philosophical errors committed by L. I. Mandelstam are repeated by some of his students and have spread in individual physics textbooks, for example, in *Mechanics* by S. E. Khaikin and *Physics Course* (Vol. II) edited by N. D. Papaleksi.

A. A. Kolomensky indicated in his speech that high demands must be placed on publications, especially such a collection of works by L. I. Mandelstam devoted not to original research in a special field, but to the treatment of fundamental, already established or developing physical theories.

Such publications exert a huge influence on the formation of the worldview of young Soviet scientists and studying youth. When a young physicist turns to a volume of Mandelstam's work, he meets a number of propositions maintained in the spirit of Machism.

Comrade Kolomensky dwelt on concrete examples from Mandelstam's works cited in the conclusion of the commission, and characterized them as evidence that fundamental

philosophical questions are resolved by Mandelstam in an idealist spirit.

In conclusion, the speaker expressed the assumption that after thorough editing or accompanying commentary, the fifth volume could bring significant benefit to broad circles of Soviet physicists.

Professor S. E. Khaikin asserted in his speech that L. I. Mandelstam was characterized by a spontaneous-materialist worldview. If we talk about special fields of physics, then every physicist, according to S. E. Khaikin, is forced to stand on positions of spontaneous materialism. However, S. E. Khaikin considers that philosophical statements of Mandelstam in a number of cases characterize him as a spontaneous materialist. In confirmation, the speaker cited evidence of L. I. Mandelstam about himself as a person "who sees in formalism a reflection of real phenomena."

S. E. Khaikin did not say, however, why openly non-Marxist statements of Mandelstam on basic problems of physics he is not inclined to consider as defining the worldview of the scientist.

Touching upon Mandelstam's erroneous positions, S. E. Khaikin mentioned the criterion of "correctness and incorrectness of definitions." L. I. Mandelstam is not guided by practice as a criterion of the truth of a given definition, but proposes another criterion linked with "suitability" or "expediency" of definitions. "It is impossible to forbid defining in this way," says Mandelstam about one of the definitions, —"but this is extremely inexpedient; Newton's laws and in

general all laws would be completely different, there would be a lot of awkwardness" (p. 179). In another place we read: "If I carried a rod along one path and it coincided with another rod, and when carried along another path it did not coincide, then our definition of length would be valid. But it would be unsuitable" (p. 182). Citing these examples, S. E. Khaikin for some reason did not notice in them manifestations of subjectivist-idealist views of the author, placing natural laws in direct dependence on definitions.

Academician M. A. Leontovich declared his disagreement with the conclusions of the commission. Characterizing his work on preparing for publication the fifth volume of Mandelstam's works as a service to Soviet physics, Academician Leontovich could not, however, refute the fact that Mandelstam's views on the foundations of quantum mechanics theory, which found reflection in the fifth volume, are not consistent from the point of view of dialectical materialism. The speaker erroneously asserted that "there is not and cannot be any other". "I consider," said he, "that on questions linked with the foundations of relativity theory and quantum mechanics, such a canonical point of view does not exist and cannot exist at the present time."

The wrong attitude of Academician Leontovich toward critique of his activity as editor of the fifth volume of Mandelstam's works found expression in the statement he made to the Bureau of the Scientific Council. "The commission," declared he, "slips into that style of fetishizing words, which is characteristic of many philosophical works on questions of physics..." Attempts by M. A. Leontovich to raise objections

against the substance of the commission's conclusions proved unsound. Citing as an example Mandelstam's considerations on the definition of simultaneity, Academician Leontovich could offer only a modest statement that Mandelstam's lectures help understand why in classical physics the question of a physical criterion of simultaneity did not arise.

Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences V. I. Veksler subjected M. A. Leontovich's speech to sharp criticism. The task of L. I. Mandelstam's students, said he, consists not in hushing up his errors, but in launching criticism and self-criticism to show and correct them. The position of Academician Leontovich brings harm, as by denying the actual errors of L. I. Mandelstam he places under attack his actual merits.

Incorrect was M. A. Leontovich in accusing the commission of allegedly erroneous criticism of Mandelstam's views on simultaneity. The commission emphasizes that the simultaneity of events is not absolute, but depends on the motion of material objects. Our knowledge of time and space becomes more accurate, but from this it does not follow at all that simultaneity relies on definition, and is not a reflection of spatial-temporal relations of the material world.

Professor V. N. Kessenikh noted in his speech that the commission correctly formulated basic conclusions on the analysis of the philosophical views of Academician Mandelstam; however, criticism of reactionary views propagated in publications of works of this major scientist is insufficiently developed and expressed by the commission very mildly. V. N. Kessenikh expressed a number of positions that

in a more expanded form were contained in his report at the philosophical seminar of the Physics Faculty of Moscow State University (see below).

