Thank you for downloading the book from the free e-library Royallib.com
All books by the author
The same book in other formats

Enjoy reading!

Historical materialism

The staff of the Institute of Philosophy of the Communist Academy under the leadership of M. B. Mitin and I. P. Razumovsky

1932

From the editorial board

The second part of the textbook is the result of the collective work of the team of the Institute of Philosophy of the Comacademy consisting of comrades: Vasilyeva, Gak, Lukachevsky, Mitin, Razumovsky, Remizov, Sekerskaya, Torner and Zimbalist.

The main work on the first three chapters was carried out by vol. Razumovsky, on the fourth chapter-vol. Remizov, on the fifth — T. Tsimbalistom, on the sixth — T. Tsymbalistom. Seckerskaya, on the seventh — T. Lukachevsky, on the eighth — t. Gakom, on the ninth chapter-tt. Vasilyeva and Torner. Final version and general guidance-tt. Mitin and Razumovsky. Researchers and students of the Institute of the Red Professorship of Philosophy were involved in viewing the facets and layouts.

A general description of the principles of textbook construction and the arrangement of materials used in the textbook, as well as criticism of existing educational literature, are given in the preface to part 1 of the textbook. The chapter devoted to the national question and problems of national culture, which was planned by the team, could not be included in the 1st edition of the book due to circumstances beyond the control of the editorial board and the publishing house.

Since we have the first experience of creating such a Marxist-Leninist textbook for comunities and universities, the result of our work cannot be free from significant shortcomings and possible blunders and mistakes. The team of authors and editors encourage researchers, teachers and students who use this book to help us make the necessary corrections and improvements for future publication through timely, in-depth and tough self-criticism.

M. Mitin, I. Razumovsky, April 15, 1932

Chapter 1. Dialectical Materialism and the Materialist understanding of History

1.1. Unity of historical materialism with the philosophy and politics of the proletariat

The distinctive feature of Marxist-Leninist philosophy is that it consistently and holistically pursues *to the end* the unity of revolutionary *theory* and revolutionary *practice* , such as the philosophy of the bourgeoisie has never known and cannot know. Philosophical abstractions, taken by themselves, have no value-according to Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Only in the process of

revolutionizing the world do we, in Marx's words, come to know the reality, the power, the "worldliness" of our philosophical thinking. The inconsistency of the old philosophical materialism in this respect, its incompleteness and one-sidedness required Marx and Engels to further deepen and develop philosophical materialism, to "complete" it, and to complete materialism by extending it to the knowledge of human *society* and its *history* .

Historical materialism, created by Marx and Engels and further developed by Lenin, is the greatest achievement of scientific thought, which gave the working class a powerful instrument of knowledge and struggle. "Thanks to two discoveries," wrote Engels, " namely, the materialist understanding of history and surplus value, that secret of capitalist production, *socialism has become a science*."

The entire revolutionary significance of the materialist understanding of history can be properly appreciated and understood only if the inner and indissoluble *connection and unity* that exists between the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism and its historical theory , between *dialectical and historical materialism , is revealed* . It is not surprising that the bourgeois "refuters" of Marx and the opportunists of all stripes who echo them have directed the arrows of their criticism precisely against this most important proposition of Marxism. Old revisionism-in the person of the venerable Ed. Bernstein and others. — I acted quite frankly in this matter. He simply rejected the "treacherous" dialectic; he denied the material conditionality of the historical development that would lead us to a communist society. He understood historical materialism as a theory of peaceful" evolution "of bourgeois society, in which "movement" is everything, the goal is nothing."

The theoretical father of modern social-fascism, K. Kautsky, despite the fact that he has long ago completely betrayed Marxism — he was never a consistent Marxist — still prefers to hide shamefacedly behind the robes of "Marxist" phraseology. Kautsky is trying to prove that he stands firm for materialism, for *a materialist* understanding of history! He admits that " historical materialism is materialism applied to history, "and that Marx and Engels proceeded in their investigations"from a certain philosophy." But Kautsky manages to reduce all his "philosophical materialism" to a "method." At the same time, he separates the "method" of historical knowledge from the philosophical worldview and comes to the conclusion that "the"materialistic" understanding of history *is not connected with materialistic philosophy*." According to Kautsky, " it is compatible (vereinbar) with any worldview that uses the method of dialectical materialism, or at least is not in an incompatible (unvereinbar) contradiction with the latter[1]." In other words, historical materialism is "compatible" with every philosophy except the one with which it is "incompatible"!

Kautsky here, in retrospect, only in a somewhat more veiled form adopted the positions of his revisionist colleagues-Otto Bauer, Max Adler, Friedrich Adler, Forlander, and A. Bogdanov. The latter declared a quarter of a century ago that Marx's historical materialism did not need any "crude", "metaphysical", or "outdated" philosophical materialism, and that Marx's historical theory was completely "compatible" with Kantianism, Machism, positivism, and ethical socialism. Our domestic " legal Marxists — - Struve, Bulgakov, Berdyaev, Tugan-Baranovsky (outspoken anti-Russian capitalists) - also believed that Marx's historical and economic theory was not connected with the philosophy of materialism, and sought to find a new "philosophical justification" for it in Kantianism.

Kautsky breaks *away from the unity of worldview and method* that distinguishes the philosophy of dialectical materialism and an entirely penetrating and materialist understanding of history.

Philosophical abstractions that are separate from real history, of course, have no value. They lead to scholasticism, to idealism. But even Marx's historical theory, if we try to separate it from its philosophical basis, from the materialist dialectic, loses all its profound philosophical and revolutionary significance. It then becomes one of the many varieties of bourgeois "positivism" in

1 K. Kautsky, Die materialistische Geschichtsauffassung, B. I.

history, the so-called "*economic materialism* ". Economic materialism is a typically bourgeois theory that differs from other theories only in that it emphasizes the importance of the economic " factor "among other" factors " that drive the history of society. At the same time, the development of the economy itself is often understood in a purely idealistic way.

Such "Marxism" emasculated by the revisionists is, of course, in no way dangerous to the bourgeoisie and is readily accepted by it. A considerable number of bourgeois "objective" historians and economists now stand on the basis of an "economic" explanation of history. They "accept" Marx's economic and, with reservations, historical theory. They tend to "recognize" even the existence of classes and class struggles in modern society. But they do not carry their " Marxism "to one essential" trifle": to the recognition of the historical and transitory character of all class inequality, to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which leads to a classless society, to the abolition of classes. For such recognition, "economic" materialism alone is not enough: it requires a revolutionary materialist dialectic.

Historical materialism is the application of dialectical materialism to the knowledge of society; it is the extension of philosophical materialism to the knowledge of social life in order to change it. This unity of dialectical and historical materialism, their direct and indissoluble connection, is immediately revealed when we approach the main task that, in Marx's words, the materialist understanding of history sets itself: "*the explanation of social consciousness from social existence*." "Materialism in general," Lenin wrote on this subject, " recognizes an objectively real being (matter), independent of consciousness, of sensations, of experience, etc., of humanity. Historical materialism recognizes social existence as independent of the social consciousness of humanity. Consciousness here and there is only *a reflection of being* , at best an approximately correct (adequate, ideally accurate) reflection of it. In this philosophy of Marxism, cast out of a single piece of steel, not a single basic premise, not a single essential part can be taken out without departing from objective truth, without falling into the arms of bourgeois-reactionary lies[2]."

We will easily fall into the swamp of bourgeois historical science if, in applying materialism to history, we deviate even one step from the consistent application of *the materialist theory of reflection* . But we will remain in the same quagmire if , in studying *the objective* course of social development independent of consciousness, we forget about revolutionary *dialectics* . There is a dialectical relationship between object and subject, between social existence and social consciousness in their historical development. Social consciousness reflects social existence and finds its explanation in the latter. But this consciousness does not play a passive role in the development of social existence. Social consciousness has *the opposite effect* on the development of social existence, and this role of social consciousness is all the more significant, the more correctly consciousness reflects the objective laws of society's development. To embrace *the objective* dialectic of social existence , independent of public consciousness, in order to be as clear, correct, *and critical as possible* to be able to influence the course of social development with the help of one's own social consciousness, the class consciousness of the advanced revolutionary class, in order to determine one's own class positions, *one's role* in the struggle for the course of historical development — this is what Marx and Lenin saw *as the main task* of historical materialism. And in this they saw the main difference between *the materialist* and the vulgar historical *objectivist* .

In the portrayal of the theorists of international Menshevism, historical materialism often turns into an almost fatalistic theory, into a kind of passive recorder of the objectively inevitable, inexorable course of historical development. They depict the objectively necessary course of the historical movement quite abstractly, outside the real class movement, without taking into account the class struggle — which, in Marx's words, is the greatest driving force in history. Hence the professorial objectivism of these caricatured " Marxists." In words, they are eager to adopt a supposedly objectively "impartial", *надклассовую*supra-class point of view in assessing historical development, but in reality they are the spokesmen for the moods and aspirations of the

2 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — стр. 267.

bourgeoisie.

Historical materialism bears the least resemblance to the "objective," "non-class," "non-party," "apolitical" theory that Kautsky, Max Adler, and other theoretical hangers-on of the bourgeoisie seek to whitewash it under. Revolutionary Marxism sees in the materialist understanding of history *an effective theory of history.* a theory, and moreover a theory whose exponents take definite class and party positions in the modern class struggle. Historical materialism from beginning to end — class, *party* theory. Historical materialism is inextricably linked with the worldview *of the proletariat* and its party, with revolutionary dialectics, with the theory of class struggle and proletarian revolution — with scientific communism. Only confusions and eclecticism can divide the materialistic explanation of history into parts, accept some of these parts and reject others. In its correct understanding, historical materialism is therefore *absolutely unacceptable* to bourgeois social science, and is organically alien and hostile to it. Historical materialism is inseparable from its revolutionary content, unthinkable without the closest connection with *the political struggle* of the working class. The combination of the highest and most rigorous *scientific* character , which makes historical materialism the highest achievement of social science, with *revolutionism*— a combination, moreover, which is intrinsically and indissolubly given in historical theory itself — this, in Lenin's words, is its irresistible attraction.

1.2. Main features of the materialist understanding of history

In the most preliminary form, we will focus on some of the most important features of the materialist understanding of history, on those features of it that were developed in the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

It would be quite wrong, as is sometimes done, to regard historical materialism as the result of Marx's economic research alone, or to date its origin with the appearance of the famous "Preface to a Critique of Political Economy." Historical materialism developed as a coherent and integral scientific theory, as a result of Marx and Engels ' critical overcoming *of all three sources of Marxism*: classical philosophy, political economy, and utopian socialism. In all these three sources, separate elements of the future materialist understanding of history were being prepared historically: as we will see later, it was prepared in the teachings of old materialism on the role of the social environment, and in some aspects of Hegel's philosophy of history and his philosophy of law, and in the teachings of classical economists on labor as a source of wealth, and in the views of utopian socialists on social contradictions and class struggle.

But all these philosophical, historical, economic, etc. social theories depicted only certain aspects of the historical process. These theories produced only raw material, which they could not raise to the level *of scientific generalization* . The latter task was hindered by reasons rooted in the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nature of these doctrines. This was hindered by their inconsistent implementation of materialism, which preserved the predominance of idealism in history, as well as the absence in these theories of a dialectical view of social relations as changing, transitory, historical formations. The old philosophy of history and the classics of political economy were mainly based on the view of recognizing some eternal, unchangeable "essence" of man; they sought this essence in the aspirations and interests of the individual, in the bourgeois individual "separated" from society, who supposedly enters into a contract with other individuals and thus creates a "civil" society. They knew only about "individual individuals and civil society" *(Marx)*. They limited themselves to the consideration of the ideological motivations of individual activity, without further investigation of the material roots of these ideas in the social conditions of production; at best, the old materialists spoke of the" population " in general, of the "peoples" appearing in history, of the "human race" , etc.

The main drawback of all previous historical theories was their inability to take the correct *path* of truly scientific generalization. First, their inability to grasp *the objective regularity* in the development of society, their inability to reveal the roots of the ideological motives that motivate individuals to act in the conditions *of material* production. Secondly, in the inability of these

theorists to rise from the actions of individual individuals to the actions *of the masses* , to the actions of entire social *classes* . All these shortcomings of the old philosophy of history and political economy are explained by the peculiarities of the economic situation of the bourgeoisie and the worldview that is conditioned by them. It was necessary to embark on the path of resolute critical overcoming of the old contemplative materialism and the old idealistic philosophy of history. Only the philosophy of dialectical materialism, the philosophy of the new revolutionary class, the proletariat, could do this. Having absorbed and critically reworked all the highest achievements of previous social theories, linking social theory with the direct revolutionary practice of the proletariat, Marxism, in Lenin's words, managed to raise old history and sociology "to the level of a science." Marxism pointed out "the way to the scientific study of history as a single, natural process in all its enormous versatility and inconsistency."[3]

The historical materialism of Marx and Engels was the first to give a correct dialectical solution to the question of the relation between *nature and society* . It was necessary first of all to eliminate that *gap* The distinction between nature and history, which was drawn by idealists and "subjective" thinkers, is "as if these two things are separate from each other, as if man is not historical nature and does not have a natural, natural history[4]before him." But it was also necessary to put an end to the previous attempts to approach society *in a naturalistic* way , to identify society with the rest of nature, with physical, biological, etc. phenomena — to put an end to the views that were characteristic in particular of the old mechanical materialism. It was necessary to show *the unity* of nature and history, while correctly taking into account *the specific*features of social life and the laws of its development that distinguish it from the rest of nature. This only correct position was advanced and developed by Marxism. The notorious "essence" of man was revealed as his true essence-in the "*totality of social relations* "*(Marx)*, "defined concretely and historically" *(Lenin)* . The qualitative peculiarity of social life, which distinguishes society from the rest of nature, was discovered by Marx and Engels in the social process *of labor* , in the successive modes of production, due to the change in the nature of the combination of labor power with the means of production. Material, socially conditioned production, the state of the productive forces, and the totality of the relations of production that are formed in the process of people's production of material life and correspond to a certain stage of development of their material productive forces, and moreover over the vast span of the preceding history of antagonistic, class relations - this is the main, decisive *basis* of society, from which Marx and Engels for understanding the structure of any society and the laws of its development. Thus, they drew a distinction between the economic content of social life and its political and ideological forms, between the economic structure of society, which is its real foundation, and the legal and political superstructure that rises on this basis and the forms of social consciousness that are conditioned by it. "The mode of production of material life," says Marx's famous materialist thesis, " determines the process of social, political, and spiritual life in general. It is not the consciousness of people that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, *social existence that determines their consciousness* »[5].

Speaking about society, Marx emphasized with particular force *the historical* character of each stage of the formation and development of society, the need to consider society not only as a unity of the history of mankind, but always in its concrete definiteness, at each particular historical stage of its development. "The relations of production," Marx wrote, " collectively form what are called social relations, *society*, and moreover *society at a certain historical stage of development*-a society with a peculiar character that differs from others. Ancient society, feudal society, and bourgeois society are such aggregates of production relations, each of which simultaneously

---

3 B. Ленин, Карл Маркс / Соч., т. XVIII — с. 13.

4 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, О Фейербахе / Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 217.

5 К. Маркс, К критике политической экономии. Предисловие. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

signifies *a special stage in the development of the history of mankind* »[6]."

The concept of socio-economic formation is the basic concept of the theory of historical materialism. It solved the difficulties that remained insurmountable for both the idealistic and the vulgarly materialistic, mechanistic understanding of history. It pointed the way to an objective scientific *generalization* of social phenomena, to finding the material foundations of the historical process. It allowed us to establish *the specific* difference between any society and nature, the qualitative originality of social life and the regularity of the course of historical development. Instead of starting out with empty arguments about society "in general," it has brought to the fore the study *of specific , historically defined features.* systems of industrial relations. The concept of socio-economic formation made it possible to reveal the real roots of people's ideological motivations in their *material practice* , to see the reflection in the forms of public consciousness*отражение* social existence. Thus, historical materialism made it possible to reveal the real role that the consciousness and will of an individual can play in historical development.

But this accomplished only one part of the task facing Marx and Engels. Applying their materialist thesis to modern antagonistic society and to the study of a number of economic formations that preceded it, Marx and Engels discovered *a pattern* in the development of these societies — the pattern *of class struggle* . The theory of class struggle becomes for Marx and Engels the guiding thread of social research in class society. The aspirations, interests, and actions of individuals are studied by Marx and Engels as conditioned by the social conditions of life of large masses of the population-classes. These aspirations and actions of individuals were generalized and reduced to the actions of social groups, to the actions and struggles *of classes*— exploiting and exploited — which differ in their position in the system of production relations, their attitude to the means of production, and their role in the social organization of labor.

The entire previous history of society, with the exception of the epoch of primitive communism, is the history of the class struggle. All social economic formations with an antagonistic structure are systems of production relations, the historical pattern of development of which *is based on class antagonism* , has *a class content , is carried out in the movement and struggle of classes* . The driving force of history is the antagonism between the class that dominates under the existing order of production relations and the productive class that it exploits, which is the largest productive force. The internal contradictions of these economic formations inevitably lead to the fact that " at a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces — according to Marx's famous formulation — fall into contradiction with the existing relations of production, or, to use a legal expression, with the property relations within which they have hitherto operated. From the forms of development of the productive forces, these relations become their fetters. Then comes the era *of social revolution* »[7]."

This is how Marx and Engels discovered and justified *the universal* law of the development of class formations — the law of social revolution. Their careful study of the special economic structure of the modern capitalist social formation and the antagonistic laws that drive its development revealed to Marx and Engels the inevitability of a conflict between the growing productive forces and the production relations of capitalism, and the impossibility of resolving under capitalism its main contradiction between social production and individual appropriation. In this way they proved the historical regularity *of the proletarian revolution* and the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, during which the struggle ends and the final destruction of classes takes place. This is how the materialist understanding of history leads Marx and Engels to *scientific communism* .

"Communism for us is not *a state* that must be established," Marx and Engels wrote in their earlier work on Feuerbach, " not *an ideal* that reality must conform to. We call communism *the real*

---

6 К. Маркс, Наёмный труд и капитал. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

7 К. Маркс, К критике политической экономии. Предисловие.

a movement that destroys the present state. The doctrine of the communist revolution[8], as a necessary component of the materialist understanding of history and the necessary conclusion drawn from it, runs like a red thread through all the works of Marx and Engels, beginning with the German Ideology and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution, and ending with the German Revolution.The Communist Manifesto." The doctrine of revolution is also fully imbued with the famous formulation of Marx's preface to the Critique of Political Economy. Marx's entire economic teaching, which he developed in Capital, is also based on the materialist conception of history — in its only correct and revolutionary meaning. Here Marx sets himself the task of studying the capitalist economic formation to show the full power of the materialist method: to explain the regularity of development and to justify the objective inevitability of the death of capitalism.

A revolution in the economic foundation, according to Marx, entails a transformation of the entire legal, political, and ideological superstructure. Marx suggests a strict distinction between the material revolution in the conditions of production and the reflection of this conflict in political and ideological forms. He suggests not judging a revolutionary epoch by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, *explaining consciousness itself from the contradictions of material life* . From these contradictions of material life historically arises the *communist consciousness*, the consciousness of the necessity of a proletarian revolution, in the minds of the exploited class, the proletariat. This task, according to Marx, is put forward by humanity only when " the *material conditions* necessary for its solution exist, or when they are at least in the process of arising[9]."

However, it would be a grave mistake to attach any fatalistic significance to Marx's last statement. It is wrong to interpret it in the spirit of Menshevik underestimation of the role of political struggle and social consciousness in historical development. Marx repeatedly noted the extremely important role that politics plays in history, since it is "a concentrated expression of economics." Marx's dictum that "ideas become a material force because they possess the masses"is also well known. Engels , in a number of his letters, never tired of explaining the significance of the *reverse effect* that the superstructure always exerts on the economy in the course of historical development.

In its development, Marxism had to subject the most severe criticism to the bourgeois eclectic theory of the multitude of" factors " of historical development, according to which both the economy, the political "factor", the ideological "factor", and the racial "factor" are considered as *equal* factors in this historical development. Marx and Engels elucidated the significance *of economic* necessity, which *ultimately* determines the character of both political and ideological development and "makes its way through the crowd of historical accidents" *(Engels)*. However, the materialism pursued by Marx and Engels in history has nothing in common with the one-sided and limited "*economic* materialism", which understands the dependence of superstructures on the economic "factor"in a purely mechanical and one-sided way. Nor does Marxism have anything in common with the Menshevik fatalistic theory of "productive forces", which sees in political organization and in social consciousness only a passive product of the development of the conditions of production. For the success of the proletarian revolution, both objective and subjective prerequisites are necessary. the proletariat needs a radical revolution, and it needs to be organized into a revolutionary *party* .

The role of the individual in history is therefore not at all denied by Marxism, as the

8 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, О Фейербахе / Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 223–227.

9 К. Маркс, К критике политической экономии. Предисловие.

subjectivist Narodniks once believed; this role of the individual receives only a correct assessment. By eliminating the Popish fable of "free will" and always considering the individual as a member of a certain class, in certain material conditions and guided by certain class interests, Marxism does not forget that "people make their own history" *(Marx)* . In their activities, each individual has the opportunity not only to participate spontaneously, but also consciously in the development of historical necessity — to contribute to this latter, to determine their role in the revolutionary process, in which they go beyond the limits of given production relations, to help accelerate or slow down this historical development. This happens if he correctly understands the laws of this development, the laws of this necessity. The influence of an individual on social development is realized to the extent that he links his activity with the activity of certain *classes and parties*, *борьба*whose struggle moves history forward.

"Freedom is a recognized necessity" - this statement of Engels is fundamental to historical materialism as a scientific theory of the proletarian revolution.

1.3. Historical materialism as a scientific theory, as a method, as a guide for action

Once we understand the basic features of the materialist understanding of history, it is easier to resolve the other question. What exactly is meant by historical materialism? It is obvious that when we speak of materialism in history, we are already referring to the concretization of the general *foundations* of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy *of dialectical materialism* , which we have been dealing with up to now. Of course, we must not forget for a moment that philosophical materialism must necessarily be "completed to the top", carried out to the end, and that in this sense historical materialism is a necessary component of Marxist-Leninist philosophy itself. But at the same time, in historical materialism we have *a special* application of dialectical materialism to history, just as we also apply it to the study of nature. It is obvious, on the other hand, that historical materialism cannot be reduced to the single ideas of scientific communism developed by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto, and to the basic propositions of proletarian strategy and tactics that follow from this. It is enough, however, to trace Marx's fundamental materialist thesis consistently to present-day bourgeois society in order to arrive at the theory of scientific communism and at the tactics of the proletarian struggle as a necessary "side of materialism" *(Lenin)*. . Any scholastic and excessive differentiation between the philosophy, historical theory, and program of the political struggle of Marxism-Leninism would only prevent us from understanding the organic unity of all the sides and components of the dialectical-materialist view, which has been consistently carried out to the end. Nevertheless, in order for us to have a correct idea of this connection, of the unity that exists between the general foundations of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, the materialist understanding of history and scientific communism, it is extremely important to show *the features*of historical materialism as a scientific theory and scientific method.

So, first of all, what is historical materialism-a scientific *theory* or *method* historical, social cognition, social methodology? On this point, two sharply opposing points of view have emerged in our modern Soviet literature. Some authors believe that historical materialism is primarily a *theory*, in the sense that it sets *out the general principles of historical materialism.* the doctrine of society and the laws of its development. This point of view was most clearly expressed by Comrade Bukharin. According to T. Bukharin, historical materialism "is *a general teaching about society and the laws of its development*, i.e., sociology… The fact that it (the theory of historical materialism) is *a method* It does not in any way destroy its significance as a sociological *theory.*" "Sociology is the most *general*(*abstract*) of the social sciences..."[10]

We will return to the question of "sociology" later. But it is not difficult to see that in these views on the subject of historical materialism we have a gap typical of Comrade Bukharin's

10 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — стр. 12.

mechanistic views between the "general doctrine of society" and the concrete laws of historical development. Tov. Bukharin makes a clear distinction between a theory taken by itself and the same theory as a "method for history", between "abstract" historical materialism and "concrete" history as "material" for sociological generalizations. Historical materialism, in this understanding, appears as a set of abstract theoretical presuppositions that are applied "from the outside" to concrete historical phenomena.

Another point of view, outwardly opposed, but in reality very close to the first, found its expression in Menshevik idealism: here the emphasis is placed on historical materialism only as a social methodology, as a kind of abstract logic or "dialectic" of social cognition. For example, according to Karev, in historical materialism, as opposed to mechanismism, we must " put forward its *methodological and historical* content." Along with materialist dialectics as a general methodology and dialectic of nature, " we get historical materialism, the dialectic of history, which is the methodology of the social sciences... ""The task of historical materialism is to develop the *prerequisites* by which we should approach the 'study of history'." This, according to Karev, is the" methodological content " of historical materialism. The "historical content" of historical materialism, according to this point of view, consists, according to Karev, in the fact that historical materialism "studies *various forms of materialism."* the laws of various social forms; but *the transition* of these laws, their change, and *the method of studying this change remain common, binding them* »[11]together ."

The author we are quoting refers here to old works by K. Kautsky. Kautsky has indeed developed similar views in his previous works. But this does not mean that this point of view of Kautsky and the Menshevik idealists has anything in common with a truly Marxist understanding of historical materialism. We reveal in it a peculiar combination of the most abstract "methodologizing" and at the same time a clearly empirical approach to individual forms and phenomena of the historical process. Such arguments later led Kautsky to a sad conclusion: to the separation of "method" from the materialist worldview, to an understanding of the historical peculiarities of each epoch in the spirit of vulgar positivism and creeping empiricism. It is characteristic that these tendencies also occur in Menshevik idealism.

It is precisely in Karev's treatment of the subject of historical materialism that the eclectic point of view has received its vivid expression, combining, on the one hand, the separation of form from content of historical materialism as a science, abstract "methodologizing" on the question of "what this science is in its form", which is carried out without analyzing the " content historical materialism" *(Karev)* , the transformation of historical materialism into a system of bare abstractions and presuppositions, and, on the other hand, a completely empirical, vulgar-positivist approach to the study and understanding of the historical laws of individual formations.

With both of the points of view we have outlined, the proper *subject disappears* historical materialism is a historical process *of development of socio-economic formations* . In the first case, Comrade Bukharin's abstract scheme of "society *in general*", which he created in advance, replaces the study of the true historical process in its special forms of society, qualitatively different from each other. In the second case — in the case of Menshevik idealism — historical materialism disappears from the field of attention as a single integral general theory of socio-historical *development* : there are only some abstract presuppositions given in advance and a number of social phenomena that differ from one another in various forms. Even in this case, the social "method" completely loses its material, concrete historical basis. All the difference between the mechanistic and Menshevik-idealist positions on the subject of historical materialism consists only in the fact that for Comrade Bukharin it *is a general concept of historical materialism.* the doctrine of "society" is a fixed, pre-determined scale that is mechanically applied to history. The Menshevik idealists, on the other hand, dissolve the historical theory of Marxism in the "method": they transform Bukharin's "general laws" into a set of equally abstract logical categories, with which we

---

11 Н. Карев, Исторический материализм как наука / Под знаменем марксизма № 12, 1929. (Ср. И. Луппол, Ленин и философия / 1927 — с. 94–100).

only "approach" the study *of the special* laws of various social forms. Both of them do not have a historical *development process* companies.

The mechanist Bukharin extends his theory of "society *in general*" - in the form of the notorious theory of social equilibrium — to the epoch of imperialism and the transition period, seeing in the "organizing" tendency of the proletariat a direct continuation of "organized" capitalism, looking for the operation of the same laws of the market, without understanding the qualitative difference between the two periods. The Menshevik idealists also substitute a concrete study *of development* imperialism and the correlation of economic structures in the transition period are empty "methodological" abstractions. Therefore, when they talk about *the peculiarities*of imperialism and the transition period, they understand these peculiarities empirically, subjectively - they see the economy of imperialism as "progress", they regard socialist construction as a manifestation of the" idea " of collectivity, and so on.

Meanwhile, Marx, Engels, and Lenin give us all the most important instructions on the subject of the materialist understanding of history that they have developed. Their historical materialism is based on their consistent implementation of the materialist *theory of reflection* and dialectical understanding of the relationship that exists between *the general and the particular* in the process *of development* companies. Engels, speaking of historical materialism, calls it not only a method of research, but also a "historical *worldview* ", a materialist "*theory of history* ". It emphasizes the indissoluble unity of worldview and method, method and theory in historical materialism. Marx, Engels, and Lenin fought against *для механистов*the contrast between historical materialism and history , which is characteristic of both the mechanists and the Menshevik idealists*противопоставлением исторического материализма и истории*, as certain abstract and logical presuppositions and concrete historical "materialism." Logical research has always been for Marx, Engels, and Lenin nothing more than a *reflection of the past.* the same history, but only a generalized reflection of it, and therefore corrected according to the laws that the actual course of historical development itself shows.

According to Engels, Marx discovered *the law of motion* , the law *of development* human history. The general "materialistic foundations of method" *(Marx)* , which he expounded in the preface to the Critique of Political Economy, are only a reflection of the general material law of historical movement. These foundations are not at all "Bukharin's most abstract social science" or "a system of laws and categories of historical materialism"*(Karev)* . In the preface to the Critique of Political Economy, Marx outlined in the most general and basic terms *the natural-historical*, i.e., *natural, process of the development of social formations*, and explained in this way the basic *law* their development and changes. Thus, Marx gave a scientific theory of socio-historical *development* . Show the process of historical *development* This is the subject and content of historical materialism, and it is necessary to identify the internal laws that determine the transition from one formation to another and a higher one; to show the objective *regularity* of this versatile and contradictory process; to grasp in basic terms this *objective* dialectic of social development, independent of public consciousness. It is precisely in this sense that Lenin calls historical materialism "a strikingly complete and coherent scientific theory that shows how *развивается*, as a result of the growth of the productive forces, another and higher order of social life develops out of one mode[12]of life."

Historical materialism is primarily a materialist *theory of history (Engels)* , which reflects in general and basic terms the historical process *of development* social formations, which reveals the antagonistic character of this development within class society. But historical materialism is not thereby transformed into an abstract, "supra-historical", historical-philosophical *scheme* of development, to which all peoples must fatally submit, regardless of their concrete historical conditions, and which can be "applied" as a kind of "lock pick"-as Marx put it — in the solution of all historical questions. Marx resolutely protested against all empty historical schematism, against

12 В. Ленин, Три источника и три основных части марксизма.

the understanding of the "general doctrine of society" that is advanced, for example, in Comrade Bukharin's sociology. The development of society is always *concrete*, it combines *common* features with *the peculiarities* of individual historical stages. The general law of the movement of human history discovered by Marx-according to which, according to Engels ' definition, the ultimate cause of all historical events must be sought in changes, together with changes in the height of the productive forces, the mode of production and exchange, and in the class struggle that expresses these internal social contradictions within class society-this general law gets its *different meaning. specific manifestation* in various social formations. Only on the basis of a concrete study of the historically determined conditions of development of a given formation — feudal, capitalist, etc., and not from general theories about "society in general" alone, can one understand the qualitative *features* of this structure — how specifically *the general*law of the movement of history manifests itself in them. Historical materialism always studies "*society at a certain historical stage of its development* ».

Only on the basis of the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge can we understand how historical materialism becomes *a method of studying social phenomena* , a methodology of social sciences. As a scientific theory that reflects the natural-historical process of the development of social formations and at the same time the most general law of this movement in human history, as an exact formulation of this actual process, historical materialism also becomes a *methodological* theory, a "theory of method in social science" *(Lenin).* a theory that gives us "the only scientific *method of explaining history*" *(Lenin)* . This methodological technique consists in *identifying the material relations of production* this formation as the actual material *basis*of all historical development[13]. It consists, therefore, in the fact that every social and historical event can receive its own illumination and explanation with the help of historical materialism, since we explain it as a phenomenon connected with *a historically determined type of production relations and the development*of these latter; each historical phenomenon turns out to be an integral organic part of a certain socio-economic formation and is studied in the process of moving this last one.

Hence it is clear that there is no abstract social methodology that is suitable "in general": the method of historical materialism is concrete, it is determined by the special nature of the social laws under study. In this sense, historical materialism is not fenced off by a Chinese wall from concrete *history* , nor is it separated by impassable borders from Marxist *political economy* and other social sciences. Historical materialism is not an empty "abstraction" from concrete history, but a philosophical, theoretical and methodological essential content of historical science itself, reflecting the concrete process of historical development. This is what historical materialism, as a theory, reveals as an indissoluble link established by Marxism between *the logical and the historical* , between philosophy and history. Being aimed at studying the internal connection of production relations in capitalist society and in other social formations, historical materialism becomes a methodological basis for *political economy* .

Concrete historical research within a class society aims to uncover the internal contradictions and class antagonisms that underlie this way of historical life. Historical materialism, however, must not, as we have already shown, confine itself to a bare, "objective" statement of the existence of these contradictions. In the very laws of the functioning and development of this formation, historical materialism must reveal and reveal the laws of its inevitable demise, justify the need to replace it with a new social order. It should show the need *to go beyond* these relations of production, to reveal *the role of the advanced class in the struggle for a new way* of life . Historical materialism must, in short, be *a guide for revolutionary action* . Historical materialism is the unity of all these aspects: the theory of historical development, the method of social research, the guide for revolutionary action. The theory *of class struggle*remains a constant guiding thread of social research and revolutionary practice within class society.

---

13 См. В. Ленин, Что такое «друзья народа» / Соч., т. I, — с. 75, 76, 80, 93, 104, 116, 181, 189, 207.

1.4. Historical materialism and old mechanical materialism. The essence of bourgeois sociology

Such a scientific and revolutionary understanding of Marxist-Leninist historical theory, which is the only correct one, was not developed immediately. It is the result of the fierce theoretical struggle that Marxism has waged and is waging against the most diverse types of bourgeois, revisionist trends in modern society.

These theories reflect the class interests and moods of the modern bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie: they reflect the changes that took place in the position of the bourgeoisie with the transition of capitalism to its last imperialist phase, the process of fascization of the bourgeoisie, the contradictory position and duality of the petty bourgeoisie, the ideological influence of both on the working-class movement, the struggle of the proletariat for the ideological purity of its theories. In the theoretical struggle developing within the Soviet Union, the peculiarities of the position of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie under the dictatorship of the proletariat and the struggle of the proletariat for its ideological hegemony are expressed. The fierce *class struggle*with all its peculiarities in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions-this is what ultimately determines the character of the theoretical struggle that historical materialism is now waging against various types of bourgeois sociological positivism, mechanical materialism and naturalism, subjectivism, Machism, Kantian and Hegelian idealism — with all the echoes that these hostile idealists find. historical concepts in the Soviet environment, in our own party environment.

The methodological roots of these historical theories, however, lie not only in the present, but also in *the past* - in the process *of historical development* bourgeois *theoretical*thought. When we compare modern bourgeois and revolutionary theories with the old philosophy of history and sociology, we discover even more clearly their striking anti-scientific character, the dilapidation of their theoretical arguments, and all the historical insanity of decaying bourgeois theoretical thought.

This applies, first of all , to all manifestations *of mechanical materialism*, to the so-called naturalism and bourgeois sociologism in modern historical and economic science. Modern mechanical materialism and naturalism in their theoretical past go back to the views of bourgeois enlightenment philosophers of the XVII and XVIII centuries. There is, however, a significant difference between the old and modern mechanicisms in their application to history*различие*, which is due to the fundamental difference *between the two historical stages*in the development of bourgeois society.

The old mechanical materialism expressed the ideology of the impending and victorious bourgeois revolution, the views of the then rising class of the bourgeoisie. He stood at the very height of the achievements of contemporary social science, and sought to establish the revolutionary theory of the historical transformation necessary for the bourgeoisie. To do this, he subjected the old feudal privileges, all existing forms of society and the state, and all traditional ideas to a merciless critique of reason. But while it was materialism "from below", i.e., in the field of the study of nature, the old mechanical materialism - up to and including Feuerbach - was still "*idealism from above*" *(Engels)* , i.e., it remained idealism in its understanding of society and its history. His critique of the feudal order was a critique in the name of rationality, a critique that started from ideas about the true, *rational nature* of man. Being alien to the idea *of development* , the old materialism has not yet matured to a dialectical view of the conditions of social life as *changing* , *historical* products. Feudal injustices and prejudices are presented to the old materialists as a kind of ugly deviation, thanks to the delusion of people, from the eternal, unchangeable *natural laws.* the laws of human existence. The bourgeois individual with his aspirations and interests, on the contrary, is portrayed by them as a kind of reasonable embodiment of the natural, innate properties of the social structure.

A person is *a product of the social environment*, circumstances, conditions of organization, upbringing, which determine his views and activities-this was perfectly understood by the old materialists. "It's not nature that makes people evil, but our institutions make them so," Holbach said. And from this materialist philosophers draw the revolutionary conclusion that it is necessary

first *to change the conditions of the social environment*in order to be able to raise a person in virtue, in the correct understanding of their interests. Properly understood interest is, in the opinion of the old materialists, the natural basis of social morality, of the moral behavior of people. Man's natural desire for pleasure, his selfishness — not in the narrowly personal sense, but in the sense of the necessity of a coincidence between personal and social interests — this was the starting point of Helvetius ' materialistic teaching. However, these philosophers did not have a clear idea of how the social environment could and should change. Placing all their hopes on the triumph of reason, they did not see in the historical reality of feudal society itself the forces and contradictions inherent in it that were to lead it to a social revolution in the course of its development. They could not, therefore, resolve in any way the contradiction between the role played by the external social environment in history and the role of "reasonable" public opinion, i.e., the activity of people — a contradiction that disappears with a dialectical-materialistic view of social life.

Closely related to this defect was another, which no less significantly and sharply distinguished the views of the old mechanical materialism from dialectical materialism. The old materialists *did not understand the specific qualitative features* inherent in social life , unlike the rest of nature. They did not see the new special connections that are created between people in the process of social life and give it its qualitative originality; they did not understand that the "essence of a person" is a set *of social relations* with *special laws of development inherent in them each time* . Therefore, they tended to view society *in a naturalistic* way — as a simple mechanical aggregate of individuals, whose structure can easily be changed by the will of the government or on the basis of a "social contract", a legal agreement. They could, in Marx's words, rise only to the idea of separate egoistic individuals, that these latter are united in "civil society" on the basis of bourgeois law, a legal *contract* . This naturalism of the old mechanists, however, had deep class roots in the structure of the emerging bourgeois society — a society of free competition and bourgeois "equality." The "natural man" of the old mechanical materialists was, in fact, nothing more than a bourgeois individual ascended to the heavens of theory, a commodity owner.

Finally, the third and no less significant flaw in the views of the old materialists — including Feuerbach — was the *contemplative* nature of their philosophy. Social reality was perceived by him only "in the form of an object, in the form of contemplation", but not in the form of sensuous human *activity*, not in the form *of practice* . They *explained in various ways* the world without understanding *the task.* of the world. They did not see that the activity of people and the change of circumstances could coincide, and that this coincidence was achieved in the process of "*revolutionary practice* »[14]."

The next stage in the development of philosophical materialism — dialectical materialism — completely overcame all these shortcomings of the views of the old mechanical materialism. The historical materialism of Marx, Engels, and Lenin established the historical and changing character of social relations and *the objective and natural* character of their development; it emphasized *the qualitative distinctiveness of social relations.* social life and the laws governing it in comparison with the rest of nature; he made historical theory *a reflection of historical revolutionary practice* and a guide for the revolutionary action of the proletariat. The mistakes of the old mechanical materialism are entirely due to the current level of development of society and scientific knowledge. At the same time, there is no doubt that the old Mechanists ' doctrine of a properly understood interest and their conception of man as a product of the social environment played an extremely important *revolutionary role* in the development of social thought. As Marx pointed out, eighteenth-century French materialism prepared the further development *of utopian socialism*— Fourier, Owen, and others.

Utopian socialism at the beginning of the nineteenth century proceeds from the same ideas about the importance of the social environment and circumstances for the upbringing of a person, about a correctly understood interest, as a coincidence of personal and public interests, and so on.

---

14 К. Маркс, Тезисы о Фейербахе.

But along with the antagonism between feudal and bourgeois society, utopian socialism reveals a new contradiction-within bourgeois society itself, idealized by mechanical materialists.

Like the mechanical materialists, these utopian thinkers remain idealists in the field of history and politics. They do not act as representatives of the new class, the proletariat, but as former enlighteners, they want to establish on earth the kingdom of reason and justice in the interests of all mankind. Socialism remains for them a kind of absolute truth that must be revealed to erring humanity. But these utopians already feel *the class differences and contradictions* of bourgeois society. Fourier's genius rises to a masterful satire on bourgeois relations, to an understanding of the contradictory character of bourgeois " civilization." Saint-Simon, the great Utopian, still strives mechanically to explain all phenomena on the basis of the laws of gravitation, and in this way to establish a positive science of society, *social physiology* . But he already sees the bourgeois revolution as *a process of the class struggle* of the bourgeoisie against the feudal lords, as a process of transition from militarism and metaphysics to "industrialism" and positive science. Politics, in his opinion, should become a "science of production". In the views of some French bourgeois historians of the feudal restoration (Guizot, Mignet, Og. Thierry), these views of Saint-Simon on the class content of the bourgeois revolution and on the role of the bourgeoisie in it were further developed. Thus, the revolutionary traditions of the old mechanical materialism contributed *to the preparation* in utopian socialism *of the doctrine of classes and class struggle*as the driving force of history.

However, this was the end of the revolutionary possibilities of the old mechanical materialism. Following the victory of the industrial bourgeoisie, it begins to set itself new tasks - to strengthen and protect the capitalist order it has created. It seeks to justify the necessity of peaceful "progress" as opposed to the revolutionary aspirations of a new class entering the historical arena — the proletariat. These goals are pursued by the new "positive" (positive) science of society — bourgeois *sociology* . They were openly expressed by the founder of positivist sociology, Og. Comte, who calls it the science of *the order and progress*of human society. He seeks to prove the impossibility of "progress" without "order", and by order he means the conditions for the" harmonious " existence of society. The tasks of bourgeois sociology are formulated in approximately the same sense by the later, even the most "left-wing", theorists of bourgeois sociology. Kovalevsky).

The most vulgar positivism, the aversion to all kinds of "broad hypotheses", i.e., to broad philosophical generalizations, the idea that empirical social science is "philosophy unto itself" — characterize the method of bourgeois sociology. While the latest discoveries in physics, biology, and physiology fully confirm the predictions of dialectical materialism and contribute to its further development, bourgeois sociology remains imbued with the ideas of mechanismism, naturalism, and historical idealism.