B. M. Vul in his closing speech showed the unsoundness of M. A. Leontovich's position regarding a "canonical point of view in science." Acting in the role of defender of views on science as developing and perfecting the reflection of objective regularities, M. A. Leontovich brings this correct thought to absurdity, asserting, in essence, that as a "canonical point of view" basic propositions of Marxist philosophy are passed off. Indeed, our representations of space and time will change, will deepen and be refined, but this does not mean that space and time cease to be objective forms of existence of matter. Therefore, the objection raised by Academician Leontovich to the commission in "fetishizing words" is unjustified and does not help the matter.

The concept of simultaneity, of which M. A. Leontovich spoke, is one of the key concepts in modern physics. In classical mechanics, the transition from one coordinate system to another was linked with the transformation **x, y, z**; further development of science showed that **t** also depends on the motion of matter, i.e., our representations of natural regularities became deeper, more accurate. Here we should talk not about the difference between clock rates and other methods of measurement, but about the fact that regardless of the method of measuring time, it remains an objective form of existence of matter.

B. M. Vul subjected to criticism that part of M. A. Leontovich's speech in which a negative assessment of the commission's conclusions was given.

Having heard speeches of meeting participants, the Scientific Council and the philosophical seminar of the Physical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences approved the conclusions of the commission and condemned the position taken by M. A. Leontovich.

***

In November–December 1952 at meetings of the philosophical seminar of the Physics Faculty of Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, the philosophical views of Academician L. I. Mandelstam were also considered and analyzed. The introductory report was delivered by Professor V. N. Kessenikh.

The appearance in print of the fifth volume of Mandelstam's works, in which without a single critical remark unpublished during the scientist's life materials of his seminars and lectures belonging to the period 1932–1944 were included, V. N. Kessenikh defines as an attempt at reviving Machist theory of knowledge and reactionary idealist views on basic problems of modern physics.

The reporter dwelt on the history of formation and sources of Mandelstam's worldview, who absorbed idealist views of E. Cohn, R. Mises, A. Poincaré, and other Machists. These reactionary ideas served, for example, as the methodological basis of Mandelstam's main lecture on relativity theory (Vol. V, pp. 90–305).

Most physical concepts—space and time—are defined by Mandelstam purely subjectively. These forms of existence of matter he considers, in essence, as a product of human reason. "I did not know, they ask me what length is, and I defined (spacing mine—*A. S.*) what I will call length" (p. 178). A subjectivist view on such physical concepts as time, simultaneity, leads in a number of his lectures on relativity theory, according to Mandelstam, to "relying on definition." The fact that the rotation of the Earth is usually placed at the foundation of time calculation, Mandelstam links with a special arbitrary assumption on the equality of time intervals corresponding to equal rotation angles. "One cannot ask," says he,—"does the Earth really turn through equal angles in equal times? For we defined equal times... it is proposed [to take] the Earth and postulate that a known angle of its rotation corresponds to the same time" (p. 179).

Mandelstam considers the concept of simultaneity of physical events as an approximate, more and more perfected—with the development of science—reflection of objective regularity, but as a defined recipe, a postulate created with the purpose of excluding logical contradictions. This leads him, for example, to the conclusion: "Without the concept of simultaneity there can be no concept of velocity; the concept of simultaneity must be defined (spacing mine—*A. S.*). Thus, in essence, according to Einstein, we could not formulate the concept of velocity" (p. 191).

Mandelstam arrives in the end at a summarizing conclusion in which reality is placed upside down: "If all definitions are good

for a given degree of accuracy, then phenomena will proceed identically" (p. 203).

With such a view on basic concepts of physics, fundamental laws of nature appear in Mandelstam as arbitrary creations of thought. He asserts, for example, that "the principle of length does not change: either the definition of time is given through Earth motion and in experience inertia is found, or, vice versa, the law of inertia is placed at the foundation of the definition and with its help Earth motion is studied" (p. 180). Such an attitude toward basic concepts and physical laws, manifested in Mandelstam's works, is characteristic of a Machist worldview.

V. N. Kessenikh emphasizes the necessity of creating a work giving a consistent dialectical-materialist treatment of the foundations of modern physics not as a logically closed system, but as a science correctly reflecting natural regularities and facilitating their creative mastery.

Professor N. A. Kaptsov subjected Mandelstam's views in the field of quantum mechanics, set forth mainly in his works entering the collection under the title "Seminar on Selected Physical Problems" (Vol. V, pp. 337–346) and "Lectures on Foundations of Quantum Mechanics" (Vol. V, pp. 347–415), to criticism.

A characteristic example can serve statements of Mandelstam during the exposition of his attitude toward the views of Idealist Neumann, who tried to prove the impossibility of constructing a physical theory on a deterministic basis. "I wanted to point out," says Mandelstam about Neumann's attempt,—"that this question in essence was posed and

resolved (spacing mine—*A. S.*) by Neumann. Results of his work usually lead without proof and in an extremely schematic form. For example, they say that Neumann proved the impossibility of constructing a physical theory on a deterministic basis. In my opinion, such a formulation says little" (p. 403). In lengthy reasoning accompanying this thought and touching upon the fundamental question of visualizability of physical representations, Neumann's point of view is not refuted. The reader is led to the sole conclusion that Neumann (who posed and resolved the problem under consideration) is right and the scope of applicability does not extend to physical processes.

Most fully in Mandelstam's works his point of view on the structure and foundations of constructing physical theories is revealed. "What is the structure of every physical theory, every physical construction in general?" asks L. I. Mandelstam. —"Not to complicate matters (as always)," continues he, —"one can say that every physical theory consists of two mutually complementary parts. I will start with what can be considered the second part. This is the equation of theory—Maxwell's equations, Schrödinger's equations, etc. Equations—this is a purely mathematical apparatus. Into these equations enter some symbols: **x, y, z** and **t**, vectors **E** and **H**, etc. On this the second part ends. Here as yet there is no physical theory. This is mathematics, and not physical science. The first part of physical theory connects these symbols (quantities) with physical objects, a connection realized according to concrete recipes (concrete quantities as etalons and concrete measuring

processes—definition of coordinates, time, etc., with the help of rigid scales, clocks, etc.).

The first part teaches how in a rational way to match to objects of nature definite quantities—mostly in the form of numbers. The second part establishes mathematical relationships between these quantities. Thereby, in view of these connections with real objects, formulas are formulated and relationships between the latter, which constitutes the ultimate goal of theory" (p. 349).

In another place L. I. Mandelstam reports: "Our general positions consist in the fact that every physical theory consists of two (connected with each other) parts: mathematical part, operating with symbols (numbers, operators, etc.), and measurements—recipes connecting these symbols with objects of nature (spacing mine—*A. S.*). Only both these parts, taken together, allow giving answers to physical questions" (p. 393).

Consequently, according to Mandelstam, it turns out that theory is created in order to "give answers to physical questions." The anti-Marxist character of these concepts does not need commentary.

Transferring to quantum mechanics, Mandelstam asserts that in this area physics has a right to match, on the one hand, operators representing in this case suitable mathematical symbols, and on the other—physical objects.

Mandelstam does not ponder over the problem of deep study of the electron, i.e., such a physical object that possesses simultaneously contradictory properties of wave and particle; he considers that the whole matter is in the name: call x and

p coordinate and quasi-momentum,—then all contradictions will vanish! (See p. 339). It is necessary to note that Mandelstam considers quantum mechanics not as a draft of a new physical theory, but as a whole worldview.

P. I. Shushpanov dwelt on the question of the ever-increasing importance of ideological work and tasks of Soviet scientists in light of directives of the Communist Party on the development of criticism and struggle of opinions in science. He emphasized that an abnormal situation, taking shape in physics where scientific criticism and self-criticism are weakly developed, found its reflection in the environment of scientists of Moscow University. Among physicists working at the university, only a few come forward with a deep scientific analysis and critical review of modern works containing idealist views.

The broad distribution of Mandelstam's Machist views, masked by imaginary non-partisanship in philosophy of a scientist engaged only in physical problems and not participating in ideological struggle, represents a great danger and requires serious attention. P. I. Shushpanov supported the critical statement of a number of students of L. I. Mandelstam about the conclusion, considering it unusable for the task of "reconstructing foundations" of quantum mechanics, allegedly accomplished by the efforts of the teacher.

R. S. Bobrovskaya made an attempt to answer first of all the question of what the general approach of L. I. Mandelstam to the exposition and foundation of relativity theory was. Recognizing that into the full content of relativity theory enters a set of questions—both physical, mathematical, and philosophical, L. I. Mandelstam in his lectures indicates that

one should "concentrate attention only on the first: on physical foundations and on that mathematical structure into which fits the principle of relativity on the basis of physical data" (p. 93). Academician Mandelstam considers spatial-temporal and methodological views necessary and basic condition of "real understanding" of relativity theory, places (however, only in words!) physical and philosophical foundations of relativity theory, does not include among physical problems the problem of structure and content of physical concepts, as well as comparison of classical theory and relativity theory. The erroneousness of this concept is obvious. The philosophical line of Mandelstam is well outlined by his treatment of the principle of relativity. If in the first lecture he declares that he sees no possibility of any serious "non-mathematical" treatment of the principle of relativity (p. 91), then in the seventh lecture he gives this "non-mathematical" treatment, in which following Einstein—Mach he uses such unacceptable concepts as "center of mass of fixed stars," rotating "as a whole around Earth" and others (pp. 170, 172), i.e., falls into non-positivist philosophizing about incomprehensible things (p. 91).