First of all, it is dominated by an abstract view *of society and social laws "in general"*, which is alien to historicism , and the various "schemes" of the conditions of existence and movement of society are a reflection of purely bourgeois ideas about an "ideal" society. Bourgeois sociologists are alien to the idea of dialectical development and abrupt transition from one formation to another: they think of the development of society only as a peaceful, calm, gradual evolution, and modern bourgeois society is presented as the highest stage of development, at which only small improvements are possible in the future. Bourgeois sociologists are unwilling or unable to identify the leading principle and basis of social development — the economic structure of society-and therefore they prefer to talk about many "factors" of this development. The fear of raising the question of changing the economic structure of society forces bourgeois sociology to imagine the very evolution of society *idealistically*-as the" progress " of legal ideas, science, and spiritual "culture." Bourgeois sociology is completely alien to understanding the qualitative peculiarity of social life — social relations and the laws of their development: it therefore easily replaces the study of specific laws of social formations with general schemes covering all phenomena of nature and society (such as Spencer's scheme of "integration" and "differentiation"), or with physical and biological comparisons.

The *натуралистическое*so-called "organic school" in sociology (Comte and Spencer) is

particularly clear about the class meaning of this naturalistic understanding of the laws of social development. Its *биологический организм*representatives view society as a biological organism in which there is an "organic" division of functions between its individual organs, i.e., groups of people: some groups necessarily work, other groups, representing the" brain " of society, necessarily manage, and so on. on the inevitability of class distinctions in every society.

The other is a distinctly bourgeois trend in sociology — the so-called "social Darwinism". Following Darwin's poorly understood teaching, bourgeois sociologists seek to prove *the inevitability of struggle and competition* in modern society. The struggle of races, peoples, and social groups leads, in their opinion, only to the fact that at the expense of the weaker, "stronger", economically more "adapted" peoples and social groups survive. In this way, the enslavement of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie is highlighted, and this exploitation is perpetuated as an immutable law of the community. The basic idea of bourgeois sociology is to preserve the" order "*and balance of bourgeois society* , and to clarify the conditions of its "harmonious" existence. Bourgeois sociology does everything possible to hide behind its "objectivism", its apolitical nature, its desire to rise above class contradictions and give a "purely scientific", "impartial" coverage of the life of society, in contrast to the "one-sidedness" of historical materialism. However, this supposed objectivism of modern sociology cannot in any way cover up the class-bourgeois content that sticks out from it, which makes sociology *a class, party science*-a bourgeois science.

It is not surprising that the ideas of bourgeois sociology also have a strong influence on petty-bourgeois "socialists" and even on theorists who call themselves Marxists. Take, for example, *the subjective sociology* of narodism, which Marxism had to contend with a great deal from the first steps of its development in Russia and which was later exposed as the methodological basis of the Socialist-Revolutionary-Kulak ideology. Lenin showed in his Friends of the People how a non-dialectical understanding of society, representing it as a mechanical aggregate of individuals, leads narodniks to idealistic ideas about the possibility of changing it "at the will of society" or "at the will of the authorities." Subjective sociologists separate *the goal* of social development from the objective study *of the causes*of its development; they abstractly imagine this development as spiritual "progress". They greatly overestimate the role of "critical thinking" individuals in history, etc.

Elements of mechanismismand naturalism in the understanding of historical development, as we will see later, were not alien to such theorists as Plekhanov. Modern social fascism is entirely influenced by the ideas of bourgeois sociology *социал-фашизм*. Sociology of G. Kunov, "materialist understanding of history" by K. Kautsky, M. Adler and others. under the guise of criticizing bourgeois sociology, they actually repeat its main propositions, only disguising them in the guise of "Marxist" phraseology. Kautsky openly pushes social Darwinism into his understanding of history, considering the process of social development-according to his own" dialectic "— as a process of biological"adaptation". The vulgar theory of evolution and the mechanistic idea of the necessity for society to maintain its equilibrium permeate Kautsky's whole attitude. Naturalism in its explanation of society, its lack of understanding of the doctrine of social formations, is combined with idealism in its characterization of the development of productive forces and relations of production, with the Kantian understanding of "property", and so on. Kautsky's positivism in his views on the relation between philosophy and history, and his "objectivism", which in fact conceals Kautsky's social-fascist justification of the boundless development of capitalism, and his hatred of communism, fully correspond to this. Penetrating Soviet literature through the mechanistic and simultaneously idealistic theory of A. Bogdanov, the same basic ideas of bourgeois sociology — the theory of social equilibrium, class cooperation, etc. — found their vivid expression in the mechanistic sociology of T. Bukharin, in the "objectivist" methodology of the right-wing opportunists. On the other hand, the idealism of "subjective" sociology, its gap between political expediency and the objective study of history, its glorification of "heroes", its subjectivism and voluntarism are revived in counter-revolutionary Trotskyism and "left" opportunism.

1.5. Historical materialism in the struggle against historical idealism

Historical materialism must wage an irreconcilable struggle against all manifestations of mechanismism in our social-historical science as the main danger on the Soviet theoretical front at the present stage. But this does not mean that we can ignore and forget, even for a moment, another front — the front of the idealistic revision of historical materialism.

Idealism in history is *the main*, eternal enemy, in the struggle against which the materialist understanding of history was forged and developed. Idealism still holds a dominant position in the bourgeois historical and economic sciences of the West. It underlies the teachings of the theorists of modern social fascism. This influence of idealism has not been overcome in Soviet theoretical literature-in philosophy, in political economy, in historical science, etc., as we will see later, it finds one of its manifestations in the methodology of Menshevik idealism. Idealism also plays a prominent role in the historical views of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism and "left" opportunism. A huge role in the development of Bolshevism was played by the struggle against *Machism* , in particular with the views of A. Bogdanov and with his perversions of the historical and economic theory of Marxism. Lenin revealed all the idealism of Bogdanov's historical views. However, the influence of Bogdanovism in the field of political economy, theory of culture, art, religion was also manifested in Soviet conditions and has not yet been completely overcome. We will focus on two main idealistic trends, the exposure of which should be given special attention to historical materialism: *neo-Kantianism and new Hegelianism*in social and historical science. As we shall see, these trends, penetrating to us and manifesting themselves in our country as two varieties of idealistic revision of Marxism, take on a very thinly veiled form under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Modern neo-Kantians and neo-Hegelians in their social methodology seek to draw on the philosophy of their great predecessors, Kant and Hegel. However, the difference between old and new Kantianism and Hegelianism is perhaps even more striking than between old and new Mechanismism. These are two completely different stages in the development of the ideology of bourgeois society.

Kant's historical and philosophical works and Hegel's philosophy of history reflected the complex, tortuous path of development of the bourgeois revolution in Germany in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Kant's theory of society and his views on world history, as well as his entire teaching in general, were called by Marx and Engels the "German theory of the French Revolution[15]." In Kant's historical idealism, the ideology of the populist German bourgeoisie was expressed in the conditions of semi-feudal Germany, where the bourgeoisie wavered between sympathy for the ideas of bourgeois revolution and fear of revolutionary violence. Kant's teaching on morality reflected this duality, which is stamped on his entire philosophy: Kant separates the world of "freedom" from the world of "necessity", *society — from the rest of nature* . The consciousness of moral duty that distinguishes man from animals, according to Kant, is something a priori, innate to man. The moral ideal rises above reality, independent of any social conditions. The development of world history is conceived by Kant as the emergence of man from the primitive state of nature, in which man followed his passions and instincts, and the subsequent development of a legal society and state. Kant's social-historical theory is not the development of historical "necessity", but *the rational progress*of humanity in the consciousness of its "*freedom* ", the development *of moral* qualities that are innate to humanity from the beginning, this is the peaceful path *of reforms* who denies all violence, all the right of the oppressed to revolution!

Hegel's philosophy of history reflected the next, more mature stage in the development of the German bourgeoisie and the bourgeois revolution in Germany. Through an idealistic dialectic, Hegel seeks to bridge the Kantian gap between nature and history. But Hegel overcomes this gap *on an idealistic basis* . He declares both nature and history *to be stages in the development of the*

15 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Святое семейство.

absolute spirit : the goal of world history and the inner connection of historical events, he proclaims the realization of the absolute *idea* ; historical "reason" manifests itself, for example, in the history of Greece as the development of a "beautiful individual", etc. world history according to Hegel. The state is the highest embodiment of the world's reason and freedom: it stands in Hegel *above all others.* It determines the development of civil society, i.e. economic relations. This high ideal of the state found a rather strange historical embodiment in Hegel's philosophical system in the Prussian semi-feudal monarchy!

Here the spirit of political compromise that prevailed in Hegel's philosophy of history, his vacillation between bourgeois revolution and feudal reaction, was clearly reflected.

But it should be noted that Hegel's philosophy of history, along with and in spite of these idealistic and reactionary moments, contained many profound propositions that contributed to a certain extent to the preparation of a materialist understanding of history. Hegel emphasizes the importance of economics for historical development, the role of practice and technology in it, the importance of tools of labor, he highlights the "geographical basis of world history". Especially important is his profoundly dialectical *formulation of the question* of history as *an integral and natural*process, in which the tension of many "small forces" generates historical events independent of the will of individual people. Nor did Hegel's famous proposition, "Everything that is real is reasonable, everything that is reasonable is real," have the reactionary meaning that many of Hegel's contemporaries attributed to it, seeing in it only the philosophical sanctification of monarchical despotism. From Hegel's point of view, what is historically "real" is only what is historically necessary: in this sense, Hegel's slogan acquired a completely different, revolutionary meaning. This was not at all a call for the preservation of the existing system, but, on the contrary, a demand for the change of the "unreasonable" social order of Hegel's time, as not "real", in the name of a new, historically necessary system.

The materialist understanding of history grew and hardened in the struggle against Hegel's historical idealism. It has overcome the old philosophy of history, which replaced the actual connection of historical phenomena with their fictitious connection, whether in the form of rational and moral "progress" or in the form of the development of an "absolute idea." But Marxism has never forgotten the positive *historical role* that the old philosophy of history once played. The attitude of Marxism to contemporary Kantianism and Hegelianism in social science is quite different. Modern neo-Kantianism, characterized by a particularly pronounced idealism in the knowledge of society, plays a deeply reactionary and class-hostile role for the proletariat. It reflects the decline and decay of the theoretical thinking of the bourgeoisie in the period of imperialism, it expresses the desire of the bourgeoisie to renounce all recognition of the existence of historical laws, since such recognition can and does lead to the recognition of the inevitable death of bourgeois society.

First of all, neo-Kantianism is characterized by its consistent separation *of logical* forms of cognition from concrete *historical* reality. The bourgeois forms of social life — bourgeois property, bourgeois law, and the bourgeois state — are elevated by neo-Kantians to the level of certain eternal, a priori, logical "categories." For example, according to R. Stammler, bourgeois law is an eternal and necessary form of "regulation" of all economic "matter" and all economic activity. In bourgeois political economy, the modern "sociological" direction (Stoltzman, Petri, etc.) breaks off the social *form* regardless of its material *content*, it deduces the laws of economic development of capitalism from only one social *form* , meaning by this "form" legal transactions between the owners of goods on the market. According to the historical theory of the most prominent neo — Kantians-Windelband, Rickert, Max Weber, and here Petrushevsky-the study of history should be radically different from the study of nature. Natural phenomena can be investigated using the "*generalizing*" method, i.e. the method of generalizations; they are investigated from the point of view of the causes that cause these phenomena*ричин*, by identifying *laws* development of nature. In history, however, according to neo-Kantians, only the "*individualizing*" method is applicable. Historical events are supposedly so different from each other that it is impossible to establish any repetitions and deduce historical laws. These historical events can therefore only be described, and

each in its own individuality, in special features that make it different from other historical events. Neo-Kantians consider the phenomena of social life only from the point of view of those higher *moral values and goals* , those ideas of culture that supposedly find their embodiment in these historical phenomena. Neo-Kantianism thus *denies historical laws altogether* and suggests that we should be content with an empirical "description" of isolated historical events. The causal study of history and society is replaced *by an ethical*assessment of them.

The gap between logic and history, between social form and material content, between nature and society, between the general, historically legitimate, and historically special, individual-all these features characteristic of the social and historical methodology of modern neo-Kantianism are directly opposed to the Marxist understanding of history. It is not surprising that neo-Kantianism has long served as the main methodological *weapon* of all bourgeois *critics*of Marxism, in particular the theorists of social fascism. If Kautsky tries to prove the" a priori "character of the feeling of ownership, then the" left "social opportunist Max Adler declares the most social form of human existence-"sociality" — to be an eternal a priori logical category. The peculiarity of social life is interpreted by him in the Kantian sense, as a form innate to man and sharply opposed to the rest of nature. The revisionist K. Fordlander considers it necessary to give scientific socialism an "ethical" justification, etc. Revisionist theorists paid particular attention to refuting the Marxist doctrine of irreconcilability and the necessary aggravation of class contradictions. In particular, the ideologues of the Russian bourgeoisie (P. Struve and others), relying on the same Kantian epistemology and historical theory, worked hard on these refutations, and tried to reduce social contradictions to the contradiction of economy and law, etc.

Neo-Kantianism, however, leads the theoretical thought of the bourgeoisie into such a hopeless impasse that in order to fight revolutionary Marxism more successfully, the ideologists of the bourgeoisie are now forced to resort to a new resurrection of the dead — this time in the person of a renewed *Hegelianism* . In Hegel, modern bourgeois theory takes on the clearly reactionary side of his philosophy, his idealism-his view of history as a spiritual process, the idea of the bourgeois state as a "rational" organism, etc. In these views of Hegel, modern fascism seeks to find harmony with its ideas of outright dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the ideology of national chauvinism, etc.

The *idea of the nation is at the center of neo-Hegelian sociological constructions* . A nation is a social whole. This idea is contrasted with the mechanical idea of a nation as a sum of people. A nation is *a whole* in which classes are" removed". A nation is, according to modern neo-Hegelian fascist ideologues, the universal, absorbing special. Nationalism is asserted as an eternal necessary category beyond time and space. A characteristic feature of neo-Hegelian nationalism is its so-called "state" character (Geller, Gentile, Spann, Binder, etc.). At the center of the ideas of fascist nationalism is the state. The state is the highest morality, it stands above culture, religion, etc. This transition of the ideologists of capitalism to the "state" ideology is very symptomatic. Bourgeois culture and civilization can no longer claim to be the essence *of the nation* when it comes to an outright fascist dictatorship. The glorification of the" national state " by modern neo-Hegelianism is nothing more than a philosophical justification for the fascist state.

It should be noted that this kind of" use " of Hegel by bourgeois social historical science for its class purposes began quite a long time ago — in the middle of the last century, in the so-called right-wing Hegelianism. Russian bourgeois historical science (Chicherin, Solovyov, and others) also adopted Hegel's historical theory, especially his teaching on the three stages of development-the family, society, and the state, and on the dominant role of the state in historical development. Our bourgeois historians have tried, with the help of Hegel, to justify their own doctrine of the supra-class role that the Russian autocracy has historically played in the development of Russia. The" role " of the autocracy was justified by the geographical features of Russia's development and allegedly consisted in protecting the Russian steppe borders from attacks by external enemies-nomads. These historians believed that in this way it is possible to "justify" the absence of class contradictions in the past of Russia and to prove the need for class cooperation in the present. This noble historical theory, as we shall see later, also had a strong influence on Plekhanov's views. Based on the geographical features of Russia's development, Plekhanov justified his theory of defencism and

class cooperation, which we will have to discuss later. The same views are characteristic of Trotsky's understanding of the historical development of Russia.

The influence of Hegelianism on *revisionism*was already evident in the works of Lassalle, who, as is well known, was a devout Hegelian and took a purely idealistic approach to the development of history, law and the state, while at the same time being the ideological forerunner of all future compromisers. The modern social-fascists, although somewhat belatedly, are also beginning to look for theoretical support in Hegelian idealism. Kautsky, for example, himself admits that his understanding of dialectics as a spiritual process is much closer to Hegel than to Marx. Kunov contrasts Marxism with Hegel's views on the state as a "higher organism", which is why, according to Kunov, it is impossible to talk about the "withering away" of the state. The" left " opportunist K. Korsch and some others limit dialectics only to social life, since consciousness is inherent only in society, and dialectical development takes place only where there is consciousness.

Under the conditions of Soviet reality, historical idealism found its expression in Rubin's counter-revolutionary Menshevik Kantianism, in the Menshevik idealism of the Deborin group, which is basically a Hegelian revision of Marxism, as well as in the historical views of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, to which we will have to return again and again.

1.5.1. Plekhanov and Historical Materialism

The revolutionary and partisan nature of the materialist conception of history, as we have already seen, has undergone a radical perversion in the writings of the theorists of the Second International. They completely failed to grasp the true teaching of Marx on the development of socio-economic formations, its inseparable connection with the theory of the class struggle and the doctrine of the proletarian revolution. They transformed historical materialism into historical objectivism, a mechanistic theory of social development, and historical fatalism.

The notorious Menshevik theory of "productive forces" has gained particular popularity; the development of productive forces is portrayed by social-fascist theorists as a kind of automatic spontaneous growth of dead means of production, in fatal dependence on which — only as its passive consequence — both the political struggle of the working class and its ideology appear. In this way the social-fascists substitute for the active participation of the revolutionary classes in determining the course of historical development the preaching of the necessity for the proletariat to submissively "wait" until the productive forces "mature". At the same time, these theorists argue that capitalism is still capable of giving enormous scope to the development of the productive forces! What level of productive forces is necessary for the success of the proletarian revolution? The Sukhanovs and Kautskys can only guess at this. So *contemplative* international Menshevism's abstract understanding of historical materialism and historical laws later leads the social-fascist theorists to a purely idealistic interpretation of them: Kautsky, as we shall explain in detail later, ends up transforming the development of the material productive forces into a spiritual process, a process of the development of human cognition. At the same time, it does everything possible to narrow the historical limits of the operation of the true laws of historical development established by Marx — the law of class struggle and revolution — and especially protects the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions from the operation of this law.

A special place among the theorists of the Second International is occupied by G. V. Plekhanov. Plekhanov is known for his services in justifying and defending historical materialism against the" critical " tendencies of subjective sociology, Struvism, and so on. His works, such as" On the Development of the Monistic View of History, " his articles against Struve, and several others, were of the most serious historical significance in this sense.

The main merit of Plekhanov in the field of historical materialism is that he showed in his works, and moreover in a rather detailed form, *the natural law of the world.* the development of Marxism from all *that has gone before* historical development of philosophy and social theory. Already in his Essays on the History of Materialism, Plekhanov raised the question of the historical antecedents of Marxism, of its preparation in French materialism, in German idealist philosophy,

and in utopian socialism. Plekhanov raises the same questions and elaborates on them in detail in his Monistic View. At the same time, Plekhanov revealed a close connection between Marx's historical theory and his philosophy, with philosophical materialism, and with revolutionary dialectics. This fact was of great importance for the promotion of dialectical-materialist philosophy. Here Plekhanov rises many heads above the other theorists of the Second International, above the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois interpreters of Marx's historical theory, who gave a vulgar interpretation of this historical theory, understanding it as "economic materialism."

Plekhanov showed that "economic materialism", which makes all other" factors "of social life dependent on the" economic " factor and at the same time explains the development of the economy itself by the development of human ideas or social needs, is a kind of the same historical idealism. In contrast to the vulgarizers, Plekhanov sought in these best works to emphasize the dialectical unity of social existence and social consciousness, the dialectical interdependence between necessity and freedom in the historical process, and to draw up a line of struggle both against historical fatalism, which condemns society to inactivity, and against the subjectivism of narodniks like Mikhailovsky. Following the well-known propositions of Marx, Plekhanov sought to show that the main cause of all economic development must be sought in the growth of the productive forces of society. However, on all these questions we have significant deviations from Marxism in Plekhanov. And we find only in Lenin real orthodox Marxist attitudes and their further elaboration in relation to the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. Nevertheless, the historical merits of Plekhanov, who emphasized the philosophical significance of Marx's historical theory, are beyond any doubt.

In these early works, Plekhanov reveals a certain understanding of the connection between the materialist understanding of history and *the political struggle*of the working class. In his early pamphlet, Socialism and the Political Struggle, which played a certain role in the development of Russian Marxism, and later in his well — known articles directed against Struve, Plekhanov showed the significance of the theory of class struggle for the materialist understanding of history. He showed that class contradictions are not at all blunted, as Struve and Co.would have liked, but become more acute in the course of the historical development of society. However, as early as 1894, as Lenin notes in The State and Revolution, opportunism and philistinism were already showing signs in his pamphlet against anarchism on the question of the state. Plekhanov's critique of Kantianism, Machism, etc., in a number of his articles, despite all its essential shortcomings, was of no small importance for its time. Finally, Plekhanov's research in the field of art theory and history, the history of religious beliefs, etc., is of undoubted interest, where a number of propositions put forward by Plekhanov still retain their significance in one way or another, although in relation to these areas it is in no way necessary to speak of a consistent Marxist interpretation of questions.

Our understanding of historical materialism by Plekhanov requires *a critical*approach. It would be wrong to assume, as the representatives of Menshevik idealism in the person of Karev do, that if Plekhanov has any errors in philosophy, then he is irreproachable in the field of a materialist understanding of history. Following this view, we would have to take the path of a break between historical materialism and philosophy, between historical materialism and politics. Plekhanov's philosophical errors and political opportunism could not but have been, and indeed were, strongly reflected in his theoretical views on society and history.

In Plekhanov, first of all , we do not find an understanding of social development in its *concrete totality*, as a living picture of history. Historical materialism is perceived by Plekhanov as *a sociology "in general"*, which is not connected with a direct historical consideration of social life, and therefore is presented by Plekhanov without considering *specific stages*in the development of society — society is always at a certain historical stage. Hence the excessive distinction that Plekhanov draws between sociology and history, or, as he puts it, between the "algebra" of social development and its "arithmetic[16]." Between the" general, "the" particular, "and the" singular "in

16 Г. Плеханов, Рецензия на Риккерта.

historical development, we do not find in Plekhanov an understanding of their dialectical transition and mutual connection, provided that only the Kantian gap between" sociology " in general and concrete history can be bridged. In Plekhanov's understanding of society , we do not find Marx's teaching about *socio-economic formations*, about social-productive organisms that have special laws of their origin and development. Therefore, Plekhanov does not have a sufficiently correct understanding of the role that his internal laws play in the development of society.*внутренние* It is also important to understand the laws and the relation of these laws to *the external*conditions of the geographical environment in which social life takes place.

This" shade", this line of Plekhanov's views on historical materialism, was already expressed in his early works, which were written at a time when Plekhanov was mainly taking consistently revolutionary positions. It is enough to compare Plekhanov's article " On the 60th Anniversary of Hegel's Death "with Lenin's statements on Hegel's philosophy of history to make clear the essential difference between these two" shades of Marxism, " as Plekhanov himself put it. Lenin sees in Hegel the most important thing in his "formulation of the question" about the approach to the study of society, in his desire to grasp historical development as a "living picture of history", to reveal the inner *dialectic* of historical form, to clarify the role *of practice*in historical development. Plekhanov, on the other hand, confines himself to looking for individual examples of Hegel's materialistic understanding of historical events and attempts to give them an economic explanation; Plekhanov devotes all his main attention to Hegel's "*geographical basis* world history"[17].

*Внешней*Plekhanov also attaches too much importance to the external , geographical environment and its influence on social life in his best work, The Monistic View. So, according to Plekhanov, our humanoid ancestors, thanks to some special properties of the geographical environment, could rise to the height of mental development and began to "make tools". And in the further historical development of society, "only certain features of the same environment" could give room for improving the ability of man to make tools. "In the historical process of the development of the productive forces," says Plekhanov, "the capacity of man to' make tools ' must be regarded first of all as *a constant quantity* , and the surrounding external conditions for the use of this capacity as *a constantly changing quantity.*" It is true that in his further exposition Plekhanov seeks to isolate himself from the naturalistic, mechanistic views of "geographical" materialists like Montesquieu. He shows that although "in the last analysis, the structure of society is determined by the properties of the geographical environment," once certain social relations have emerged, their further development takes place "according to its own internal laws," that the dependence of a person on the geographical environment "turns from a direct dependence into a *mediocre* one." Nevertheless, Plekhanov's general conclusion is as follows:"the geographical environment provides people with a greater or lesser opportunity to develop their productive forces, and all the more or less energetically pushes them along the path of historical movement[18]."

It is quite obvious that Plekhanov makes a fundamental mistake here: we can speak of a "geographical bias" in Plekhanov. He forgets that while the capacity of man to " make tools "can be regarded as a constant quantity in the sense that this capacity occurs at different stages of historical development, the capacity to" make tools " is also a quantity *that changes* with the development of the productive forces. At the same time, the external conditions of the geographical environment for a certain country may remain relatively *more constant*and unchanged.

Plekhanov's exaggerated ideas about the role of external geographical conditions as the initial cause of historical development are further and even more clearly expressed in his "Basic Questions of Marxism": we will have to deal with them later. These views are in perfect harmony with the elements *of social Darwinism* that we find in Plekhanov's historical views. Plekhanov, for example, defines Marxism as "social Darwinism", i.e., he understands Marxism as Darwin's theory applied to

---

17 В. Ленин о философии истории Гегеля / Ленинский сборник XII; Г. Плеханов, К 60-летию смерти Гегеля.

18 Г. Плеханов, К вопросу о развитии монистического взгляда на историю — с. 109, 187, 228 и др.

society about the struggle of biological species for their existence and their *adaptation to external conditions of existence* . Plekhanov thus ignores the qualitative distinctiveness of social development and introduces naturalism and biologism into his views.

Darwin's theory of the development of the natural organs of animals and Marx's theory of the development of the artificial organs of social man and his instruments of labor can, of course, draw certain analogies, and this was pointed out by Marx and Engels themselves. But at the same time, Darwinism cannot be mechanically transferred to the social sciences, and we must not forget about the qualitative originality of social life. It must also be remembered that in the teachings of Darwin, and especially of some of his followers, in the theory of the "struggle for existence" , we have a reflection of the views *of the bourgeoisie.* companies. Bourgeois sociology understands " social Darwinism "as a recognition of the inevitability *of competition and struggle* in any human society — a struggle in which the most" adapted " to external conditions, the most powerful social groups, win. In this way, bourgeois sociology perpetuates capitalist competition and the exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie — as stronger and "fitter". Meanwhile, we must not think of the development of society as a passive *adaptation* It applies to the conditions of the geographical environment, but as an active process of transformation of nature, as a process *of internal* development of society, which in the conditions of a class society manifests itself as a pattern *of class struggle* .

The abstract nature of Plekhanov's sociology makes it impossible for Plekhanov to understand *qualitative distinctiveness* individual stages of historical development. Plekhanov's understanding of historical development as a process of adaptation of society to *external* , geographical conditions leads to the fact that Plekhanov disappears the internal regularity in the development of society, that he ignores the role of classes and the significance *of the class struggle*in history. The contemplative "Feuerbachian" character of Plekhanov's historical views determines that it emasculates the revolutionary content of historical materialism.

Plekhanov's misinterpretation of the entire course of the historical process becomes particularly noticeable if we take it in organic connection with his political opportunism, Menshevism. These errors of Plekhanov's were expressed in his *famous five-term formula*in The Basic Questions of Marxism, where he gives a summary of his understanding of history and the relationship between the basis and superstructures in the historical process. "If," says Plekhanov, " we wanted to briefly express the view of Marx-Engels on the relation of the now famous "foundation" to the equally famous "superstructure,"we would get the following:

1) *the state of the productive forces* ,

2) *the economic relations caused by it* ,

3) the socio-*political*system that grew up on this economic "basis",

4) the psyche of a social person, determined partly by the economy itself, and partly by the entire socio-political system that grew up on it *психика общественного человека*;

5) various ideologies *that reflect the*properties of this psyche[19]."

The whole scheme of Plekhanov — although some of it may be explained by the popularity of its presentation — is clearly mechanistic in nature: the separate categories of historical materialism-the productive forces, the relations of production, the socio-political system, etc. - appear here as "floors" built on top of each other, without taking into account their unity and unity. interactions between them in a specific historical reality. For example, there is no correct understanding of the interdependence that exists between the productive forces and the relations of production, and there is no understanding of the role that the social *quality* of the relations of production plays in the development of the productive forces. Ultimately, this schematism leads to the Menshevik theory of productive forces as an independent factor that develops automatically under the influence of geographical environment. Plekhanov's formula says nothing about *classes and class struggle* and their role in economic development. It left obscured the basic thesis of Marxism about *the state* as

19 Г. Плеханов, Основные вопросы марксизма / Соч., т. XVIII — с. 231.

an instrument of class exploitation and its impact on the economy. Here there is no theory of the class struggle as the guiding thread of all social research, no doctrine of *the social revolution*, and there is certainly no bringing the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the abolition of classes. In this view, Plekhanov's materialist conception of history is quite acceptable to the bourgeoisie. And it is not for nothing that this formula of Plekhanov is so often invoked by bourgeois professors who are beginning to "get acquainted" with Marxism in our day.

Plekhanov's formula also lacks a dialectical understanding of the active role that social consciousness and class *ideology* play in historical development. Ideology, according to Plekhanov, is determined by the properties of the social psyche and appears as a passive product of the latter. Plekhanov developed the same view in an even more pronounced political application in his article "The Working Class and the Social-Democratic Intelligentsia", which was directed against Lenin's pamphlet " What is to be Done?" Here Plekhanov not only very simplistically interprets Lenin's idea that in Russia the theoretical teaching of social-democracy arose independently of the spontaneous working-class movement, but also reveals a misunderstanding of the relationship that exists between *consciousness and spontaneity* in the development of the working-class movement, and a clear underestimation of the role of revolutionary *theory* . Thus, Plekhanov believes that the workers themselves" at a certain stage of social development " (?) would have come to socialism, despite the influence of bourgeois ideology on them!

Plekhanov's errors in the question of social formation also found political expression in Plekhanov's assessment of the 1905 revolution in Russia. Abstract schematism prevented Plekhanov from understanding the whole qualitative peculiarity of the revolution in Russia and its difference from other, earlier bourgeois revolutions. In developing the Menshevik formal-logical "truths" about the bourgeois character of the 1905 revolution, about the necessity for the proletariat to support the bourgeoisie, Plekhanov did not even raise the question of *the driving forces* of this revolution — the hegemony of the proletariat and the role of the peasantry in it, about the two possible paths of the peasant revolution, about *перерастании*the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one. Plekhanov's blurring of the class struggle eventually led Plekhanov to his teaching about the necessity of solidarity, *class cooperation*, in order to protect the country from the attacks of external enemies. It received theoretical expression in the supra-class theory of Russian autocracy, developed by Plekhanov in the History of Russian Social Thought. In the period of the imperialist war, this disregard for the class struggle led Plekhanov to the Kantian theory of morality, to his views, developed jointly with L. Axelrod, on the existence of "simple laws of law and morality."

To all this it must be added that Plekhanov's criticism of the revisionists along the lines of a materialist understanding of history was often conducted not only from erroneous positions, but that in this criticism Plekhanov sometimes makes significant concessions to the revisionists. For example Plekhanov did not even dare to launch a critique of historical *objectivism* Even Struve failed to uncover its Kantian roots.

The abstract-academic nature of Plekhanov's materialist understanding of history brings him much closer to bourgeois "positivist" sociology in a number of crucial questions. In these propositions of Plekhanov we have the germs of those errors which were further developed, on the one hand, in the mechanistic sociology of right opportunism, and, on the other, in the historical theory of counter — revolutionary Trotskyism and Menshevik idealism.

1.5.2. Lenin and Historical Materialism

In connection with the perversion of Marxism, which we observe even among the best theorists of the Second International, Lenin's role in the justification and development of historical materialism becomes particularly important. Lenin's understanding of historical materialism was developed and forged by him in the party battles that Lenin waged with the idealism of the Narodniks, with the historical views of the Kantian-Struvists, with the historical theory and practice

of international and Russian Menshevism, with the machism of Bogdanov, with the opportunism of Plekhanov, with Kautskyite centrism, with the historical subjectivism of Trotsky, with the idealism and mechanismism of R. Luxemburg and others. other" left " social-democrats, with Bukharin's sociological scholasticism. Hence its exceptional significance for the theory and practice of not only Russian but also international Bolshevism.

Lenin raises the materialist understanding of history to *a new and higher level* . By deepening, developing, and clarifying the basic propositions advanced by Marx and Engels, and applying them to the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, Lenin further reveals their enormous *philosophical* content and their direct significance for *the political struggle*of the working class. For Lenin, historical materialism means a further "deepening and development" of philosophical materialism, "bringing it to the end, "and"*a consistent continuation* and extension of materialism to the realm of social phenomena." This is the materialistic theory *of reflection* extended to history. "In the same way," says Lenin, " as human cognition *reflects* thus the social cognition of man, i.e., different views and doctrines, philosophical, religious, political, etc., *reflect*the economic structure of society[20]." At the same time, Lenin sees in the historical theory of Marxism a reflection of the internal dialectic of the historical forms themselves, a natural historical process *of development* socio-economic formations. This is the "path to the scientific study *of history* as *a single , natural phenomenon."* in all its great *versatility and inconsistency*of the process."

However, it was important for Lenin not to confine himself to the study of history, but to draw from this and continue consistently the conclusion that world history teaches. This conclusion is *the doctrine of the class struggle* . All the enormous political significance of historical materialism follows from the fact that, in Lenin's words, "historical materialism made it possible for the first time to study with natural historical accuracy the social conditions *of life of the masses and the changes* in these conditions. Thus, *the tactics of the class struggle of the proletariat directly follow from historical materialism*: "At every stage of development, at every moment, the tactics of the proletariat must take into account this objectively unavoidable *dialectic of human history* »[21]." For Lenin, historical materialism is not an abstract sociology "in general"; it becomes *the theoretical and methodological basis of the tactics of the proletarian struggle* .

Having come out at the same time as Plekhanov, and even somewhat earlier than Plekhanov, to fight against narodnik sociology — Lenin's "Friends of the People" were published earlier than the "Monistic View" — Lenin, in contrast to Plekhanov, immediately takes the position of fighting *on two fronts* for historical materialism. He fights not only against the historical subjectivism (idealism) of the Narodniks , but also against historical *objectivism*, Struvism, and "legal" Marxism, revealing the bourgeois character of the latter and its Kantian methodological roots. In contrast to Plekhanov's abstract academic treatment of questions of historical development, Lenin's emphasis is on the *class-party character* historical materialism, and the political content of all its main propositions. It establishes a fundamental difference between the materialist and the historical objectivist of the Struve type.

Already in his early work "What are the Friends of the People", Lenin puts in the center of attention and closely connects all the basic concepts of historical materialism — the concept of socio-economic formation, the theory of class struggle and the doctrine of the communist revolution. Lenin gives the most complete dialectical account of the Marxist doctrine of socio-economic formations, of the special laws governing the origin, functioning, and development of social-productive "organisms." The concept of socio-economic formation immediately reveals in Lenin's writings all its political, revolutionary significance. It becomes the starting point for Leninism's correct understanding of the laws and special paths of the development of capitalism in Russia, the peculiarities of our bourgeois revolution, for Lenin's definition of the fundamental difference between the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions, for Lenin's doctrine of the uneven

---

20 В. Ленин, Три источника и три составные части марксизма.

21 В. Ленин, Карл Маркс / Соч., т. XVIII — с. 28.

development of capitalism, for Lenin's doctrine of imperialism, for his doctrine of the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution, and also when Lenin clarified the nature of the transition economy.

If the concept of socio-economic formations developed by Lenin enables us to grasp *the objective* logic of historical development and the regularity of this development, then Lenin's theory of class struggle helps us to identify the role of the advanced class in historical development, in *determining*the character of the emerging social relations by this revolutionary class. Lenin reveals the class content of every historical pattern in class society, finds out which class "manages" this pattern, and steadily pursues the theory of class struggle as the guiding thread of social research.

Lenin's definition of classes has an extremely important methodological significance, allowing us to link all the categories of class society into a single whole. In his critique of Struve, Plekhanov, Trotsky, Bogdanov, and Bukharin, Lenin relentlessly emphasizes *the class element.* the content of all the main categories of historical materialism — the productive forces, the relations of production, the state, and the ideological superstructure. Lenin reveals the class content of the productive forces and the role of the revolutionary working class in them, the class antagonism "within the limits of the relations of production" of class society, and the class character of every ideology in this class society. Lenin's teaching on spontaneity and consciousness in the development of the working — class movement, on the role of revolutionary theory in the development of the class consciousness of the proletariat, proves the full significance *of the ideological struggle* as a special form of class struggle. Lenin's analysis of individual social classes and social groups — the proletariat, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc. — is also a new contribution to the theoretical treasury of Marxism. No less important for historical materialism are Lenin's works on *the agrarian* question, as well as Lenin's profound coverage *of the national question*and criticism of the mistakes of R. Luxemburg and others.

The scientific class analysis of the development of Russian capitalism and Lenin's study of the epoch of imperialism are extremely important for historical theory. Lenin explains the enormous role that the revolutionary *party* of the proletariat can play in determining the paths of the proletarian revolution. *The doctrine of the party*, its organization and its connection with the working class, the doctrine of *tactics* According to Lenin, the party struggle is a necessary aspect of historical materialism, without which, in Lenin's words, the latter would be "half-hearted, one-sided, dead"[22]. Lenin's teaching on *the revolution* and its objective and subjective factors confirms the correctness of Lenin's two-front struggle in matters of historical materialism. Lenin's elaboration of the theory of revolution, its prerequisites, its driving forces, and the stages of its development strikes painfully at every historical *subjectivism* , such as Trotsky's views, and at every objectivist theory of peaceful historical "evolution." The doctrine of revolution throws a bright light on all the fundamental problems of historical materialism, and thus elucidates the true significance of this party combat theory.

Historical materialism, the military weapon of Marx and Engels, is resurrected again in Lenin's works: it is clothed in the flesh and blood of living concrete political action. Lenin's dialectic in understanding history gives us the most profound understanding of the objective logic of historical processes, and at the same time it makes it possible to determine at each historical stage the role and tasks of the proletariat and its party. Lenin here follows entirely the path laid down by Marx and Engels. But, as we have already seen, he is not content with simply repeating the basic tenets of their historical worldview. It *clarifies, complements and develops further* a materialist understanding of the history of Marx and Engels, giving its main issues the most profound and comprehensive coverage that corresponds to the new historical era. This *new* element that Lenin brings to historical materialism can be traced in Lenin's teaching on social formations, in his analysis of the forms of class struggle, in his theory of the state, in his teaching on spontaneity and consciousness, on the role of the party, on the national question, in his views on the development of

22 В. Ленин, Карл Маркс / Соч., т. XVIII — с. 28.

proletarian culture and on cultural freedom. revolution, etc. This new element is introduced by Lenin into historical materialism in the course of his study of the epoch of imperialism, the ways of the proletarian revolution, and the conditions of the transition period. Lenin's teaching on the unevenness of capitalist development, on the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one, Lenin's teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the relationship between the proletariat and the peasantry, and the justification of the possibility of building socialism in one country are in this sense particularly important points that characterize Leninism as a new stage in the development of historical materialism.

Of course, it would be wrong to identify the philosophical premises and all the components of Marxism-Leninism — philosophical materialism, dialectics, its economic theory, etc. — with one of its most important components, the materialist understanding of history. But there is no doubt that *historical* materialism proper, the dialectic *of historical*processes — the doctrine of social formation, class struggle, etc. — plays a most direct role in the solution of all these problems.

Of particular importance is historical materialism in its Leninist understanding, as a methodological basis *for the theory and tactics of the proletarian dictatorship* , as a justification for the possibility *of building socialism in one country* . The whole doctrine of the transition period follows directly from the Marxist-Leninist understanding of socio-economic formations, the specific laws of their origin and development. In his State and Revolution, Lenin reveals all the strict scientific accuracy of Marx's analysis, which examines the conditions of the birth and development of communist society, which through the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat replaces capitalism. The same rigorous "natural-scientific" analysis was used by Lenin as the basis for studying economics and politics in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat, where Lenin examines the relationship between economic structures and the social classes that represent these economic structures during the transition period, changes in these economic structures, changes in classes and relationships between them. On the basis of the same materialist understanding of history, taking into account the dialectical interdependence between economics and politics, Lenin builds his entire teaching on the new type of state corresponding to the transition period, and on the role of the proletarian state in the development of the new economy.

Lenin's critique of Trotsky's subjectivist theory of permanent revolution and his critique of "Sukhanovism" in the question of the maturity of the prerequisites for the proletarian revolution are extremely important for the study of historical materialism. In justifying his view on the possibility of building socialism in one country and deducing it from the law of uneven capitalist development, Lenin — in contrast to Trotsky's adventurism and voluntarism and Sukhanov's dead Menshevik schemes, which demanded "first" a certain (?) level of productive forces — unfolds before us the true dialectic of the historical process. Lenin proves to Sukhanov that *the unity* and *general* regularity of world history do not in the least indicate the inevitability of the development of all countries according to a single template, that this unity and general regularity of the historical process are quite compatible with its *versatility and inconsistency* . Lenin shows that the historical development of individual countries brings *общую*its own qualitative originality to the general line of development of world history*качественное своеобразие* either in the form or in the order of this development.

The opportunists of the Second International, Lenin points out, have not understood what is decisive in Marxism — its revolutionary dialectic. "They are completely alien to any idea that, given *a general pattern* of development in the entire world history, separate lines of development representing originality are not excluded at all, but, on the contrary, are assumed*отдельные полосы развития* , представляющие *своеобразие* either the form or order of this development." Russia, in Lenin's words, "could and should have shown some *distinctiveness*, lying, of course, *along a common line."* but it distinguishes its revolution from all previous revolutions of Western European countries and introduces some partial innovations in the transition to Eastern countries." Lenin criticizes the scholarship of these opportunists, who claim that we do not have "objective economic prerequisites for socialism." "What," Lenin asks, " if the complete hopelessness of the situation, thus increasing the strength of the workers and peasants tenfold, opened up the possibility

of a different transition to the creation of the basic premises of civilization than in all the other Western European states? Has this changed the general line of development of world history? Has this changed the basic relations of the main classes in each state, and is the latter being drawn and drawn into the general course of world history?"

And Lenin draws a conclusion that, in a certain sense, completes the materialist understanding of the history of Marxism-Leninism:

"If the creation of socialism requires a certain level of culture (although no one can say what this certain "level of culture" is), then why can't we first begin by gaining the prerequisites for this certain level by revolutionary means, and then, on the basis of the workers 'and peasants' power and the Soviet system, move on to catch up with other peoples?"[23].

1.5.3. Modern tasks of historical materialism in the struggle on two fronts

The task of our party and of the entire Comintern is to continue Lenin's work of further developing historical materialism on the basis of Lenin's historical methodology and in connection with the new problems of socialist construction and world revolution that have become urgent for us.

And this most important task is being successfully carried out by the party, under the leadership of Lenin's best disciple and the leader of our party and the Comintern, Comrade Lenin. Of Stalin. On the analysis of the contradictions of modern capitalism and the laws of socialism under construction, on the problem of the transition of possibility into historical reality, on the questions of substantiating Lenin's theory of building socialism in one country, in the merciless struggle against counterrevolutionary Trotskyism, against right-wing opportunism, on the questions of socialist reconstruction of the countryside, complete collectivization and elimination of the kulaks as a class, on the questions of the conditions for the development of productive forces (6 historical conditions) Stalin), on the role of technology in the modern historical period, on the entry into the period of socialism, etc. Stalin gave brilliant examples of materialist dialectics and its further development. "Those who do not understand this *dialectic of historical processes* are lost to Marxism," said Comrade Lenin. Stalin at the XVI Party Congress, formulating the tasks of the struggle on two fronts - against right and" left " opportunism.

In the field of historical theory, these two fronts were designated as revisionist objectivism and mechanistic sociology, on the one hand, and Trotsky's idealistic subjectivism and Menshevik idealism, on the other.

Historical objectivism, which separates Marxism from the tasks of the class struggle of the proletariat, emasculates its revolutionary party content and transforms Marxism into a scholastic "dogma", received its vivid expression in the historical works of D. Ryazanov, who went so far as to betray our party.

Discussions that have taken place on various sectors of the theoretical front — in history, political economy, literary studies, law, etc. — have shown that both types of revision of historical materialism find their theoretical manifestation in a number of special issues. A correct understanding of imperialism, an understanding of the 1905 revolution, the question of the Asiatic mode of production and serfdom, an understanding of the changing relations between classes in the transition period, the question of economic categories in the transition period, the problem of ideology, the ideological struggle in art, the development of proletarian culture, and finally the most important question of the historical role of Bolshevism as the vanguard of the question of the struggle of Bolshevism against opportunism, Centrism against the "left" in German social-democracy, and so on — all these questions are of paramount political *and practical*importance. Under these conditions, the struggle on two fronts for a Marxist-Leninist understanding of historical materialism becomes an important part of the general struggle for the theoretical foundations of the

---

23 В. Ленин, О нашей революции / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 2 — с. 118–119.

party's general line in carrying out its tasks of proletarian revolution and building socialism.

Comrade Bukharin's general mechanistic conception of historical materialism led him to a number of propositions that we have already noted as characteristic of bourgeois sociology. First of all, Comrade Bukharin clearly misuses the very term "sociology" uncritically in its application to historical materialism, as if forgetting its connection with positivism, with bourgeois "objectivism", and its contemporary class role. But even more important is the fact that he puts the same bourgeois-sociological content into the concept of his sociology. It was not for nothing that Lenin wrote about the" sociological " scholasticism of vol. Bukharin, that we have to put the concept of "sociology" in ironic quotation[24]marks. The profound philosophical and political content of historical materialism is grossly distorted by Bukharin's sociology, which is clearly mechanistic and contains elements of agnosticism.

As already noted, Comrade Bukharin takes the point of view of an abstract understanding of society and its laws, of society "in general": the concept of socio-economic formation and Marxist historicism remain alien to his mechanistic concept, in which the qualitative originality of individual social forms is blurred. Sociology as an abstract science of society breaks away from history and appears as a kind of scholastic, far-fetched "scheme", according to which every society and its development should be built. This is quite consistent with Comrade Bukharin's lack of understanding of the specific features of social relations, as opposed to nature. Tov. Bukharin approaches society *in a naturalistic* way, as a "collection of elements" "in natura". He imagines people's relations to production in a purely mechanical way — as their mechanistic "arrangement" in space, among the instruments of production. This also implies Comrade Bukharin's "technical" understanding of social classes, his underestimation of the role of politics, the significance of the class struggle, and the totality of his right-wing opportunist views.

The basic idea pursued by Comrade Bukharin in all his works-the replacement of materialist dialectics by a mechanistic *theory of equilibrium*-as applied to society is a new example of the old bourgeois transfer of physical, mechanical, energy, etc .to society.d. regularities. Historical development is conceived in the following terms: Bukharin as a transition from one stable equilibrium of society to its stable equilibrium on a new basis. *External links* the conditions of equilibrium — the equilibrium between nature and society-determine the internal equilibrium of society. Changes in the external environment-this is the reason for the course of historical development. Like bourgeois sociologists, Comrade Bukharin proceeds from the proportions and a certain tendency towards equilibrium characteristic of the development of capitalist production, misunderstood the entire relative nature of this tendency towards equilibrium and incorrectly extended it to all societies, including the transition economy. Bukharin has no clear idea of the internal laws of social reproduction, of its qualitative originality in our country, of the significance of the plan, of the significance of the accelerated pace of socialist construction.

The desire to maintain at all costs a "balance" between the various branches of our industry, between urban industry and agriculture, between the socialist and capitalist sectors of our economy-this is what leads Comrade Bukharin to the famous slogan of "equalization to narrow places", to the policy of "self-sufficiency" in agriculture, to opportunist-consumerism We encounter similar manifestations of mechanistic materialism in political economy (the works of Kohn, Bessonov, Eichenwald) and in history (Slepkov, Dubrovsky), and so on. *Right-wing opportunism*finds its most important methodological basis in mechanistic "sociology", although it should be noted that to a certain extent mechanismism feeds on the idea of the "bond" of and "left" opportunism. It is not surprising that "sociological" mechanismism meets with sympathy in clearly hostile to the proletariat purely wrecking concepts (in Kondratiev, Bazarov, Groman, etc.). The mechanical

24 Ленинский сборник XI — с. 369.

transfer of the laws of capitalist development and capitalist proportions to our economy and the notorious theory of "equilibrium" are, for obvious reasons, extremely close to their hearts!

As we have mentioned on a number of occasions, mechanistic methodology is closely intertwined with historical idealism and is sliding towards the latter. We could already see this in the example of Narodnik subjective sociology. Bukharin's mechanistic sociology not only contains elements of Kantian idealism, but it is also very close to the "*organizational theory*" of social development put forward by A. A. Bogdanov. Bogdanov's machism, as already noted, finds its vivid manifestation in his historical views. Bogdanov identifies social existence and social consciousness: he therefore considers historical development as an " organizational process "in which the consciousness of the" organizational " classes plays a crucial role. At the same time, Bogdanov's historical idealism is based on his theory of mechanical equilibrium: it is Bogdanov who puts forward the need for an "energy balance" between nature and society, the view of historical development as a "social selection" , and so on. This combination of idealism and mechanismism was reflected in Bogdanov's theory of "proletarian culture", which was also developed by Comrade Bukharin, as well as in his views on economic development, on the theory of value, on art, history, religion, language, and other special areas of theory, where Bogdanov's influence is often reflected to this day. A peculiar combination of mechanistic methodology and idealism in historical views can also be found in the works of mechanists such as L. Axelrod (especially in matters of ethics and art theory), Sarabyanov, Varyash, and others.

But the active struggle against idealism in Soviet social science is in itself extremely important for the historical materialism of our day.

If in the conditions of the bourgeois West Marxism has to contend with the undisguised manifestations of idealism in bourgeois and social-fascist historical theory, then in the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat idealism is forced to appear in a much more *veiled form* , often under the guise of "one hundred percent Marxism". Exposing and combating idealistic tendencies is therefore much more difficult. Thus neo-Kantianism found a skilful expression in the economic works of the Menshevik wrecker Rubin: the separation of the social form of value from its material content, the gap between the productive forces and the relations of production, the deduction of economic laws from the forms of exchange — all these features characteristic of the bourgeois "sociological" school found shelter in Rubin's methodology and were received relatively late. proper rebuff.

The Hegelian abstract-idealist point of view was reflected in *the views of representatives of Menshevik idealism on society and history* , which have already been mentioned. They ignore historical materialism as an integral theory reflecting the process of development of social formations and reduce it to an abstract "methodology". The logical form of historical materialism dominates their material, concrete historical content. At the same time, they ignore the really *concrete problems*of the materialist understanding of history. All this leads Menshevik idealism to a Kantian separation of the social form from the material content, to an understanding of the "specificity" of social formations and their special laws in the spirit of the Kantian Rickert, to an active defense and promotion of Rubin's Kantian views on the "immanent" development of social forms.

Exposing counterrevolutionary Trotskyism, Rubinism, Riazanovism, Deborinism, etc. in the understanding of history and society is therefore one of the most urgent tasks now being put forward in the struggle for a Marxist-Leninist understanding of historical materialism.

The historical views of counterrevolutionary *Trotskyism*, as well as Trotskyist methodology in general, are an eclectic combination of idealism and mechanismism poorly disguised by a "Marxist" phrase *идеализма и механицизма*. At the same time , the main role in the Trotskyist perversion of historical materialism is played by idealism — *subjectivism and voluntarism*, i.e. underestimation of objective conditions and misunderstanding of specific stages of historical development, abstract schemes and subjectivist "jumps" through individual historical stages, the desire to rely on administrative and bureaucratic arbitrariness, overestimation of the role of "leaders" as opposed to the masses in historical development. Trotsky regards the whole course of the development of

historical necessity as a "selection of accidents"; he reduces the history of the proletarian revolution to the actions of the "leaders" and to the exaltation of his own person; Trotsky's focus is not on the working class and the party, not on the masses, but on the "leading stratum"alone. Idealism permeates both Trotsky's supra-class theory of the Russian autocracy, where he mainly cites Plekhanov's scheme of the historical development of Russia, and his abstraction of the "workers ' state", which Trotsky, both in 1905 and in 1921, put forward in a trade union discussion, clearly ignores the question of the peasantry and the relationship of the proletarian dictatorship with it. The same idealism has also manifested itself in Trotskyist plans for" super-industrialization " and in the abstract opposition of communist and bourgeois culture, while denying the historical militant role of proletarian culture. At the same time, we find in the historical and economic views of Trotskyism also vivid manifestations of vulgar mechanismism: a lack of understanding of the connection between philosophy and the historical theory of Marxism, identification of the latter with "social Darwinism"; a fatalistic-Menshevik theory of the development of productive forces and the reduction of productive forces to technology; a mechanical transfer of concepts related to class contradictions and class exploitation, from the conditions of capitalism to the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry during the transition period; the idea of the internal forces of socialist development as entirely dependent on external conditions, on the course of the world revolution, the resulting lack of faith in the possibility of building socialism in our country; the doctrine of weakening the effect of uneven capitalist development under imperialism, etc.[25]

Historical subjectivism and idealism, combined with mechanismism, are characteristic of the social methodology of the" left " social-democrats in the pre-war period (R. Luxemburg, Parvus), and of the modern "left" social-democrats and Trotskyists in the West (K. Schulz). Korsh et al.), for the" left " opportunists at the present stage of socialist construction.

Our entry into the period of socialism, marked by vol. Stalin's report to the XVI Party Congress, the completion of the foundation of the socialist economy, and the historical decisions of the XVII Party Conference on the construction of a classless socialist society set us tasks of great theoretical importance in the field of historical materialism, raising our understanding of all questions of the historical theory of Marxism-Leninism to a new height. The development of the socialist socio-economic formation, the task of eliminating classes in the second Five-year plan, the further tasks of the proletarian state, the historical role of the proletarian party, the problem of eliminating the antithesis between town and country, the task of technical reconstruction, the creation of prerequisites for the elimination of the antithesis between mental and physical labor, etc. - from the point of view of all questions of historical materialism must be dealt with, and every kind of opportunism in questions of historical theory must be combated.

Chapter 2. The Doctrine of socio-economic formation, productive forces, and Relations of Production

2.1. The concept of socio-economic formation

The whole bourgeois social-historical science, at various stages of its development, is still characterized by its inability and unwillingness to work objectively, *materialistically* approach *society* and at the same time understand the special features that distinguish it from the rest of nature.*особые* laws of development.

Bourgeois and petty-bourgeois sociologists and historians completely lose sight of *the objective, material basis* of social life, independent of the ideal motives of people — its economic structure. Bourgeois science is unable to identify important and unimportant phenomena in a

25 Л. Троцкий, Уроки Октября, Моя жизнь, Наши политические задачи; статьи о культуре и другие работы; Е. Преображенский, Новая экономика, Закат капитализма и др.

complex network of social phenomena, to identify the main driving forces of development — to reveal the economic essence of society behind its political and ideological forms. Philosophers and sociologists limit their entire consideration of social life to the study of political and legal forms of society. At the same time, they seek to derive the forms of state and law from certain human *ideas* . Bourgeois science generally sees the presence of consciousness, ideological motives, and goals *as the only thing that can be achieved.* the difference between society and the rest of nature. She doesn't notice the specific *quality* public *relations* of people, special *laws* social development. For bourgeois sociology, there *are only individuals and the ideas*, goals, and intentions of these individuals: through the medium of consciousness, people enter into relations with each other and thus form a society. In order to understand the character of social life, bourgeois science starts *from the individual, from the individual and his consciousness* . The people who make up society are conceived by bourgeois sociologists as separate, independent "equal" individuals. Bourgeois science does not regard these individuals as members of historically defined social relations that actually shape the character and characteristics of each individual — as members of social classes. The approach of bourgeois sociology to society is *individualistic and naturalistic* , biological: the person with whom the study of society begins is understood by it as *a natural being* , a physical, physiological, psychological being, etc. He is credited *with the innate* traits of character and aspirations that are supposedly inherent in human nature "in general", but in reality very similar to the thinking of the modern bourgeois.

It is not surprising that with this approach to the study of social life, society is usually identified in bourgeois science with *the state and law* . Even Fichte and Hegel called civil society "the state of need and reason," i.e., they considered society to be a lower form, subordinate to the state. Modern bourgeois science follows the same proven path of political and legal definitions of society. The well-known R. Stammler, a German lawyer and inspirer of our native Struve and Bulgakov, saw the main sign of public life in the presence of *legal* regulation and legal norms in it. In society, according to Stammler, we must distinguish between its "matter", economy — by economy Stammler means the technique of production - and law — the "form" of social life. According to Stammler, *law*is what binds people together and "regulates" the nature and purpose of historical development.

Modern bourgeois fascist theorists who want to give some explanation to society as a *whole* , to understand the social *connection*of people, also look for the reason for this connection in legal and moral forces and ideals, in an unearthly spiritual force, in God! For example, the economist Stolzman, a representative of the "social" direction, believes that social regulation is "the subject sediment of the main ethical forces", "the moral ideal". The fascist sociologist O. Spann also believes that "the economy is an external reflection of spiritual life": society as a whole, in his opinion, arises due to" creative, life-provoking force", from the spark of the divine being.

Undoubtedly, one of the essential differences between the history of society and the development of nature is that in history there are people who are gifted with consciousness, driven by beliefs and set themselves certain goals. Everything that motivates people to act must pass through their heads and affect their will. But this circumstance does not mean that neither determine *the objective* social relations, *laws*of historical development.

All the generations of people who historically preceded us, in antagonistic social formations, did not have a correct, deep understanding of the material conditions and objective laws of social development, and the aspirations of individual individuals and classes contradicted each other, not being united by a single plan. Therefore, the consciousness of individuals, moral ideals, and even legal norms could only have a very small impact on the course of social development. Only the proletarian revolution makes possible the systematic construction of socialism based on a thorough knowledge of its material conditions, on the unity of the plan of the working class, which under the leadership of the party is carrying out its dictatorship, with the objective laws of the development of the new society. Historical materialism, in contrast to the entire bourgeois, idealistic sociology, reveals *the independent of consciousness* objective, material roots of social relations in order to explain the origin of state and legal norms, human goals and aspirations, regardless of the "ideal

principles" from which these norms and goals supposedly derive, as well as the role of human consciousness in social development, the role and significance of revolutionary theory in the hands of the revolutionary class, as well as the changes that are taking place in events that take place in different socio-historical conditions.

The naturalism, subjectivism, and individualism of bourgeois social doctrines have their class roots in the very structure of bourgeois society. Together with the development of commodity-capitalist production and free competition, the personality of the commodity owner is freed from the former natural ties that bound a person to the clan and community. The individual is, as it were, isolated from other opposing owners of goods, also "free" and "equal" to it. Bourgeois science therefore starts from the individual, from *the individual* — from his desires, interests, and goals. In fact, these individuals are *bourgeois*individuals, with their class interests and bourgeois ideals. It was on this class basis that all the so-called "robinsonades" of the eighteenth century emerged, i.e., such ideas of bourgeois economists about society, which were built up by considering the motives and aspirations that motivate the activity of some lonely hunter and fisherman, separated from the society of other people. The tendency to set out in the study of society from the subjective views and egoistic needs of the individual bourgeois persists throughout the later bourgeois science of society, for example, in the psychological "Austrian" school of bourgeois economy.

"In bourgeois society," says Marx, " the various forms of social connection appear in relation to the individual simply as *a means to his particular ends* , as an external necessity. However, the epoch that gives rise to this *point of view — that of the isolated individual* — is precisely the epoch of the most developed social (i.e., from this point of view, universal) *ties* [26]. Modern fascism, which can no longer turn a blind eye to the existence of these connections, remains, as we have seen, to look for their explanation in the divine will!

The individualism, naturalism, and subjectivism of bourgeois science are inextricably linked by another characteristic feature — the extreme *abstractness* of bourgeois ideas about society. Bourgeois historians and sociologists ask, " What is society, what is social progress? "and answer these questions with arguments about the" essence "of man, about human"nature." These judgments, which follow from the conditions of bourgeois society, must, in their opinion, have *a general, eternal, unchangeable meaning.* meaning for all historical epochs and for all peoples. Social relations and the laws of social organization are thus identified with the universal laws of nature. Instead of studying the actual, historical, *changing*social relations and relations, bourgeois science obliterates all historical differences in universal laws. Social production, in Marx's words, is portrayed by bourgeois economy "as enclosed in the framework of eternal laws of nature, independent of history, in order to slip bourgeois relations as immutable natural laws of society in abstracto[27]at every opportunity."

Petty-bourgeois sociologists also speak of a society "in general" corresponding to the" nature " of man. The well-known ideologist of narodism, N. K. Mikhailovsky, saw this as the most important task of his "subjective" sociology. By studying society, he believed, it is necessary to find out the social conditions under which the "needs of human nature"can be met. The Narodniks sought such an ideal of social life in the old peasant commune, not noticing the historical connection of this commune with subsistence farming, with feudal social relations, and not seeing the disintegration of this commune along with the development of capitalism.

Not far from these bourgeois and petty-bourgeois positions did modern social fascism, in its perversion of the Marxist doctrine of society, go *социал-фашизм*. Kautsky takes a distinctly eclectic, essentially subjectivist and naturalistic position on the question of society, only slightly embellished by "Marxist" phraseology. Kautsky begins by "dividing" man into three whole beings: the egoistic being, i.e., the natural being, the social being, and finally the sexual being. Kautsky considers separately the laws of development of each such aspect of human " nature." He does not

---

26 К. Маркс, Введение к критике политической экономии. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

27 К. Маркс, Введение к критике политической экономии. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

see the real unity of all these moments in the process of social life, and that the special character of their unity at each historical stage is determined *by social relations* . Kautsky, on the other hand, sees social relations as nothing more than a manifestation *of social instincts* that have their origin in the *animal* kingdom; he interprets social relations as a coincidence *of the will and thinking* of the members of society. "The most important connections of society, "he writes in The Materialist Understanding of History," have formed social instincts from the very beginning and coincide in the interests, thinking, and will of the members of society." According to Kautsky, the law of lawyers developed out of these "coincidences of will", which were fixed in customs. Kautsky polemics with Stammler only in the sense that, in Kautsky's opinion, it is not legislative norms, but customs, "customary law" that underlies the structure of society. But in essence he takes the same *anti-materialist* , bourgeois-legal point of view on society as Stammler. Thus Kautsky declares "democracy" and not "despotism" to be the original state of human society. Kautsky also tries to drag his purely bourgeois idea of the eternity and immutability of bourgeois democracy and bourgeois law through here, in order to "put to shame" in this way the proletarian dictatorship, which he detests.

Marxism resolutely rejects bourgeois subjectivism with its a priori and abstract-dogmatic arguments about society "in general". There can be no correct understanding of society if we start from the individual, from the individual "people" who make up society. Similarly, we will not arrive at a correct understanding of social life if, like the Kantians, we completely abandon the study of its objective laws, which are independent of consciousness *законов*. We must take into account all the specific features of each historical phenomenon. But at the same time, as Lenin points out, we must apply to social relations "the *general scientific criterion of repeatability*, the applicability of which to sociology was denied by the subjectivists" and which allows us to *generalize* historical phenomena, reveal *social ones* fundamentals *of individual* aspirations. To this end, Marxism distinguishes the relations of production from the totality of social relations *производственные отношения*as the objective basis of society, as its economic *structure* . Marx's starting point is not individual individuals, not "people", but *socially conditioned material production* . However, *the relations* of production that individuals enter into among themselves in the production process are not eternal, they are not relations of production "in general". In social phenomena we find a dialectical unity of repetition and non-repetition. Social relations change with the development of the productive forces, and with them the laws of social life change, and the whole character of society changes. Society is always a certain qualitative *peculiarity* , a society at a certain historical stage of development. "The relations of production as a whole," says Marx, " form what are called social relations, society, and, moreover , society *at a certain historical stage of development*, a society *with a peculiar character peculiar to itself* . Ancient society and bourgeois society are such aggregates of production relations, each of which at the same time marks a special stage in the development of mankind[28]."

Thus, rejecting the bourgeois-dogmatic definitions of society "in general," Marx and Engels developed the concept *of a socio-economic formation* , i.e., " a society at a certain historical stage of development." In the development and change of socio-economic formations, they saw *a natural-historical process* , that is, a process that proceeded naturally and still *independently* from the consciousness of people, as well as natural phenomena. The consciousness of the isolated bourgeois individual not only cannot give a correct idea of the relations of social production, but it also needs to be explained from the relations of production of bourgeois society. Man, Marx emphasizes, is not only a" social animal", as Aristotle considered him, but also an animal that *can be isolated only in society* . But the bourgeois relations of production, with their separate "equal" commodity owners, are not eternal, not ideal; they are *historical, transitory* education.

Lenin gave a vivid critique of the a priori and abstract arguments of our Narodniks on the subject of "what is society?" "Where, "he asked them," do you get the concept of society and

---

28 К. Маркс, Наёмный труд и капитал. Подчёркнуто ними. — *Авт* .

progress *in general* , when you have not yet studied a single social formation, *in particular* you have not even been able *to establish this concept* ... "Such techniques," Lenin pointed out, " only allow you to slip under the concept of society either the bourgeois ideas of an English merchant, or the bourgeois-socialist ideals of a Russian democrat — nothing more." Lenin saw the greatest merit of Marx in the fact that Marx began "with the analysis of facts, not with final conclusions, with the study of particular, historically determined social relations, and not with general theories about what these social relations in general consist[29]of."

The definition of society given by Marx, Engels, and Lenin is entirely imbued *with historicism* . At the same time, it is an example of the application of the materialist worldview and method. As a starting point in the characterization of each socio-economic formation, Marxism takes a certain *way of obtaining the means of subsistence* , or, as Marx puts it, *a way of producing material life* . Socially conditioned production is *material production* , the production of the material means of immediate life, i.e., the means necessary for the maintenance of human existence — food, clothing, housing, etc. - without which the very existence of human society would be unthinkable. The production and reproduction of these necessary means of subsistence and the tools necessary for their further production forms the material life of a given human society, the primary condition and material basis of its entire spiritual life. This is the most *general law*of the movement and development of human history, discovered by Marx and Engels.

But, as we have already pointed out, the forms of production of material life do not remain the same: they change depending on the level of productive forces that society possesses at each historical stage of its development. As a result of the change and growth of productive societies, the historically determined mode of production of material life and the corresponding, each time special, historically determined social relations of production in which people relate to each other in the production of material life change. These material, historically determined relations are formed in the production process itself, and they have been formed so far *independently of the public consciousness of people* . In contrast to superstructured, ideological relations, *the material* social relations are formed independently of the public consciousness of their participants. These basic relationships were formed each time in accordance with *the special laws*of functioning and development that were inherent in each social formation.

A historically changing, historically defined system of production relations, a certain economic structure — this is the objective, material basis of each socio-economic formation. Production relations are not relations of individuals, but relations involving the broad *masses* involved in the production process. In antagonistic class societies, the relations of production and material relations are those of social groups that differ in their place in a historically determined system of production, in their relation to the means of production, and in their role in the social organization of labor, i.e., in their different positions that allow one social group to appropriate labor to another. These are relations of social *classes* .

"The mode of production of material life," Marx wrote, " determines the process of social, political, and spiritual life in general." The mode of obtaining the means of subsistence and the corresponding totality of relations of production are the starting point in the consideration of social life. But the economic structure underlying society does not exhaust the whole concept of socio-economic formation. Marx, in Lenin's words, was only able to give a "*vivid picture*of a certain formation," to show the capitalist formation "as if it were alive-with its everyday aspects, with the actual social manifestation of the class antagonism inherent in industrial relations, with the bourgeois-political superstructure that protects the rule of the capitalist class, with bourgeois ideas of freedom, equality, etc. P., with bourgeois family relations"[30]- that he did not limit himself to analyzing the production relations of capitalism, but clothed this skeleton with flesh and blood, traced the political and ideological superstructures corresponding to production relations

---

29 В. Ленин, Что такое «друзья народа» / Соч., т. I — с. 74–75. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

30 В. Ленин / Соч., т. I — с. 72, 73.

надстройки. Only in the concrete unity of its economic basis and its corresponding superstructures, political and ideological forms, does each socio-economic formation appear as a whole, as a living "*socio-productive organism*" *(Marx)* .

1) The mode of production and the corresponding totality of production relations as *the material basis*of the social structure;

2) the dialectical definition of a society that is always *at a certain historical stage*, with the clarification of each time only this stage of its inherent, *special laws* , functioning and development, and in the conditions of a class society, the identification of its *class structure.* structures.

3) the internal, concrete unity of all aspects of social life that form a given living social-productive *organism*— the unity of the basis and superstructures.

These are the characteristic features of the Marxist-Leninist concept of socio-economic formation. Materialist dialectics permeates Marx's theory of society from beginning to end, being its methodological basis. As Lenin most succinctly puts it, " by taking as its starting point the basic fact of every human community — *the way of obtaining the means of living* — it has linked with it the *relations between people* that are formed under the influence of these methods of obtaining the means of living, and in the system of these relations (relations of production — in the terminology of the Marx) indicates the *basis* of society, which is clothed with political and legal forms and well-known trends of social thought. Each such system of production relations is, according to Marx's theory, *a special social organism*, which has *special laws of its origin, functioning and transition to the highest form*of transformation, into another social organism[31]."

Thus, a socio-economic formation is a whole historical *epoch* of the economic formation of society *(Marx)* , a certain historical *stage* of its development, a living socio-productive organism *(Marx, Lenin).* . Such, for example, is the capitalist social formation: the capitalist mode of production, bourgeois class relations of production, the bourgeois state and law, and bourgeois ideology.

It is impossible to put a sign of identity between the socio-economic formation and the economic *order* . A certain set of production relations, the economic structure of society is undoubtedly the material basis, and therefore the most important sign of social formation. Lenin sometimes uses the expression "economic structure" in the sense of the economic structure of a social formation. But the concept of a social formation is not limited to its economic structure alone. In addition, Lenin, in his well-known article on the food tax, pointed out as many as five economic structures in our transition economy. Some of them — capitalism and socialism-testified not to the existence of a complete capitalist or socialist formation in our country, but to the struggle between two formations. Some ways of life by themselves could not form the material basis of any of the historical formations (for example, the peculiar type of state capitalism indicated by Lenin), or they could be associated with the development of various formations (small-scale commodity production, natural production) .

The concept of economic structure as a certain *type* of production relations is poorer in its content than the concept of social formation. The number of socio-economic formations in history is more limited. We know only primitive society, ancient society, the feudal formation, the capitalist formation, and the future communist society. At the same time, Marxism knows much more about economic structures in the sense of the various types of production relations that make up or *remainders of production.* in the transition economy — capitalism), or *the embryos* of a new formation, or individual elements of a more complex economic structure (commodity production), or finally different *stages*in the development of a single formation (for example, serfdom as a form of feudalism). Sometimes different economic systems co-exist together in one formation, provided that they are subordinate to any one dominant or leading system. For example, the remnants of feudal relations are often now intertwined with the highest forms of capitalism, with forms of imperialist exploitation (in the East).

---

31 В. Ленин / Соч., т. II — с. 73. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

For a correct understanding of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of social formations, it is also important to note that historical formations form *progressive stages of development* societies-from a lower to a higher level. Marx speaks of "progressive epochs in the economic formation of society", Lenin emphasizes "special laws of origin, functioning and *transition to a higher form* , transformation into another social organism". Historical materialism does not study separate, disjointed, isolated social formations, but " the natural-historical process *of development* historical materialism, according to Lenin, "shows how from one mode of social *развивается*life another, *higher*mode of life develops, for example, from serfdom — capitalism[32]."

The development of one formation from another, the transformation of the lowest form of society into the highest form, and the progressive course of development of social formations as historical stages in the development of society — this is what creates the unity of the historical process — *the general course* of development of human society and its *special* , historically defined forms. The concept of social formation cannot be separated from the movement and development of concrete social formations: *social formations cannot be studied outside of their movement and development* .

That is why Lenin strictly distinguishes two points in this movement of social formation: first, *a qualitative leap* , the transformation of one formation into another, the transition to a higher form, and, secondly, the process of development *of the same* social formation, but which we study at different *stages , stages*, and stages of development, when all the basic principles are preserved. signs of a given formation, a given system of production relations. Imperialism, as the newest stage of capitalism, is not at all a special, separate social formation, but only the highest, last stage of development of the capitalist formation. Similarly, serfdom, not being a distinct formation from feudalism, is only a special form of development of feudal relations.

On the other hand, it is important not to confuse the laws and peculiarities of various socio-economic formations, not to transfer mechanically the laws of one formation to another, not to erase the special distinguishing features of individual social forms in abstract definitions of society "in general". On this issue, we must take the position of fighting on *two fronts* . We must not forget that every social formation-ancient society, feudal society, bourgeois society-represented a qualitatively unique and at the same time progressive stage in the general historical development of mankind. In *the special* laws of each socio-economic formation, with all their profound qualitative differences, the unity and connection of the historical process, *the general*materialist law of the movement of history, as set out by Marx in the preface to the Critique of Political Economy, find their manifestation.

Mechanists, in fact, are completely alien to the concept of a socio-economic formation. Bogdanov spoke of three "basic *types*" of economy-pre - "fractional subsistence economy", "exchange economy" and collectivism, completely ignoring the qualitative distinctiveness of formations in the mode of production and the relationships of classes. Bukharin, from the heights of his sociological scholasticism, defines society as the broadest system of interactions between people, as society "in general", blurring the boundaries between the special laws of various formations. Although he sometimes speaks of social formations, he does not give them the real, concrete class analysis necessary for the study of class society. Bourgeois society, a transitional economy, and a communist society — all these various economic structures and aggregates of economic structures represent, according to Bukharin, only various manifestations *of the general* laws of "equilibrium of the social system and environment", which, in his opinion, find their expression in the various "arrangements" of people, in space and time. To support this theory of social equilibrium, Comrade Bukharin refers to the tendency towards equilibrium in the various spheres *of capitalist development.* productions. Tov. Bukharin forgets that this tendency, in Marx's words, is "only a reaction against the permanent destruction of this equilibrium" and is explained *by the spontaneous* nature of the laws of capitalism, which can only maintain temporary stability in a

32 В. Ленин, Три источника и три основных части марксизма (Маркс, Энгельс, марксизм) — с. 42.

spontaneous way. Bukharin tries to transfer this trend to the development of our *transition*economy as the basic law of the latter. The lack of understanding of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of social formation becomes one of the starting points for the entire system of right-opportunist views, which were defended by the Soviet Union. By Bukharin.

On the same path of mechanistic confusion of the laws of capitalism and the transition period, and so on. Preobrazhensky in his "New Economy" — that economic platform of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism-when he interpreted his" law of initial socialist accumulation " in full analogy with the methods of exploiting the peasantry that were characteristic of initial capitalist accumulation.

Meanwhile, it should be emphasized that in *a class*society, the doctrine of social formation is inextricably linked with the Marxist theory of class struggle and the doctrine of social revolution. The social-productive organisms that Marx and Lenin speak of have nothing in common with plant and animal organisms, whose "harmonious" structure is assiduously praised by the bourgeois organic school of sociology, which strives to find the same harmony of social functions and "reconciliation" of interests in class society. As Lenin notes in the margins of Comrade Bukharin's "Economy of Transition," "social system," "social formation" — all this is not concrete enough without the concept of class and class society[33]. The regularity of the development of the formations of class society is *the regularity of the class struggle* . Therefore, the laws *of development* At the same time, the laws of the capitalist social formation are laws of its inevitable *demise* : they lead to the development and aggravation of the internal antagonistic contradictions of this formation, to their transformation into irreconcilable contradictions. Consequently, they also lead to a social *revolution* , to the transformation of a given formation into *another*social organism. Neither the right-wing opportunists nor the Trotskyists understood the qualitative peculiarity of the transition economy, in contrast to the capitalist one, the peculiarity of class relations during the transition period, the peculiarity of laws regulated not by the elements, but by growing planning.

Mechanistic errors in the understanding of the socio-economic formation were very clearly expressed in the discussion on the historical front of Marxism, in the speeches of Comrade Dubrovsky and some other historians on the question of serfdom, on the character of the Soviet economy, and so on. Dubrovsky distinguishes as many as nine social formations according to the "arrangement" of people in the technical process of production, and in particular formations he has patriarchal economy, serfdom, "small producers 'economy", and the transitional economy. A misinterpretation of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of social formations inevitably led Vol. Dubrovsky's approach to distorting the theory of the class struggle and drawing a number of politically incorrect, opportunist conclusions. Dubrovsky understands serfdom not as a form peculiar to the feudal system, but as a very special socio-economic formation. According to his theory, under feudalism, the peasant is free and, while working in the *public service, he is not free.* land, has the possibility of accumulation; in serfdom, this peasant is completely dependent on *the owner* the land on which he works, and gives him his surplus product.

Comrade Dubrovsky's mistake is that he forgets the relations *between the classes* , the big landowners and the peasantry, which are based on the landlords ' ownership of land and on the extra-economic compulsion they exert towards the peasantry — relations that are exactly *the same* under feudalism and serfdom. Tov. Dubrovsky mechanically proceeds only from external signs — different roles and different "arrangements" of people in the technical process. As it turned out in the course of the historical discussion, this mistake of Comrade Dubrovsky's led him to believe that the Russian peasantry had no possibility of accumulating under the semi-feudal conditions characteristic of our pre-revolutionary past: this mistake led him to deny the two paths of bourgeois revolution in Russia, to a purely Menshevik denial of the possibility of an American farmer's path of development. Finally, to portray the October Revolution as a revolution supposedly paving the way for capitalism in our countryside for the first time. Just as untenable are the ideas of T. Dubrovsky

33 Ленинский сборник XI — с. 383.

on the Soviet transition economy as an independent formation. This attitude, as we will show later, obscures *the transitional* character of our economy, the struggle between capitalist and socialist elements in it, and the significance of the struggle for *the socialist*path of our development. In the words of the same Dubrovsky, in the transitional era, " a purely socialist way of developing large-scale agriculture is not applicable." Thus, an incorrect starting point in the theory of formation leads Comrade Dubrovsky to a whole system of opportunist views.

The perversion of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of socio-economic formation and its development is also characteristic of Menshevik idealism. First of all, the concept of social formation — which the Menshevik idealists assiduously emphasized in their criticism of the mechanists — was of an abstract, logical, idealistic nature; they did not take the social formation in its real historical development and change. Thus, according to T. Luppol, " the concrete *concept of* society *in combination (!) with the concept* of development *in the language of methodology (!)*gives rise to a movement, moreover progressive, of social formations[34]." Here we have a vivid example of abstract "methodologizing", an example of the idealistic substitution of material movement and the development of social formations *for logical movement of concepts*, abstract "premises" - with which they tried to approach the questions of the historical development of tt. Deborin, Karev, Luppol, and others. Naturally, the Menshevik idealists, just like the mechanists, do not understand the dialectical *unity of the general and the particular* in the development of society. But while the mechanists extinguish in the laws of society "in general" the qualitative distinctiveness of the special laws of various social formations, the Menshevik idealists, on the other hand, forget the general materialist law of social development and the unity and connection of the whole historical process; they see only separate formations, separated from one another, with their special laws, *and they contrast* the special laws with the the general in the study of social life, forgetting about the indissoluble connection of the particular with the general, that each formation is "a society at a certain historical *stage of its development* According to T. Karev, who gives such an idealistic definition of society, "Marx's definition of society *does not take* society in general, does not emphasize what is common to all epochs and, in the end, has only a very limited significance for real knowledge, but emphasizes precisely the moment that really *constitutes it."* a society that is a constituent *type*of the given society[35]." Such an idealistic view of the special laws of society smears *the material and production* basis of society and leads to a lack *of understanding of the development process* society and *transition* from one formation to another. For example, T. Luppol considers the Soviet transition economy as a special socio-economic formation[36]. The Menshevik idealists try to define the very concept of society narrowly empirically, starting from the special features of individual formations: they believe that all these special features should be preserved in the general definition of society. Thus, T. Luppol identifies the concept of society with the concept *of class* society. "The Marxist definition of society," he said, " must be universal, but it must contain the concept *of class relations of production* and through them all single phenomena[37]."

Finally the Menshevik idealists are inclined to emphasize *the gradual* development of society: they borrow the bourgeois concept of social transformation, substituting it for the dialectic of the contradictory development of society and breaking the concrete unity of the economic basis and political superstructure in this development of social formations. A step towards vulgar evolutionism is being taken by T. A. Tolstoy. Deborin. According to Deborin, historical materialism "shows how one social order *is transformed*into another, higher type." Imperialism, in the opinion

---

34 И. Луппол, Ленин и философия / 1927 — с. 105. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

35 Н. Карев, Исторический материализм как наука / Под знаменем марксизма № 12, 1929.

36 И. Луппол, Ленин и философия / 1927 — с. 117, то же у Н. Карев, статья / Под знаменем марксизма № 10–11 — с. 95.

37 И. Луппол, К вопросу о теоретических корнях правого уклона / Большевик № 18, 1929.

of T. P. Blavatsky. Deborina, being a political reaction, "means progress economically," because in the era of imperialism " production becomes more and more socialized, "and on this basis free competition"is replaced by monopoly." In this sense, imperialism is interpreted by Deborin as a transition from the old capitalism to a new socio-economic formation. Meanwhile, according to Lenin, imperialism is the latest stage of capitalist formation, and monopoly is only a transition from capitalism to a higher system because competition will continue along with monopoly, and because in such conditions monopoly generates "a number of particularly acute and major contradictions." This revolutionary content of Leninist thought is completely emasculated in the interpretation of vol. Deborina[38].

2.2. Nature and society. Labor process

If bourgeois social science is unable to give a correct answer to the question of the nature of social relations, it has already been shown that it is also unable to give a correct idea of the relationship between nature and human society.

In some bourgeois theories we find *an abstract identity* drawn between society and nature. These are theories, sociological naturalism and mechanismism. Society is considered here as a mechanical aggregate, as the sum of human organisms, as the totality of physical, physiological, and biological individuals; social life is transformed into a special case of biology, into a special manifestation of the social instinct inherent in animals as well. In other theories, a frankly idealistic point of view is put forward, drawing *an abstract distinction* , a complete *gap* between nature and society. In this case, social life is portrayed as something that cannot be known with the help of general concepts, such as those used in natural science. According to these theories, we are not supposed to determine the causes of social phenomena; social phenomena are supposedly not subject to any laws, and we can only navigate among them by considering them from the point of view of "purpose", the value of "moral duty", etc. These are the views of neo-Kantians and other subjectivists.

Marxism establishes a dialectical *unity* of nature and society, i.e., a unity that takes into account all their differences, all the qualitative specificity of social phenomena. Marxism sees in the social life of people *a special, specific quality* that cannot be recognized using the concepts of physics, physiology, biology, etc. A social person is not just a biologically considered organism, and society is not a collection of these organisms: this is something different, *new* in comparison with the natural side of human beings. Social life can be known only through *the special* social relations and laws that are inherent *only in society,* which characterize its *originality,* in comparison with the rest of nature. But at the same time, Marxism recognizes that the special relations and laws of human social and historical life are in *unity with the general laws of nature* , and that they do not represent an absolute break with these general laws. Not subjective "goals" and "values", but objective knowledge of the causes and laws of social development should also be the method of Marxist research here.

The unity of social and natural phenomena is realized in *the process of social labor* , which underlies the entire historical life of a person. "Labor," Marx defines, " is primarily a process that takes place between man and nature, a process in which man, by his own activity, determines, regulates, and controls *the exchange of substances between himself and nature* . He himself opposes the substance of nature as a force of nature. In order to appropriate the substance of nature in a certain form suitable for his own life, he sets in motion the natural forces belonging to his body, arms and legs, head and fingers. *By acting through this movement on the external nature and changing it, he also changes his own nature.* He develops the latent faculties of the latter and subordinates the play of these forces to his own power[39]."

---

38 А. Деборин, Ленин как мыслитель.

39 К. Маркс / Соч., т. I — с. 157.

In this classic passage, Marx shows how, based *on the general* laws of nature, qualitative distinctiveness is created in the process of social labor*своеобразие* public life. Marx here portrays the process of labor in its most general and simple aspects, taken independently of any form of social life, as an " eternal *natural condition* human life." Man *as a natural phenomenon* the creature opposes the "substance of nature", as well as some "force of nature". His work, considered as *a natural* process (physical, chemical, physiological, etc.), is the process in which man sets his natural organs in motion and in which the *exchange of substances* between man and the rest of nature takes place. In other words, man appropriates the substance of nature in the form necessary for his natural existence. But already in this natural process of metabolism between man and external nature, which is accomplished by the movement of natural forces belonging to his body, a *qualitative peculiarity of human labor* arises , which deeply distinguishes it from the metabolism that occurs in the rest of nature, in other animal and plant organisms.