Touching upon the history of development of pre-relativistic electrodynamics, L. I. Mandelstam almost completely ignores the work of Russian scientists in the field of theoretical and experimental research of electromagnetic field. The only exception—mention of A. A. Eichenwald's experiment (pp. 111, 138). In editor's notes to these lectures a few words are said about research of A. A. Belopolsky on the optical Doppler effect in laboratory conditions (p. 104). It is known that N. I. Lobachevsky anticipated not only the mathematical side of

relativity theory, but also its physical representations of time, space, inertial reference frame, contained some basic physical ideas of special relativity theory. Felix Klein in his work on the history of mathematics in the 19th century admits that the kinematics of special relativity theory coincides with the kinematics of hyperbolic space of Lobachevsky. In Mandelstam's work this major contribution of the Russian mathematician is bypassed in silence. As for experimental research, Mandelstam mentions, for example, the works of Michelson (p. 96), Trouton (p. 107), but says nothing about classical experiments of P. N. Lebedev, which have fundamental importance in establishing connection between energy and mass.

In conclusion R. S. Bobrovskaya dwelt on the characterization of Mandelstam's philosophical views, given by his students in essays on life and activity of the scientist and in scientific memoirs. She emphasized the subjectivist character of a number of essays and memoirs belonging to N. D. Papaleksi, G. S. Landsberg, I. E. Tamm, G. S. Gorelik. Authors of memoirs, without formulating their attitude toward the philosophical views of Mandelstam and without giving them a clear definition, nevertheless shed bright light on the history of formation of the scientist's worldview. Essays and memoirs contain message that Mandelstam "acquainted himself thoroughly" with philosophical views of A. Poincaré, "learned a lot from scientific communication" with E. Cohn, "studied the English philosopher Whitehead," "corresponded with Mises" and so on. Characterizing what in no essay is mentioned that L. I. Mandelstam studied or even read

"Materialism and Empirio-criticism" by V. I. Lenin or "Anti-Dühring" and "Dialectics of Nature" by F. Engels.

Professor S. D. Gvozdover dedicated his speech to two positions touched upon in the report of V. N. Kessenikh: first, the possibility of a non-relativistic method of constructing special relativity theory and, second, the erroneousness of publishing the fifth volume of Mandelstam's works. Discussing the topic of Mandelstam's philosophical views he considers unnecessary, as it is clear that the worldview of this major physicist was purely Machist.

S. D. Gvozdover considers that attempts to construct relativity theory without relying on Maxwell's electromagnetic field equations are at least naïve. Like any other theory, Maxwell–Lorentz electrodynamics has a definite, limited, though sufficiently broad, field of application. The correctness of Lorentz transformations is confirmed by experiment, experience. But, recognizing their correctness, we cannot help encountering the so-called "paradoxes" of relativity theory. Speed of light, constant Planck's constant, propagation of vacuum—all these quantities preserve their value in any coordinate system, but clock rate, length of scales and other physical quantities change depending on the motion of the coordinate system. Maxwell's equations in Lorentz transformations accurately reflect these objective regularities of the world surrounding us.

Further S. D. Gvozdover dwelt on the problem of vacuum, wherein an attempt was made to assert that this problem is a direct development of the ether theory. There was a time, says Prof. Gvozdover, when scientists thought that vacuum needed

no representation of ether for explaining natural phenomena, assuming that the concept of ether is equivalent to the concept of purely mathematical space. Development of modern physics shows, according to Prof. Gvozdover, that the problem of ether is not solved. Modern science knows that vacuum possesses concrete physical properties (wave resistance), influences behavior of atom, causes shift of electronic levels (vacuum theory). Consequently, state of modern physics leads to the necessity to study ether, to study properties of world space.

S. D. Gvozdover considers that publishing the fifth volume of work of L. I. Mandelstam cannot be considered erroneous or inexpedient. The volume contains valuable physical works of the scientist, lectures and seminars of whom "give excellent examples of deep... together with that concrete physical thought" (p. 6).

M. D. Karasev noted in his speech that L. I. Mandelstam was interested not only in physical problems, but in philosophy as well. However, in published works of Mandelstam (Vols. I–IV) there is no clear statement of his philosophical views. In some works (for example, report on optical works of Newton in the third volume of works) he comes close to the treatment of fundamental philosophical questions, but constantly breaks off his thought when it comes to sharp statements on the character of his worldview. All material of his public speeches was filled with cautious thought: let us not touch upon philosophy. But one cannot set forth physical theories without touching upon questions of general worldview. However Mandelstam masked his philosophical views, they, undoubtedly, must be disclosed upon attentive analysis of his physical works. Such an analysis

of Mandelstam's works leads to the sole correct conclusion: views of this major physicist were permeated with subjective idealism in the form of Machism and operationalism. Completely wrong is S. D. Gvozdover, asserting that methodological distortions do not exclude expediency of publishing the fifth volume of Mandelstam's works. Ideological education of young people by such works can cause significant damage.

Let us turn to the most vivid examples.

Openly idealist point of view is propagated by Mandelstam in "Lectures on Some Questions of Oscillation Theory." On page 428 of the fifth volume we read: "What are those signs by which oscillation theory is distinguished? Looking closely, we see that they are fundamentally different from those that divide physics into optics, acoustics, etc. This division is produced, obviously, by the sign of physical quantities that we directly perceive (spacing mine—*A. S.*). The erroneousness of this position is beyond doubt: physical phenomena, for example acoustics or optics, differ qualitatively, and this determines the division of branches of physics studying them, and not the participation in perception of the object of study of eye or ear.

Commonality of regularities in phenomena of nature Mandelstam reduces to commonality of mathematical apparatus (for example, in oscillation theory). According to Mandelstam, mathematical apparatus arises independently of needs of practice. As an example he refers to creation of non-linear mathematical apparatus by A. M. Lyapunov. But it is known that Lyapunov created mathematical apparatus proceeding from practical needs arising during study of

projectile flight, cosmogonic processes, and not out of abstract mathematical interest, as Mandelstam assumes.

Professor D. D. Ivanenko, emphasizing expediency of discussion, noted that its significance is far broader than just evaluation of views of L. I. Mandelstam. Kessenikh's report was dedicated mainly to weak sides of Mandelstam's activity; however, works of the latter contain a lot of valuable factual and historical material. True, biographers often picture Mandelstam as the greatest physicist in the area of relativity theory and quantum mechanics, but this is wrong. Mandelstam engaged mainly in classical physics; his merits in development of relativity theory and quantum mechanics are insignificant. V. N. Kessenikh correctly raised the question of essential significance of Mandelstam's lectures on relativity theory for development of modern physics. One cannot agree with reporter that idea and development of quantum mechanics theory of space bears idealist character. It is necessary to note leading role of Soviet scientists (including speaker himself) in creation of this new direction in modern theoretical physics.

V. G. Fridman touched upon history of struggle with Machism in Soviet physics. Publication of the fifth volume of Mandelstam's works he considers a gross mistake, which was the result of dominance of alien to Soviet science rules, consequence of monopoly position of a group of scientists, not allowing criticism and self-criticism in their environment.

In the closing speech Professor V. N. Kessenikh indicated the value of speeches of a number of speakers touching upon the question of ideological education of cadres, emphasized the growing importance of scientific critique, noting deep

correctness and timeliness of instructions of newspaper *Pravda* on abnormal situation in modern physics. Reporter made a number of remarks regarding speeches of discussion participants.

Conclusion on results of discussion of report of V. N. Kessenikh was made by head of philosophical seminar Professor Ya. P. Terletsky. He emphasized that the held discussion will contribute to revealing Machist character of Mandelstam's ideology and thereby bring significant benefit to all Soviet physicists encountering in their activity the heritage of this major scientist and works of his followers.

***

In report and speeches of discussion participants it was shown that publication of fifth volume of works of L. I. Mandelstam represents an attempt at reviving Machist views in Soviet physics. Appearance of the volume—vivid evidence of weakly developed critique and self-criticism in environment of Soviet scientists[39].

Should be noted as essential shortcoming of held at Physics Faculty discussion that in it did not take part scientists of Philosophy Faculty of university.

[39] Thus, for example, in review of Acad. V. A. Fock all critique of idealist statements of Mandelstam was reduced to remarks on inaccuracy of a number of his expressions. Editors of journal *Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk*, publishing this review (Vol. XLV, issue 1 for 1951, pp. 160–163), and this time took erroneous position in evaluation of important questions of natural science philosophy.—*A. S.*

APPENDIX

Index of Articles and Materials Published in the Journal "Voprosy Filosofii" (*Problems of Philosophy*) for the Year 1953

CONTENTS

From the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. To all party members, to all working people of the Soviet Union — Issue 1 (p. 3)

EDITORIALS AND LEADING ARTICLES

On the Teaching of Marxist Philosophy in Higher Education Institutions — Issue 1 (p. 81)

On the State of Legal Sciences — Issue 1 (p. 91)

The Communist Party — The Leading and Guiding Force of Soviet Society — Issue 4 (p. 3)

Ideology of Friendship and Peace Among Peoples — Issue 6 (p. 3)

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

AZIZYAN A. K. — The Great Power of the Ideas of Proletarian Internationalism — Issue 5 (p. 3)

ARTUROV O. A., SHAFIR M. A. — State Building of the People's Republic of China — Issue 2 (p. 39)

BREGEL E. Ya. — The Basic Economic Law of Modern Capitalism — Issue 5 (p. 21)

GLEZERMAN G. E. — The Cultural Growth of Society — A Necessary Condition for the Transition to Communism — Issue 3 (p. 3)

EGERMAN E. Ya. — The Struggle of Italian Communists for Democratic People's Rights and National Independence — Issue 4 (p. 112)