It consists in the fact that social labor is a *conscious* process, a manifestation of the purposefully directed will of man; man, by his activity, "determines, regulates and controls" the exchange of substances between himself and nature. Labor in this form, which is exclusively the property of man, is essentially, fundamentally different from the "labor" activity of certain types of animals-bees, ants, spiders, beavers, etc. Man, according to Marx, not only changes the form of the substance given to him by nature, but "in what is given by nature, he carries out at the same time, it is also his *conscious*goal, which, like a law, determines the way and nature of his actions and to which he must submit his will[40]."

Another qualitative difference between human labor arises from the dialectical relationship between man and nature, in which man, acting "on external nature and changing it, changes at the same time his *own* nature." This change in the" nature " of man consists primarily in the change *of organs* its activities, in the creation of *artificial* tools by it. In the course of his labor, man uses the physical, chemical, and mechanical properties of other bodies and forces of nature and forces them to act as such forces on other bodies. He attaches objects of nature to his *natural* organs, turning them into his *artificial ones* government agencies. Earth, stone, trees, bones, metals-gradually become *the means of labor* human. Man not only uses the objects of nature directly given to him as means of production, *but also changes* the form of natural objects in accordance with his activity and *creates new forms of production.* new means of labor. "The use and creation of the means of labor," Marx points out, " although inherent in the germ form of certain animal species, is *a specifically characteristic feature of human labor.*" Marx believes that the view of the American thinker Franklin, who defined man as "*a tool*-making animal", is correct[41]. In creating the means of labor, man sets them in opposition to the rest of nature as his organs and directs them to this or that *object* nature, the subject of labor.

The expedient nature of human activity, the use and creation of labor tools aimed at the subject of labor are the most common features that distinguish *human labor* . The creation and use of tools of labor leads to the fact that human labor acquires, along with the natural side, and another specifically human, *social* side. Along with the natural process of physical, mechanical, etc. movements of human organs , people's relations to the tools of labor created and used by them arise: a new *artificial environment* is created in which the labor process *takes place, social relations* of people, social *relations of production* are created .

A person does not produce alone: a person's work always takes place in *society* people like him. Man is a social animal, and his production is always *socially conditioned* production. The production of isolated individuals who live outside of society — with the rare exception of being stranded on some uninhabited island-is simply nonsense. Human labor develops *historically* : labor functions become more complex, and with the increasing complexity of the means of labor, these labor functions are divided between different groups of people. All this is possible only in society, if

40 К. Маркс / Соч., т. I — с. 155.

41 К. Маркс / Соч., т. I — с. 157.

there is cooperation, joint work of people. Human labor is always *social labor* : but it takes place in *certain* social relations and relations between people. The general features of all human labor-conscious, purposeful human activity and the availability of certain means and objects of labor-are *different* manifestation at every historical stage of the development of society, each time in *a historically defined* social form. The social life of a person acquires *a specifically social quality* , its historical certainty.

Thus, in the historical process of labor development itself, the social side of labor arises and develops, which is in interpenetration with its natural side, but plays a decisive role in their dialectical unity. Using the example of the development of primitive humanity, Engels vividly showed this dialectic of the natural and social side of human labor. Labor, according to Engels, is the first and basic condition of human existence itself, it is caused by the natural need of man for food, shelter, clothing, etc.But, developing, labor has its opposite effect on the natural nature of man, it contributes to the final formation of man as a biological species and the development of his natural needs. Labor, says Engels, "created man himself." Modern biology, in the person of Darwin and his followers, has established the animal origin of the human species-its development from the humanoid ape. But the process of evolution from ape to man did not proceed, as Engels shows, as a purely biological process of "adaptation" of the human body to nature, which is usually depicted by bourgeois Darwinists. This evolution took place together with the development of human labor and under its direct influence. Thus, the straight gait of a person and the use of only the legs when walking could only arise and strengthen when the human hand specialized in other labor functions. The hand, Engels points out, is "not only *the organ* of labor, it is also its *product*." Only through labor, through the adaptation of the hand to increasingly complex labor operations and the hereditary transmission of these improvements, did the human hand acquire its modern form. Work helped to unite people, work helped to create the need for human articulate speech: it contributed to the development of the human brain. The joint work of the brain, hands, and speech organs contributed to the further development of the human body.

Labor distinguishes primitive human society from the earlier swarm of humanoid apes. Primitive animal forms of" labor " were *instinctive*. Animal instincts of self-preservation, etc., and not a deliberate conscious goal, played a major role in the labor activity of primitive people, who, like animals, only use nature predatingly, but do not yet put the seal of their will on it. Along with the development of labor itself, the human brain develops, there is a conscious, purposeful, deliberate activity of a person who makes the tools of his labor and directs them to certain objects of labor. The idealistic point of view tries to explain this process of development of human labor and changing forms of labor by growing *потребностями*human needs. It remains unclear why needs arise and grow. In fact, it is not the growth of needs that causes changes in production, but, on the contrary, *changes in the forms of labor, in production, lead to an increase in needs* . By changing the external nature of its conscious activity and learning about it in the process of this labor practice, human society is faced with ever-new sources of manufacturing tools, with ever-new objects for which human labor is directed. In this way, the tools of labor change and improve, and along with the change in the means of labor, the nature, method, and form of a person's labor activity itself change, and "his own nature"changes. A change in the nature *of production* causes *new needs in a person*, which push him to new searches in order to improve the means of labor in a new way. By changing the external nature, a person also changes his "own nature", that is, the social environment in which and through which the process of his work takes place. This *is the dialectic of the social labor process* which forms the basis of the entire development of human history.

However, which plays *a decisive* role in this dialectical interaction between human society and nature — the external 'natural', 'geographical' environment or the nature of human society itself? This question, which bourgeois sociology is unable to answer, often causes confusion among Marxists, which introduces a number of perversions into our understanding of the historical process. Bourgeois naturalistic and mechanical views on this issue were formed in a special historical and sociological trend, which was called *geographical materialism* : its most prominent representatives — in the XVIII century. Montesquieu, in the XIX century — Bockl ' Ratzel, Ratzenhofer,

Mechnikov and others. This sociological trend clearly overestimates the role and significance of geographical and natural environments in general for the development of society and its history. The methodological roots of geographical materialism are inextricably linked with the foundations of the bourgeois worldview. They must be sought in a profoundly bourgeois theory that speaks of *the balance* that supposedly exists between society and nature, and which therefore determines the "inviolability" of the existing social system. Closely related to this is the misinterpretation by bourgeois thought of Darwin's teaching in its application to society as the doctrine of the passive *adaptation of society to nature* . Even the French educator Montesquieu put forward in the XVIII century the famous position that the history of peoples has its own geographical basis. The" spirit of laws " of each nation, according to Montesquieu, should correspond to the physical properties of the country, the peculiarities of its climate, the quality of its soil, and so on. Later representatives of geographical materialism developed in detail the view of the influence that the soil, climate, location of seas, rivers, mountains, and the nature of the animal and plant world of a given country have on everyday life and the historical features of the people who inhabit it. From the conditions of the geographical environment, they deduced the natural "inclinations" of a particular people to agriculture, navigation, their "temperament", their hard work or "natural" laziness.

Geographical materialism thus establishes a certain balance between nature and society, and it is the external nature surrounding society that plays a decisive role in the process of adapting society to natural conditions. All historical development is regarded by geographical materialists as a gradual *adaptation* society's attitude to *внешней*the external environment. Human society, according to this point of view, is doomed in this process of "adaptation" to a purely *passive* role: the existing social relations depend entirely on the conditions of the external environment and are determined by these latter. Hence it is concluded that the laws of social life are also entirely determined by the laws of the development of external nature, these laws can change only *depending on changes in the external natural environment* .

Modern social-fascism also adheres to this clearly bourgeois view, which condemns society to complete passivity and immobility and fatalistically interprets the regularity of social development *социал-фашизм*. Thus, according to G. Kunov, the technique of social labor is highly connected with the conditions of nature[42]. Kautsky, even in his early writings, came up with his theory *of equilibrium* , which, as he established, supposedly exists in nature between different animal and plant species, where the existence of some species is closely dependent on others, and which Kautsky also sought to find in the development of society. In this book, Ethics and the Materialist Understanding of History, Kautsky drew on this basis an identity between the social instincts that arise in human society and the biological instincts of animals. In his last works Kautsky develops a whole doctrine of *adaptation* society to nature. The whole process of historical development is interpreted by him as a process of conscious adaptation (Anpassung) of society to the conditions of the natural environment[43].

We also find a whole series of errors following the same line of geographical materialism, so to speak, a clear "geographical bias" in Plekhanov. We have already pointed out the exaggerated importance given to the geographical environment in his "Monistic View". In his Fundamental Questions of Marxism, Plekhanov openly states that " the properties of the geographical environment determine the development of the productive forces; the development of the productive forces determines the development of economic relations and, after them, of all other social relations... The development of the productive forces, which ultimately determines the development of all social relations, is determined *by the development of all social relations. properties of the geographical environment* "[44]. Plekhanov tries to justify this position by pointing

---

42 Г. Кунов, Марксова теория исторического процесса общества и государства.

43 К. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории.

44 Г. Плеханов, Основные вопросы марксизма.

out that the properties of the geographical environment determine the nature of those *objects* that serve man and are produced by him to satisfy his needs , i.e., the properties of labor techniques, tools and objects of labor. Where there were no metals in the earth, he points out, primitive people could not have emerged from the Stone Age period; seas and rivers bring people together at a higher stage of their development and separate people at lower stages of the development of productive forces, etc. But these examples are not only unproven, but they contradict Plekhanov's main thesis. After all, the bowels of the earth are full of metals, which we are now discovering in new places. However, it is a matter of technical possibility and social conditions that make it necessary to find them, get them, and use them, and this is possible only at a certain stage of the development of the productive forces, only under certain production relations. Pre-war Russia was considered a backward country in terms of the amount of metal, coal, etc.found in it. Socialist construction leads to the discovery of huge geological and other natural resources in our country. As for the role of the seas and rivers, according to Plekhanov himself, the latter changes depending on the level of productive forces of mankind. Dneprostroy, Volgostroy, etc — are vivid examples of how new social conditions are changing the nature and significance of waterways. Therefore, the main reason for historical development is not so much in external geographical conditions, which change little over long historical periods, as *in the internal laws*of development of society, in the nature of production relations, in the level of productive forces, depending on which at different historical stages a person is able to use the properties of the geographical environment in different ways.

In the" organizational science "of the machist A. Bogdanov, and then in the" Theory of Historical Materialism " of T. Bukharin, this *mechanistic* understanding of the relationship between society and external nature received its complete expression. Tov. Bukharin criticizes the attempts of the social-fascist Kunov to start from the properties of the geographical environment in order to understand the conditions of social development. In contrast to Kunov, Bukharin believes that the starting point should be the productive forces of society. But the trouble is that the most productive forces, according to Bukharin's theory, express the energy *balance*between nature and society. T. Bukharin understands the" exchange of substances " between man and nature roughly mechanically — as the transfer of material energy from the bowels of nature to society, resulting in the expenditure of human labor energy[45]. Tov. Bukharin insists that the adaptation of society to nature is an active adaptation. However, according to his theory, it turns out that a "balance with a positive sign" between society and nature can be established only as a result of the excess of material energy pumped out of nature over human labor costs. In other words, not *internal* laws of social development, but *external conditions*are, according to Bukharin, the driving force of historical development.

Thus, in essence, Comrade Bukharin's notorious theory of equilibrium finds itself in the position of the same geographical materialism. In his opinion, the internal "equilibrium" of society is a quantity that depends on *the external*equilibrium, i.e., the equilibrium existing between the " social system "and the natural"environment". Violation of the" sustainability " of society is possible only as a result of changes in the external environment. The examples given by Comrade Bukharin to show what causes the disturbance of the" equilibrium " of society — changes in the fertility of the soil, etc. — all also indicate that Comrade Bukharin does not understand the significance of the internal laws inherent in social life and its development[46].

The "ultimate cause" of the development of social relations of production must be sought in *the social relations* themselves-*in the internal* patterns of their development. We find the driving force of this development in the dialectic of the social process *of labor* , in the state of the productive forces, and in the special social quality of the relations of production at each historical stage. This is not to say that the external conditions of the natural environment do not play any role in social development. Otherwise, we would have to adopt the Kantian point of view, the idealistic

45 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — с. 117.

46 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — с. 77–81.

separation of society from nature. We must not forget for a moment that human society, in its historical development, comes out of the bowels of nature, that the whole social life of men and the labor process that underlies it are an "exchange of substances" between man and nature, that they also have their natural side — physical, mechanical, etc., that they also have their natural side. the means and objects of human labor are the bodies and forces of nature that are changed and used by man. In this sense, the importance of the natural "environment" in which the social production process takes place is truly enormous. But these natural conditions of the labor process cannot play *a decisive*role in the development of a particular mode of social life, in the development of feudal society, in the capitalist economy, in the construction of socialism.

Marxism proceeds from the dialectical *unity of internal and external conditions* in the development of society, but internal conditions play a decisive role here, and we must proceed from internal conditions in order to correctly assess the significance of the external, natural environment. Only at the earliest stages of historical development does nature, as Marx put it, lead primitive man exactly "on the shoulders" and make him completely dependent on its conditions. But the higher the stage of social development, the more complex the economic structure, the more and more the very nature of the natural conditions used by man as a means and object of labor depends not so much on nature itself as on the specific properties of this economic structure. *Society*, not external nature, is the decisive factor in this dialectical unity of nature and society.

Russian capitalism, for example, could not set itself such grandiose tasks as harnessing the water power of the Dnieper, Volga, and Angara rivers, creating the Kuzbass, fighting for cotton independence, and so on, which are solved by victorious socialism. Social life does not adapt itself at all to the laws of nature, but, on the contrary, it "adapts" natural conditions to its needs; it contributes to the fact that the very properties of the surrounding natural environment change and thus the laws of nature are increasingly transformed into historical laws.

Idealistic attempts to separate society from nature have also found expression in contemporary social-fascist perversions of historical materialism. They manifest themselves in such social-democratic theorists as Max Adler, Otto Bauer, the" ultra-left " Korsch, in the same Kautsky, in his view of the productive forces and relations of production, and others. For example, for M. Adler, "sociality" is a certain innate property of a person's spiritual life that distinguishes him from the rest of nature.

In the Soviet economic literature, these attempts were expressed in the idealistic revision of Marxism by the Menshevik Rubin. The gap between society and nature is clearly expressed in Rubin's idealistic understanding of the social process of labor itself, from which Rubin completely eliminates the natural, physiological side of labor. The same idealistic views in understanding the relationship between society and nature can be found among representatives of Menshevik idealism. In their fascination with the "social form" movement, they underestimate the importance of environmental conditions for social development, and do not understand *the determining factor of social development.* the importance that human labor has for society as an exchange of substances between man and nature. For example, T. Luppol, defining society as a set of production relations, believes at the same time that the labor connection of people in the production process is not an essential, basic feature of production relations, that labor, therefore, is not the basis of human society: T. Luppol finds the labor connection in both bees and ants, forgetting about specific features human labor[47]! These various perversions of the basic line of materialist understanding of society are most clearly manifested in the teachings on the basic elements of the mode of production — the productive forces and relations of production.

2.3. Productive forces

The concept of the productive forces of society is the most important concept of historical

47 И. Луппол, Ленин и философия — с. 101, 102.

materialism, without the analysis of which it is impossible to get an accurate idea of the driving forces of the development of a socio-economic formation. In the category of productive forces, we have a kind of touchstone for a correct understanding of the entire historical and economic theory of Marxism. And yet, precisely on the question of the productive forces, we still find an incredible number of perversions, even in Marxist literature, which once again show that there is Marxism and "Marxism".

Even before the war, international Menshevism had adopted an openly revisionist line on the question of productive forces, and modern social — fascist "Marxism"had descended to completely bourgeois views on their nature. The notorious Menshevik theory of" productive forces " consists in the fact that it transforms the productive forces into a certain fetish, into a kind of new "God". The development of the productive forces is conceived by it as a purely *automatic* process that takes place independently of the state of society, and therefore independently of the class struggle and class contradictions. The reference to the "insufficient" development of the productive forces is always made by the social-fascists in order to "prove" the immaturity of the proletarian revolution. At the same time, the change in the productive forces is usually identified by social fascism with the progress *of technology* . Social prerequisites necessary for further historical *change* the very technique created by capitalism is not at all clear.

In this question Kautsky takes a further step towards a purely bourgeois theory of society. Under the guise of Marxist phraseology, Kautsky seeks to introduce into his understanding of the productive forces a historical idealism so pleasing to the bourgeois heart*идеализм*, and in this way to make his own "materialist" understanding of history quite acceptable to the bourgeoisie. According to Kautsky, " the development of the material productive forces is basically just another designation for *the development of the knowledge of nature* . The deepest foundation of the real basis, this material foundation of human ideology, is thus *the spiritual process*— the process of cognition of nature[48]."

We will return later to Kautsky's idealistic conception. In the meantime, we will focus on the apparently opposite concept of productive forces, which is characteristic of modern *mechanists* . Tov. Bukharin sees the " central question of sociology "as"why the productive forces are involved as the ultimate cause of everything." He is clearly dissatisfied with this solution of the problem, which does not explain the reasons for the change in the productive forces themselves, and tries to give it a mechanistic solution. According to Comrade Bukharin, " the productive forces determine social development because they express the relationship between society as a definite real aggregate and its environment. *And the ratio between the environment and the system is a quantity that ultimately determines the movement of any system* ." In other words, Comrade Bukharin sees the reason for the development of productive forces in external contradictions between the environment (nature) and society, in external environmental conditions. By productive forces, however, he means "the relationship between society and nature, *the amount of material energy that society uses to live* »[49]." Elsewhere, taking the productive forces as the starting point of his analysis, Comrade Bukharin defines them as the "technical basis of society", the "natural technical apparatus". And in this case, he proceeds entirely from his theory of equilibrium. According to T. Bukharin, labor productivity expresses the ratio between the amount of material energy extracted from nature and the amount of labor expended. From the point of view of its material components, the productivity of labor depends on the "mass of means of production" and the "mass of labor forces", which together form the material productive forces of society. But since the means of

---

48 K. Kautsky, Die materialistische Geschichtsauffassung, B. I. Следует отметить, что к абстрактно-идеалистическому пониманию производительных сил скатываются и представители меньшевиствующего идеализма, говоря о развитии производительных сил «вообще», не учитывая активной роли, которую играет общественная форма развития производительных сил или объясняя причины развития производительных сил их «беспокойным характером» (?!) (см. работы Тымянского, Гоникмана и др.).

49 Н. Бухарин, К постановке проблем теории исторического материализма.

production "determine the labor forces as well," and since, in Bukharin's words, people are "fitted" to machines, then so are the labor forces. Bukharin comes to the conclusion: "an accurate material indicator of the relationship between society and nature is the system of social tools, i.e., *equipment* this company. In this technique the material productive forces and the productivity of social labor find their expression[50]."

Abstract-mechanistic formulation of the problem. The question of the "causes" of the development of the productive forces and the desire to find these "causes" *outside the scope of Bukharin's work.* the productive forces themselves do not take into account the specific *social dimension at all.* the content of the productive forces and the role that the concrete historical structure of production relations plays in their development. Comrade Bukharin's arguments about productive forces as a certain "quantity of material energy" are neither new nor original. Tov. Bukharin only repeats in a new form the same theory of the "energy balance" between nature and society that A. Bogdanov and other Machists developed in their works and which at one time met with the sharpest rebuke from Lenin. Lenin particularly objected to the understanding of the growth of the productive forces as the accumulation of "energy" and, in general, to the application of empty "energy" phrases to Marx's social theory. "Marx," Lenin wrote at the time, " gave an absolutely *precise definition of the concept of productive forces* and studied *the concrete*process of this growth." In response to the Machists ' abstruse statement that "the productive forces perform an economic function in relation to the process of labor," Lenin quipped: "it is as if one were to say that the vital forces perform a vital function in relation to the process of life[51]." As far as Comrade Bukharin's views were concerned, Lenin considered it clearly erroneous that Bukharin reduced the productive forces to technology and forgot *the social order.* contents of the concept of productive forces. To refer, as Marx does, to machines as productive forces, according to Lenin, does not mean at all to identify productive forces with machinery.

Both in the idealistic view of the development of the productive forces as a "process of knowledge" and in the mechanistic attempt to reduce the productive forces to "technology" or a certain amount of "material energy", we have a clear distortion of the Marxist dialectic. There is no understanding of the dialectical unity that exists between *the objective* and *subjective* factors of the production process. *Social content is ignored here* and *the historical*content of the concept of productive forces. The "energetic" phrases do not in the least express the actual social and historical content of the concept of productive forces as the basic concept of historical materialism.

The law of development of the material productive forces is the deepest *foundation* of the entire process of social and historical development. "According to the materialist conception of history," says Engels,"*the defining* moment of history is *ultimately*the production and reproduction of immediate life[52]." The development of the productive forces is nothing more than the social expression of the content and material result of the activity of men directed to the production and reproduction of their material life, their immediate life, that is, to the maintenance of their existence, this process of "social administration of their life." But by "*developing their productive forces, i.e., by living*," people also develop certain *relationships* to each[53]other. The productive forces really express *the relation of human society to nature* . But this is possible only because the development of the productive forces presupposes and reveals historically determined *relations in society* itself . As Marx and Engels wrote in their earlier work, in history "there is at every stage a certain material result, a certain sum of productive forces (by Marx's hand: *a historically created relation to nature*

---

50 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — с. 122–124.

51 В. Ленин, Материализм и эмпириокритицизм / Соч., т. XIII.

52 Ф. Энгельс, Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства. Подчёркнуто нами — *Авт* .

53 К. Маркс, Письмо к Анненкову.

and individuals to each other)[54]."

Productive forces are not an energy "balance" between society and the external environment. They reveal each time a historically determined stage *of the internal* development *of society itself* , and consequently the resulting historically changing active attitude of this *society* to external nature. Therefore, it is fundamentally wrong to raise the question of the "causes" of the development of the productive forces abstractly, without taking into account the concrete historical form of society. The totality of the various constituent elements that make up the productive forces — technology, labor power, etc. — receives its unity and its social, historical connection in the process of social labor itself. A historically determined combination of these material and personal factors of production reveals to us a historically determined *stage in the development of the productivity of social labor* [55].

Social productive forces are the totality of all the moments of the production process that are aimed at the production and reproduction of the immediate, material life of society and the tools of labor necessary for this. The state of the productive forces expresses a historically determined stage in the development of labor productivity and thus "the historically created relationship of society to nature and people to each other." What determines the increase in productivity — the productive power) of social labor at each historical stage? There was an extensive debate on this issue in the economic literature even before Marx. The bourgeois economists, as advocates of capital, sought to explain all the productivity of social labor *by the material* elements of production, to deduce it from the tools of labor, from the techniques belonging to the capitalists. In contrast, utopian socialists rightly considered *the work* of the worker to be the only source of value. But they drew the erroneous conclusion that all productivity of labor can be explained by one *subjective*, personal factor of production — the art, abilities, and skill of the workers. Criticizing this erroneous position, Marx wrote: "This *stage of labor productivity development* there is something from which we start — something that is present not only as *a talent, a capacity of the worker* , but also in *the material tools* that this labor has created for itself… This is the real Prius (originally) that makes up the starting point, and this Prius is the result of the development process[56]." Elsewhere, Marx gives a more detailed description of the entire complex set of factors that determine the productive power of social labor: "The productive power of labor is determined by polysyllabic circumstances, among other things, by the average degree *of art* the level of development *of science* and its technical applications, *the social organization* of the production process, the size and capacity *of the means of production*, and, finally, *natural*conditions[57]." Thus, Marx sees in the means of production and in the material instruments a very important point, but only one of a number of points that determine the productivity of labor at a given historical stage.

The productive forces in which the historical stage of development of labor productivity finds its material expression are always the unity *of the material and personal* (subjective) factors of the production process — *the unity of human labor power with the means of production* . These are the necessary factors of any production process, which need to be *combined* in order for the production process to be possible. The different historical way in which they are combined determines a given, historically determined *mode of production* . "Whatever may be the social forms of production," says Marx, " the workers and the means of production are always its factors. But, being in a state of estrangement from one another, both of them are its factors only in possibility. In order to produce

---

54 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, О Фейербахе / Архив Маркса и Энгельса — с. 227.

55 Как излагает Ленин мысль Маркса, — производственные отношения «всегда соответствуют той *степени развития производительности* , которой в данное время обладают их экономические силы… На известной ступени развития своей производительности силы приходят в столкновение с производственными отношениями» и т. д. (В. Ленин, Что такое «друзья народа» / Соч., т. I — с. 69).

56 К. Маркс, Теории прибавочной стоимости / т. III.

57 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 6.

at all, they must connect. The *particular character and manner in which this connection is made distinguishes the individual economic epochs of the social structure* »[58]."

The means of production-machinery, machinery, etc. - taken by themselves are not identical with the productive forces of society; they are *only possible* factors in the future production process. Only the living flame of labor, as Marx put it, raises them from the dead. Only when combined with labor — power in the process of production do these material tools of labor become *actual* factors in the development of labor productivity-its productive forces. But it is just as wrong to reduce productive power to the development of people themselves, their labor power, their knowledge, art, and abilities, and to the practical energy displayed by people. People, Marx wrote, criticizing the views of the idealist Proudhon, "are not free to choose their productive forces... Every productive force is an acquired force, *a product of previous activity* . Thus, the productive forces are the result of the practical energy of people, but this energy itself is limited by the *conditions* in which people find themselves, by the productive forces already acquired earlier, by the social form that existed earlier, which was not created by these people, which is the creation of previous generations[59]." The material result of the work of previous generations that is available at each historical stage — in the form of a complex technical apparatus, certain working conditions, and the social form of this work-determines the necessary environment in which the knowledge, abilities, and practical energy of the new human generation are applied every time. To fail to see the role of living labor in the development of the productive forces is to fall into bare technicism, into mechanicism. To forget the material conditions of the employment of labour — power is to embark on an idealistic explanation of history, as Kautsky did.

The combination of the means of production with live labor takes place in the process of social production. The personal, subjective factor of production — labor-power-always has a definite class significance in *a class society.* content. This circumstance makes the productive forces a social category. The concept of productive forces is not *at all a technical*concept, as Comrade Bukharin believes. Bukharin's definition of the concept of productive forces as a category "bordering" on technology and economics also does not express the essence of the issue. The concept of productive forces is the basic concept of historical materialism, and it has a certain social significance and meaning.

But even this is not enough for a correct understanding of the productive forces. Marx, according to Lenin, not only gave a precise definition of the concept of the growth of productive forces, but also "studied *the concrete* process of this growth." Like any social category, the concept of productive forces is steeped in historicism from beginning to end *историзмом*. This concept expresses the historically created relationship to nature and individuals to each other. The union of labour-power with the means of production does not take place in *the form of productive* forces "in general", but always *concretely and historically* , in various historical forms, each time differing in the "*special* character and mode" of this union. *Development* It is not "generally" a technical process independent of class contradictions and class struggle, as the mechanists imagine, nor is it "generally" the development of human knowledge, abilities, etc., as the idealists would like.

The right-wing opportunists, with their characteristic mechanistic attitude, took kulak farms under their protection in the name of "developing the productive forces." They have forgotten that these productive forces will inevitably be the productive forces of capitalism, strengthening capitalist relations. The state of the material productive forces, the definite stage and forms of their development are inextricably linked with a historically determined *social formation* , with definite *classes* and their contradictions-and they cannot be understood outside of this historical concreteness. The productive forces of capitalism, the productive forces of feudal formation, the productive forces of socialist construction — everywhere here the combination of labor power with the means of production takes place each time in a special social form that determines the social

58 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. II — глава 1, с. 10.

59 К. Маркс, Письмо к Анненкову.

*quality and ways of development*of the productive forces. The concept of "*level* of productive forces" under various economic conditions acquires a special content, and *the growth*of productive forces under capitalism, the transition economy, etc. also has a different character.

The transition period and the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. bring a number *of new* points to our understanding of the Marxist doctrine of productive forces, contribute to its further concretization, and thereby raise it to a higher level. From the moment of the transfer of power to the proletariat and its nationalization of the land and the transfer of the commanding heights of industry into the hands of the proletariat, the productive forces of the Soviet country acquire a new, *socialist*quality: they become the productive forces of socialist development. The leading role of the socialist system in the reconstruction period, its victory in the reconstruction period, its entry into the period of socialism and the completion of the foundation of the socialist economy, the second five-year plan, which should complete its technical reconstruction, each new stage in the development of the transition economy deepens and strengthens this new social content of the process of development of the productive forces.

The development of the productive forces under capitalism is *стихийный*spontaneous: at the present imperialist stage, capitalist relations of production become slingshots in the way of further development of labor productivity, and the indignation of the productive forces against the production relations that bind them finds its vivid expression in the world economic *crisis* . The proletariat, once in power, sets as its task *the systematic development of the proletariat.* development of the productive forces and their rational use in the interests and in the direction *of socialist development.* construction projects. Even during the recovery period, the growth of the productive forces of small and medium-sized peasant farming is closely dependent on the development of the productive forces in the socialist state industry. Socialist reconstruction leads to an ever-increasing subordination to socialist planning of the process of development of the productive forces in all areas of the national economy: in agriculture, in handicraft industry, in co-operation, etc.

1) rational *placement* industry in terms of the proximity of raw material sources and the least loss of labor during the transition to successive stages of raw material processing,

2) the most *rational concentration* and the merger of production in *the largest enterprises* ,

3) the greatest provision of opportunities for the Soviet country *independently* supply yourself *with all the most important types of raw materials and industry* ,

4) special attention *to the electrification*of industry and transport, the application of electricity to agriculture,

5) resolution *of the fuel problem* ,

6) *water-based applications* for example, the use of wind, electric, etc. *engines* in general and in particular in *agriculture* [60].

It is easy to see that the extensive program of the planned and rational development of the productive forces in the direction of socialism outlined here by Lenin is now being fully implemented by the Communist Party. Economic zoning, the creation of new industrial areas, bringing enterprises directly to the sources of raw materials and their rational placement, the industrialization of national suburbs — the importance of all these tasks was confirmed by the XVI Congress and the XVII Conference. Giants and super-giants of industry have been created and are being built up again, rationally concentrating the most important industries-tractors, automobiles, etc.; a new form of industrial combines and associations is being created; the state and collective farms covered by the MTS combine and concentrate the productive forces of the U.S.S.R. from the capitalist encirclement, independence in the supply of "all the most important raw materials and raw materials". industry". The XVII Party conference raised the problem of creating the technical base of a socialist society in full force, emphasizing the importance of electrification as an essential element of technical reconstruction and the leading role of mechanical engineering.

---

60 Г. Кржижановский, Основы технико-экономического плана реконструкции СССР / 1931; В. Ленин, Набросок плана научно-технических работ.

The question of the significance *of all the elements of the productive forces* in the national economy of the Soviet Union is raised concretely and in more depth. Even Lenin set before Soviet science the task of studying *the natural productive forces* , the task of finding new sources of raw materials, and studying the power of water, fuels, and other types of energy contained in the diverse and rich natural conditions of our country. The significance of nature as an "object of labor" for the development of the productive forces of socialism under construction receives its full and correct assessment. In contrast to the right-and"left" - opportunist whiners and sceptics, the party, under the leadership of Lenin and then of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. She stressed the importance *of the technical*reconstruction of our entire national economy for building socialism. The task of "*electrifying the whole country* ", applying new types of energy, using new engines in industry and agriculture, set by Lenin, is being successfully implemented in the ongoing construction of giant power plants, in the mechanization of the production process, in the development of Soviet *mechanical engineering* , in the technical reconstruction of agriculture. Tov. Stalin emphasized the exceptional importance of technique and the mastery of technology in the period of socialist reconstruction: "Mechanization of labor processes," says Comrade Stalin. Stalin is a new and *decisive problem for us.* a force without which it is impossible to maintain either our pace or the new scale of production."

Finally , during the transition period, the question of *labor power,* as a necessary and most important component of the productive forces of socialist development, receives the most profound coverage. This is the question of *workers ' and technical cadres,* and of the forms of socialist *organization of labor* , and of the most rational use and training of the labor force from the point of view of socialist planning. An exhaustive account of this problem is given in the historical *six conditions*of vol. Of Stalin. According to T.'s instructions. According to Stalin, the introduction of socialist planning into the problem of labor power presupposes:

1) *an organized*recruitment of workers for industry, which should replace the spontaneous movement by the "spontaneous flow" of labor from the countryside to the city, which is characteristic of capitalism;

2) the correct *qualification* of the employee, the expression of this in the salary system according to the qualification, in the elimination of equalization, and *fixing* in this way, the employee follows the enterprise;

3) the correct *organization of work,* with the correct *balance* of forces and strict *responsibility*of the employee for the mechanisms, for the implementation of the plan, for the quality of products;

4) creation *of industrial and technical intelligentsia of the working class* , planned training of highly qualified personnel;

5) using and attracting *the old technical intelligentsia* ;

6) introduction *of self-financing*and creation of conditions for intra-industrial accumulation and further deployment of productive forces.

Having placed the problem of labor power in the most important place among the conditions for further socialist construction, Comrade Stalin at the same time considers this problem concretely and historically, in inseparable unity with the process of technical reconstruction, with the growing mechanization of our production, with the organization of labor, with the economy of self-financing, with the socialist form of social relations. All these instructions are given by T. They are of the greatest importance for historical materialism, for the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the process of development of the productive forces.

2.4. The role of technology in the development of productive forces. Science and Technology

All the objections we have raised to the one-sided, mechanistic, narrowly "technical" understanding of the productive forces should not lead us to the false conclusion that technology plays an insignificant role in the development of the productive forces.

The significance of the material means of production, and especially of tools and equipment, for historical development is enormous. It is not for nothing that Marx calls the means of labor — "the productive organs of social man" — "not only a measure of the development of human labor power, but also an indicator of the social relations in which labor is performed." Each social formation corresponds to a certain *technical basis* , and economic epochs "differ not in what is produced, but *in how* it is produced, *by what means of labor* »[61]."

First of all, Marx never identifies *the technical* process with simple *mechanical features* He does not confuse the science of mechanics with the science of the social technique of production, with *technology* , although there is the closest connection between these sciences and the subject of their study. *Historicism*is the first requirement of materialist dialectics, and Marx also introduces it into his understanding of technology. It seeks to draw attention to the "critical history of technology", to the history of the productive organs of public man. Pre-capitalist formations based on handicraft and manufacture are characterized by the fact that the producer is inextricably linked to the conditions of any one branch of production: in each branch, the same handicraft means of labor are continuously reproduced, and the art of the worker himself plays a significant role. Each separate branch of production here, in the words of Marx, "*empirically* (by means of experiments) finds a corresponding technical system, slowly perfects it, and quickly crystallizes it as soon as a certain degree of maturity is reached… Once the corresponding form of the instrument has been found empirically, *the working instrument also freezes*, as is shown by its passing from the hands of one generation to the hands of another in the course of sometimes a millennium." *The special* nature of the technical and production process in each branch of the craft requires long-term training in order for the apprentice to become a master craftsman. Therefore, individual branches of the craft are transformed into "secrets" in relation to one another. The development of large-scale industry, which came along with bourgeois society, breaks this veil of secrecy from the technical process. In Marx's words, " the principle of large-scale industry — that every process of production, taken by itself and above all without regard to the human hand, should be decomposed into its constituent elements — has created the entire modern science of technology. The motley forms of the social process of production, apparently devoid of internal coherence and frozen, have decomposed into *consciously planned, systematically dissected forms.* depending on the desired beneficial effect of applying natural science."

"In the same way," Marx continues, " technology has discovered the *few groups of basic forms of motion* in which the entire productive activity of the human body invariably moves, no matter how diverse the tools used — just as mechanics, despite the greatest complexity of machines, is not deceived by what they all represent. constant repetition of elementary mechanical means. Modern industry never considers or interprets the existing form of a known production process as final. Therefore, its technical basis *is revolutionary* , whereas in all previous modes of production the basis was essentially conservative[62]."

The above words of Marx reveal the entire internal dialectic of the historical development of technological processes. The task facing the science of technology is to rationalize the technological process of production as much as possible, to bring it to *a conscious, systematic* application of natural science. For this purpose, according to Marx, it is necessary to divide the entire technical process into the most *general, basic, necessary forms of movement*, which are taken independently of the worker's art as taking place in the use of a wide variety of tools. However, the conscious scientific application of technology does not take place outside of certain *class relations* , outside of the conditions created *by the social form* . It became possible only in the epoch of the development of capitalism, when a variety of forms of labor was created and along with them the idea of measuring all concrete labor by universal, socially necessary labor developed, when machines appeared and the independence of the technical process from the direct influence of the worker's

61 K. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 151.

62 K. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 487.

hand grew. The contradictions of the capitalist economy — the economic struggle between the bourgeoisie and the working class, and the competition between the capitalists — all these conditions demanded an ever-increasing improvement in the epoch of the development of capitalism*совершенствования* tools of labor and the greatest *independence*of the technical process from the hand and from the art of the worker. Hence the ever - increasing consciousness and regularity of technical organization in each individual capitalist enterprise, which formed a clear contrast to the spontaneous development of the bourgeois economy as a whole.

Hence the need for the rising bourgeoisie to constantly *revolutionize,* change and improve its instruments of production, which was a characteristic feature of the developing bourgeois society, in contrast to all previous conservative methods of production. And the application of technology under the conditions of the decadence of modern capitalism, which lead to technical stagnation, takes on a completely different character. Only the proletariat, which builds a new, socialist society, becomes here the exponent of further technical progress.

When we speak of technology as a moment of the productive forces of society, we must not forget the constant connection that exists between technology and certain historical and economic conditions, or the *relation of workers to tools*in one way or another-or, as Marx puts it, we must not forget the "*historical element*" that enters into the definition of the means of labor. In this respect, technology is also *a historical* category. Marx noted in the most complex machines "the repetition of elementary mechanical means." However, he objected to attempts by bourgeois authors to define a machine simply as a "complex" tool or to define a craft tool as a "simple" machine, i.e., to limit themselves to general mechanical terms, without taking into account *historical originality* cars. He also considered it wrong to distinguish between a machine and an instrument based only on what exactly is the driving force in this case — the human hand or the force of nature, water, steam, etc.

The real difference between the machine and the craft tool that historically preceded it lies, according to Marx, in the fundamental change that the machine's executive mechanism, the so-called "working" machine, undergoes. In it, the very process of technical processing has completely changed — with the displacement of human labor, which was previously directed to this processing. Emphasizing this historical element in the definition of the machine, Marx at the same time considered it wrong for petty — bourgeois idealists like Proudhon *to identify technology with economics,* to see the machine as an economic category, a kind of "synthesis" of labor functions, instead of the division of social labor that had previously taken place. Marx argued that " the way machines are used is not at all the same as the machines themselves," and that the technique of modern production must be distinguished from its capitalist *application* . The division of labor not only does not disappear with the advent of machines, as Proudhon thought, but it becomes even stronger. In addition, we must strictly distinguish *between the technical division of labor* that takes place in the workshop, in the factory, in the enterprise, and the division of labor *in the whole society* . When we speak of the way machines are used, for example in capitalist society , we are referring not only *to the technical methods* that are determined by the nature of the tools used, but also *to social relations* that are based on the different distribution of the means of production among social classes. The machine, in Marx's words, "is as little an economic category as the oxen that pull the plow[63]." The economic categories of bourgeois society express relations of capitalist appropriation-relations that develop spontaneously, *independently of the consciousness* of the members of capitalist social relations. The technique of capitalism, which was continuously revolutionized at the ascending stage of development of the bourgeois mode of production, expressed *socialization* the process in each individual enterprise and the growing *consciousness*and systematic use of tools by each individual capitalist.

The historical element introduced by Marxism in the definition of the means of labor consists in the fact that the means of labor are always considered as expressing the *historically changing,* active, conscious attitude of man to nature. The productive organs of social man are inextricably

63 К. Маркс, Нищета философии.

linked in their historical development with the course of the historical development of human labor power: they serve *as a measure*of the level of its development and its productivity at each historical stage. Hence the important role that technology plays in the development of the productive forces of society.

In enumerating the factors that contribute to the growth of the productivity of social labor, Marx at one point mentions among them: first, *the natural factors that contribute to the growth of the productivity of social labor.* second, the progressive improvement of the *social*productive forces, such as the expansion of production, the concentration of capital, the combination and division of labor, the introduction of machinery and the improvement of chemical and other methods of production, scientific discoveries and inventions[64]. We will now see that in the development of all these natural and social conditions of labor productivity, technology occupies a particularly prominent place.

Let's start with *natural conditions* , the importance of which for the development of society we have already partially discussed above. Such a natural condition is primarily the" nature " of the working person himself, for example, the employee's belonging to a certain race, nationality, etc. In the opinion of bourgeois scholars, this latter has a decisive influence on his diligence and the intensity of his work. But actual historical experience completely refutes these thoroughly bourgeois imperialist theories. It shows that the" nature " of man himself-racial and other characteristics-are themselves dependent on economic conditions, that they *change*with the change of the economy. There are no absolutely " hardworking "people, just as there are no absolutely" lazy " peoples and races. The development of capitalist industry destroys the sluggishness and immobility of the peoples of the East and transforms the working people of the yellow, black, etc.races into proletarians like their white brothers. The construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. has now brought even more amazing transformations into the life of the backward peoples of the Caucasus, Siberia, and Central Asia, creating national cadres of the proletariat everywhere, drawing the line of collectivization of agriculture everywhere, and introducing forms of social competition and shock resistance everywhere. Obviously, the impact of race, nationality, etc. on labor productivity can only be very small.

As for *the external ones* According to Marx, they fall into two broad classes: natural wealth *in the means of subsistence*, such as soil fertility, etc., and natural wealth *in the means of labor* — such as water power, coal, metals, timber, etc. As we have already seen, the fertility of the soil and other natural resources of the means of subsistence can play a decisive role only at the lowest levels of culture, with an extremely *low level of technology* . With the development of culture, *natural productive forces*— the power of animals, the power of water, wind, and steam-become much more important. Land, according to Marx, serves as the "original arsenal of the means of labor", which are made of stone, wood, and then metal.

There is no doubt that natural productive forces, when used by human society, exert their influence on the development of the productivity of social labor: the use of the force of water, steam, etc.significantly increases the amount of the product of labor and helps to accelerate the production process. But natural productive forces are productive forces only *in possibility* : land, water, and steam *alone* are not capable of exerting any influence on the development of labor productivity. "The functioning of land as a means of labor," Marx observes, " presupposes... *other means*and a high development of labor power[65]." Only when these natural productive forces are transformed into *a means or object of labor* do they become factors in the development of its productivity. But in order for the object of labor given by nature — wood, coal, ore, cotton — to enter the process of production, it is necessary, along with certain social conditions, a certain *technical possibility*to extract this object of labor from the depths of nature and apply social labor to it — in other words, a certain level of technology is necessary.

---

64 К. Маркс, Заработная плата, цена и прибыль.

65 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 153.

The object of labor — whether given directly by nature or already processed by man in the form of raw material-is one of the necessary components of any labor process. The properties of objects of labor are therefore one of the factors contributing to the development of the productive forces of society. But, as we have already seen, any objects of labor can play such a role only when their technical application begins. And this role changes depending on *the character* technical application. The transition from wood to iron as an object of processing undoubtedly greatly increased the productivity of primitive man, but this productivity of labor takes on a completely different character and size when modern machinery is used to extract iron ore.

The relationship between technology and the social "combination and division of labor," i.e. , *the economy*, with economic relations as a condition for the development of the productive forces, is somewhat more complicated. However, as we will see later, even here the importance of technology is very great. Marx calls the means of labor *an indicator* those social relations in which labor is performed. Economic epochs, according to him, differ depending on the nature of the means of labor they use. Marx attaches to the "remnants of the means of labor" the same importance for the study of extinct socio-economic formations that the remains of bones have for the study of extinct animal organisms. The means of labor, in Marx's phrase, are the backbone of social production. The manual mill, he says, gives us a society headed by a feudal lord; the steam mill gives us modern capitalist production.

Mechanists understand Marx's idea in such a way that the character of the means of labor must directly follow the character of the economic structure of society. Mechanists reason according to the" scheme": the means of labor determine the technical organization, the technical organization of society determines its economic structure. Such a mechanistic view, combined with his idealism, was for Trotsky one of the theoretical propositions for justifying his denial of the possibility of building socialism in our country, taking into account the backward nature of our technology. "It is impossible," wrote Trotsky, " to create large — scale agriculture out of peasant ploughs and peasant nags." It is easy to see, however, that such a direct deduction of the economy from the nature of the means of production does not give us any idea of the qualitative peculiarity of economic development, of the class relations underlying it, of the nature of the distribution of the means of production, of class exploitation, and so on. They do not yet speak of the socialist character of the relations of production in the state and collective farms, nor of the forms of social competition and striking applied here. The development of socialism can at first find its expression here in the simple addition of peasant implements to the work of collective farms.

Marx's real idea here is that every historical mode of production, in its developed form, *also rests on a certain technical basis* ; this technical basis cannot be created at earlier historical stages of the development of society, but in a certain respect it characterizes this society. The steam mill is characteristic of the age of capitalism, not of the pre-existing feudal system. Similarly, the planned "electrification of the whole country" is possible only under socialism, under public ownership of all the decisive means of production, and cannot be carried out completely under conditions of capitalist private ownership and competition. In this sense, the technical basis determines *the character of social relations*, is their *indicator* : the means of production, as Marx says, "determine the labor organization of society." Having reached a certain stage of maturity, social technology also requires certain social forms in order for further technical development to be possible. Thus, using the example of manufacturing, Marx shows how the technical character of manufacturing (differentiation of tools, etc.), which presupposes a certain maturity of the social division of labor, in turn contributes to the further social division of labor, how it leads to an increase in the number of workers and to an increasing transformation of the means of production into capital.

But historical development does not follow the path of mechanistic schemes, and it is not at all necessary that "first" technology arises, and "then" the economy conditioned by it. In the period of its origin, each new mode of production proceeds from the technique that it finds in the depths of the old social formation. The development of a new mode of production forces it to enter into *a contradiction* with the old technical organization; this contradiction is destroyed by the fact that the new mode of production *creates new conditions of production.* an adequate technical basis for

it. For example, having emerged on the old handicraft basis, the capitalist mode of production had to come into conflict with feudal technology and pass over to machine production in the era of the industrial revolution. In the same way, socialism, which is growing in the transition period, at a certain stage of its development, comes into conflict with the old technical basis inherited from capitalism: it becomes necessary to complete the technical reconstruction of the entire national economy, not only to catch up with the advanced capitalist countries, but also *to overtake*the most advanced capitalist technology. Thus, not only technology is "ultimately" a well-known indicator of the nature of the economic structure, not only the development of the technical basis is a condition for the development of the economy, but also the opposite. The development of the economy, for its part, is a driving force in the development of the technical basis itself. Causes and effects here are dialectically reversed. At a certain stage of development, the construction of a new technical base becomes a necessary condition for the existence, strengthening and further development of the socialist economy itself. But this completion of technical reconstruction becomes possible only due to the peculiarities of the same economy of socialism under construction, after the foundation of the socialist economy is completed.

In the history of the development of the machine, Marx clearly showed this influence of the economy on the development of technology and the role of technology in the development of the economy. As the capitalist mode of production becomes stronger, so do the market demands and the need for mass production of goods. Therefore, the industrial revolution begins with the" executive " mechanism of the machine, with such a technical revolution, in which the old craft tool increases, becomes more complex, and many tools are united by one engine. The further development of the class struggle between the capitalist and the worker gives a further impetus to the development of technology. It transforms machines "into *the fighting means of capital* against the indignation of the workers." Every new technical invention — for example, the automatic spinning machine (selfactor), the steam hammer, etc. - aims to replace labor with machine power. This causes competition in the growing army of unemployed and thus lowers the material level of the worker. This is joined by the competition of the capitalists among themselves, which forces them to improve their instruments of production in order to sell their goods better. All these conditions lead to ever-increasing *mechanization* The result of the technical process is that the labor force is gradually displaced from the engines, from the transmission mechanisms: the need for control and supervision by the worker is reduced, the number of workers servicing the machine is reduced. Only by organizing the production of machinery with the help *of machines* does capitalist industry find an "adequate technical basis"for itself.

The development of the machine is completed in a modern *automatic machine system* . Here the subject of labor passes through "a series of mutually connected processes that are performed by a chain of heterogeneous, mutually complementary working machines[66]." The process of labor performed by machines becomes *more continuous* : the continuous connection of individual processes dominates the factory. The growing automation of production at the present stage of development, the conveyor system, and continuous flow are all products of the capitalist rationalization of the production process. But technical growth here is already beginning to go beyond the limits allowed by the framework of capitalist ownership. Further growth of mechanization and automechanization, linking industry into a single technical whole, is possible only with public ownership of the means of production: thus, in the depths of capitalism, the material and technical prerequisites for a new social system, the socialist one, are maturing.

Therefore, capitalist property, which has constantly revolutionized the means of production during the development of capitalism, leads at the highest imperialist stage of capitalism to its direct opposite: along with certain major achievements of modern advanced capitalist technology , it simultaneously leads to *technical stagnation*, to the inability to fully utilize the growing productive forces within the framework of capitalism, and even to their partial destruction. Lenin, in his

66 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I.

Imperialism, gave vivid examples of the technical decay of modern capitalism, when new inventions, for example in the glass industry, are not used and are put "under the cloth". These trends of technical stagnation and technical reaction are now particularly evident in connection with the economic crisis that has broken out. In order to organize "public works" for the unemployed, the bourgeoisie replaces powerful excavators with a simple pick and shovel; tractors that are plentiful are not available for a large number of farms. The slogan "down with electricity" is thrown out, and bourgeois philosophers like O. Spengler begin to curse technology and praise the return of man to nature. At the same time, the socialist economy in the Soviet Union, by mastering advanced technology and combining it with the socialist organization of labor, leads to an unprecedented increase in labor productivity, lays the foundations for further technical progress, and solves the most complex technical problems that capitalism has not solved.

We thus see that economic relations contribute to the development of the productivity of social labor only by being closely interdependent with social technology and *through the mastery of technology* . This applies even more to the role that science plays in the development of the productive forces of society *наука*. Marx calls science a "*general* productive force", which distinguishes it in this way from the social productive forces directly involved in the productive process. Marx repeatedly emphasizes the special importance of scientific discoveries and inventions for the development of the productive forces; in his words, *art is the most important form of development.* the individual worker "disappears as an insignificant, unimportant detail before science." But in order for science to become this powerful factor in the development of productive forces, its *technical application is necessary* in the production process. This circumstance imposes a specific social imprint on scientific work, which is determined each time *by a given economic structure* .

Thus, for a society of commodity producers, scientific work is productive only insofar as it is included in the production of goods. Under the conditions of capitalist society, scientific discoveries and inventions are inevitably appropriated by capitalists and get their technical application in capitalist interests. Only under conditions of socialist construction can the development of science and its technical application flourish in the interests of the broadest masses of the working people. Therefore, as long as there is no economic need for the technical application of a scientific invention, this scientific invention itself cannot have any impact on the development of the productive forces. Gunpowder and printing were invented in ancient times, but they did not receive any industrial significance at that time. The invention of the steam engine dates back to the end of the 17th century, but until the end of the 18th century, its existence alone did not cause any industrial revolution. Only the increased needs of trading have caused the technical application of the properties of the pair that have long been discovered by science. Only socialism creates the conditions for the "electrification of the whole country," for the widespread use of heating methods, for underground gasification of coal, and so on .In short, scientific discoveries could only have had a significant impact on the development of the productive forces when they *coincided in time with the general movement*.

"If technology," Engels wrote in one of his letters, " largely depends for the most part on the state of science, then conversely, science depends much more on the state and needs of technology[67]." The interdependence that Engels emphasized here between science and technology in their development is extremely significant. Marx, Engels, and Lenin considered it necessary to note the exceptional importance and revolutionary significance of certain scientific inventions: the genius of Watt, who was able to appreciate the universal significance of his steam engine, the transmission of electric current through a wire, the method of direct extraction of gas from coal seams, discovered by Ramsay, and so on. Engels called the entire history of mankind "the history of the transition from the practical discovery of the transformation of mechanical motion into heat to the practical discovery of the transformation of heat into mechanical motion" — that is, from the

67 Ф. Энгельс, Письмо к Штаркенбергу от 1894 г.

discovery of fire by primitive man to the creation of the modern steam engine[68]. This significance of scientific discoveries is not diminished by the fact that they do not immediately and not always directly receive their practical application, although they are extremely important for scientific theory. The discovery of the law of conservation of energy by Mayer, Clausius, and other scientists was of exceptional importance for the entire further development of technology.

But history shows at the same time that scientific discoveries and scientific theories are less often the free product of the intellectual creativity of individual scientists and inventors, but are brought to life by the needs and previous state *of technology* . For example, geometry arose from the need to measure areas, in the process of developing land ownership. The whole science of hydrostatics — Toricelli's discoveries, etc. - was brought to life by the need to regulate mountain flows in Italy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Very important for scientific development was the intermittent (sporadic) use of machines even in the manufacturing period. An exceptional role, as Marx pointed out, was played in the development of science by the clock, on which the whole theory of uniform motion was built: at the same time, "the clock gave the first idea to apply automata to production." The flour mill had the same significance in the development of science and technology. The doctrine of friction, the study of mathematical forms-all this was developed in the study of the mill.

We thus see that the state of technology is both a condition for the use of natural resources and the forces of nature, and a powerful weapon *in the economic* struggle, and the embodiment of the movements *of science*, and a prerequisite for the movement and development of the objects on which human labor is directed. Technology serves as a yardstick for each historical stage in the development of human labor power; it is a prerequisite for further economic development.

In the initial period of development of capitalist industry, the rapid growth of machinery and the replacement of the old handicraft implements by machines that replaced manual labor had a particularly severe impact on the living situation of the working class. At that time they aroused the workers ' indignation against machines; they gave rise to a movement for the destruction of machines, which the workers regarded as their immediate enemies. The proletariat has now learned *to distinguish between modern technology and its capitalist application* , the capitalist economy. The mechanization of the production process has now reached amazing records in the advanced capitalist countries. A number of new machines have been created to replace the manual labor of the worker. The invention of machinery in the glass industry, in the construction industry, the complete mechanization of coal mining, the mechanization of agricultural processes by introducing tractors and combine harvesters — all these technical inventions make it possible to develop enormous labor productivity, reduce the cost of production, and speed up the production process many times over. Mechanization can significantly reduce the number of workers needed. So for example in some capitalist enterprises of the weaving industry one worker now serves more than 100 looms! The need for control on the part of the worker and for the use of workers is also reduced by the increase in automation of the production process, the introduction of continuous flow, etc.But all these great achievements of technology lead to *completely different social consequences*under different economic structures — under capitalism and under socialism.

"Under capitalism," Lenin wrote about Ramsay's discovery in the field of coal mining, " the 'emancipation' of the labor of millions of miners engaged in coal mining will inevitably lead to mass unemployment, an enormous increase in poverty, and a deterioration in the condition of the workers... "Under socialism, the application of Ramsay's method," by liberating the labor of millions of miners, will immediately reduce the working day for all", make working conditions more hygienic, etc.[69] Lenin notes the same negative social consequences for the working class when he speaks of Engineer Taylor's system of labor, the highest achievement of modern capitalist rationalization of production. "All these enormous improvements," Lenin remarked, " are being

68 Ф. Энгельс, Анти-Дюринг.

69 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 2-е, т. XVI, ч. 2 — с. 317.

made *against our will.* the worker, leading to even greater suppression and oppression of him, and at the same time limiting the division of labor *within the factory to a rational, reasonable* one . Naturally, the thought arises: and the distribution of labor within the whole society?.. And in all social production, chaos remains and grows, leading to crises when accumulated wealth does not find a buyer, and millions of workers die and starve without finding work... "Completely different consequences arise after the victory of the proletariat, in the conditions of socialist rationalization of labor:" Large-scale production, cars, railways, telephone-all this it gives thousands of opportunities to reduce the working hours of organized workers by four times, providing them with four times more welfare than they currently have[70]."

At the same time, Lenin notes the internal contradictions of technological progress at the present stage of capitalism, which is intricately intertwined with *technical reaction* , stagnation and decay: "Capitalist barbarians are stronger than any civilization. Wherever you throw it, at every step you meet tasks that humanity is able to solve immediately. *Capitalism is hindering* … It *solved* the most difficult technical problems and *stalled*the implementation of technical improvements — because of the poverty and darkness of millions of people, because of the stupid avarice of a handful of millionaires… But the young grows and will prevail, no matter what[71]."

The above considerations of Lenin represent a brilliant anticipation of the two paths of technical development along which the capitalist world, now suffocating in the grip of a crisis, is proceeding, on the one hand, and socialism, which is increasingly expanding its industrial base in the Soviet Union, on the other. During the reconstruction period, the economy of socialism under construction came into conflict with the backward technology inherited from pre-revolutionary Russia: it requires the creation of an adequate technical basis. Therefore, "technology in the period of reconstruction *solves everything*" *(Stalin)* . Hence the slogan of "*mastering technique*" now put forward by the Communist Party. Therefore, as the resolution of the XVII Party Conference points out, the main economic task of the second five-year plan is "to complete the reconstruction of the national economy, *to create the latest technical base* for all branches of the national economy." In the shortest possible time, we must catch up with the advanced capitalist countries in technical terms. We combine the advanced technology created by capitalism with the socialist organization of labor, thereby giving it a new *socialist* quality, causing completely different social consequences for the working class, facilitating its work, and improving its material situation. But the most advanced capitalist technique will not be sufficient to create a technical basis that is completely adequate to socialism. We will have *to surpass* the most advanced capitalist countries in technical terms, and create models *of a new economy.* techniques. The "electrification of the whole country" lays the foundations of a new technical system, an indicator of the social relations in which communist labor will be carried out.

2.5. The role of the labor force. Industrial relations

However important the technical basis of social production may be, the means of production still remain the "measure of human labor power," the " material factors of living labor." The teachings of Marx and Engels, overcoming the bourgeois limitations of classical economy, consider labor to be the sole source of all material wealth. "Past labor," says Marx,"both in the form of means of labor and in the form of materials, has significance in production only in contact with living labor, as its material moment[72]." The productivity of any machine, he said, is measured by the degree to which it replaces human labor.

Based on the unity of man and the rest of nature, Marx shows a dialectical transition from

---

70 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XII ч. 2 — с. 407–408.

71 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 2-е, т. XVI — с. 622–623.

72 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, О Фейербахе / Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 250.

natural to social on the labor side: "The creation of value is the transformation of labor-power into labor. In turn, labor power is primarily *a substance of nature transformed into the human body* »[73]." Labor power is primarily a part of the human body, the result of its assimilation of the substance of nature. The transformation of labor-power into labor, if we take labor-power exclusively from this natural side of it, is a manifestation of the natural strength of the human organism, of its physical and spiritual capacities. By labor power and working capacity, Marx means "*the totality of physical and spiritual abilities* that a particular organism, the living personality of a person, has at its disposal and that are used by him when he produces any use values[74]." The most diverse types of labor, taken from their physiological side, are functions of the human body, " the waste of the human brain, nerves, muscles, sensory organs, etc." From this material, physiological, and natural basis of labor-power, we cannot in any way renounce it, unless we want to renounce materialism. as the neo-Kantian Rubin does, for example, when he banishes any notion of a physiological process from his theory of the "abstract labor" of commodity-capitalist society. Whatever the concrete types of productive labour, whatever the various use-values to which this labour may be directed — there is always a certain material unity between the most diverse concrete types of labour*материальное единство* . This is some " productive expenditure of human muscles, nerves, brain, etc."

In addition to physical abilities, human labor power is also a certain set *of spiritual* abilities, which in the process of labor turn into *intellectual ones* costs, in the expenditure of intellectual labor. It would be completely wrong to imagine *the material* production and the totality *of material* productive forces in such a simplified way that human consciousness does not relate to them at all. The labor process is not limited to the consumption of the worker's muscular energy: it must be constantly accompanied *by control* on the part of the worker, the use of certain *knowledge and skills* that show the skill, dexterity of the worker, his production qualifications. The more skilled labor is, the more complex the machines and other means of production that are used in the production process, the more important the technical training and skill of the worker becomes in comparison with his direct muscular, physical efforts. It is enough to recall the work of a spinner, mechanic, etc., to understand the whole complex nature of labor as a psycho-physiological process.

But what determines the quality and degree of skill and knowledge of each individual worker? It is obvious by the requirements imposed on the worker by the given social environment in the given social conditions of production. And these requirements and these working conditions are quite different in primitive society, in the Middle Ages, under capitalism. The concept of labor power is by no means limited to its natural, physiological, etc.basis. Human labor power exists and is transformed into labor always in a certain *social form* . The physical and spiritual abilities that determine labor power and its physical and mental costs are always manifested in the labor process as physical and spiritual abilities and their costs in entire *social groups* : the people who make up these groups are in certain *social relations* . In a class society, the human labor force involved in the production process is always represented by a certain *productive*class, which stands in certain relations to the unproductive class that opposes it in its interests and exploits its labor. Slaves, peasants, and wage-workers-these are the living labor force of class societies and their most important instruments of production. "*Of all the instruments of production, the revolutionary class itself represents the greatest productive force* »[75]." Lenin attached great importance to this proposition of Marx's, which our mechanists are so often inclined to ignore.

The above statement of Marx emphasizes the genuine revolutionary character of the entire Marxist doctrine of productive forces. This greatest significance of the productive class among all the instruments of production is, of course, not to be understood in a narrow "quantitative" sense. In capitalist society, on the other hand, we observe a tendency for constant capital, i.e., the means of

---

73 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 142.

74 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 142.

75 К. Маркс, Нищета философии.

production, to increase faster than the share of variable capital, i.e., labor power. Under the conditions of the Soviet economy, the most important task is the mechanization of manual labor, i.e., the strengthening of the importance of technology in contrast to the simple physical expenditure of labor. The whole point is that in order to determine the height and maturity of the productive forces at each historical stage, it is necessary to take into account not only the level of technology used, but also the degree *of mastery* of this technique by the productive class, the degree of its industrial qualification, and the nature *of the social organization of labor* . The relations between classes, the form of class exploitation, and the level of class consciousness of the productive class are essential for determining the latter. The means of production themselves are, in Marx's phrase, "*the yardstick."* development of the labor force". In the revolutionary conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production, the revolutionary productive class also comes to the fore.

"The organization of the revolutionary elements into a class," Marx says immediately after his famous statement, " presupposes in advance the existence of all those productive forces that may have originated in the bowels of the old society[76]." The role of the revolutionary exploited class in this case consists in the fact that it represents in its struggle all the elements of the productive forces that are rebelling against the old mode of production.

In considering the productive forces, we must not detach *human labor power мерила*We must not think of technology outside the process of mastering this technique , outside the application of its technical standard, which is given in the means of production.*овладения* этой техникой, вне *применения* its labor force. At the same time, we must distinguish the productive forces from *the mode* of their application, from those social relations which serve as a form of development of the productive forces. The question of the place of the productive class in the development of the productive forces is inextricably linked with the question of the relationship between the productive forces and the social *производственными*relations of production in which the process of social production takes place. Therefore, while emphasizing the leading role of the working class in relation to all the elements of the productive forces, it is wrong to "compare" the elements of the productive forces outwardly and mechanically and to pose the question as is sometimes done in the literature: which is "more important" for the development of the productive forces — the means of production or labor power. At the same time, the question of the historical role of technology, the expenditure of labour-power, etc., cannot be solved purely abstractly, without an analysis of the historically determined social form of development of the productive forces and the concrete role of each of these elements of the productive forces.

"During production," says Marx, " people relate not only to nature, but also *to each* other . They cannot produce without connecting in a certain way to *work together* . In order to produce, people enter into certain connections and relationships, and *only through these social connections and relationships does the impact of people on nature* take place, production[77]takes place." In the preface to the Critique of Political Economy, Marx describes the social relations that people enter into "in the social exercise of their lives", in "*definite ones that do not depend on their will* relations are relations of production that correspond to a certain stage in the development of their material productive forces. The totality of these production relations forms *the economic structure*of society."

Here Marx has made all the most important instructions for understanding the distinctive features of the relations of production, through which the "influence of people on nature" takes place. First of all, these are relations for "joint activity and for the mutual exchange of the products of one's activity", i.e. social relations expressed in social *cooperation and in the division of labor* . They are, further, always historically determined relations-relations that are not eternal, that are changing and transitory, and that are characterized by a special quality at each historical stage. The

---

76 К. Маркс, Нищета философии.

77 К. Маркс, Наёмный труд и капитал. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

relations of production *are material relations* that have hitherto been formed in the production of material life independently of the will of the people who enter into them, expressing the attitude of these people to *the means of production* , and therefore it is precisely these relations that we distinguish as the material basis of society, as its economic structure, from the totality of social relations. These are relations that correspond to a certain stage in the development of the productive forces and change with the *development of the productive forces* .

The materialist dialectic is the basis of the views of Marxism on the relations of production that we have outlined. Therefore, it is important to focus on the question of *the materiality* of production relations and their historical certainty: here we have especially many mistakes and perversions. The material character of the relations of production is either obscured in every possible way or completely denied by modern social-fascism. For example, the "Austro-Marxist" Max Adler, who seeks to "connect" Marx with Kant, understands the social connection of people as their *psychic* connection, as a psychic interaction. Kautsky also emphasizes *in every possible way the psychological* "volitional" moment in the formation of industrial relations. According to Kautsky, production relations are formed as a "consequence of the strong will" of the people involved in the production process, while the "will" to create production relations is generated *by the needs*of people, which in turn are conditioned by the development of the productive forces of society[78]. But we already know that Kautsky reduces the very development of the productive forces to the process of cognition. It turns out that the development of knowledge causes people's needs, and needs generate the "will" to form production relations. Thus historical materialism is being replaced by Kautsky's bourgeois idealism and voluntarism!

In contrast to this psychological understanding of production relations, Comrade Bukharin puts forward his *mechanistic* view of the essence of their "materiality". He considers the arguments of the" Psychomarxists "in favor of the fact that social relations are mental interactions of people to be" effective " and seeks to find counterarguments against their arguments. For this purpose, Comrade Bukharin reduces the relations of production *to the placement, to the arrangement of people in space and time* . "What is the expression *of this attitude*?" asks Comrade Bukharin. "The point," he answers, " is that every human being has his own place, just like a cog in a clockwork mechanism. It is precisely this definiteness of position in space, "on the labor field, "that makes this" placement, "" distribution, " *a social*-labor *relationship* ." "Under the relations of production," writes T. V. in another place. Bukharin — - I mean the labor coordination of people (considered as living machines) in space and time. The system of these relationships is as "psychic" as the system of planets together with their sun[79]."

Bukharin's vulgar-mechanistic concept is also reflected in his understanding of the relationship between the productive forces and the relations of production. As we have already seen, Comrade Bukharin basically reduces the productive forces to technology as the most accurate expression of the" balance " between nature and society. According to T. Bukharin, industrial relations, as the placement of people in space, are entirely determined by "*technique*", the system of machines, their combination, *and the organization of the material* apparatus of the factory. "Combinations of tools, social equipment, determine the combinations and relations of people, i.e., the social economy." Thus, the "social economy" and the relations of production are reduced to the following categories: Bukharin's approach to "technical" combinations, to the placement of people in the technical process. Technology is the material apparatus to which the economy is "fitted", forming *the human*apparatus of the same technical process: there is also, in the words of Comrade Bukharin, "equilibrium"between them. "If society exists, then there must be a certain balance between its technique and its economy, that is, between the totality of its instruments of labor and its labor organization, between its productive material apparatus and its productive human

78 К. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории.

79 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — с. 10–161.

apparatus[80]."

Mechanical installation of T. Bukharin's definition of the relations of production and their relation to the productive forces was further developed in Soviet literature: in the works of T. A. Cohn, S. Bessonov, N. Dubrovsky — in his views on social formation-and others. This mechanistic attitude has led the Mechanists into *confusion* technical process and its social form. Productive forces and relations of production on "equal rights" as identical "components" were included by the mechanists in the subject of Marxist political economy. At the same time, the mechanists deduced the relations of production *directly* from the current state of the art, they were understood as technical placement of people. They therefore gave a purely physiological and energetic interpretation to such historical and economic categories, such as the abstract labor of a commodity-capitalist society, etc.

The opposite, Menshevik-idealistic perversion of Marxism on the question of production relations found its expression in the works of Rubin and some of his followers. Rubin's entire theoretical construction is imbued with Kantian dualism. The basis of the theory of historical materialism, according to Rubin, as well as other Mensheviks, is "*adaptation* people's relations of production to the development of productive forces". According to Rubin's theory, it is necessary to distinguish in capitalist economy "two different aspects of it: technical and socio-economic", i.e., the productive forces studied by a special "science of social technology", and the relations of production that constitute the subject of political economy. "Political economy," says Rubin, " does not study the material and technical side of the capitalist process of production, but its social form... The technique of production or the productive forces enter the field of study of Marx's economic theory only as a prerequisite." Thus the productive forces are identified by Rubin with technology, and at the same time the "social" is separated from the "material" in Rubin. It turns out that *the social form is not material* . Let us note in passing that in drawing an idealistic distinction between material production and its social form, Rubin only follows Kautsky, who also "distinguishes" production and the relations of production on the basis of the interests of... capitalist production! "The problem of production," says Kautsky, " is more important than the question of the relations of production. Therefore, we must promote the revival of capitalist economy..."

What does Rubin mean by production relations if they are not material relations? In a commodity-capitalist society, according to Rubin, these are relations of purchase and sale, relations of equal economic entities. "The totality of industrial relations between people," writes Rubin, " is not *a single, connected system* … In a commodity economy, the commodity producer is connected only with an indeterminate market, into which he includes himself through *an intermittent series of individual contractual transactions* ..." Rubin also reduces the basic production relation of capitalism — the relation of class exploitation-to a simple exchange of commodities*эксплоатации* between capitalist and worker: "The capitalist, the wage-worker, and the landowner are formally independent *commodity* owners . The direct production relation between them must still be established (?!), and moreover in the form usual for commodity owners, in the form *of purchase and sale* ..."[81]. Thus the social form is separated by Rubin from its material basis, from the material process of production. The class essence of production relations is ignored and glossed over by Rubin. The Menshevik Rubin reduces the social form exclusively to *the exchange* form, to *contractual and legal*relations. It is not surprising that abstract labor in commodity-capitalist society completely loses its natural, physiological side for the idealist Rubin and does not contain "not an atom of matter"!

This idealistic understanding of the social form by the Menshevik Rubin and the separation of the relations of production from the productive forces were supported by *Menshevik idealism* . Thus, while defending Rubin's views, T. Karev said: "Political economy has as its subject the study of those *social forms* that contribute to the development of the productive forces under capitalism

80 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — с. 146, 148, 152, 153 и т. д.

81 И. Рубин, Очерки по теории стоимости Маркса / изд. 3-е, 1928 — с. 10–11, 25–28 и др.

and at the same time come into conflict with them… Can we say that if we give such a definition to the subject of political economy, if we put forward the moment of social form, then we arrive at an idealistic point of view and eliminate a completely material moment, and undermine the foundations of a materialist understanding of history? It seems to me that to say this would be absolutely wrong… The relations of production, of course, are not something material in the sense of something material, like the substance of nature, but they are not something ideal, they are the relations of production of people who are connected in a certain way in the process of production, "[82] etc.

The above words of Comrade Karev clearly show that, like the "Psychomarxists," mechanists, and neo-Kantians, Menshevik idealism also does not understand the special *social quality* of the relations of production and obscures the question of their *materiality* . M. Adler, Kautsky, and Bogdanov identify industrial relations with the mental interactions of people, with their volitional relations. Tov. Bukharin sees their materiality in the mechanical placement of people in space and time. For Rubin, as for all Kantians, the" social form " remains outside the material process of production. From the point of view of T. Karev ,the "matter of social life", the" material moment " (?!) of production relations consists in the fact that people are "connected" in a certain way in the production process, and in this sense production relations are "not ideal": in other words, the "materiality" of production relations consists only in the fact that they exist in a real, "definite" way*существуют*, and do not lead an "ideal" existence. But both the Adlers and Kautskys can fully agree with this view: certain "psychic" and "volitional" connections also exist in reality!

Meanwhile, both Marx and Lenin understood the materiality of the relations of production quite differently and did not at all reduce the matter to their definite existence. Marx never distinguished between the" material "content of production and its" social " form. For Marx, it is *socially conditioned* production is *material* production. Marx quite clearly expressed the distinctive feature of the relations of production in the preface to the Critique of Political Economy, pointing out that people enter into them in *the social production of material*life, or, as Marx puts it, "in the social exercise of their lives", i.e., in other words, that these relations of" joint activity " are relations of social activity. these people's relationship to the material means of production, and that therefore these relations "*do not depend on their will*", and, on the contrary, the mode of production of material life determines the process of spiritual life. Lenin also notes the same peculiarity of the relations of production when he distinguishes between ideological social relations and *material relations* , i.e., in Lenin's definition, those " which *are formed without passing through the consciousness of people* ". According to Lenin, the basic idea of Marx and Engels "was that social relations are divided into material and ideological ones. The latter are only a superstructure over the former, which are formed *in spite of the will and consciousness* as a result, a form *of human activity aimed at maintaining its existence* »[83]." Elsewhere, Lenin emphasizes "*objective regularity*in the development of the system of social relations" and seeks "the roots of these relations in the degree of development of material production[84]."

The process of production of material life, i.e., the process of labor aimed at maintaining the direct existence of man, and the objective regularity of the development of production relations that form in this process itself, which determine the consciousness and will of people — this is what Marx, Engels, and Lenin saw *as the materiality* of production relations. This also implies the interdependence that Marxism establishes between the relations of production and the productive forces. Just as the productive forces are by no means a "purely technical" category, but a social category, so the relations of production, their "social form", are *not at all isolated* from the material and technical process taking place in this form, as idealists think. On the other hand, these

---

82 Н. Карев, К вопросу о предмете политической экономии / Под знаменем марксизма № 5, 1929.

83 В. Ленин / Соч., т. I — с. 71, 80.

84 В. Ленин, Карл Маркс / Соч., т. XVIII.

material relations of production *are not limited* to the technical organization of production and the arrangement of people, as the mechanists believe. Marxism is based on the point of view of dialectical *unity* technical and economic processes, productive forces and relations of production, along with their identity, indicate their differences. Marxist political economy does not study production "in general", taken outside of its social form. She studies "the social system of production" and" the social relations of people in production " *(Lenin).* . But Marxism refuses to see in the productive forces only one "technical presupposition" of the social form: it always studies the relations of production as a form of development of the productive forces of a given formation.

A number of other questions that arise when considering the relations of production, in the solution of which we encounter similar perversions, are connected with *the concreteness* of this category, with *the historical certainty* of the relations of production. Let us dwell in particular on the question of *the class*nature of production relations in antagonistic formations. As has already been pointed out, for a class society, the concept of social formation must necessarily contain the relationship between classes and their class struggle. Relations between classes underlie antagonistic modes of production. The historically determined type of class exploitation — slave — owning, feudal, or capitalist-also determines the historically determined type of production relations, and gives them, as Marx puts it, their "*specifically social quality.*"

But here we can meet with the following objection. The production process always presupposes a certain *organization of social labor* , i.e., a certain type of cooperation or division of labor — certain relations between the engineer and the worker, etc.The production relations that people enter into with each other in the process of production must obviously be in each individual case the relations of direct producers, the relations of a certain form of organization of social labor. But the organization of the production process largely follows from *technology* productions: it is determined by the nature *of the means of labor used in production* . "The means of labor is not only a measure of the development of human labor power, but also an indicator of the social relations in which labor is performed[85]." Marx develops the same idea in The Poverty of Philosophy: "Labor *is organized* and divided differently, depending on *the tools* it has at its disposal: a hand mill presupposes a different division of labor than a steam[86]mill." Finally, in a letter to Engels, Marx explicitly calls his theory "the theory *of determining the organization of labor by the means of production* »[87]."

Relying on these propositions of Marx, Comrade Bukharin tries to justify his technical understanding of production relations as the arrangement of people in space and time. In his opinion, industrial relations are " extremely diverse and complex." "One *part* of production relations" is formed by the "system of labor relations", *the division of labor* between working people, which is determined by the nature of the tools used. "The division of social labor," says Comrade Bukharin, " is one of the fundamental relations of production. What is the basis of the modern division of labor? It is not difficult to see that it is determined by the modern tools of labor, by the character, type, and combination of machines and tools, i.e., by the technical system of capitalist society." As an example, Comrade Bukharin cites a modern enterprise, a factory, with its precise division of labor, its machine-like character, with precise consideration of the "placement" of workers , etc.Here the relations of people are completely determined by "*technology,* the system of machines, their combination, *and the organization of the material apparatus of the factory*." According to Comrade Bukharin, there is another type of production relations — relations between large groups of people, between *classes* . Classes differ, according to Bukharin, in their "different roles in the production process." Therefore, class relations of production, in his opinion, also *follow from the technique of production* . "When technology changes, the division of labor in society also

85 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 156.

86 К. Маркс, Нищета философии.

87 К. Маркс, Письмо к Ф. Энгельсу от 7 июля 1866 г.

changes, some functions of labor in production disappear and do not become important, new ones appear, etc. At the same time, the class grouping also changes[88]." Thus, according to Bukharin's theory, all types of relations of production follow from the *technical process itself* they are due to the different nature of the means of labor, the location and role of people in relation to these latter.

Comrade Bukharin understands class relations of production in this way as relations that flow directly from the technical role, from the technical functions of the social class in the production process. But in doing so, he ignores the most important feature of class relations of production — *the different distribution of the means of production between classes* . Considering class relations only as a "part" of the relations of production in class society, Comrade Bukharin will never be able to explain why it is precisely class relations that form the basis of the mode of production and of a given economic structure. The" labor relations " between factory workers, between slaves in ancient Latifundia, etc., appear in Comrade Bukharin's work as relations *independent of the class structure*of society and arising only from the technical process. It is quite unclear how approximately the same craft technique could have generated different class relations of production in slave-owning and feudal societies.

The point is that when Comrade Bukharin speaks of the division of labor, he does not clearly distinguish between the division of labor in *society* as a whole and *the technical* division of labor in an individual enterprise, which Marx speaks of when analyzing the process of capitalist production. At the same time, Comrade Bukharin does not understand the dialectical interdependence between them in the process of their development. Technical planning*планомерное* the division of labor in a separate capitalist enterprise and the division of labor between different branches of production, which under capitalism are connected only *spontaneously* , through the exchange of goods — both of these types of division of labor are manifestations of the basic contradiction of capitalism — between social production and private appropriation. The roots of both types of division of labor lie in *the class system.* the structure of society, in class relations of production. We distinguish between relationships between employees in an enterprise, or for example, relationships between product owners and relationships between classes. But these are by no means different "types" or "parts" of production relations. In both cases, the class structure of society manifests itself in various ways. The social organization of labor is therefore not something that depends solely on "technology" and is independent of the class relations of production. The gap between the organization of labor and class relations leads to the grossest perversions of Marxism-Leninism. Tov. It led Bukharin to the theory of" organized capitalism", to incorrect ideas about the possibility of a rational, from the point of view of the proletariat, organization of labor under capitalism. Proceeding from the same mechanistic attitude, Kamenev and Zinoviev denied the socialist character of our state-owned enterprises, believing that the organization of labor in them is "state-capitalist", etc.The factory, as Marx points out, really represents a social relation of production, *an economic* category. But when we speak of a factory in this sense, it is not a question of" technical " relations, not of the material apparatus of the factory, but of *social relations.* the role of the factory determined by the class structure of modern society. If you follow T. If, therefore, we are beginning to get the idea that the organization of labor in the factory is something neutral*нейтральное* in relation to the class structure of society.

A somewhat different form was given to the same "extra-class" point of view on industrial relations, as we have already seen in Rubin. According to Rubin, as we have seen, the essence of the production relations of capitalist society consists not in the capitalist exploitation of wage labor, but in the contractual, barter relations of the "commodity owners", which each time "must still be established".

Mechanistic errors, etc. Bukharin and Rubin's idealistic perversions coincide in this question. Both do not proceed from Marx's understanding of production as a certain integral unity of all its aspects — production, distribution, exchange, and consumption proper — as "differences within

88 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — с. 151–152, 159.

unity." Production always covers all these points of its own, and therefore it is *the starting point* development of society and its study. Marx, therefore, does not regard the process of production in isolation from the distribution of the means of production, nor does he identify production itself with its exchange forms. According to Marx, *the distribution of the means of production among classes directly determines the nature of the organization of social labor* . According to Marx, it is: "(1) the distribution of the instruments of production, and (2) — which is a further definition of the same relation — the distribution of the members of society according to the various kinds of production (subsuming individuals under certain *relations of production*). The distribution of products is obviously the result of this distribution, which *is included in the production process itself and which determines the organization of this latter* . Production, considered independently of this distribution, is obviously an empty abstraction[89]."

Production in a class society is by no means a "purely technical" process, but a process that always presupposes a different distribution of the means of production between *classes* . The relations of classes also determine the very organization of social labor, the direct relations between *producers* . The organization of social labor, which results from the historically determined distribution of the means of production among classes, in turn contributes to the fact that this distribution of the means of production is again "reproduced". The capitalist relations of production — the relations of wage labor and the exploitation of the working class by the capitalists — are based on the ownership of the means of production by the unproductive capitalist class and on the deprivation of ownership of these means of production by the working class. This distribution of the means of production among classes determines the social division of labor under capitalism, and consequently the capitalist organization of labor. Of course, the nature of the organization of labor in each social formation reflects the level of development of the productive forces at a given historical stage. At each individual enterprise, the organization of labor is determined simultaneously by the *level of technology* capitalist production. However, the class structure of society as an intermediary link also leaves its mark on this seemingly "purely technical" process. After all, we now distinguish between capitalist rationalization of labor and socialist rationalization of labor, revealing in these processes completely different social content. We already know that the class structure of capitalism does not allow it to make rational use of all the powerful techniques that it has brought to life, and so on.

Marx's idea of defining the organization of labor by means of production should not be understood in a simplified way. It is not only a question of the technical role played by the means of labor, but even more so of *distribution* the same means of production between classes, in the mode of production as the basis of social formation.

While Comrade Bukharin rises to a supra-historical and extra-class "height "in his understanding of the relations of production as merely" technical " relations, some representatives of Menshevik idealism are inclined to go to the opposite extreme. In their judgments about the relations of production, they tend to proceed from *historically defined* relations that are characteristic only of the development of class society. They transform classes and the class struggle into a necessary feature *of all society.* social relations, identifying the relations of production at all stages of historical development with class relations. According to the definition already given by T. Luppol, society necessarily "contains the concept of production, class relations". Meanwhile, the relations of production of the future communist society will not be relations between classes and will not be based on social antagonism, although they will also represent historically defined relations between producers, a historically defined social organization of labor in the presence of public ownership of the means of production.

2.6. Dialectic of productive forces and production relations

89 К. Маркс, К критике политической экономии. Предисловие.

The state of the productive forces and the form of production relations are everywhere components of a single developing social formation, a single socio-productive organism. In the development of the socio-economic formation, according to its *internal* laws, in the process *of production and reproduction* The dialectical unity of historically defined production relations is evident*диалектическое единство* their productive forces and their corresponding relations of production.

As Marx briefly put it in his notes to the introduction to the Critique of Political Economy: "*The dialectic of the concepts of' productive forces '*(means of production) *and 'relations of production*' is a dialectic whose boundaries are subject to definition and which does not eliminate the real distinction[90]."

In his understanding of the interdependence between the productive forces and the relations of production, Marx proceeds from the unity of the material production process and its social form. Marx regards each mode of production as *a unity in it of the labor process* , which is expediently directed to the creation of use values, where labor appears in its most *general* properties for all historical forms, and of the *special specifically social* form in which this labor process appears to us at a given historical stage. Marx therefore defines the capitalist mode of production as "a combination *of social* relations and *technical* techniques." The process of capitalist production, in Marx's words, "is simultaneously the process of producing *material conditions* human life and the process *of production and reproduction of these very relations of production that takes place in specific historical and economic relations of production..., i.e., a certain socio-economic form of the latter* »[91]."