ZVORYKIN A. A. — On Certain Issues in the History of Technology — Issue 6 (p. 32)

KOZLOV V. K. — Development of the National Question in I. V. Stalin's Work "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics" — Issue 2 (p. 156)

KONSTANTINOV F. V. — The Main Engine of the Development of Productive Forces — Issue 1 (p. 29)

KUDRYAVTSEV I. S., FEDOROVA A. T. — On the Elimination of the Essential Distinction Between Physical and Mental Labor — Issue 1 (p. 47)

KUCHERSKAYA S. N. — On the Features of Socialist Culture — Issue 5 (p. 39)

MALYSHEV I. V. — The Driving Forces of the Development of Socialist Society — Issue 5 (p. 196)

Acad. NEMCHINOV V. S. — Development of the Productive Forces of Agriculture Under Socialism — Issue 6 (p. 15)

OVANDER N. E. (Kiev) — On the Objective Nature of the Laws of Development of Soviet Socialist Society — Issue 4 (p. 40)

OKULOV A. F. — Scientific Foresight — The Foundation of Party Leadership — Issue 2 (p. 3)

The Role of the Masses of People in History — Issue 4 (p. 171)

RUMYANTSEV A. M. — The Discovery and Substantiation by Comrade Stalin of the Basic Economic Law of Socialism — Issue 1 (p. 6)

SELEZNEV I. A. — On the Coexistence of Two Systems — Capitalist and Socialist — Issue 1 (p. 65)

SOBOLEV A. I. — The Liberation Struggle of the Working Class of Capitalist Countries at the Present Stage — Issue 2 (p. 20)

TROSHIN D. M. — On the Features of the Development of Science — Issue 6 (p. 46)

YANG HING-SHUNG — The Struggle of the Communist Party of China for the Re-education of the Chinese People — Issue 3 (p. 145)

DEPARTMENT OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

GORSKY D. P. — On the Role of Language in Cognition — Issue 2 (p. 75)

GORSKY D. P., KOMLEV N. G. — On the Question of the Relationship Between Logic and Grammar — Issue 6 (p. 63)

DUDEL S. P. — On Internal Antagonistic and Non-Antagonistic Contradictions — Issue 2 (p. 57)

LOMTEV T. P. — On the Conformity of Grammatical Means of Language to the Needs of Mutual Understanding — Issue 5 (p. 76)

PILIPENKO N. V. (Yaroslavl) — Science Is the Enemy of Chance — Issue 3 (p. 20)

ROZENTAL M. M. — Materialist Dialectics as a Creatively Developing Science — Issue 4 (p. 18)

SPIRKIN A. G. — On the Question of the Laws of Language — Issue 5 (p. 89)

TAVANETS P. V. — On the Objective Content of the Laws of Formal Logic — Issue 3 (p. 34)

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

BARSUK I. Ya. (Kiev) — N. G. Chernyshevsky — Inspirer of Advanced Figures in Ukraine in Their Struggle Against Nationalism — Issue 6 (p. 103)

BASKAKOV V. G. — A Great Figure of Revolutionary Russia N. G. Chernyshevsky — Issue 3 (p. 88)

DMITERKO Ya. D. — T. G. Shevchenko — Comrade-in-Arms of Russian Revolutionary Democrats — Issue 4 (p. 99)

KESSIDI F. Kh. — Dialectics and Materialism in the Philosophy of Heraclitus of Ephesus — Issue 5 (p. 130)

KUZNETSOV K. T. — On the Political and Philosophical Views of K. Marx in the Early Period of His Activity — Issue 5 (p. 107)

LECHNER E. A. — N. P. Ogarev and Natural Science — Issue 3 (p. 164)

Corr. Member Academy of Sciences USSR MIKHAILOV A. A. (Leningrad) — Nicolaus Copernicus — A Revolutionist in Science — Issue 4 (p. 89)

OIZERMAN T. I. — From the History of the Ideological and Political Struggle of Marx and Engels in the 1840s (On the 70th Anniversary of the Death of Karl Marx) — Issue 3 (p. 70)

PODMARKOV V. G. (Kharkov) — J. Dietzgen — An Outstanding German Thinker and Militant Materialist — Issue 6 (p. 114)

PRUTSKOV N. I. (Pushkin) — G. I. Uspensky on K. Marx's Letter to the Editorial Board of the Journal "Otechestvennye Zapiski" (On the 70th Anniversary of the Death of Karl Marx) — Issue 3 (p. 81)

SIDOROV M. I. — On Certain Patterns of the Development of Philosophy — Issue 3 (p. 59)

TIKHVINSKY S. L. — The Chinese Utopian Kang Youwei — Issue 6 (p. 126)

KHACHATURIAN A. B. — The Great Armenian Enlightener-Democrat Kh. Abovyan and Advanced Russian Culture — Issue 5 (p. 118)

CHUCHMAREV V. I. — On Denis Diderot's Study of the Russian Language — Issue 4 (p. 192)