The distinction that Marx makes between the process of labor and the social form of this process is certainly not to be understood so metaphysically as idealists like Rubin do, who completely separate the social form from material production. What we have here is not two processes of labor, but *a single* process of labor subject to a single law: the labor process "as such" does not exist outside of its specifically social forms. But we must not, like the mechanists, ignore this crucial methodological distinction drawn by Marxist dialectics. Marxism considers the labor process in its most *general* properties, which express at each historical stage *the active attitude of man to nature* , the need for him to appropriate and process the substance of nature. Thus agricultural labor-whether performed by a primitive savage picking the ground with a stick, an ancient Roman ploughing, or a serf of the Middle Ages — has certain features in common that make it this particular type of labor, agricultural labor. But at the same time, Marxism studies the same process of social production in its *special* features, which arise only together with a historically determined stage of development and express each time a historically determined *relationship of people to each* other in this labor process. We must see in this mode of production the process of production and reproduction of historically defined social relations of production. Such, for example, is the labor of the worker, if we study not the concrete properties of the labor of the metalworker, textile worker, miner, etc., aimed at creating various consumer goods, but the labor of the worker in its historically *special*features for capitalism - as wage labor, which is transformed into labor power purchased and exploited by the capitalist, as labor that creates value and surplus value. cost.

This unity of the most general aspects of the labor process and its particular socio-historical form is a dialectical, *contradictory unity* . The elucidation of these internal contradictions in the labor process was extremely important for Marx's theory as *a revolutionary one.* theories. It allowed Marx to distinguish between the development of social production, which passes from a lower form to a higher historical form and becomes more and more "truly social", and the historically transitory *class* , antagonistic form of this process of production. From this it became possible to distinguish between the productivity of labour, which results from a higher level of

90 К. Маркс, К критике политической экономии. Предисловие.

91 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. III, ч. 2.

social production, and the productivity of labour, which is created only by the class exploitation of this labour.

The unity of these two aspects of the labor process is reflected in the dialectic of productive forces and relations of production. In the productive forces, we have here the content, the basis of the entire social process of production: this content, this basis is the level of productive capacity and its factors that express the active attitude of man to nature. In the relations of production, we have a specifically social *form* of the same process of production — the relationship of people to each other. As we have already seen, any unity in the development of content and form is their *interpenetration* and at the same time their *mutual exclusion* , i.e. the dialectical *transition* of each of these opposites into the other and *the struggle*of these opposites.

The productive forces and the relations of production are not two independent forces or entities, each developing according to its own laws. The productive forces do not somehow exist independently, "by themselves"'*out* the corresponding industrial relations. The relations of production should not be portrayed as a superstructure or another "floor" above the productive forces, as, for example, Plekhanov does in his five-term formula: "(1) the state of the productive forces; (2) the economic relations conditioned by it, "[92] and so on. Proceeding from the conditions of material production itself, the historically determined relations of production reveal to us the social *form* of the given state of the productive forces, they express *the law of connection and development* of the productive forces themselves at this historical stage. The state of the productive forces of feudal society finds its social expression in the serf organization of labor; the combination of means of production and labor power under capitalism manifests itself in the form of social production in factories and factories owned by capitalists. During the transition period, the socialist relations of production impart a new socialist quality to the productive forces inherited from the past, transform them, and become the law of their further development. Marx and Engels have pointed out, from their earliest writings, that the mode of production is inextricably linked to a certain mode of human co-operation, and that "*this mode of joint activity is itself a certain productive force* »[93]." In the words of Marx, cooperative forms of labor are simultaneously concerned with " the creation of a new productive force, which in its very essence is a mass force." The manufacturing division of labor "creates a definite organization of social labor and at the same time develops a new social productive power of labor[94]." Social competition and striking, being forms of socialist relations of production, at the same time create a new productive force of socialist labor.

It is therefore impossible to consider the growth and development of the productive forces only in its most general terms, only as a "natural", unchangeable, "material and technical" prerequisite of the social process. This development of the productive forces cannot be regarded as something that develops by itself, independently of the relations of production in the form in which they develop. The law of the development of the productive forces cannot be separated from the special regularities in the development of a historically defined system of production relations. There are no two parallel laws here. The basis of the historical process is *общий*the law of the development *of productive forces* , *which is common to all economic epochs*, but it cannot be thought of as an abstract premise (like Bukharin's "law of labor costs"), divorced from the specific forms of its manifestation. This general law is always given historical certainty. laws of development that are crucial and intrinsic to a particular system of production relations. The law of development of each given mode of production, given social formation, given socio-productive organism, encompasses and expresses both the development of productive forces and the development of production relations.

---

92 Г. Плеханов, Основные вопросы марксизма.

93 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, О Фейербахе / Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 220.

94 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 356.

The contradiction that arises between the productive forces and the capitalist relations of production should not be understood in such a simplistic way that the supposedly independent growth of the productive forces "outstrips" the development of capitalist relations of production. Otherwise, we will adopt a clearly *mechanistic* position — the position of Bogdanov, Bukharin and their followers. The productive forces will thus be transformed into *a kind of extra-class* category "in general", which invariably and for unknown reasons "develops" in history. In reality, the development of the productive forces under capitalism is entirely determined by the internal laws of the capitalist structure. The most fundamental contradiction of capitalist production, the contradiction between social production and private appropriation, forces the bourgeoisie, as Marx puts it, to continuously *revolutionize*its productive forces, which thus exceed the limits within which they can be used by the bourgeoisie. But both the fact that the development of the productive forces goes beyond the possibilities of using them in the process of capitalist production, and the fact that the capitalist relations of production at a certain stage become fetters for the productive forces — both of these circumstances follow entirely from the immanent internal laws of the capitalist mode of production itself. In the words of Marx, capitalist production "*is forced by its own immanent laws* , on the one hand, to develop its productive forces in such a way that it is not production on a limited social basis; on the other hand, it can develop them again only within the limits of this limitation: this is the deepest, innermost part of production." the mysterious cause of the crises, the contradictions that appear in it, within which it moves"...[95]

We cannot mechanically separate the productive forces from the relations of production and reduce the relations of production to a passive consequence of the development of the productive forces. However, it would also be quite wrong to say the opposite: when speaking of the unity of the productive forces and the relations of production, one should forget about their *difference* , about the limits of their dialectic. Only then does the law of the development of the productive forces acquire all its *generality* meaning as the basis of the historical process, if we do not forget about *primacy* the *struggle* of content with form, if we do not substitute the development of the content of the productive forces for the development of the social *form* . It is precisely this path of perversion of Marxism that idealists like Rubin take. The representatives of Menshevik idealism are also leaning in the same direction.

For example, according to T. Karev, who openly supported Rubin on the question of productive forces and relations of production, " content has a certain priority over form in the sense that it presupposes and presupposes a certain form, and on the other hand, the form, once it has emerged, does not represent something a is passive, external to the content, and has some *immanent logic of development*, presupposes a dialectical interaction with the content, and finally comes into conflict with the content that develops within the given form." It is easy to see that although t. Karev speaks of a" certain (?) priority "of the content, but this" priority "is purely *logical* , not material: the content, in the words of T. Karev, both" presupposes "and at the same time" presupposes "the same" definite "form, in other words,it is always the same "definite" form. the movement of productive forces takes place within the framework of the same relations of production "within the limits of a given form". Karev thus has no material, truly historical *development* content, productive forces, which *generated* *new* forms of industrial relations would be created every time. T. Karev idealistically substitutes the "immanent logic of development" of the social form for the development of the mode of production as a contradictory unity, social content and social form, unity based on their *struggle формы*. In order to somehow explain the conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production, Comrade Karev gives the productive forces their "own logic" of development, while at the same time subordinating the logic of the development of the productive forces to the logic of the social form. This development of the productive forces, according to Karev, " is included in the law of its development[96]."

---

95 К. Маркс, Теории прибавочной стоимости / т. III.

96 Н. Карев. К вопросу о предмете политической экономии / Под знаменем марксизма, № 5, 1929 — с. 45–46.

Thus, while the mechanists separate the development of the productive forces from the development of the relations of production and "reduce" the development of the relations of production to the development of the productive forces, the Mensheviks of Rubin's type and the Menshevik idealists remain similarly on the point of view of a double "own logic" for the development of the productive forces and the relations of production. But in contrast to the mechanists, they tend to reduce the development of social content to the development of social form, without understanding that the unity of content and form is relative, and their "struggle is absolute."

It is necessary to focus on these mechanistic and idealistic errors in order to get a correct idea of the dialectical interaction that takes place between the productive forces and the relations of production in their development. It would be wrong to see *the active* beginning of this process of development only in the productive forces, and to regard the relations of production only as *a passive* consequence reflecting the activity of the developing productive forces. This is basically what the notorious theory of productive forces professed by all international Menshevism amounts to. According to Kautsky and other social-fascist theorists, the emergence of socialist relations is possible only as a passive result of the higher development of the productive forces, and not as a consequence of the active revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. Recognizing that the relations of production play only a passive role in historical development, the social-fascists naturally fail to understand the full significance of the socialist relations of production as a form of development of the productive forces during the transition period. Meanwhile, industrial relations *are also active* in this development. A certain level of development of the productive forces is necessary for a socialist revolution to take place. But during the proletarian revolution new socialist relations of production are created at a given average level of productive forces: these socialist relations of production then become *prerequisites* for a higher development of the productive forces and *contribute*to their higher development. This is what the experience of the October Revolution tells us, and it is precisely this point that Lenin emphasized in his criticism of the Sukhanovs ' positions. This historical dialectic was completely misunderstood by neither Comrade Bukharin, with his slogan of equalizing the "bottlenecks" and the" level of productive forces", nor Trotsky, who covered up the same Menshevik theory of productive forces with" left-wing "hopes for a" world revolution", with his plans for developing the country's productive forces at the expense of exploiting the peasantry.

While fighting the mechanistic right-opportunist attitude, the underestimation of the role of the social form in the development of the productive forces, we must also fight the tendency to idealistically overestimate the active role of the social form, to transform the form into something self-sufficient, subordinating and "including" the development of content — as we have found in the Menshevik idealists, as is characteristic of the modern " left"opportunism. The" left " opportunists, in their pursuit of exaggerated figures for collectivization, etc., forget that the socialist quality of our production relations is based on further improvement of the level and quality of production, on technical reconstruction, on the organizational and economic strengthening of collective farms, on the training of cadres, etc. *they separate* the development of production relations from the development of the productive forces. The activity of social forms is actually explained by the fact that social content and social form are *the content and form of a single mode of production* and subordination to the internal regularity of its development. In order to understand the activity of historically defined production relations, it is necessary to start from the social, from *the class content* this production method. Only on the basis of the class character of the internal laws of the capitalist mode of production can we understand why the production relations of capitalism play an active role in the development of the capitalist productive forces; only by understanding the new social content of the productive forces in the transition period, the tasks and conditions of their development, and the role of the revolutionary working class in relationships.

Within the limits of class society, the dialectic of productive forces and relations of production can be properly elucidated only if the starting point for us is *class antagonism*, which permeates the entire structure of both the productive forces and relations of production of an antagonistic society. Otherwise, the class nature of the *contradiction* and *conflict* between the productive forces and the

relations of production at a certain stage of their development, which are the driving force of all historical development, will not be clear. In every antagonistic social formation, at a certain historical stage, the relations of production are transformed from *forms of development* of the productive forces into their *fetters* . The contradiction between the productive forces at a certain stage of their development and the relations of production, its manifestation in class contradictions, the development of this contradiction to the point of acute conflict, the struggle of content with form, the throwing off of the old social form and the alteration of content, the emergence of qualitatively new relations of production and a new quality of productive forces — *закон социальной революции* underlying the historical theory of Marxism.

"At a certain stage of their development," Marx formulates this law in the preface to the Critique of Political Economy," *the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production* , or, to use a legal expression, with the property relations within which they have hitherto operated. *From the forms of development* of the productive forces, these relations become their *fetters* . *"The*simple elements of the labor process," Marx develops the same idea elsewhere, " *are common* to all forms of social development. But each historically determined form of this process *further develops its material foundations and its social foundations* forms. Having reached a certain stage of maturity, this historical form is eliminated and gives way *to a higher* one . The moment of the onset of such a crisis is revealed in the fact that *особую широту и глубину*the contradiction and opposition between the forms of distribution and, consequently, the historically determined form *of the relations of production* corresponding to them, on the one hand , and *the productive forces*, productive capacity and the development of its factors, on the other hand, acquire a special breadth and depth. Then *a conflict breaks out* between the material development of production and its social form"[97].

These famous propositions of Marx were repeatedly attacked by bourgeois and opportunist "critics" of Marxism. At one time, P. Struve tried to shave revolutionary Marxism under a bourgeois comb, to present the matter in such a way that Marx supposedly understands legal relations here by relations of production. According to Struve, Marx is not concerned here with the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, but with the conflict between the economy and *law* . Legal norms cease to meet the needs of the "economy", and then they undergo a corresponding change. It turns out that no doctrine of social revolution follows from this "conflict", since the change in legislation in connection with the new needs of the economy does not necessarily have to take place in a revolutionary way. And, indeed, according to Struve's theory, social contradictions do *not become more acute* in the course of historical development, but on the contrary — these contradictions *are blunted*and reduced.

Plekhanov severely criticized Struve's view. He pointed out to Struve that the concept of production relations is not at all identical with the concept of law, and that Marx's main conflict is not between the economy and law, but between the productive forces and the relations of production. Using a number of striking examples, Plekhanov argued that with the development of capitalism, the share of the working class in the social product is constantly decreasing and its position is getting worse, and therefore it can only be a question of *aggravation* social contradictions, and not at all about their "blunting".

However, Plekhanov's own interpretation of this question is also far from satisfactory. Plekhanov here identifies the concept of productive forces with "social needs, "which he finds in conflict with" social institutions " that no longer meet these needs. Plekhanov certainly forgets here that social needs themselves arise and develop only together with the means of satisfying them, with the productive forces. At the same time, in Plekhanov's vague formulation, *the class*antagonism that permeates the entire conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production disappears from view. In this understanding, the conflict itself appears to us as a conflict of external phenomena, as a lack of harmony between the growth of "needs" and "institutions" that lag behind

---

97 K. Маркс, К критике политической экономии. Предисловие; Капитал / т. III, ч. 2. Подчёркнуто нами — *Авт* .

this growth, and not as a result of the development of a social contradiction that is initially internal, immanent, inherent in this mode of production[98].

Comrade Bukharin's understanding of this fundamental revolutionary contradiction and conflict is clearly mechanistic. In full accordance with the "theory of equilibrium", the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production turns out to be nothing more than a *violation of their equilibrium* , a direct result of the violation of the "equilibrium" between nature and society. The productive forces and the economy were previously "adapted" to each other: during a conflict, the productive forces "can no longer fit" within the framework of the old relations of production. According to T. Bukharin, the conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production is a conflict between the " material apparatus "and the" arrangement " of people in the production process, which is fixed by the political and legal organization of society. The growth of technical tools, means of production, etc., according to Comrade Bukharin, "requires that people also be *regrouped* accordingly." Since, according to Bukharin, class relations of production represent only one of the various types of production relations in a given society, the conflict of the productive forces does not take place in his opinion with *all kinds of social relations.* industrial relations. Part of these production relations, namely, the labor relations between workers, "evolutionarily" adapt to the changed technique. In this way, according to Comrade Bukharin, a new mode of production matures within the old mode of production: for example, socialized labor appears in capitalist society.

Hence Comrade Bukharin concludes that the main contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production does not consist in the fact that "the means of production, things, climb on people" — this idea seems strange even to Comrade Bukharin, although it follows entirely from his mechanistic concept. Bukharin reduces the basic contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production to the fact that it gets "its expression in a derivative contradiction, namely, in the contradiction between one part of the relations of production of capitalism and the other part of it." "Socialized labor," Comrade Bukharin continues to develop his idea, " expresses *the organization*of society. And this organization can not be carried out to the end (?) in capitalist society, in particular, it cannot be drawn along the social line..."[99] (!). Bukharin here blurs the basic contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production and substitutes for it the contradiction between the various "parts" or groups of relations of production. This argument also shows how the logic of the mechanistic conception leads Comrade Bukharin into the bosom of the theory of "organized" capitalism. Tov. Bukharin here confuses the socialist *organization* of social relations, which is possible only under socialism , and capitalist *organization*, the basic law of development of which is the contradiction between social production and private appropriation. Lenin once remarked in the margins of Comrade Bukharin's Economics that capitalism is also "organized"in its own way!

"Every process of social production," says Marx, " considered *in a constant connection in the continuous stream of its renewal, is* at the same time a process *of reproduction*." The continuous course of production, however, presupposes not a simple resumption of the production process that has already taken place, but *reproduction on an extended scale, i.e., development* productive forces and industrial relations.

Comrade Stalin, in his famous speech at the conference of Marxist agrarian workers, pointed out that Marx's theory of reproduction is the best weapon in the fight against the right-wing opportunist theory of equilibrium. Indeed, the theory of the equilibrium of the socialist and capitalist sectors of the economy, put forward by Comrade Bukharin as the "road to socialism", presupposes that both these sectors are constantly maintaining independent development, and that at the same time the capitalist kulak economy, while developing its productive forces, is growing peacefully into socialism, thanks to the simple operation of the laws of commodity exchange

98 Г. Плеханов, Статьи против Струве.

99 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — с. 280–288.

between the socialist commodity-capitalist economy. This idea follows from Comrade Bukharin's mechanistic view of the process of production and reproduction as a "purely technical" process, an automatic process determined by the equilibrium of society with the external environment. This is a process in which only the development of productive forces (more precisely, technology) plays *an active* role: Comrade Bukharin considers it "in general", abstractly, regardless of its *social form* . Moreover, Comrade Bukharin remains entirely on the point of view *of commodity* production, which is characteristic of bourgeois political economy. Bukharin forgets that classes are behind the circulation of commodities*классы* that the trade forms of the bond are not something neutral in relation to the class structure of a given society, that in the transition period trade is a form of class struggle.

The Marxist doctrine of reproduction provides us with a genuine dialectic of the development of productive forces and relations of production. It strikes both the *right-wing opportunist* theory of the balance of sectors and the *Trotskyist*"law" of socialist accumulation at the expense of exploiting the peasantry, which was put forward by the Trotskyists during the recovery period.

Analyzing capitalist production and reproduction, Marx shows what an active, defining role the capitalist *social form* of reproduction, the capitalist relations of production, once played. In the process of commodity circulation, Marx reveals the relations between *classes* . Marx shows that capitalist accumulation is carried out by the capitalists at the expense of the working class, and that to understand capitalist accumulation and capitalist extended reproduction, it is sufficient to proceed from the essence, from *the internal relations of the working class.* laws of capitalist production' that, therefore, there is no need to resort to external conditions for the realization of the product, to "third parties", as R. Luxemburg did in her theory of accumulation. It is quite obvious that socialist extended reproduction under socialist relations of production, which are alien to all class exploitation, presupposes a struggle against the reproduction of capitalist relations and can be based only on intra-socialist accumulation, on the mobilization of internal resources by the proletariat.

The whole point is that T. Bukharin identifies social contradictions with the antagonism of external, oppositely directed forces. Bukharin does not see that in the fundamental contradictions of capitalist society *the internal regularity of development finds its expression* of capitalist production itself. According to Marx, the internal contradictions and opposites of capitalism turn into conflict only when they " acquire a special breadth and depth." The capitalist mode of production, from its very beginning, develops in a dual, contradictory form. The fundamental contradiction inherent in it between the material development of its productive forces and its relations of production finds its expression in *the social system* capitalism-as the main contradiction between social production and individual appropriation. But this latter is not at all a contradiction between two "types" of production relations — one production relations that have already "adapted" to the changed technique, and the other production relations that are not adapted to it, as Comrade Bukharin thinks. "Social production" under capitalism undoubtedly expresses a higher stage in the development of production than in previous formations, but it by no means has the new quality of socialist relations: it expresses one of the opposites of the contradictory *capitalist world.* development does not tell us at all about the socialist "organization" of capitalism!

The law of social-historical development consists in the fact that each historical stage of the development of social labor "*develops further*" its material foundations and its social forms, thus preparing the transition to a "higher stage". "Each succeeding generation," says Marx, " finds the productive forces obtained by previous generations, and these productive forces serve it *as raw material* for new production; thanks to this fact, the *connection of human history* arises , the history of mankind is formed… In order not to lose the result achieved... people are forced *to change*all inherited social forms."

Thus, the process of maturing the prerequisites of a new society in the bosom of the old social formation is expressed in the fact that the productive forces are maturing, in the form of raw material inherited by the next generation. In this way, *material resources are created* and social prerequisites, the material *foundations* of the future mode of production are being prepared. However, it is not necessary for new production relations to arise within the old society. The

fundamental difference between the bourgeois revolution and the socialist revolution lies in the fact that both the productive forces and the relations of production of capitalism are prepared in the depths of the feudal formation, whereas the socialist relations of production are created only after the victory of the proletariat in the socialist revolution. The productive forces acquired by mankind at the previous historical stage will be inherited by the new historical stage only as "raw material", only as the material basis of the new mode of production. The social, concrete historical *quality* of these productive forces is always given by the form of their development-historically determined relations of production. The productive forces have one capitalist quality before the social revolution, and they acquire a new, socialist quality only after the old social form has been replaced by a new one. The contradiction between *the general* course of development of material production in the history of mankind and its *particular* historical forms therefore appears every time as a contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production within *a given society.* a historically defined method of production. This dialectic of "general" and "special" was completely misunderstood by Comrade Bukharin!

The contradiction between productive forces and relations of production is *the driving principle* of every historical mode of production. It takes place in all social formations, not only in a class society, but also in a classless one. But in a class society, this contradiction is antagonistic, develops into an irreconcilable conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production, and leads this class formation to its inevitable demise. In class society, this basic contradiction is only another expression *of the class contradiction*-between the ruling class, which represents the old distribution of the means of production, and the revolutionary productive class, which represents all the productive forces of society that are rebelling against the old property order: new technical achievements that cannot already be used, under the old property order, the level of intellectual development the working class and at the same time the poverty-stricken level of its consumption, etc. From this contradiction and irreconcilability of class interests — at a certain stage *of maturity* of the given mode of production and its material prerequisites-directly grows an open class conflict, a social *revolution* . The revolution overthrows the economically and politically dominant class, destroys the old economic order, and, by placing a new social class in power, creates a new form of distribution of the means of production among the classes — a new form of production relations; it entails a qualitative transformation of the inherited and newly acquired productive forces. In this way, it is not things that "climb" on people, but *classes*that struggle with classes in this conflict of productive forces and relations of production.

"No social formation perishes before all the productive forces for which it gives ample scope have developed," says Marx, " and new, higher relations of production never come into *being before the material conditions* of their existence in the bosom of the old society have matured. Therefore, humanity always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve, since on closer examination it will always turn out that the task itself is only put forward when *there* are already material conditions necessary for its solution, or when they are at least in the *process of arising* »[100]."

This proposition of Marx's was also subjected to innumerable perversions and misinterpretations. Social-fascism, relying on it, tries to prove that capitalism today still offers a great deal of scope for the development of the productive forces, and therefore it cannot soon perish. On the other hand, the social-fascists claim that the material conditions for the existence of socialist society have not yet matured in the depths of capitalism, that the Bolshevik revolution is a utopia, and so on.

Meanwhile, Marx's thought, which is really directed against all utopianism, has a completely different meaning and is not at all so favorable to the capitalists and their social-fascist advocates. A revolutionary conflict breaks out when the old property relations are transformed into "fetters" that prevent the development of all elements of the productive forces, i.e., the development *of the technical* capabilities of production and the development of the physical and spiritual abilities *of the*

100 K. Маркс, Письмо к Анненкову.

labor force . Previous property relations make it impossible to fully use the new achievements of technology and their further development.

At the same time, the same conditions lead the productive classes to lower their standard of living, allow them to clarify their class interests, and thereby shape their class consciousness. In order for the revolutionary working class to face its revolutionary tasks, it is necessary that at least "in the process of emergence" there should be such new material productive forces that the old social system is unable to fully utilize and develop further. But both these points — the historical limits set for the further development of technology, and the growth of the class consciousness of the productive class-are closely and inextricably linked. In order for the revolutionary class to be finally formed as a class, it is necessary that all the material prerequisites that this society is capable of developing should be formed in the bowels of the old society. Therefore, the class maturity of the revolutionary class — the development of its class consciousness, the creation of its political organization, the revolutionary character of its actions, etc. — all this serves as a perfectly clear symptom of the fact that the objective material conditions necessary for the solution of revolutionary tasks have already emerged or are emerging. The epoch of imperialism, which sets a slingshot to the further development of the productive forces created by capitalism — when the ruling classes, as Lenin put it, *can* no longer live in the old way-is at the same time the epoch of proletarian revolutions — when the oppressed classes no longer want to live in the old way. Only in this way can we know a certain level of material culture, the level *of maturity*of the material conditions that must be present for the exploited class to set and solve revolutionary problems.

Any other understanding of the" scope "that capitalism will give to the development of the productive forces and the" maturity "of the material prerequisites of the new system, any other demand for the" level " of material culture necessary for the revolution, leads to abstract and obviously opportunist chatter, represents a direct defense of capitalism and an effort to perpetuate its existence. "No one can say what this level of culture is," Lenin wrote on this point, in response to Sukhanov's Menshevik "arguments."

Chapter 3. Capitalist and socialist economic systems

3.1. Two farming systems. Pre-capitalist formations and the role of their remnants in the modern economy

The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of socio-economic formations and the dialectic of the process of social production is the basis for our study *of the two opposing economic systems* that characterize the modern world economy — dying *capitalism* in the capitalist countries and *socialism under construction*in the USSR.

In his report to the XVI Congress of the CPSU(b), Comrade Stalin vividly revealed this "*difference* economic *systems* of the economy in our country and among the capitalists", this is "the contradiction between the capitalist world and the U.S.S.R." "Here in the U.S.S.R.," said T. P. Tolstoy. Stalin — *the growing upsurge* of socialist construction in both industry and agriculture. They, the capitalists, have a *growing* economic crisis both in industry and in agriculture... "" B what is the reason why the U.S.S.R., despite its cultural backwardness, despite its lack of capital, despite the lack of technically trained economic cadres, is in a state of growing economic *recovery* and is making decisive progress on the front of economic construction *ycnexu*and the advanced capitalist countries, despite their abundance of capital, their abundance of technical cadres, and their higher level of culture, are in a state of growing economic *crisis*and are suffering defeat after defeat in the field of economic development?"

"Reasons," T. replies. Stalin: in *the difference*between the economic systems of the economy between us and the capitalists. The reason is the failure of the capitalist economic system. The

reason lies in the advantages of the Soviet economic system over the capitalist[101]one."

The task of the historical and economic theory of Marxism-Leninism is to elucidate as fully and comprehensively as possible this difference and contrast between the economic systems of capitalism and socialism, to reveal their historical preparation in the development of social formations, the specific features and driving forces of each of these economic systems, and to show the historical inevitability of the replacement of capitalism by socialism.

But within the limits of modern capitalist society, we also find remnants of other pre-capitalist modes of production; remnants of elements of various economic structures also characterize our transitional economy at a certain stage of development. The role of these pre-capitalist modes of production in the historical preparation of the modern economy and their relationship to the capitalist and socialist systems deserve the most serious attention. Therefore, we must first briefly discuss the *pre-capitalist*formations.

"In general terms," says Marx in the preface to the Critique of Political Economy, " we can outline both progressive epochs of economic formation of society: *the Asiatic, ancient, feudal, and modern bourgeois modes of production* . Bourgeois relations of production constitute *the last antagonistic form* of the social process of production... " This view of Marx and Engels on the antagonistic character of hitherto existing social formations is quite consistent with their definition of the history of all preceding society as the history of the class struggle, which was given by them in the Communist Manifesto. However, even in their early works, Marx and Engels spoke of ancestral property, of public ownership of land that preceded private ownership. The appearance of a number of new historical studies, and in particular the American Morgan's book on primitive society, confirmed their assumptions. It forced Engels to emphasize later that the existence of antagonistic social formations is limited only to the period *of written* history. Class formations were preceded by an earlier form of social order, which, moreover, far exceeded all later formations in the historical duration of its existence — this is *a primitive classless society* .

Describing the pre-capitalist formations, Marx wrote: "These old social-productive organisms are incomparably *simpler and clearer* in their structure, they are better than the bourgeois, but they rest either on *the immaturity* of the individual man, who has not yet broken away from the umbilical *cord of natural-generic ties* with other people, *or* on *direct relations of domination and subordination* . The condition of their existence is *a low level of development of the productive* forces of labor and the corresponding *connectedness*of people in the process that creates their material life, and at the same time the connectedness of all their relations to each other and to nature[102]."

The characteristic features of primitive society were: *common ownership of the tools of production,* which is inextricably linked with primitive family and tribal life, and certain forms of collective, joint activity of primitive people in the primitive production process, i.e., when collecting food, hunting, etc. They are, in Marx's words, "based, on the one hand, on the fact that the individual has not yet severed the umbilical cord that binds him to the tribe and to the community, and is as closely connected with them as the individual bee is with the hive[103]of bees."

In his Origin of the Family, Engels gives a clear materialistic justification for the influence that sexual and gentile relations had in the first stages of human culture. The production and reproduction of immediate material life, he points out, "is of two kinds. On the one hand, the production of the means of subsistence, food, clothing, housing, and the necessary tools; on the other, the production of man himself, the continuation of the species. The social institutions in which people of a certain historical epoch and a certain country live are determined by both types of production: the degree of development, on the one hand, of labor, and on the other, of the family.

---

101 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

102 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 48.

103 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 323.

The *less developed labor* is, the more limited is the sum of its products, and consequently the wealth of society, the more dominant is the influence of the relations between the sexes on the social order[104]." In this way, the role of sexual and ancestral relations is given its *own economic explanation by Marx and Engels*. The low level of development of the productive forces and the consequent connectedness of primitive man in the material process of production were reflected in the "connectedness" characteristic of all the social relations of primitive society… *This*led to complex forms of primitive group marriage, which were regulated by very strict customs, the dominance of elders in the family and tribe, etc. All these reasons led to the fact that primitive man was organically fused with his group, genus, tribe.

Thus, the dominant influence of sexual and ancestral ties at different stages of human culture is explained by the fact that labor productivity is still very poorly developed and its technical basis is extremely imperfect. Primitive production, as a general rule, rests on the significant role played by the personal factor, on the human labor force. Hence the special importance of those social relations in which the "production of man himself" — the family and the clan-takes place.

The mechanistic point of view of A. Bogdanov and some other authors, who seek to explain all the peculiarities of the primitive social system by "social technique" alone, "technical rules of conduct" resulting from primitive production, etc., is clearly incorrect. In this sense, Marx's and Engels ' references to the significance of sexual and tribal ties are extremely valuable. However, the latter was explained by their *lack of labor productivity* primitive man. It sounds absolutely absurd when bourgeois scientists begin to argue that Engels at the end of his life recognized, along with the economic factor, the special role of the sexual "factor"in historical development. Engels ' materialistic clarification of this question has nothing in common with those idealistic ideas about the meaning of "sexual experiences" in primitive people, which, for example, are preached by modern *Freudianism*— the Viennese psychologist 3. Freud and his followers. Freudianism attempts to explain the entire primitive gentile system on the basis that primitive man is supposedly "born" with the sexual drives of close relatives to each other, and that the entire structure of the primitive gens is built on these complex relationships between father, mother, and children[105]. The psychology of primitive man is considered here from the point of view of a modern bourgeois erotomaniac. The basis of primitive tribal life could not be the "sexual psychology" of primitive people, because after the emergence of private property, tribal life begins to collapse and there can be no question of any such influence of psychology.

The same wrong path is followed by those bourgeois sociologists who explain the peculiarities of primitive society from primitive religion, from the "pre-logical" thinking of primitive people, etc. (Levy-Bruhl et al.). The true historical and economic basis of the social system was the common *ownership of the means of production* . This shared ownership of resources was due to the undeveloped productivity of primitive man's labor, and therefore the "technical" impossibility for primitive people to gather food, hunt, and produce alone. Any more or less extensive hunting enterprise required the participation of the entire group of people; similarly, on such communist principles, the household had to be maintained, the hearth maintained, and so on. In this sense, we must regard the primitive mode of production as a primitive form of collective *communist labor* . There is not yet a social division of labor. The division of labor here is purely *of natural* origin, it is caused by differences *in sex and age*: men, as stronger and younger members of the family, naturally perform the most important functions-hunting, making tools, waging war, etc. The entire social organization of primitive man, which did not yet know classes, wealth, etc., corresponded to the primitive communist economy. and poverty, domination and enslavement, political organization and built on the broad principles of primitive democracy. As an example of a primitive communist organization, Engels cited the tribes of North American Indians. Now this nation is almost completely extinct due to the penetration of capitalist "culture". In this question, we

104 Ф. Энгельс, Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства — с. 1.

105 3. Фрейд, Тотем и табу и другие работы.

have a striking contrast between the attitude of capitalism towards primitive peoples and the attitude towards them in the Land of the Soviets, where the former extinction of the northern primitive peoples was replaced by their growing cultural upsurge!

The doctrine of *primitive Communism* It has a very important methodological significance for Marxism. It confirms the historical, transitory character of modern class inequality and class exploitation; it says that there was already a social system that did not know classes. It is not surprising that bourgeois science disputes this position of Marxism in every possible way. Bourgeois scientists strive to prove that primitive man was almost a" born " individualist, that he lived almost alone, and so on, that in many respects he resembled the modern egoistic bourgeois. This bourgeois view was also reflected in the views of such old materialist philosophers as Hobbes, who argued that in the primitive, "natural" state, "man is a wolf to man." It was repeated in the " robinsonades "of bourgeois economists: some of them, in their analogies with modernity, went so far as to make absolutely ludicrous statements, calling, for example, the stick of primitive man his" capital " and so on.The bourgeois economist Karl Bucher developed a particularly coherent theory on this question. According to his theory, primitive people live and produce completely separately from each other: this is the period of the so-called "individual search for food". Then, according to Bucher's theory, social ties are more strengthened in the local economy of the ancient and feudal system, but all the social properties of a person are fully developed only in modern bourgeois society! However, numerous historical and ethnographic materials do not support Bucher's theory. The communal ownership of land that had been preserved in Russia until recently, and over which there were disputes between Marxists and Narodniks, was undoubtedly a relic of primitive land communism, as well as the German "mark", etc.It is true that these were remnants of primitive communism that had already been exposed to serfdom and were decaying under the influence of capitalism. Traces of primitive communism in hunting life, in the forms of marriage, etc., are still preserved in the lower stages of development of backward hunting tribes-in America, Australia, in our Siberia, etc. The same remnants of tribal and ancestral life are now evident in some Caucasian peoples, among nomadic pastoralists in Central Asia. Intertwining with the remnants of the feudal system, they form the basis of the power of tribal elders, etc.Noting the presence of patriarchal economy in the transition economy, Lenin linked it in particular with the remnants of nomadic and semi-nomadic life. Consideration of these economic peculiarities is necessary for the transfer of these primitive peoples to the rails *of Soviet* organization and socialist economy. Primitive communism is not only a matter of history, but also of practical *politics* .

Development primitive society has led to its *disintegration* . The highest form of primitive communism is the tribal and tribal system, under which the communal masses of primitive people were already united; this system led to the strengthening of the power of the ancestors and elders, military leaders, priests; it led to the gradual separation and isolation of the dominant social elite.

The main reason for the development and disintegration of primitive society was the *growth of labor productivity* . "As long as the productivity of labor has not reached a certain level," says Marx, "there is no surplus time at the disposal of the worker , without which *surplus labor* is impossible, and therefore capitalists are impossible, but at the same time slaveholders, feudal barons, in a word, any *class of large proprietors* »[106]is impossible." The transition from primitive society *to class* society became possible only with the development of labor productivity. Productivity of labor "is not a gift of nature, but a gift *of history*," Marx observes. Undoubtedly, natural and environmental conditions also played a certain role in the development of labor productivity. For example, the diversity of natural conditions in temperate climates formed the natural basis for the beginning development *of the social division of labor* . "It is not the absolute fertility of the soil," says Marx, " but its differentiation, the diversity of its natural products, that constitutes *the natural condition."* the basis of the social division of labor: it encourages people to diversify their own needs, means and methods of labor by the diversity of natural conditions

106 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 513.

surrounding them."

But the favorable conditions of the natural environment in themselves form only natural prerequisites, they provide only *the possibility* of the worker's surplus labor. In the same way, it is wrong to explain the growth of labor productivity and the appearance of a surplus product by the "nature" of man himself — for example, *by population growth* . Population growth itself needs a historical explanation and depends on the laws of a particular economic structure. The growth of labor productivity assumes as its main premise that labor is performed in certain *social*conditions. In order for an employee to spend surplus labor on others, in Marx's words, "*external compulsion is required*."

On the basis of the diversity of natural conditions as a natural prerequisite, the earliest social division of labor between *agricultural and pastoral* tribes developed. This first division of labor, in turn, contributed to the further development of labor productivity. On the same basis, there is a gradual *exchange* between tribes and communities that produce and produce various products. Thanks to all these conditions, along with the product necessary for maintaining existence, a surplus product also began to form. Accumulated in the hands of elders and leaders, it served as a source for the development *of private property,* which existed alongside the former public ownership of the means of production. The development of property inequality in turn caused the possibility of using labor and caused the need for it for their own personal purposes: Thus, social inequality emerged in the form of domestic slavery to which prisoners of war, unpaid debtors, etc. were subjected. This *is how public organizations were created* conditions under which the employee has excess time and the ability to force him to do surplus labor. Thus, the foundations *of class antagonism* were laid .

"The clash of newly formed social classes," says Engels, " *blows* up the old society, which is based on tribal associations." The first social revolution is being prepared over a long period of time within the framework of the tribal system — new private property relations are invading the previously dominant social property. The development of classes and the class struggle finally leads to the explosion of the old tribal associations:" The new society expressed in the state " *(Engels)* is based on *private property,* which is the main relation to the means of production. It is based on *class inequality* and the domination of the owners of the means of production over the productive classes. It is based on *local*, territorial associations of society members that have replaced the old family ties.

Despite the profound differences that exist between individual class formations-ancient, feudal, and capitalist societies-we must emphasize these common features that are characteristic of the development of the entire class society. First of all, these are *antagonistic* social formations whose economic structure is based on class antagonism, on *the class exploitation* by the ruling classes of the surplus labor provided by the enslaved productive classes. The economic basis of this class domination is various forms *of private ownership* of the means of production, ancient, feudal, and bourgeois property. Class rule is protected everywhere by a special political organization in the form *of the state* and is established by appropriate *laws* . The *antithesis between town and country also remains characteristic of the whole class society* . The separation of the city from the countryside occurs in the process of social division of labor, primarily as a separation from agricultural activities of the craft that developed in the cities. It is being strengthened along with the development of exchanges and the creation of shopping centers in cities. The city everywhere leads the backward countryside; it concentrates power, the highest achievements of science and art; it draws together the masses of the urban population, cut off from the healthy natural conditions of existence, while the rural population is doomed to backward forms of labor and the "idiocy of rural life" *(Marx)* . "The antithesis between town and country," Marx and Engels wrote in their earlier work, " can exist *only within the framework of private property* . It is the crudest expression of the fact that the individual is subordinated to the division of labor and to certain activities that are forcibly imposed on him[107]."

---

107 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, О Фейербахе / Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 234.

Finally, the whole history of class society is permeated by the division and *opposition of physical and mental labor* . Thanks to the surplus product, spiritual labor is gradually separated from material production and becomes the privilege of the ruling classes and the "ideologues"who serve them.

The task of Marxism in studying these class formations is not to confine itself to a purely "historical" consideration of them. It is necessary to identify all the most important features that connect these pre-capitalist formations with *modern*society, which are important for the modern struggle of the proletariat. The remnants of all these types of production relations in capitalist society, their role in the transition economy, the significance of pre — capitalist forms in the development of the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions, and the tasks of the struggle against imperialism in colonial countries where pre-capitalist relations have been preserved-this is what should be the focus of our attention.

When we approach class formations from this point of view, we are first confronted with the question of the so-called *Asiatic mode of production* . Marx, in his Preface, begins with him the enumeration of " epochs of economic formation of society." However, in a number of other places, Marx, Engels, and Lenin name only three formations-ancient, slave-owning society, feudal society (or serf society), and capitalist[108]. Among Marxist historians, the question arose: what did Marx mean when he spoke of the Asian mode of production? According to one view, Marx is referring here to early Asian communities with public ownership of land, and thus the Asian mode of production must coincide with primitive communism. This view can hardly be considered correct. The Asiatic mode of production is listed by Marx without any reservations in a number of antagonistic formations. Speaking of the original tribal or communal ownership of land, even in this communal ownership Marx and Engels found the germs of class inequality in the form of hidden slavery, etc.; starting with their early works, they linked the existence of communal property not only with early Asian communities, but also with the ancient form of property, with feudal society, etc. Finally, in a number of passages in Capital, when Marx speaks of the East Asian or Eastern social system, he connects it with the existence *of feudal classes and the state* .

Equally wrong is the view that was reflected in counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, then in the works of Comrade Magyar and some Soviet historians. According to this view, the Asian mode of production should be considered as a completely special, *independent* socio-economic formation. Proponents of this view tend to emphasize some distinctive features of the East Asian states: the concentration of supreme power over land in the hands of the sovereign, the organization of public works by the state — irrigation, etc. - and its interference in economic life, the despotic nature of government, etc. All these features did take place, but they do not yet speak in favor of the existence of a special Asian formation. The main mistake of the "Asiatophiles" is that in defining the mode of production they do not proceed from the basic relations of production, not from the relations between classes. And these relations in the East Asian despotisms (Assyro-Babylonia, Persia, Egypt, etc.) were mainly *feudal*relations. Meanwhile, the recognition of a special Asian mode of production entails a whole series of opportunist perversions, which are characteristic in particular of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism. This means recognizing a special path of development for the Asian countries, refusing to see in modern China, etc., the existence of feudal relations that are closely intertwined and connected with imperialist exploitation. Connected with this view is the Trotskyists ' denial of the significance of the bourgeois liberation movement and bourgeois revolutions in the East; this view contradicts the basic tenets of the Comintern's program. The Asian mode of production can best be considered as a special specific form of feudalism, which has acquired some distinctive features in the conditions of the economy of eastern countries, taking into account the importance of the problem of irrigation and control over water resources, etc.