YANG HING-SHUNG — On the Struggle of Materialism Against Idealism in Ancient China — Issue 2 (p. 106)

DEPARTMENT OF AESTHETICS

BUROV A. I. — On the Specifics of Content and Form in Art — Issue 5 (p. 142)

DRAGOMIRETSKAYA N. V. — Reality and the Beautiful in the Aesthetics of N. G. Chernyshevsky — Issue 4 (p. 76)

KEMENOV V. S. — On the Objective Nature of the Laws of Realistic Art — Issue 4 (p. 50)

KUDENKO O. I. — On Certain Principles of Typification in the Satire of V. Mayakovsky — Issue 5 (p. 162)

LOMUNOV K. N. — Leo Tolstoy in the Struggle for Realism in Art (On the 125th Anniversary of the Birth of the Great Russian Writer) — Issue 5 (p. 178)

MATYSHCHIN F. Ya. — V. I. Lenin's Struggle Against the Vulgarizing Views of Proletkult on Art — Issue 1 (p. 111)

NIKOLAEVA G. E. — On the Specifics of Fiction — Issue 6 (p. 83)

SEMIVOLOS M. V. (Sumy) — Against an Erroneous Interpretation of the Problem of the National Character (*Narodnost*) of Literature (Letter to the Editor) — Issue 3 (p. 187)

ELSBERG Ya. E. — For a Combative Soviet Satire — Issue 2 (p. 95)

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY OF NATURAL SCIENCE

KARPACHEVA S. M. — On the Constant Mobility of Atoms of the Inorganic World — Issue 6 (p. 150)

KEDROV B. M. — Mendeleev's Law and the Task of Controlling Nuclear Processes — Issue 5 (p. 53)

KONIKOVA A. S., KRITSMAN M. G. — Living Protein in the Light of Modern Biochemical Research — Issue 1 (p. 143)

LEPESHINSKAYA O. B. — Creative Significance of the Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin for the Development of Natural Science — Issue 2 (p. 120)

LEPESHINSKAYA O. B. — Creative Significance of the Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin for the Development of Natural Science (Second Article) — Issue 3 (p. 46)

MERLIN V. S. (Kazan) — Against Reactionary Theory in Psychology — Issue 5 (p. 220)

Acad. OPARIN A. I. — On the Question of the Origin of Life — Issue 1 (p. 138)

PLYUSHCH L. N. — On the Foundations of the New Cell Theory — Issue 4 (p. 185)

PRATUSEVICH Yu. M. — On the Speech-Motor Analyzer and Its Role in the Process of Cognition — Issue 6 (p. 140)

SKABICHEVSKY A. P. (Omsk) — The Problem of the Origin of Life on Earth and the Theory of Acad. A. I. Oparin — Issue 2 (p. 150)

STUKOV A. P., YAKUSHEV S. A. (Chelyabinsk) — On Protein as the Carrier of Life — Issue 2 (p. 139)

TSYBENKO V. A. — Scientific Significance of D. I. Pisarev's Articles on Natural Science — Issue 1 (p. 126)

YAGUNKOVA V. P. — On the Basic Principles of Academician I. P. Pavlov's Reflex Theory — Issue 3 (p. 109)

CRITIQUE OF BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY

BAKRADZE K. S. (Tbilisi) — Logical Empiricism — Weapon of Imperialist Reaction — Issue 3 (p. 137)

Acad. DEBORIN A. M. — Agents of American Imperialism — Issue 1 (p. 151)

YEPISKOPOSOV G. L. — The Philosophy of George Santayana — An Ideological Weapon of Imperialism — Issue 3 (p. 156)

ZASLAVSKY D. I. — Philosophical Ravings of the Vatican's Jesuits — Issue 4 (p. 127)

KOLMAN E. — Bertrand Russell — Squire of Imperialism — Issue 2 (p. 168)

KOLMAN E. — Where Subjectivism Leads Physicists — Issue 6 (p. 171)

MATERIALIST — Whom Does Cybernetics Serve — Issue 5 (p. 210)

MATERIALIST — Philosophy of the Doomed (On the Latest Revelations of Karl Jaspers) — Issue 3 (p. 120)

MELVIL Yu. K. — The Philosophy of Mysticism and Reaction — Issue 4 (p. 147)

TROFIMOV P. S. — Modern Reactionary American-British Bourgeois Aesthetics in the Service of US Monopolies — Issue 2 (p. 183)

FRANTSEV Yu. P. — The Degradation of Modern Bourgeois Sociology — Issue 6 (p. 157)

DISCUSSIONS AND DEBATES

Corr. Member Academy of Sciences USSR ALEKSANDROV A. D. (Leningrad) — Regarding Certain Views on the Theory of Relativity — Issue 5 (p. 225)