The ancient or *slave-owning* system is the earliest form of production that developed directly from the bowels of primitive society and had its origins in the system of domestic slavery of

---

108 К. Маркс, Наёмный труд и капитал; Ф. Энгельс, От утопии к науке; В. Ленин, Лекция о государстве.

primitive peoples. The earliest class production relation was *that of a slave owner and a slave* . Ancient Greece and ancient Rome have left us with classic examples of slave relations. The extremely primitive craft techniques of the slave-owning system required the expenditure*of more*labor. At the same time, wars, the enslavement of insolvent debtors, and the slave trade with surrounding tribes created a vast market for cheap labor in the form of slaves. The peculiarity of the slave-owning system of production consists in the fact that the slave is regarded by his master only as *a tool gifted with speech*, completely disenfranchised and completely dependent on the slave owner. The idea of physical labor is so associated with the slave class that it becomes something that dishonors the free man. The class of free slaveholders is limited to "spiritual" activities in politics, government, art, etc. The material foundations of the ancient world thus created the possibility of a broad development of spiritual culture (Greek art, Roman law). In the development of a vast material and spiritual culture*прогрессивная для своего времени*, the historical role of ancient slavery, which was progressive for its time, consisted.

Thanks to these conditions for obtaining cheap surplus labor, exchange was greatly developed in the ancient world *обмен*, commercial and merchant capital was born, and favorable conditions were created for selling agricultural products to other countries. All this leads to the fact that the small peasants in the countryside are being depopulated in favor of large-scale land ownership. Free artisans were also gradually disappearing in the city; agriculture and urban industry were concentrated in the hands of large slave owners, who, with the help of forced labor, carried out work on their estates (latifundia) and in manufactories. It should be noted that the features close to this economy of the ancient world were also worn by slavery in modern times — for example, the economy of American planters, etc.

The slave-owning system excluded the possibility of natural development and transition to another, higher mode of production due to the fact that slave forms of labor and low production qualifications of slaves made it almost impossible to increase the technical level of production, and free citizens of the ancient world were not drawn into the direct production process. This is the main *internal contradiction* this led to a stagnation in the development of material production. This stagnation turned out to be economically unprofitable at a certain historical stage. However, without being the bearers of a new, higher mode of production, the slaves could not lead the revolt of the productive forces against the relations of production that bound their development. Therefore, the necessary revolution in the mode of production took place "in most cases through the forcible subjugation of the dying society by the stronger[109]ones." This was the fate of ancient Greece, and then of ancient Rome.

But slavery is not only a subject of historical study. The remnants of slavery have been partially preserved in modern capitalist society. They exist in hidden and open forms, despite the official "prohibition" of slavery and the "moral" rejection of it by European "culture". There are still millions of slaves in Africa and elsewhere. The "free" natives of many colonial countries are also in a situation close to slavery, and they are condemned to numerous labor obligations in favor of imperialist rapists. And this de facto preservation of slavery turns out to be beneficial where imperialism is given the opportunity to use free labor - in conditions of predatory exploitation of colonies and extremely primitive production equipment. The struggle against open and hidden forms of slavery and slave and forced labor is therefore an urgent task in the struggle of the colonial peoples for their liberation from the yoke of imperialism.

A higher mode of production compared to slavery was represented *by feudal society* . The development and disintegration of European feudalism covers the period of the so-called Middle Ages and part of modern history. In Russia, feudal-serf relations were partially preserved until the February Revolution, and the tsarist autocracy rested on these relations. Typical forms of feudalism or remnants of feudalism still exist in Asia, for example, in China, India, Indo-China, and the African Negro states. In contrast to the capitalist mode of production, in feudal exploitation, a

---

109 Ф. Энгельс, Диалектика природы / Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. II — с. 87.

significant role is played by the principle of *personal dependence*, direct domination and subordination, and the use of so-called *non-economic control.* compulsions. However, it would be wrong to think that feudal exploitation did not have its own economic basis. The economic basis of feudalism is *the small-scale individual production* of peasants and artisans under the rule of the feudal class, large landowners-*owners of land* . Feudalism is characterized *by the natural* the economy, i.e., the conditions of economic activity, are overwhelmingly produced in the feudal lords ' own economy, and are not obtained from outside by means of exchange. In accordance with this, the feudal form of labor, as Marx points out, is nothing more than its natural, natural form, in which labor is directly directed to the production of use values, and the relations of personal dependence are expressed in the natural duties and services that the productive class — the peasantry — carries out in relation to the class of landowners.

Of course, this natural character of feudal production should not be understood in the sense that there was no *exchange at all in feudal society* . A decisive struggle on two fronts is necessary on this issue. It is necessary to fight against *механистической*Bucher's mechanistic scheme, according to which the feudal economy is portrayed as a kind of closed estate ("oikos"), which does not know trade and monetary relations. This scheme was adopted in our country by A. Bogdanov and with his light hand became widespread among Marxists. But it is also necessary to fight the openly idealistic theory of modern bourgeois historians such as Dopsch, Max Weber, Petrushevsky, and others, who seek to perpetuate the existence of commodity-capitalist relations and exaggerate the role and significance of trade in feudal economy.

The character of the relations of production in feudalism cannot be properly understood *outside the relations of classes* specific to feudal society — the class of large landlords and their dependents , small farmers, and peasants. The exploitation of the peasants by the landlords is expressed in various forms of land rent: labor rent, food rent, and money rent. At the same time, according to Marx and Engels, medieval feudal land ownership " corresponded in the cities to corporate ownership and the feudal organization of handicrafts." The form of this feudal organization was the own labor of artisans, united in *guilds*, "in the presence of small capital and the labor of apprentices used by them." Insufficient social division of labor led to more patriarchal relations between masters and apprentices. It would be wrong to regard the medieval apprentice as a modern proletarian: at best, we have here a pre-proletariat. On the other hand, it is wrong to idealize these relations, which served as a special form of feudal exploitation.

Bourgeois historians often tend to view feudalism through modern *legal* glasses and see it as an exclusively political or legal organization. They present the case in such a way that the feudal peasant — especially in the period of early feudalism — is the free and independent owner of his piece of land. In their image, the property of the feudal lord is only nominal, and these free peasants themselves enter into a voluntary legal *agreement* with the feudal lord, giving him a part of his labor in compensation for the "protection" of peasant lands, which the feudal lord allegedly carries out when fighting external enemies. From this point of view, serfdom is portrayed as a random episode that did not take place in all countries, but only in Russia and Prussia of the XVIII century. B At the same time with *the economic* This feudal economy is interpreted by bourgeois historians in terms borrowed from bourgeois economics as "natural-economic" or "patrimonial" *capitalism* (see the works of Dopsh, Petrushevsky, etc.). Here we have both the perpetuation of capitalism and the explicit *idealization*of medieval feudal orders. Unfortunately, Marxist historians are sometimes inclined to the same position. For example.t Dubrovsky, who was already mentioned above, believes that the peasant has opportunities for accumulation in the early feudal period and completely loses these opportunities in serfdom.

However, a correct Marxist assessment of feudalism is important in order to properly understand the nature *of the bourgeois revolution* , in particular *the two possible paths of the peasant bourgeois revolution* in Russia. Serfdom cannot be considered as a special mode of production, fundamentally different from feudalism. The period of serfdom is a period of the same *feudal* relations with the predominance of basically the same *natural* economy, characterized even by a certain decline in the productive forces, but only at a different stage of development of these

relations. The enslavement of the peasants and feudal relations are most clearly expressed in the later period of the development of feudalism, especially in certain countries such as Russia or Germany. But the same feudal relations, in a somewhat relaxed form, were inherent *in the entire*feudal mode of production. In this sense, both Marx and Lenin identified the feudal and serf system.

Lenin strongly objected to the views of our bourgeois sociologists regarding the feudal peasant as an independent landowner. "Reality," Lenin wrote, " does not know that the land belongs to the farmer, which exists separately and independently… This is only one of the links in the relations of production at that time, which consisted in the fact that the land *was divided among the large landowners, the landlords, that the landlords gave the peasants this land in order to exploit them* , so that the land was like natural wages: it provided the peasant with the necessary products so that he could produce a surplus product on It was a center for the peasants to perform their duties for the benefit of the landowner."[110] Marx also speaks in the same way about feudal relations. At the same time, it shows that the possibility of a certain peasant accumulation — as a necessary prerequisite for the future peasant bourgeois revolution — was not excluded even under serfdom. He explains this possibility of accumulation not by any means by the" free property " of the peasant in the feudal period, but *by the underdevelopment of the productive forces of labor* . "Although," says Marx, " the direct producer *is not an owner, but only* an owner, and all his surplus labor really belongs to the landowner, yet under these conditions there can generally be an independent development of property and, even relatively speaking, of wealth among those who are indebted to corvee or serfs… Since this form of surplus labor, corvee labor, is based on *the underdevelopment of all the social productive forces of labor* , on the primitiveness of the mode of labor itself, corvee labor necessarily takes from the direct producer, of course, an incomparably smaller share of all labor than under developed modes of production… Thus there is a *possibility of a certain economic development here* »[111].

Here Marx explains the prerequisites for the development of the bourgeois revolution laid down in feudal agrarian relations. He justifies economically the theory *of two possible paths* the peasant bourgeois revolution, which later received its fullest expression in Lenin. The possibility of a certain peasant accumulation in feudal society allows the agrarian revolution not necessarily to follow the Prussian, "Junker" path of development, when the entire mass of landowner land ownership is preserved, which gradually turns into capitalist land ownership. It turns out that another "American" way of developing the agrarian revolution is also possible — the formation of free farming among the peasants through the radical abolition of landowning by landlords. It was precisely this task that Lenin set before the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia.

The study of feudal systems is very important not only for understanding the process of development of capitalism, but also for the present-day struggle of the working class, for a correct understanding of the situation that is being created in backward and colonial countries, in China and India. Here the surviving forms of feudal land ownership and feudal relations often get along well with the latest forms of imperialist exploitation of colonies and adapt to the maintenance of these latter. The economic and political alliance between local feudal lords and foreign imperialists becomes the basis on which the enslavement of the broad peasant masses continues or even increases. The struggle against all kinds of feudal survivals in the colonies and the support of the local national bourgeois liberation movement at a certain historical stage of development, while maintaining the independent policy of the working class, the demand for an agrarian revolution by the peasantry is one of the most important tactical tasks of the local Communist parties.

At the same time, they must take into account that, once in power, the local bourgeoisie changes the revolution and comes to an agreement with local feudal lords and foreign imperialism (for example, the Kuomintang in China), and that therefore the complete elimination of feudal

110 В. Ленин / Соч., т. I — стр. 113.

111 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. III, ч. 2.

relations is possible only under Soviet conditions. Remnants of feudal relations, often intertwined with remnants of tribal life, are the legacy of tsarist Russia, with which the Soviet government also has to fight hard — for example in the Central Asian Soviet republics.

3.2. The capitalist system of economy. Imperialism

The capitalist formation is the most complex system of social economy in comparison with the previous ones. All the contradictions *of class*society receive their fullest development and expression under capitalism: the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, the antagonism and struggle of classes, the development of the state and the legal superstructure, the opposition of the city and the countryside, the separation of intellectual labor from physical labor.

Earlier, in the chapter on dialectics, we have already found out what paths Marx takes in Capital, revealing to us the inner dialectic of the capitalist mode of production. Here we will focus on some of the main features and main contradictions of capitalism and on the controversial issues that arise when studying the features of its economic structure. This *specific one* the quality that is characteristic of the laws and social relations of the capitalist formation is completely overlooked by bourgeois historians such as the aforementioned Dopsch and Petrushevsky. Just as for them feudalism is an eternal, unchangeable *legal* category, a form of political agreement, so "capitalism" seems to them to be an *economic*category that is unchangeable throughout history. They find "capitalism" both in the slave system and in the Middle Ages, in the feudal period!

Capitalism is not an eternal, unchanging form of society. Capitalist society develops out of feudal society. Even before the bourgeois revolution, *the material and technical foundations of capitalism were being laid in the depths of the feudal formation*, and *ready-made forms of the capitalist system were being created* . The technical revolution that prepares for the victory of capitalist relations consists in the transition from the low *handicraft technique* characteristic of feudal society to a higher level of technology in factory enterprises, to machine production. Production from the individual production of independent artisans, separated from each other, becomes production that unites the labor of many workers in a single production process, becomes *social production* . *The* historical role of capitalism lies in the enhancement of the productive forces of social labor and in *обобществлении*its socialization.

However, ownership of these socialized means of production remains private property: *appropriation* the produced product remains the individual, *private* appropriation of the capitalists, the owners of the means of production, *who exploit* the wage labor of the proletarians in order to obtain capitalist *profit* . This monopoly of the capitalists over the means of production and their exploitation of the proletariat is protected by the State *power* belonging to the capitalist class.

"The capitalist system of economy," characterizes T. P. Tolstoy. Stalin, - means that:

1) *power*in the country belongs to the capitalists;

2) the tools and means of production are concentrated in the hands *of exploiters* ;

3) production is subordinated not to the principle of improving the material condition of the working masses, but to the principle of ensuring high *capitalist profits* ;

4) *distribution* it is not in the interests of improving the material condition of the working people, but in the interests of ensuring the maximum profits of the exploiters;

(5) capitalist rationalization and rapid growth of production, which aim at securing high profits for the capitalists, encounter poverty and *decline as obstacles.* the material security of millions of working people who are not always able to meet their needs even within the extreme minimum, which inevitably creates the ground for inevitable *crises of overproduction* , rising unemployment, etc.;

6) the working class is *an exploitable* class, working not for itself, but for someone else*'s class, the exploiters* '[112]class ."

112 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

The contradiction between public production and private appropriation It is the driving force, the basic *law* of capitalist production. The social character of production is expressed in the planned organization of labor in each *individual* capitalist enterprise; the private character of appropriation is manifested in the fact that the capitalists, the owners of these enterprises, are not bound together by a single planned organization, and capitalist production, taken *as a whole*, is dominated *by anarchy* of production. The contradiction between social production and capitalist appropriation "appears as *a contradiction between the organization of production in a particular factory and the anarchy of production in the whole of society* »[113]."

Anarchy of production is a characteristic feature of the capitalist mode of production; it results from *the free competition* of independent commodity producers, the capitalists. A capitalist economy is by no means an *organized* economy that operates according to a premeditated plan. It is conducted by a multitude of" autonomous", isolated capitalists who communicate with each other only through the market. *Зacons* capitalist production manifests itself as natural, as *spontaneous* patterns. They are found only as a reaction to the violation of these laws. The basic contradiction of capitalism manifests itself in periodic crises that shake the capitalist mode of production. The operation of the laws of the capitalist system takes place, in Marx's figurative phrase, "in the form of the violent operation of a law of nature, as the law of gravitation is revealed, for example, when a house collapses on someone's head." *The distribution of labor is also spontaneous* between different *branches*of capitalist production: "the constant striving of various spheres of production for a stable equilibrium manifests itself only as a reaction against constant disturbances of this equilibrium[114]."

The contradiction between socialized production and capitalist appropriation finds its direct class expression in the form of antagonism *between the bourgeoisie* and *the proletariat exploited by it* . This class antagonism permeates the entire structure of capitalist society. In the sphere of productive forces, it finds its expression in the contrast between past and present labor-*dead and living labor* . The capitalists ' monopoly on the means of production *separates them from each other.* from the live labor force, its own products and the material and technical conditions for the implementation of this labor force. Since the labor of the worker is constantly dependent on whether it is applied to the means of production belonging to the capitalist, this leads to the fact that not living labor dominates its products, but, on the contrary, *the product dominates the producer* : the past labor of a person, embodied in the means of production, dominates his living labor. The separation of the means of production from direct producers leads to the idea that capitalist means of labor are endowed with their own "productivity" in addition to the labor applied to them. Capital, and not labor, appears to be the source of value, the source of further reproduction of capitalist means of production and capitalist relations. This is the "*fusion of material and technical working conditions with their social form" characteristic of capitalism*. This "reification" of social relations distinguishes the capitalist mode of production from the earlier, more transparent pre-capitalist formations in their economic structure.

The latter circumstance determines *the contradictory* nature of wage labor itself under capitalism. *Its* productivity acts as the productivity of its own *product* , the means of production it produces. The very concept *of productive gets an effective meaning* of labor. Productive labor is not all labor of the worker that follows from the very nature of material production and contributes to the growth of the productive forces of society. The concept of productive labor of the worker under capitalism also includes the specifically social, historically developed production relation of capitalism: only the labor of the worker, which creates surplus value for the capitalist, is productive. The working class is transformed into the same "accessory of capital as a dead working tool", into "conscious instruments of production", into "living machines". The same metamorphosis occurs

---

113 Ф. Энгельс, Анти-Дюринг — ч. III.

114 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 43, 310.

with *science* and with the forces of external, surrounding *nature* : both science and the natural productive forces are also monopolized by the capitalist and directed to their own interests. In Marx's words, everything "is both *social* and *natural."* the productive forces of labor, that is, those which it finds in inorganic nature, exist as the productive forces of capital."

All the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production are contained in their germ already in the basic cell of the economic fabric of capitalism — *in the commodity* . Capitalist production – *commodity production* production. The exchange of goods leaves its mark on all products of production. Along with the immediate utility of the commodity — its use value — the socially necessary labor contained in it adds *value to the commodity* . This means that the concept of a commodity includes the concept *of a social relation*, which, being manifested in the material shell of a commodity, expresses the ability to exchange these goods on the market. A commodity, in Marx's phrase, is "a sensuously supersensible thing." It is only in the exchange of commodities that the social ties that exist between commodity producers are revealed: the social ties of people manifest themselves as the movement and connection *of things* . "The purely atomistic relations between men in their social-production process," says Marx, " lead first of all to the fact that their own relations of production, which are beyond their control and beyond their conscious, individual activity, assume a material character[115]." The labor process itself "takes the form of the movement of things," the purchase and sale of labor power. The apparent, formal independence of individuals from each other is supplemented by a system of "comprehensive property dependence". On this economic basis, *commodity fetishism arises* : just as in primitive religions a priest-made fetish, so here human-made goods, like fetishes, dominate people.

The law of value is the only regulator of the spontaneous production of commodities under capitalism. On the basis of the law of value, the average rate of capitalist *profit is formed* . The desire of the capitalists to secure an average rate of profit establishes a certain proportionality in the distribution of social labor among the various branches of production. In full accordance with this atomistic *economy* of capitalism is its *superstructure* : in the sphere of state organization, the commodity-capitalist production of "independent" and "equal" owners corresponds to bourgeois democracy, in the public consciousness — to the "legal worldview", the illusions of freedom and equality of members of society, the principle of gross utilitarian profit in the actions of the capitalist.

As the unity of the process of labor that creates use value and labor that creates value, *each of the following functions is considered as the same.* commodity production is internally contradictory. But not all commodity production is imbued *with class antagonism* . Marxism makes a clear distinction in this respect between *the simple* commodity production of independent producers-peasants and artisans - which is still in existence under the slave-owning system and in feudal society , and in which only *value is produced* , and *commodity-capitalist production*, in which *surplus value is created* for the capitalist. Capitalist production historically arose only from the moment when labor power became the object of purchase and sale, the commodity *рабочая сила*. The latter became possible only as a result of the expropriation of direct producers in the era of so-called "initial accumulation", when *separation took place* labor force from the means of production.

In making this distinction between simple commodity production and capitalist production, one should not fall into the opposite error: not to see that the germs of all future capitalist contradictions are already embedded in the commodity, that simple commodity production, at a certain historical stage of its development, *is necessary* It leads to class differentiation, expropriation of direct producers, and the transformation of labor power into a commodity. Therefore, it is a mistake to see in simple commodity production *a special,* independent social formation, as Bogdanov did, for example, or is doing today. Dubrovsky. It is important to remember that the spontaneous development of simple commodity production necessarily leads to the emergence of capitalist relations. Thus, during the transition period, small-scale commodity

115 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 63.

production, as Lenin put it, "chemically" separates capitalist elements from itself every day and every hour, giving birth to capitalism. What was needed was the systematic impact of the growing socialist industry, the success of the development of state and collective farms, then complete collectivization and, on its basis, the elimination of the kulaks as a class, so that a socialist form of economy could also be created in the countryside.

The main contradictions of the capitalist mode of production also manifest themselves in *the distribution* of the national income, i.e., the capitalist surplus product. The bulk of it is spent not on variable capital spent on labor power, but on constant capital, on *the further growth of the means of production* .

The process of capitalist development is the process *of extended reproduction* of capitalist productive forces and capitalist relations of production. The more rapid growth of the capitalist means of production in comparison with the share of the working class generates *a relative surplus of workers* and allows for a rapid expansion of capitalist production. The driving forces of capitalist reproduction must therefore be sought *in the internal relations of the state.* the laws of the capitalist *mode of production* itself, in its very essence as a mode of production based on the class exploitation of the wage labor of the workers.

The development of the productive forces of capitalism and the growth of production, as indicated in the above characterization of the capitalist system, by T. P. Tolstoy. Stalin, do not indicate the development *of consumption* They do not lead at all to the impoverishment of the working class, to the deterioration of its material condition. However, it is a mistake to think that the product of capitalist production cannot therefore be realized in capitalist society, and that the latter, in order to get out of its difficulties, *needs*"third parties", i.e., the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry of backward countries, without whose consumption capitalist production is supposedly unthinkable. This point of view was adopted by our narodniks, who saw the main cause of capitalist crises not in the contradiction between social production and *private appropriation* , but in the constant absence of a "balance" between production and *consumption under capitalism* . A similar point of view was developed by Rosa Luxemburg in her theory of capital accumulation. Lenin, however, strongly objected to this understanding. Lenin, criticizing the theories of the Narodniks, showed that as long as capitalist reproduction takes place, the product produced is fully realized in capitalist society itself, because the *expansion of production outstrips consumption* : the need for a foreign market is explained only by the unlimited expansion of capitalist production. Of course, this circumstance does not mean that we can completely separate the question of "pure" capitalism from the question of peasant commodity production, as Comrade Bukharin does, for example, when considering the economy of the transition period.

Let us briefly discuss the question of *exchange* relations, the role *of commercial* capital in the development of capitalism, and Marx's theory of commodity *fetishism* . Here, too, we encounter a whole host of errors and perversions.

As we have already seen, neo-Kantians like Rubin see exchange as the basic social relation of capitalist society; they reduce the capitalist relations of production to relations of purchase and sale. Rubin polemics against Struve's" brilliant (?) excursion", in which the latter completely severed the" inter — economic "categories, i.e., exchange relations, from the" social " categories-relations between classes. The apologist of the bourgeoisie, Struve, had to prove this in order to "prove" that the task of economists is to study only inter-economic, i.e., exchange relations, but not social, i.e., class relations. According to Struve, social categories can only be "clothed in the costume" of exchange relations, which creates the "appearance of identity" of these supposedly completely different categories[116].

But in opposing Struve, Rubin, in contrast to him, *identifies* the basic production relations of capitalism with exchange relations. In the interaction of "autonomous farms" Rubin sees certain relations of production — "relations that presuppose a certain social structure of society" (?). Rubin

116 П. Струве, Хозяйство и цена / т. I — с. 17.

here tries to rely on the position of Marx that under capitalism economic relations do not have the character of direct rule of some classes over others, and the relationship of classes is manifested through "economic coercion". This means, "Rubin explains," that they are carried out "through the interaction of individual autonomous economic entities on the basis of a contract between them. Class relations have their *own origin* "the relations between capitalist and worker as between autonomous economic entities"[117]. Being completely alien to Marxist dialectics, the Menshevik Rubin here obscures *the class essence* of capitalist production relations as relations of class exploitation, identifying it with the form of their manifestation that they receive on the market in the process of buying and selling labor power. Rubin completely "forgets" what Marx wrote about this "autonomy" of the worker who *is forced*to sell his labor power; he forgets that the essence of the capitalists ' economic coercion of the workers is in no way limited to this market "transaction." For Rubin, the whole complex set of relations between classes refers at best to the" material and technical " process, rather than to social relations.

Marx and Engels attached great importance to exchange in the specific characterization of a particular social structure; but they always spoke of "production and exchange"; they did not separate *the mode of exchange from the mode of production* . Both distribution and exchange constitute one of the aspects of the production process in the broad sense of the word. Through the movement and exchange of things, various activities in this production process are exchanged. "Exchange," says Marx, "in all its aspects is either directly *contained in production or determined by it*." ...[118] " In general, the mode of exchange of products corresponds to the form of production[119]." Indeed, the exchange of commodities in the society of simple commodity producers, trade in bourgeois society, and Soviet trade are completely different forms of exchange relations, which are determined each time by the relations of production, by the relations of classes. The relations of purchase and sale in capitalist society, therefore, cannot in any way be the basic relations of production: they only reveal, in a special, historically necessary form of the purchase and sale of labour-power, the basic class relations of production of capitalism, the relations of class exploitation. When Struve makes the separation of "economic" and exchange relations from "social" relations, he obscures the fact that exchange relations are a special but only historically necessary form in which the relations between classes manifest themselves in the conditions of commodity production. However, his" critic " Rubin is no better aware of the interdependence of production and exchange. Like all bourgeois economists, Rubin substitutes exchange for production. It reduces the social content of capitalist relations of production to the specific form of their manifestation that they acquire in the process of buying and selling labor power.

Some Soviet historians, who attach *crucial importance to trade and trading capital, are taking a clearly erroneous path* in explaining the origin and historical development of the capitalist mode of production. Following the bourgeois theories of Dopsch and Petrushevsky, they see the development of exchange as the main reason for the transition from feudalism to serfdom, and they regard this particular form of feudal relations as an early form of capitalism. Some of these historians speak of the "era of commercial capital" and even of " commercial *capitalism* ", meaning by this term a special system of production relations. For example, commercial capital is sometimes given an extremely exaggerated significance when explaining the development of autocracy in Russia[120].

There is no doubt that the development of trade played a significant role in the historical

---

117 И. Рубин, Очерки по теории стоимости Маркса / изд. 3-е, 1928 — с. 61–62.

118 К. Маркс, К критике политической экономии. Предисловие.

119 К. Маркс, Нищета философии — с. 7.

120 См. например работы А. Богданова и И. Степанова, С. Пионтковского, Томсинского, Н. Розенталя, С. Кунисского, Малышева и др.

development of capitalism. But the development of trade, taken *by itself*, could not ensure the transition from simple commodity production to capitalist production: for such a transition, it was necessary to develop the internal contradictions of the old feudal formation, it was necessary to break up the old relations of production peculiar to feudal society. The transition to capitalism required: the process of expropriation of peasants and free artisans, the development of new bourgeois relations of production, the transition from handicrafts through manufactory to factory. Commercial or merchant capital, as Marx pointed out, does not in itself create value or surplus value, but only contributes to the exchange of commodities. The process of exchange takes place, as already indicated, in a variety of forms, beginning with the earliest form of simple robbery, always depending on the prevailing mode *of production* . Therefore, the claim of some historians that the Russian autocracy represented the interests of commercial capital is erroneous. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the tsarist autocracy should be seen as representing the interests of the feudal class, the class of large landowners that dominated Russia until the 1917 revolution. It is even more wrong to speak of commercial "capitalism" and see it as a special independent formation, as Bogdanov, Stepanov and some others did, for example. To exaggerate the role of commercial capital in elucidating the historical development of capitalism means to proceed from additional, "external" factors, and not from *the internal contradictions* inherent in the class relations of production of feudal society , in the depths of which the prerequisites of capitalism are maturing.

Rubin's understanding of Marx's doctrine of commodity fetishism also leads to a blurring of the class essence of capitalist relations of production*товарном фетишизме*. In order to understand the nature of the relations of production in capitalist society, Rubin, as we have seen, starts not from production, but from exchange. Production relations, i.e. simply exchange relations, according to Rubin, are "created" in the market every time: people communicate with each other only through the medium of things — goods. Therefore, Rubin sees in the theory of commodity fetishism "*the basis*of the entire economic system of Marx[121]." In fact, the basis of Marx's entire economic theory is, in his own words, " the revelation of the law of development of modern bourgeois society." Marx's starting point here is not commodity fetishism, but *class exploitation, the appropriation of surplus value by the capitalist* . Marx, Engels, and Lenin depart from the social and productive relations of capitalism, and not from their material envelope. According to Marx, the fetishism of commodities is most fully developed only when the purchase and sale of labour-power develops, i.e., in capitalist relations: the" reification " of social relations is fully completed in *capital* . There is no doubt that all the contradictions of capitalism are already embedded in the commodity. However, in order to correctly understand these contradictions and the ways of development of commodity-capitalist production, it is not enough to start from the conditions of simple commodity production. One can fully understand the nature of commodity fetishism and the reasons for its development only on the basis of *the basic contradiction*of capitalist production — between social production and private appropriation.

This fundamental contradiction of the capitalist mode of production — the contradiction between the social character of production and capitalist appropriation — finds its expression in periodic economic *crises* , in crises *of overproduction* . All contradictions become extremely acute in times of crisis, which should lead to the destruction of the capitalist system itself.

"The basis of the economic crises of overproduction," points out T. Their cause lies in *the very system* of capitalist economy. The basis of the crisis lies in the contradiction between the social character of production and the capitalist form *of appropriation* production results. *An expression* of this fundamental contradiction of capitalism is the contradiction between the colossal *growth of the production capacities* of capitalism, which are designed to increase capitalist profits, and the relative *reduction of the capacity to pay on the part of the millions of working* people , whose standard of living the capitalists are always trying to keep within an extreme minimum. In order to win the competition and squeeze out more profit, capitalists are forced to develop machinery,

---

121 И. Рубин, Очерки по теории стоимости Маркса / изд. 3-е, 1928 — с. 13.

rationalize, increase the exploitation of workers, and raise the production capacity of their enterprises to the extreme limits. In order to keep up with each other, all capitalists are forced in one way or another to embark on this path of frenzied *development* of production capabilities, but the internal and external markets, the purchasing power of the vast masses of workers and peasants, who are ultimately the main buyers, remain at a low level. Hence *overproduction crises* »[122].

"Bourgeois relations of production, "says Marx in the preface to the Critique of Political Economy," constitute *the last* antagonistic form of social production. But the productive forces developing in the bosom of bourgeois society create at the same time the material conditions necessary for the solution of this antagonism." The development of the productive forces of social labor brings the technical basis of capitalism and its productive capacities to such a high level, and so intensifies the process of ever-increasing socialization of production that the capitalist form of appropriation becomes a genuine fetter that hinders the further development of the productive forces. Crises are a symptom of this growing *indignation*of the productive forces against the capitalist relations of production. The further centralization of capital, the concentration of production, the growth of monopolies, and the growing indignation of the working class must inevitably lead to the explosion of the private ownership envelope.

Marx characterizes the " historical tendency of capitalist accumulation "as a dialectical process in which there is a dialectical" negation of the negation " of the expropriation of small private property of peasants and artisans, which was once produced by the capitalist mode of production. "It is no longer the worker who leads an independent economy himself who is subject to expropriation, but the capitalist who exploits many workers." This expropriation is accomplished by the immanent laws of the capitalist mode of production itself, by *the centralization* of capital. "Hand in hand with this centralization or expropriation of many capitalists by a few, *the cooperative form of the labor process is developing* Together with the ever-decreasing number of magnates of capital who usurp and monopolize all the benefits of this process of production, *the mass of poverty* , oppression, slavery, degeneration, exploitation increases, but *at the same time the indignation of the working class*, which is trained, united and organized by the mechanism of the capitalist production process itself. The monopoly of capital becomes *the fetter* of the mode of production that has grown up under and above it. The centralization of the means of production and the socialization of labor reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist shell. It *explodes* . The hour of capitalist private property strikes. Expropriators are being expropriated..."[123]

This historical trend of capitalist development, brilliantly predicted by Marx even in the era of the domination of industrial capital, is being realized in modern conditions, at the newest, highest and last stage of capitalism — under imperialism. Continuing the work of Marx, Lenin gave his most profound characterization of the basic characteristics and fundamental contradictions of the imperialist stage of capitalist development.

The economic essence of imperialism boils down to the fact that imperialism is *monopoly capitalism* . Imperialism, considered historically, is "*the development and direct continuation of the basic properties of capitalism* in general." Therefore, we should not speak of imperialism as *a special* social formation: we have here only a stage in the development of capitalism that preserves all its basic properties. At the same time, imperialism means the transition of capitalism to a new stage and thereby the acquisition of some *new qualitative* features, although we remain within the same capitalist mode of production. Capitalism, according to Lenin's instructions, becomes imperialism "only at a certain, *very high stage* of its development, when some of the basic properties of capitalism began to turn into *their opposite*, when the features of the transitional epoch appeared and were revealed all along the line*переходной эпохи* from capitalism to a higher socio-economic order. The economic basis in this process is the replacement of capitalist free *competition* by capitalist *monopolies* . And at the same time, monopolies, growing out of free competition , *do*

122 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 608.

123 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 787.

not eliminate it, but exist above it and next to it , thereby generating a number *of particularly acute and large-scale contradictions*, frictions, and conflicts." In this sense, "monopoly is a transition to a higher system." In this sense, imperialism is "*the eve of the proletarian revolution* ».

Imperialism is thus not only *politics* , as bourgeois economists and social-fascists try to present it, but also *the economy* of the latest stage of capitalism. Lenin's definition of imperialism is remarkable in that it captures the very economic essence of imperialism, considering it as a new stage in the development of the capitalist mode of production, when some of the basic properties of capitalism pass into their opposite, when free competition is replaced by monopoly, etc. At the same time, we must consider imperialism as *a continuation and development* the main features of capitalism, such as the preservation of all the basic capitalist contradictions, which *increase and become even more acute* during the monopoly period. Thus, the basic contradiction of capitalism — the contradiction between socialized production and the capitalist character of appropriation- becomes even more acute in the era of imperialism. Competition remains *наряду*alongside monopoly: the unity of competition and monopoly, their intertwining, is an expression of the same basic contradiction under imperialism.

Bourgeois economists proceed from their apologetic ideas about the eternity and immutability of the capitalist system. Therefore, the vast majority of them try not to notice the changes taking place in *the economic sphere.* the structure of capitalism. They reduce imperialism to a system *of foreign policy* aimed at the conquest and annexation of industrially backward countries; this policy, with rare exceptions, receives their approval and support.

The social-fascists, in their efforts to obscure the contradictions of imperialism, are less far-sighted than some of the more sharp-sighted bourgeois economists. For example, Kautsky also prefers *to separate the politics of imperialism from its economy* . He sees in imperialism not a stage in the development of the economy, not a new stage in the development of capitalism, but only a colonial *policy* , which, in his opinion, "highly *developed industrial* capitalism" is striving for and which finds its expression in the seizure by the imperialist states of the backward agrarian regions. Kautsky presents the matter in such a way that a "less" imperialist policy is possible for imperialism, and that the working class needs to fight only the most negative manifestations of this policy. Lenin strongly condemned Kautsky's attempt to separate the colonial policy of imperialism from its economy. "Colonial politics and imperialism," says Lenin, " existed even before the latest stage of capitalism, and even before capitalism… But "general" arguments about imperialism, which forget or relegate to the background the fundamental *difference in socio-economic formations*, inevitably turn into the most empty platitudes..."

Following Lenin's perfectly just instructions, Kautsky, by shifting the center of gravity to politics, obscures the most fundamental contradictions in the economy of this latest stage of capitalism. Kautsky puts forward "the idea that the domination of finance capital *weakens the economy."* unevenness and contradictions within the world economy, while in reality it *increases the level of inequality and contradictions in the world economy.* them[124]." In this "blunting" of capitalist contradictions lies the innermost meaning of Kautsky's theory *of ultra-imperialism* . Kautsky believes that the new "foreign policy" of industrial capitalism, which, in his opinion, has remained unchanged and continues to thrive, will lead us painlessly, without any revolution, to the formation of a single world capitalist trust. This, according to Kautsky, will mean the cessation of wars, the weakening of competition between the imperialists, and "the general exploitation of the world by international united finance capital."

It should be noted that R. Luxemburg also came to mistakes close to Kautskyism in her understanding of imperialism. Based on her theory of capital accumulation, R. Luxemburg saw in imperialism "the political expression of the process of capital accumulation in its competitive struggle for the remnants of the non-capitalist world environment, over which *no one has yet laid their hands*." Like Kautsky, R. Luxemburg identified imperialism with colonial

124 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 300–310.

policy.*промышленного* of capitalism, without seeing the new economic features of imperialism, without understanding that the struggle is for the redivision of an already divided world.

Kautskyite ideas were further developed opportunistically in the so-called theory *of organized capitalism* . The latter finds a warm defense among the theorists of social fascism. The theory of organized capitalism is based on the view that modern capitalism has already passed into a higher form of development when capitalist anarchy was replaced by capitalist *planning* . Capitalism is thereby transformed by the social-fascists into an "organized" type of economy conducted according to a plan. In their opinion, capitalism itself is preparing all the conditions for a completely painless, "evolutionary" transition to a higher, socialist form of production.

The social-fascists point out the conditions of the so-called *state control system.* during the period of the imperialist war, i.e., when the bourgeois state, representing the interests of the entire capitalist class, intervened more intensively in economic life and made attempts to regulate it in some way for military needs. Based on these imperfect and temporary attempts at "regulation" during the war, modern social-fascists speak of the possibility of a planned economy under capitalism! "Organized capitalism," says Hilferding, for example, " means in reality the fundamental replacement of the capitalist principle of free competition by the socialist principle *of planned*production[125]." The theory of organized capitalism is the theory of the" peaceful growth " of capitalism into a socialist society, the actual transition to which is being pushed back by the social-fascists into the distant future.

Some of the main points of this typically reformist theory found their theoretical justification in the mechanistic methodology of Comrade Bukharin. Tov. Bukharin has a very one-sided understanding of the process of centralization of capital and concentration of production, which is characteristic of the imperialist era. He is referring to the replacement of free competition by monopoly. But he does not understand the inner dialectic of imperialism, when free competition, giving rise to monopoly, is not only not eliminated, but continues to exist simultaneously and alongside the monopoly, and when this combination of competition and monopoly further sharpens the basic capitalist contradictions. According to Comrade Bukharin, under imperialism capitalist competition continues to exist only on an international scale — between the trustedstates, but it disappears *internally* states, being replaced here by a monopoly. Moreover, Comrade Bukharin considered the formation of a single world trust to be" abstract and theoretical". Naturally, Comrade Bukharin had to look for the reasons for the aggravation of the contradictions of imperialism not in *the internal* contradictions of the imperialist economy, but in *the external*conditions for each individual state. The main characteristic of imperialism for Comrade Bukharin is not the intertwining of monopoly and competition, but the concentration of violence and coercion on the part of imperialist trusts, united on a state scale and competing with each other.

All these peculiarities of the understanding of imperialism made Comrade Bukharin extremely exaggerate the features that characterize the" planned nature "and" organization " of modern capitalism, and slide into clearly opportunist tracks in understanding the ways of its development. In his" Economy of Transition", Comrade Bukharin considered the process of socialization under state capitalism in the Bogdanovian way - as a peaceful "organizational" process. He saw state capitalism during the war period as a "rationalization" of the production process, when, in his opinion, the capitalist's surplus value begins to turn into a simple surplus product. Bukharin forgot that state capitalism in bourgeois society is inextricably linked with capitalism, and therefore with trusts, shares, and monopolies[126]. In later articles, Bukharin once again developed his idea of this growing "planned nature" of capitalism, although these articles were written by him already on the eve of the modern world crisis...

Meanwhile, Lenin considered all talk about the possibility of eliminating crises while preserving capitalist relations "a fairy tale of bourgeois economists." "On the contrary," he wrote, "

---

125 Протоколы социал-демократического партейтага, выступление Р. Гильфердинга, 1927.

126 В. Ленин, Замечания на «Экономику переходного периода» т. Бухарина / Ленинский сборник IX.

the monopoly that is being created *in certain* branches of industry increases and sharpens the chaotic character *of* capitalist production as a whole; the discrepancy in the development of agriculture and industry, which is characteristic of capitalism in general, becomes even greater… The strenuously rapid growth of technology brings with it more and more elements of inconsistency between different aspects of the national economy, the chaotic nature of crises..."*обострение* According to Lenin, " contradictions are the most powerful driving force of the historical transition period[127]."

To fully understand imperialism as the last stage of capitalism, it is necessary to focus on the question *of uneven development* capitalism in its imperialist stage. *The law of uneven development of capitalism* was fully described in the works of Lenin and Stalin. Lenin established as *a general rule* the significance of this law for the entire development of capitalism, as well as the *special significance of the law itself.* the significance that it acquires in the imperialist era. The very anarchy of capitalist production inevitably leads to uneven and irregular development of individual enterprises and entire countries, which outstrip each other. "Unevenness and leaps in the development of individual enterprises, individual branches of industry, and individual countries are unavoidable under capitalism,"[128]Lenin pointed out. "There can be no uniform development of individual enterprises, trusts, branches of industry, or countries under capitalism[129]." "The unevenness of economic and political development is an absolute *law*of capitalism[130]," Lenin wrote elsewhere. At the same time, using a number of examples , Lenin showed how *обостряется*this unevenness of capitalist development becomes more acute in the period *of imperialism,* where it is reinforced by the intertwining of competition and monopoly.

This basic idea of Lenin's was completely perverted by Trotsky and Zinoviev. Both Trotsky and Zinoviev argued that unevenness of development is a general law for all capitalist development, and that, on the contrary, it was precisely before the era of monopoly capitalism that there was more "economic inequality" in individual countries, and that now this unevenness of development is becoming much *less* , and that this unevenness of development *is being weakened*in the period of imperialism.

Comrade Stalin pointed out that this attitude of Trotsky and Zinoviev led them into the swamp of the Kautskyite theory of ultra-imperialism. "The unevenness of economic and political development," pointed out T. A. Tolstoy. Stalin — it is incomparably *more* pronounced than before , it *is more acute* than before, and this unevenness necessarily and inevitably leads to *leaps* in development, leads to the fact that the countries that have lagged behind in industrial terms overtake the countries that have gone ahead in a more or less short time, which cannot but create the prerequisites for grandiose *imperialist reforms. wars and the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country.*" Stalin justifies this law of uneven development under imperialism by the peculiarities of the era of finance capital: by the fact that the division of the world by the imperialists is already over, that the struggle for markets leads to the displacement of "advanced powers" from the market, to the nomination of new powers that are faster in time to develop their technology. The necessity of forcibly *redistributing* the previously divided world leads to open conflicts between imperialist States, to imperialist wars. On the other hand, it creates the possibility *of breaking*through the imperialist chain and the victory of socialism in one country[131].

Imperialism further develops and sharpens all the fundamental contradictions of capitalism:

---

127 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 256–257, 338.

128 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 284, 329.

129 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 329.

130 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 133.