ANTONOV N. P. (Ivanovo) — Dialectical Materialism — The Theoretical Foundation of Psychology — Issue 1 (p. 195)

DISHKANT G. P. (Dnepropetrovsk) — On the Physical Meaning of the Wave Function — Issue 4 (p. 212)

LEKHTMAN Ya. B. (Leningrad) — For the Restructuring of Psychology Based on the Teachings of I. P. Pavlov — Issue 2 (p. 219)

Corr. Member Academy of Sciences USSR MAKSIMOV A. A. — The Struggle for Materialism in Modern Physics — Issue 1 (p. 175)

OMELYANOVSKY M. E. (Kiev) — Against the Idealistic Interpretation of Statistical Ensembles in Quantum Mechanics — Issue 2 (p. 201)

PETROVSKY A. V. — On the Objective Nature of Psychological Patterns — Issue 3 (p. 173)

ROZOV A. I. (Minsk) — Reflections of a Rank-and-File Psychologist — Issue 3 (p. 177)

SAVICH A. V. — On the Existence of Trajectories in Microparticles — Issue 2 (p. 209)

SEMEVSKY B. N. (Leningrad) — Certain Issues of Economic Geography — Issue 2 (p. 213)

SIMONOV P. V. — On the Term "Higher Nervous Activity of Man" — Issue 4 (p. 213)

TERLETSKY Ya. P. — On the Presentation of the Foundations of Special Relativity — Issue 4 (p. 207)

Acad. FOCK V. A. — Against Ignorant Criticism of Modern Physical Theories — Issue 1 (p. 168)

KHROMOV N. A. (Leningrad) — On the Scientific Understanding of Mental, or Higher Nervous, Activity — Issue 4 (p. 216)

CHELINTSEV G. V. — On Chemical Science — Issue 6 (p. 190)

CRITIQUE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAZHENOV L. B. — *M. M. Rozental*. The Marxist Dialectical Method. Gospolitizdat. 1952 — Issue 1 (p. 203)

BELOV A. P. — On the 200th Anniversary of M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University — Issue 2 (p. 235)

BOIKO E. I., KOLBANOVSKY V. N. — On Certain Shortcomings in the Coverage of Philosophical Issues in Psychology — Issue 3 (p. 180)

GERMAN L. I. — The Theoretical Bankruptcy of American Sociologists — Issue 4 (p. 224)

GORSKY D. P., IVANOV M. S. — A New Book on the Theory of Knowledge — Issue 3 (p. 192)

EGERMAN E. Ya. — "Literature and National Life" by Antonio Gramsci — Issue 1 (p. 215)

ERMOLOVA N. V. — The Struggle of French Communists for Progressive Ideology — Issue 5 (p. 252)

KOMAROV E. A. — Expose Bourgeois Ideology More Deeply — Issue 4 (p. 219)

KOPNIN P. V. (Tomsk) — A New Book on Logic — Issue 6 (p. 205)

KURSANOV G. A. (Sverdlovsk), MIKHAILOV S. I. — G. F. Aleksandrov's "I. V. Stalin's Works on Linguistics and Questions of Historical Materialism" — Issue 2 (p. 225)

NARSKY I. S. — A Polish Philosophical Journal in the Struggle for the Propaganda of Marxism — Issue 1 (p. 208)

POLYAKOV I. A., MIKULINSKY S. R. — Expose Concepts Hostile to Marxism — Issue 2 (p. 230)

Acad. TOPCHIEV A. V. — A Solid Work by a Progressive English Scientist — Issue 5 (p. 246)

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

BAEV B. F. (Kiev) — At the Conference of Psychologists in Kiev — Issue 4 (p. 236)

Conversation with Professor Bernal — Issue 6 (p. 221)

Dissertations in Philosophy Defended in 1951–1952 — Issue 1 (p. 230)

ZAITSEVA M. I. — Meeting with Polish Philosophers — Issue 6 (p. 218)

KAIRYAN V. M. — Tasks of Soviet Philosophers in Light of the Decisions of the September Plenum of the CC CPSU — Issue 6 (p. 209)

KACHALOV I. P. — In the Department of Economic, Philosophical, and Legal Sciences of the USSR Academy of Sciences — Issue 6 (p. 226)

KOLPAKOV A. P. (Stalinabad) — On the Work of the Philosophy Department of the Academy of Sciences of the Tajik SSR — Issue 6 (p. 231)

KUKARKIN B. V., MASEVICH A. G. — Soviet Astronomers at the VIII Congress of the International Astronomical Union in Rome — Issue 1 (p. 222)

New Works of the Institute of Philosophy, USSR Academy of Sciences (According to the Publication Plan for 1954) — Issue 5 (p. 264)

PETROVSKY A. V. — On the Results of the Conference on Psychology — Issue 5 (p. 261)

SEMENOV A. A. — On the Results of the Discussion of Academician L. I. Mandelstam's Philosophical Views — Issue 3 (p. 199)