131 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма.

the contradiction between the growth of productive forces and capitalist relations of production, the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of appropriation, as well as the contradiction that expresses it between the organization of production in an individual enterprise and its anarchy throughout society: imperialism further sharpens the class antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

In the era of imperialism, the contradiction between the powerful productive forces created by capitalism and the capitalist relations of production is expressed in *the decay* of capitalism. Imperialism sharpens the competition between monopolistic associations of capitalists, which leads to a certain *growth in technology* . But at the same time, and in contradiction to this, capitalist monopolies place *limits* on the growth of technical production capabilities. The monopoly prices of commodities that capitalists can set deprive them of any incentive to further technical progress. Moreover, they create an economic opportunity for capitalists to artificially *delay* technological progress. A tendency is created to lead to technical *stagnation*and decay of the acquired productive forces: it makes no sense for the capitalist to encourage new scientific discoveries, acquire new machines, etc., if competition from other capitalists disappears, if it is possible to remain with the old means of production and put new inventions under the cloth.

The same decay manifests itself in a special form of " economic parasitism." A whole stratum of people is formed who live on the income of money securities and are completely cut off from production — a stratum of rentiers. This economic parasitism is sometimes carried out by entire countries. Thus, after the last imperialist war, a number of victorious countries have been living for a number of years on reparations siphoned from the defeated countries — Germany and Austria.

Therefore, it is wrong to say, as, for example, following the theorists of "organized" capitalism, T. P. Tolstoy does. Deborin believes that imperialism represents "progress" in economic terms. Dialectical *contradiction* imperialism consists precisely in the fact that, despite the gigantic socialization of the productive forces, which no longer correspond to private property relations, along with a certain growth in technology, etc., imperialism simultaneously leads to the greatest economic reaction, to economic stagnation and decay. These reactionary tendencies in the economy of imperialism are fully consistent with its political and ideological *superstructure*— the transition of the bourgeoisie in the field of politics and ideology from bourgeois democracy to open fascism.

Of course, it would be equally erroneous to assume that modern capitalism is no longer capable of any further, even *relative* , development of its productive forces. Trotskyism takes this view*троцкизм*. Completely alien to the dialectical view of the abrupt and contradictory character of imperialist development, Trotsky, and after him, and so on. Preobrazhensky believes that under imperialism there is an "*absolute suspension of the development of the productive forces" for a "long period (20-25 years)"*, after which a "new era of capitalist upsurge" (?!) can begin[132]. This Trotskyist theory of periods of "stagnation" of capitalism is fundamentally alien to Leninism. The internal contradiction of imperialism lies precisely in the fact that, despite a pronounced tendency to stagnation and decay, imperialism is able, within certain limits, to reproduce and even expand capitalist relations, which creates periods of relative "stabilization" of capitalism.

However, this stabilization is very *relative* and ephemeral, since it is established against the background *of the general crisis*of capitalism. Capitalism is no longer able to "give scope" to the development of the powerful productive forces it has created. His death becomes inevitable. In the great economic crises of the world, the greatest of which we are now witnessing, the productive forces are being senselessly destroyed, and it is becoming clear that they cannot be widely used in the conditions of capitalism. The overproduction of unmarketable consumer goods, which the capitalists are forced to destroy, is growing, and at the same time the need and poverty of the exploited classes is growing.

The current *global economic crisis*has its consequences, as pointed out by T. Stalin, a number of features that distinguish him from the previous crises of capitalism. The crisis hit the main

---

132 См. Л. Троцкий, Европа и Америка; Е. Преображенский, Закат капитализма / 1931.

country of capitalism, the United States, the hardest. The industrial crisis is intertwined with the agricultural crisis in the agrarian countries; because of the desire of the capitalists to maintain their monopoly prices, the crisis is particularly painful and prolonged; finally, the present economic crisis unfolds on the basis of the general crisis of capitalism, which began with the imperialist war, with the era of wars and revolutions, when the very foundations of capitalism are being undermined.

The world crisis leads to the exposure and further *aggravation of all the contradictions* of world capitalism: the contradictions between the most important capitalist countries, between the victorious and vanquished countries, between the imperialist states and the colonies, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. "But apart from these contradictions," points out T. Stalin: there is another contradiction… This is *a contradiction between capitalism as a whole and the country of socialism* under construction " ... " Along with the capitalist system of economy, there *is a socialist*system that is growing, that is doing well, that is opposed to the capitalist system, and that by the very fact of its existence demonstrates the rottenness of capitalism and undermines its foundations."

The contradiction between the capitalist and socialist systems, in the words of T. P. Blavatsky. Stalin, "*reveals to the roots all the contradictions*of capitalism and gathers them into one knot, turning them into a question of life and death of the capitalist order[133]itself."

Imperialism is not only *decaying*, but also *dying*capitalism. The world proletarian revolution, which began in October in Russia, must ensure the world's transition to a new, higher, socialist mode of production.

3.3. Transition economy. Development of the socialist organization of the economy

The capitalist social formation, in Marx's figurative phrase, completes the "*prehistory* of human society." When, says the Communist Manifesto, the proletariat, in its struggle against the bourgeoisie, necessarily unites itself into a class, becomes *the ruling* class by means of the revolution, and as the ruling class forcibly destroys the old relations of production, then together with these relations of production it *destroys the conditions of existence of the class opposition, destroys classes in general, and thereby its own rule as a class* . Instead of the old bourgeois society with its classes and class opposites, there is an association in which " the free development of each is a condition for the free development of all[134]."

Investigating the conditions of the emergence of a new, communist society, Marx and Engels came to the conclusion that communist society cannot arise immediately, immediately after the proletarian revolution, that "between capitalist and communist society lies *a period of revolutionary transformation of one into the other*", when classes and class society still remain — the period *of the dictatorship of the proletariat* . In a number of their works, they identified the forms in which the prerequisites for a new, higher mode of production are created. At the same time, Marx and Engels found out that communist society itself must first pass through the lowest phase of its development — *socialism* [135]. They proved the ways of developing the socialist organization of the economy after the proletarian Revolution — during the *transition period.* period.

At present, *the socialist economic organization* created in the Soviet Union by the victorious proletariat is already opposed to the capitalist system, and its growth and strengthening are undermining the very foundations of world capitalism. "The Soviet system of economy," points out T. V. Tolstoy. Stalin, - means that:

---

133 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

134 К. Маркс, К критике политической экономии, Предисловие; К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Коммунистический манифест.

135 К. Маркс, Критика Готской программы.

1) the power of the capitalists has been overthrown and replaced *by the power of the working class* ;

2) the instruments and means of production, land, factories, etc., have been taken from the capitalists and transferred to the *ownership*of the working class and the working masses of the peasantry;

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

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

5) the systematic improvement of the material condition of the working people and the continuous growth of their needs (purchasing power), being a constantly growing source of expansion of production, *guarantees the working class against crises of overproduction, rising unemployment, etc*.;

6) the working class is the master of the country, working not for the capitalists, but for its own class[136]."

But the Soviet, socialist system of economy as it exists today was formed not immediately after the first Proletarian revolution, but as a result of the persistent struggle of the proletariat and its party to *build it up* socialism. The nature of this struggle of the socialist system, which is winning out during *the transitional period* like all other economic structures, it is absolutely necessary to study them in order to properly understand the ways and means of developing the socialist system.

The October Revolution in Russia was the first break in the chain of imperialism. It brought *власти*the proletariat to power and transferred *the commanding heights* of the national economy to the ownership of the proletarian State. It marked the beginning of the transition period from capitalism to socialism. Developing further the instructions of Marx and Engels, Lenin gave a theoretical analysis of economics and politics in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin showed that the transition to socialism is a whole historical period characterized by the struggle between the old and new economic systems. "Theoretically, there is no doubt," Lenin said, " that there is a certain period of transition between capitalism and communism. It cannot fail to combine the features or characteristics *of both these modes of social economy* . This transitional period cannot but be a period of struggle between *a dying capitalism and a nascent communism* , or, in other words, between a defeated but not destroyed capitalism and a born but still quite weak communism[137]."

The transition period combines the characteristics *of both* struggling modes of life, capitalist and communist. This means that it is wrong to regard the transition period as a special *independent* socio-economic formation, which both the mechanists (Comrade Dubrovsky) and the Menshevik idealists (Comrade Luppol) were inclined to do. But it also means that we can't assign the transition period to just *one category.* either of these two formations-or to capitalism, as was done, say, after Trotsky tt. Zinoviev and Kamenev, declaring the entire transition economy "state capitalism"; or identifying the transition period in all its stages with a complete socialist organization of the economy, as the right-wing opportunists did, who already at the dawn of the reconstruction period of NEP saw "socialism all around".

Neither the right-wing opportunists nor the Trotskyists had a correct understanding of the peculiar, *transitional*character of our Soviet economy. For example, according to Trotsky, the economy of the transition period "can be called' state capitalism '(in quotation marks) or, as some

---

136 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

137 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 347.

have suggested, 'commodity-socialist economy'[138]." Tov. Preobrazhensky transformed the transition period into a "period of initial socialist accumulation"[139], which, in his opinion, should take place through the exploitation of the peasantry by the proletariat. Trotsky, etc. Preobrazhensky thus spoke of the supposedly "socialist" character of the transitional epoch, but they applied to this "socialism" all the concepts they had borrowed from the conditions of bourgeois economy and capitalist class exploitation. They combined their "socialist" phraseology with disbelief in the possibility of building socialism in one country, with the theory of state capitalism, the theory of "thermidor", etc. Bukharin pursued an open right-opportunist tendency to blur the class struggle during the transition period. With his "technical" understanding of production relations, he tended to view the social relations of the transition economy only as a "regrouping" of relations created in the era of finance capital. While Comrade Bukharin strongly objected to Lenin's use of the term "state capitalism" in defining *individual* elements of our economy, he also saw the main way for the development of socialism in the process *of commodity production.* requests[140]. The seemingly opposite points of view of right-wing opportunists and Trotskyists thus converged: both of them either mechanically transferred to the transition economy concepts belonging to capitalist society (exploitation by one class of another class), or they saw in the transition economy a form of development of simple commodity production (circulation of goods), forgetting that spontaneously developing commodity production gives rise to the development of capitalism.

The peculiarity of the transition economy consisted primarily in the fact that during a certain period several *different types*or different orders of production relations existed and intertwined with each other — both those that remained from the previous socio-economic formations and those that emerged again under the dictatorship of the proletariat. In 1921, Lenin counted "five different systems, or modes, or economic orders" as "the basic elements of our modern economy, which is in transition from capitalism to socialism." These "elements, parts, pieces" of various socio-economic structures were:

1) patriarchal, subsistence peasant farming,
2) small commodity production'
3) private economic capitalism,
4) state capitalism,
5) socialism.

"Russia is so large and diverse," Lenin pointed out, " that *all these different types of socio — economic structure are intertwined* in it. *Unique features* this is exactly the situation[141]."

The last economic system listed by Lenin, *socialism*, was created by the proletarian revolution together with the dictatorship of the proletariat. This was "the socialist attitude of the workers in state-owned factories." But alongside socialism, there was a small-scale peasant economy, which was still partly *natural* in nature, and for the most part was small — *scale commodity production*-the production of agricultural products sold on the market. Small-scale commodity production, as we already know, although not *identical* capitalism, but it inevitably, at a certain stage of its development, *gives rise to* capitalism. As a spontaneous product of small-scale production, capitalism and capitalist relations were, in Lenin's words, "unavoidable to a certain extent": the petty bourgeoisie, which had accumulated money reserves , was the basis of speculation and *private-economy capitalism*, which was preserved to a small extent after the revolution and was again generated by small-scale commodity production. Hence the only correct policy of the proletariat, which was carrying out its dictatorship, was "not to try to prohibit or block the

---

138 Л. Троцкий / Соч., т. XXI — с 159.

139 Е. Преображенский, Новая экономика — с. 63.

140 Н. Бухарин, Экономика переходного периода, К вопросу о закономерностях переходного периода и др.

141 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 1 — с. 203.

development of capitalism, but to try to direct it in the direction *of state capitalism* »[142]." According to Lenin, the various varieties of state capitalism — in the form of foreign concessions, leasing of enterprises, etc. — were intended, at this first stage, the stage of restoring productive forces, to direct the development of capitalism in the direction of state capitalism, to create the possibility of state regulation of economic relations and thereby ensure at a certain stage the transition from state capitalism to socialism. These are the conditions for the emergence of another type of production relations in our economy — state capitalism, but it has not been widely developed in our country.

The transition period is a period of struggle between capitalism and communism. But it would be wrong, Lenin pointed out, "to forget the totality of the existing socio-economic structures, while taking out only two of them." This would mean taking the non-dialectical path of apparently lifeless abstractions, not seeing *concrete steps of transition* from capitalism to socialism, do not see *the ways of development* to a higher form, to socialism. But this would also mean failing to understand that the entire transition period is "a continuation *of the class struggle* in new forms" — the struggle for *building a new state.* socialism. Taking into account all the economic features of the former Russia and a number of transitional measures in five economic structures, Lenin at the very beginning of the transition period indicated three *main*economic forms and three main class forces characteristic of the development of the transition economy.

"These new forms of social economy," Lenin said, " *are capitalism, small — scale commodity production, communism* . These are the main forces: the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie (especially the peasantry), and the proletariat. The economy of Russia in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat represents *the struggle of the first steps of a communist-united* — on a single scale — huge state *of labor*with small commodity production and capitalism preserved, as well as reviving on its basis[143]." The existence of small-scale commodity production at a number of stages of the transition period was the most important point that determined the forms and conditions of the struggle between capitalism and communism, the forms of solving the problem posed by Lenin, "*who is who?* ". The struggle for socialist *leadership* small producers, for the socialist path of unification of commodity production, against the subordination of this small-scale production to the forces and tendencies of capitalist development — this struggle found its expression in the various slogans put forward by the proletariat in relation to the peasantry at various stages of the transition period.

The peculiarity of the transition economy is not only in the fact that various forms of economic structures existed, intertwined and struggled with each other. Its peculiarity also lies in the fact that *the ratio of* these economic structures *changed* at different stages of the transition period. The peculiarity of the transition economy lies in the fact that in the process of class struggle, in the process of ousting and overcoming all other economic structures, it built the highest mode of production — *the development of socialism* . The peculiarity of the proletarian revolution and its main difference from the bourgeois revolution is that the proletarian revolution begins in the absence or almost absence *of ready-made forms*of the socialist system. The task of the victorious proletariat was to "*organize* socialist production" *(Lenin)* and "*build* a new, socialist economy" *(Stalin).*

The transition period is no longer capitalism, and at the same time we do not yet have a fully developed socialist society. The transition period is the period of the proletarian, communist *revolution* , and the revolutionary reorganization of society. The revolution began in October with the transfer of political power to the proletariat, the conquest of commanding heights in industry, and the nationalization of land, but the revolutionary reorganization *continues*throughout the transition period, taking place in various forms — the strengthening of the socialist sector during the recovery period, the socialist reconstruction of the economy, the collectivization of agriculture, the cultural Revolution, etc. it ends only with the construction of a complete socialist society.

---

142 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 1 — с. 216.

143 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 348.

Therefore, the transition period did not mean the end of the class struggle, nor "peaceful evolution", nor "consolidation" of the existing system, nor "civil peace", as the right-wing opportunists thought, but *the continuation of the class struggle* of the proletariat in other forms. At the same time, the transition period is a period of development, construction, *and formation of socialism* . The socialist system gradually triumphed over all other economic systems due to the fact that the proletariat established different relations with the main class forces representing these systems at different stages of socialist construction. Hence other, different, completely *new forms* of class struggle that capitalist society does not know. During the transition period, the attitude of the proletariat towards the exploiting class, which has been defeated but is still resisting, and towards the mass of the working people is completely different — a difference that the "left" opportunists and Trotskyists did not understand. Forms of class struggle *of a special kind* are the alliance of the proletariat with the mass of the middle peasantry, the systematic guiding influence of the working class on the broad masses of the working people. The creation and education of a new socialist discipline, which is now becoming particularly important, is becoming a form of class struggle *воспитание новой социалистической дисциплины*.

The economy of transition and its development cannot be depicted abstractly, "in general", without taking into account *individual stages* in the development of the socialist system of economy, without *taking into account the changing correlation* different economic structures, without taking into account the state *of the productive forces*at each stage of socialist construction.

We inherited from the pre-revolutionary system an extremely low level of productive forces compared to the advanced capitalist countries, which was further reduced by the devastation caused by the imperialist and civil wars. The proletariat, having won power, was *ahead*of any capitalist state in its political structure and at the same time "*behind*the most backward of the Western European states... in terms of the degree of preparation for the material and production" introduction"of socialism[144]." Technical backwardness made itself felt strongly even at the commanding heights of socialist industry, not to mention the primitive technique of dispersed, fragmented peasant farming. But the basis of the productive forces of socialist construction was the revolutionary working class, with its highly developed class consciousness, headed by the Bolshevik Party. From the original task *of preserving* this greatest productive force and the political gains of the working class, we later passed on to the task *of restoring and raising* the entire aggregate of the productive forces of industry and agriculture , and finally to the complete *reconstruction of our economic and technical base*, to the construction of the economic and technical basis of socialism.

The development of production relations during the transition period can no longer be understood at all if it is considered as a kind of "spontaneous" development that resembles the automatism of capitalist production and reproduction. The economy of the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat is most closely connected with its *policy* , with the political struggle of the working class for the solution of the tasks set by it for the construction of socialism, with the implementation of socialist *planning* , which gradually covers all areas of our national economy. By emphasizing this inextricable link between the economy and the politics of transition, it is necessary to fight both against right-wing opportunist "objectivism", which ignores the role of proletarian state policies in determining the nature of our economy, and against" left-wing "subjectivism, which tends to "administer" and completely ignores the qualitative distinctiveness of each individual stage of our development. economic and political development.

Only under these conditions can we get a correct idea of *the laws* in force in the transition economy, of *the class*character of relations and categories of this economy. Neither counter-revolutionary Trotskyism nor right-wing opportunism were able to grasp its peculiarity, and so instead of specifically studying the driving forces of its development, they created obviously artificial schemes of "laws", mechanically drawing analogies between the Soviet economy and the

144 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. I — с. 211.

laws of capitalist society.

Thus, the theorists of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism put forward the "*law of initial socialist accumulation "as the basic law of the transitional economy*. "All the main processes of economic life in the sphere of state economy are subject to this law." Along with it*борьбу,* the law of value (value), which operates in private commodity production, exists and fights against it. The author of this view, T. Preobrazhensky, considered it necessary to emphasize the similarity between the development of socialist and capitalist modes of production.

The similarity is, according to T. Preobrazhensky's theory consists in the fact that both capitalism and socialism begin their development with "initial accumulation", and this "accumulation" is historically unavoidable, both under capitalism and under socialism, at the expense of the material resources of small-scale peasant production by exploiting the latter. Tov. Preobrazhensky considered this situation of particular importance for the backward peasant countries. "The more economically backward, petty — bourgeois, and peasant a country becomes when it passes over to a socialist organization of production," says Comrade Lenin. All the more so will socialist accumulation be forced to rely on *the exploitation* of pre-socialist forms of economy." In the opinion of the Trotskyist theorists of that time, the original socialist accumulation was to be carried out through the exploitation of small producers through high taxation or in any other form, through a policy of high prices for manufactured goods, or through direct absorption of small — scale production by the State economy. Only in this way, in their opinion, was it possible to ensure the implementation of *accelerated research projects.* the pace *of industrialization* of the country and rationalization of agriculture. The task of the socialist state, vol. Preobrazhensky saw "not taking less from the petty-bourgeois producers than capitalism took, but *taking more*from an even greater income." A greater income should have been provided to the exploited peasant economy by superindustrialization carried out at its own expense! This thought is T. Preobrazhensky's position was in full accordance with the basic tenet of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, which states that, having won power, the proletariat will inevitably have to come*into " hostile clashes with the broad masses of the peasantry* with the help of which he came to power."

The initial methodological flaw of the entire theory presented here is that of the following: Preobrazhensky — its *mechanistic and metaphysical* nature . This theory was based on an explicitly mechanical representation of T. Preobrazhensky talks about *two* laws or "regulators" on which our economy is supposedly built: the law of value and the law of socialist accumulation. According to Trotskyist theory, both these laws represented *two economic systems* — the " socialist system "and the" system of private commodity production", i.e., mainly peasant production. The law of socialist accumulation, which was abstractly contrasted with that of socialism. Preobrazhensky's "law of value", in his opinion, in *the fight*against the law of value, " changes and partially eliminates the law of value." Balance between the socialist and private commodity systems*равновесие* it cannot exist for a long time, because one system must *devour*another[145]."

At the same time, Comrade Preobrazhensky included "private goods" production and *idle time in one category.* commodity production, which is characteristic of the middle peasantry, and commodity-*capitalist* production blur all the essential differences between them. Ignoring the alliance of the proletariat with the middle peasantry and the possibility for socialist industry to influence the development of the peasant economy through co-operation, Comrade Preobrazhensky, in search of a "balance", abstractly *opposed* the "devoured peasant commodity production" to the "socialist system"that devoured it. It completely isolated the "socialist" and "private commodity" systems and the two "regulators", thus breaking the real *unity* of our economy, which was actually realized in the process of socialist construction, in the process of the leadership of the proletariat by the peasantry, in the process of the commercial and industrial link between town and country. Along with the mechanistic view of socialist industry and peasant production as two separate systems with no "equilibrium" between them, the Trotskyist views on the nature of the transition economy were

145 Е. Преображенский, Новая экономика.

imbued with a heavy dose *of subjectivism and idealism* . At an early stage of the restoration and development of the transitional economy, the Trotskyists tried to skip the nearest objective stages in our development and put forward impracticable plans for"superindustrialization." They considered it possible to carry out the latter by means of bare "administration", completely disregarding the state of the productive forces of industry and peasant economy. This circumstance did not prevent Trotsky, in the subsequent period when the objective conditions for socialist reconstruction were created, from talking about the need to reduce the pace of our development.

Representatives of right-wing opportunism took the opposite position on the question of the basic laws of the transition period, but they were completely imbued with mechanismism. Tov. Bukharin discovered his basic law of the transition economy "*in the law of labor costs*". This" law", according to Comrade Bukharin, appears here naked from the sinful, fetishistic" value " underwear in which it is clothed under capitalist relations. Tov. Bukharin tried to build on the idea of Marx in his letter to Kugelmann, where Marx states that "*the necessity of dividing labor in certain proportions* "is a" law *of nature* "and that it"cannot be abolished *by a certain form*of social production." Marx immediately points out that under the conditions of commodity production, exchange value is a form of manifestation of a certain proportionality in the distribution of labor in society[146].

Comrade Bukharin drew the conclusion from these instructions of Marx that Marx here allegedly advanced a certain "law of proportional labor expenditures" common to all times, i.e., material *maintenance* This law remains *unchanged* , but the historical *forms* of manifestation of this law *are different*in different social formations. In commodity-capitalist society, the law of" labor costs " appears in the fetishistic guise of the law of value.

In the conditions of the transition economy, together with the victory of the socialist principle, according to T. Bukharin, the process of throwing off the "law of labor costs" of its value "laundry" begins, and its "defetishization"occurs. It turns into a" simple " law of labor costs, which characterizes the development of our economy. The effect of this "law" in the transition economy is limited. Bukharin at the same time understood as *conscious* we anticipate the same proportions in the distribution of labor costs, which, as a result of regulating their value, should have been established *by themselves*, spontaneously, as, therefore, a conscious equalization to maintain certain proportions existing between the various sectors of the transition economy.

The whole difference between the" naked "law of labor costs and the same law disguised as the" law of value " thus consists only in the conscious establishment *of the*same labor proportions that would have been established by gravity, spontaneously. In this sense, according to Comrade Bukharin, it is unacceptable to oppose socialist accumulation to the law of value in the same way that Comrade Bukharin does. Preobrazhensky Monastery. "Figuratively speaking," Comrade Bukharin declared, " we also force the law of value to serve our purposes[147]." Tov. Bukharin here proceeded from his notorious theory of equilibrium, which has already been repeatedly mentioned. But in contrast to the point of view of T. Preobrazhensky, who saw two systems that were hostile to each other and could not maintain a balance between them, Comrade Bukharin considered the Soviet economy as *an equilibrium of two sectors — capitalist and socialist* .

Comrade Bukharin understood the equilibrium of both sectors in such a way that the planned influence of the socialist sector is forced to follow the laws of spontaneous commodity production, and that the policy of the dictatorship of the proletariat must adapt itself "objectivistically" *приспосабливаться*to these laws. The sectors of T. Bukharin Stalin therefore wittily compared it to two boxes that roll along parallel lines; this movement cannot go beyond the laws of spontaneous commodity production, and therefore cannot lead *to the expanded reproduction of socialist relations, to the victory of the socialist sector* . It is also interesting that Comrade Bukharin understood his law of labor costs as the law of"production costs". The latter, as we know, is

146 К. Маркс, Письмо к Кугельману от 11 июля 1868 г.

147 Н. Бухарин, К вопросу о закономерностях переходного периода.

characteristic of the capitalist mode of production, where the regulation of costs depends on the price of production, i.e., ultimately on the same value. In short, in his definition of the laws of the Soviet economy, Comrade Bukharin did not leave the *circle of concepts of bourgeois economy* . It is not surprising that the only possible" straight-line " way of transition from small-scale production to socialism, according to Comrade Bukharin, lay through *circulation* , through commodity exchange, and not through the development of higher forms of socialist production in the countryside[148].

T. Bukharin's" law "could explain the nature of the transition economy as little as T. Preobrazhensky's" law". The law of labor costs is an empty *supra*-historical abstraction, completely unable to explain the actual, changing laws of the transition period. Tov. Bukharin, in a purely Kantian way, separated the unchangeable "material" content of his law from the specific historical forms of its manifestation, separated economics from the politics of the proletariat, forgetting that the different proportions in the distribution of social labor themselves depend each time on the different nature of social relations and the rule of a particular class. The proportional distribution of labor under capitalism is determined by the capitalist relations of production and distribution; similarly, the proportions in the distribution of social labor under the socialist system, under planned socialist construction, acquire a completely different character. The" left " Comrade Preobrazhensky, in his understanding of the laws of the transition economy, proceeded from *the special* laws of initial accumulation and class exploitation of the peasantry, which are characteristic of the development of the capitalist formation, but extended these laws to new transitional social forms. The right-wing Comrade Bukharin, on the contrary, proceeded from a *general*, supra-historical premise. Both theories would be fundamentally alien to materialist dialectics, and both would be alien to a correct understanding *of the unity* of our economy, which was created in the process of reproduction, expansion, and development *of socialist*relations of production.

The socialist system was not in "equilibrium" with small-scale commodity production. But the proletariat during the transition period was not at all in irreconcilable hostility with the small producer. From the very beginning, the socialist system was *the leading* system in the economic union of the proletariat and the middle peasantry. At a certain stage of its development, it began *to transform* the totality of production relations that remained from the previous social formations. Not a passive adaptation to the conditions of "equilibrium" of the commodity economy, but *an active one* The impact of socialist relations formed the basis of the transition economy, which was inextricably linked to the economic *policy* of the proletarian dictatorship. *The law of building socialism* — and therefore the qualitative strengthening and quantitative expansion of the socialist relations of production, *their expanded reproduction on the basis of the growth of the planned principle* , on the basis of the struggle against and victory over all the remnants of capitalism — is the basic law that characterizes the development of the economy in transition to socialism.

The role of the socialist planning principle was increasingly revealed along with *the preponderance* of the socialist elements of our economy over the capitalist ones; this planning principle manifested itself in very different forms at different stages of the transition period, each time reflecting the state of the productive forces and the changed correlation of economic structures. With the October Revolution, the Soviet country entered the path *of development* socialism. The task of the economic policy of the proletarian state during the period of so-called "war communism" was necessarily limited *to securing* the main commanding heights in socialist industry and *preserving* the most important productive force — the working class. This was a period of civil war, surplus development, etc. The new economic policy marked the beginning of a new and longer stage of development. Nep is designed for the victory of the socialist elements. Hence the party's policy of a bond and alliance with the middle peasant. At *the restoration* stage of the NEP, commodity exchange and the trade bond acted as *the main* form of communication between the city and the countryside. *The reconstruction* period set forth new tasks for socialist industrialization, for the transformation of our agrarian country into an industrial country producing the means of

148 Н. Бухарин, К вопросу о троцкизме, Заметки экономиста и др.

production, for the reconstruction of the entire national economy and thus for building the *foundation of a socialist economy* . These objectives were expressed in *the first five-year plan* socialist reconstruction.

But the socialist *industrialization* of the country has become closely dependent on the growth of our raw material resources and on the development of agriculture. "It is impossible," Comrade Stalin said as early as 1928, " for too long a period of time, to base Soviet power and socialist construction on *two different foundations* — on the basis of the largest and most unified socialist industry, and on the basis of the most fragmented and backward small — scale peasant economy. We must gradually, but systematically and persistently *transfer agriculture to a new technical base, to the base of large-scale production*, and bring it closer to socialist industry[149]." But the technical revolution in agriculture was inevitably connected with a complete *economic*revolution in the social relations of the peasant economy: it was possible only if the small-scale peasant economy was transformed.

The socialist industrialization of the country necessarily required a revolution in agrarian relations — a transition from small-scale, fragmented peasant production to *collective* forms of agriculture, to large-scale agriculture. In this way, a new *производственная*form of production linking the proletariat with the peasantry emerged — through *the collectivization of agriculture* . In the collectivization carried out by the party, Lenin's cooperative plan received its highest expression and further concretization.

The capitalist elements, and in particular the kulaks, who were being liquidated as a class on the basis of the complete collectivization of agriculture, fiercely resisted this entire revolution, which was being carried out in the city and countryside by socialist construction. The intensification of the class struggle has led to the emergence of erroneous opportunist views on the nature of NEP, to disbelief in the very *possibility of building socialism in one country* . These anti-party, anti-Leninist concepts were consistently developed first by the Trotskyist opposition, then by the new opposition of Zinoviev and Kamenev, and finally by representatives of right-wing opportunism. They were the mouthpiece of the dying capitalist and kulak elements in some of the weakest strata of the party. The struggle against all these perversions of the general party line was and still is the most important prerequisite for successful economic construction in our entire development.

Recognition of the law of building socialism as the main regularity driving the development of the transition economy implies *confidence in the possibility* of building socialism in *one country.* the country-the country that managed to break through the chain of world imperialism earlier than others. This possibility, in spite of all social-democratic theories, was brilliantly justified by Lenin, who deduced it directly and directly from *the law of uneven development* capitalist countries in the period of imperialism. Social-democratic theories depicted the world revolution as a simultaneous and therefore very remote act. They did not take into account the special conditions of uneven imperialist development and completely denied the possibility of building socialism in one country, while capitalist rule still remains in other countries. As early as 1905, Lenin put forward the proposition *that the bourgeois-democratic revolution would grow into a socialist* revolution . This position of Lenin was in complete contrast to the Menshevik understanding of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the imperialist period as only bourgeois, and to the "left" Trotskyist phrase about a "workers ' government", which ignored the concrete stages in the development of the socialist revolution. Lenin then formulated the proposition that the victory of socialism is possible "in a few and even *a single country."* a separate capitalist country."

"The unevenness of economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism," Lenin said on this point. — *It follows* that the victory of socialism is possible initially in a few or even in *one* capitalist country taken separately. The victorious proletariat of this country, " having expropriated the capitalists and *organized socialist production* for itself, would have turned against the rest of the capitalist world, attracting to itself the oppressed classes of other countries[150]." The

149 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 509.

150 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 133.

power of the state over the most important means of production, the existence of political power in the hands of the proletariat, its alliance with the middle peasantry — "isn't that all *that is necessary*, "Lenin asked," *to build a complete socialist society?*"[151].

This is Lenin's basic proposition, which was further developed by vol. Stalin, met with the most severe resistance from the representatives of Trotskyism, and then the Zinoviev-Trotskyist new opposition (Zinoviev, Kamenev).

Based on his notorious theory of permanent revolution, Trotsky argued that without the support of the world revolution, without the "direct state support" of other advanced capitalist countries that have revolutionized themselves, it is impossible to build socialism in one country. From Trotsky's point of view, it takes 50 or 100 years for socialism to prove its superiority over the capitalist system of economy: to do this, the productive forces of socialism must be much more powerful than the productive forces of the old economic system, which is also impossible in a short time without the support of the "world economy". Because of our economic backwardness, according to Trotsky, we will "always be *under the control of the world economy*" — in other words, we must inevitably become an appendage of world capitalism.

Menshevik fatalism of the Sukhanov type, mechanismismin understanding the development of the productive forces of the proletarian revolution and the ways of building socialism, disbelief *in the internal forces of the proletarian revolution.* the forces of the revolution and the desire to substitute its internal conditions for dependence on the conditions *of the external* , "world" environment — all these characteristic features of Menshevism were masked here by Trotsky's "left-wing", abstract-idealistic, *subjectivist* phrase about the "world revolution"that ignores the objective course of things. "Isn't the fact that the producers themselves, rather than parasites, will be at the head of production," Comrade Stalin replied, " isn't this the greatest factor in ensuring that the socialist system of economy will have every chance of *moving the economy forward* by leaps and bounds and prove your superiority over the capitalist system of economy in *a shorter period* of time ?" And at the same time pointing out that we may have certain inter-revolutionary periods in the development of the world revolution, that the Trotskyist opposition does not believe in the internal forces of our revolution, in the forces of the working class and its ally, the peasantry, that it is afraid of the relative stabilization of capitalism, and that at the same time it is trying to jump over the facts adventurously by Comrade Stalin asked: "What does it mean to ignore the facts, the *objective*course of things? It means getting off the ground of science and getting on the ground of medicine[152]."

The essentially Trotskyist position of disbelief in the possibility of building socialism in one country was later adopted by the tt. Zinoviev, Kamenev, Sokolnikov and others. They believed that even our state-owned industry could not serve as evidence of our socialist maturity. They believed that the economic system during the NEP period should be considered as *state capitalism* . They saw NEP only *as a retreat* rather than a policy of attacking the capitalist elements. They did not understand *the dual* nature of NEP and the struggle taking place in it between capitalist and developing socialist elements, nor did they see that we were successfully using the methods of trade and the monetary system developed by capitalism and applied by us *against it.* capitalism, to build the foundation of a socialist economy. Our party saw State capitalism *as one of the ways of life* a transition economy characterized by the well-known assumption of capitalism under *state control* - in the form of concessions, leases, etc., a way of life that, moreover, has not received sufficient development in our country. Meanwhile, Zinoviev, Kamenev, and others extended the concept of state capitalism to the *entire* transitional economy, to the entire nature of NEP, and in particular called our *socialist*industry " state-capitalist."

Defining the true nature of NEP, Comrade Stalin said: "NEP is a special policy of the proletarian state, calculated to allow capitalism in the presence of commanding heights in the hands

---

151 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 2 — с. 140.

152 И. Сталин, Ещё раз о социал-демократическом уклоне.

of the proletarian state, calculated to *fight* capitalist and socialist elements, calculated to increase the role of socialist elements to the detriment of capitalist elements, *calculated to win the victory of socialist elements over capitalist* ones , calculated to *destroy* the to *build the foundation of a socialist economy* . Anyone who does not understand this *transitional, dual*nature of NEP departs from Leninism[153]."

Nor did the right-wing opposition (Bukharin, Rykov, and others) understand this ambivalent nature of NEP, which came out at the beginning of the period of socialist reconstruction, when the success achieved made it possible *to accelerate the pace* of our construction, when the party was faced with the task of creating socialist heavy industry and collectivizing agriculture. In preaching "civil peace, "" the consolidation of the existing system," and the peaceful "growth" of the kulak into socialism, Comrade Bukharin "forgot" the *class struggle* , the struggle of capitalist elements against socialist elements, and "forgot" the existence of capitalist elements alongside the socialist ones.

Formally, the right recognized the possibility of building socialism in our country; but by suggesting that the party *should be equal to the bottlenecks* of our socialist system, demanding *that the pace* of socialist industrialization be slowed down, and seeing not in the collectivization of agriculture, but in the process *of conversion* ,the "pillar road" to the development of socialism in the countryside, the right thereby rejected all *пути и средства*to successfully build the foundation of a socialist economy. And thus, according to the just instructions of T. V. The right took the same Trotskyist path *of denying the possibility of building socialism*in our country. This was reflected in Comrade Bukharin's lack of understanding of the class essence of socialist construction. It was not for nothing that he substituted the struggle between the socialist tendency of the proletariat and the commodity-capitalist tendency of the peasantry for the struggle "between the organizing tendency of the proletariat and the commodity-*anarchist*tendency of the peasantry." For Comrade Bukharin, the construction of socialism is a peaceful "organizational process" in general, a generalization of socialism "in general", which, in his opinion, was only a direct continuation of the generalization that had already begun in the era of finance capital[154].

It is not surprising that both the Trotskyist opposition and the right-wing opportunists questioned the possibility of implementing the first socialist *five*-year plan . The Trotskyists argued in their platform that the party's theses on the five-year plan would lead to "the triumph of anti-Proletarian tendencies" and that in practice we would see the growth of only the capitalist elements of industry. The right-wing opportunists (Rykov) opposed the five-year plan to a "two-year plan". They assumed that with the implementation of the five-year plan, there would be a "lowering of the investment curve" in industry. Neither the Trotskyists nor the right supported the party's policy in the countryside. The Trotskyists argued that this policy increased the" dependence of the State economy on the kulak-capitalist elements " of the countryside. The right-wingers believed that the main source of bread "will be for a long time the individual farms of the peasants." Both the Trotskyists and the right shouted about the death of the revolution when the victorious offensive of socialism was underway.

3.4. Main features of the socialist economy. Socialism and communism

Bourgeois science, and after it social-fascism — and our opportunists as their echoes — transform socialism into an empty abstraction, infinitely remote from reality *абстракцию*. For social-fascism, it is incomprehensible how we can now speak of *the entry of the Soviet country into the period of socialism*, when at the same time we still have classes, when the class struggle is going on, when one of the methods of our class struggle is the development of Soviet trade, when we are now eliminating "equalization" in "wages" and "depersonalization" in the production sector in this

153 И. Сталин, Заключительное слово по политическому отчёту ЦК XIV съезду.

154 В. Ленин, Замечания на «Экономику переходного периода» т. Бухарина / Ленинский сборник IX.

process, we enter the start date for self-financing. In this connection, the bourgeoisie and social-democracy are inclined to shout about the "liquidation of communism", about the "capitulation of the Bolsheviks" to capitalism, etc. Meanwhile, in all these phenomena , *the dual*, contradictory nature of NEP finds its expression: *the entry into the period of socialism* At the same time, it means the *last stage of NEP* . But even in the period of expanded socialism, the beginning of self-financing, responsibility, etc."as we will see, they will retain all their great importance.

Transition mode the period cannot be conceived of as a period separated by a Chinese wall from the period *of socialism* . With the beginning of the transition period, the development *and formation of a new socialist formation began* — first in the form *of a single state.* out of five, but *leading* the socialist way of life. This leading role of the socialist system has also left its mark on the totality of NEP production relations, and it has given a new *socialist quality* its productive forces. However, the new socialist formation went through a whole series of stages in its development, reflecting the process of gradual displacement by the socialist way of life of all other ways in the conditions of fierce class struggle. The victory of socialism could be assured only after *its economic base was built* .

What is the economic essence and economic basis of socialism? T. asked — Stalin answered this question: "To create the economic base of socialism means to unite agriculture with socialist industry in one *whole* to bring agriculture *under the leadership of socialist industry* , to establish relations between town and country on the basis of a direct exchange of agricultural and industrial products, *to close and liquidate all the channels through which classes are born* and capital is born in the first place, and finally to create *conditions of production and distribution* that lead directly and immediately to *destruction classes* "[155]. We have now reached this turning point in the construction of socialism. We "*cancel* the initial stage of NEP, deploying *its subsequent* stage, which is *the last* stage of NEP." Overcoming the difficulties of socialist reconstruction and *resistance* "we have already emerged from the transition period in its old sense" (Stalin) : *(Сталин)* :

We have entered the period of socialism, and we have also completed the foundation of a socialist economy.

Entering the period of socialism means a new stage in the revolutionary reconstruction of society, a new stage in the development of the socialist formation. It means that we have already solved the problem of " who is who?", the problem of the struggle between growing communism and moribund capitalism, which persisted during the entire transition period; that "the socialist sector holds in its hands all the economic levers of the entire national economy" *(Stalin)* ; that *a socialist system of economy has already been created* , encompassing the entire national economy of the Soviet Union.

First of all, the question "who is who?" is fully resolved in *the industry* . Not only are the commanding heights of industry-the direct conquest of the proletarian revolution - entirely in the hands of the proletariat, but we have the exceptional growth of socialist industry, which has finally supplanted the remnants of capitalism and *has outstripped the capitalist countries at a pace unprecedented in history.* From *an agricultural country* we have already become an *industrial country* . We are gradually beginning to catch up with capitalism in terms of the *level* of development of our industry, taking one of the first places in its most crucial areas (oil, coal, metal), building super-giants of industry that compete with the largest enterprises created by capitalism, creating powerful industrial complexes, laying new mines, mines and the world's largest power plants, mastering the production of new manufacturing the most complex machines and creating *new* models of them. "But," says T. Stalin — we do not need all industrialization. We need an industrialization that ensures a growing preponderance *of socialist forms of industry* over *small-scale forms*, and even more *so capitalist* ones . The characteristic feature of our industrialization is that it is *socialist industrialization* , an industrialization that ensures the victory *of the socialized*

---

155 И. Сталин, Ещё раз о социал-демократическом уклоне. Подчёркнуто нами — *Авт* .

state. industrial sectors"[156].

The share of the socialist sector of the economy in the national income for 1932 was set at 91%. This means that along with the success of complete collectivization and the elimination of the kulaks as a class on its basis, the problem of "who is who?" has also been fully resolved in *agriculture* . The socialist transformation of small-scale peasant farming must lead to an unprecedented increase in the productive forces of agriculture. Exceptional success in the construction of state and collective farms, the ongoing mechanization of agriculture by covering collective farms with MTS, the planning and operational management of the most important agricultural activities, the consistent resolution of grain, livestock, and other problems-all this indicates that agriculture is increasingly merging with socialist industry into one *integral state.* the economy is increasingly subordinated *to the planned leadership* of socialist industry. Organization of Soviet *trade* and the ever-expanding scope of planned *supply cooperation* the broad masses of the working people, a significant improvement in the material and cultural conditions of their everyday life — all these are also signs that we have completed building the foundation of a socialist economy, that we have created the economic prerequisites for the abolition of classes planned in the second five-year plan. At the same time, the entry into the period of socialism means a further *strengthening of the pace* of socialist construction, *the transition of socialism to the offensive along the entire front* .

In the process of building the foundation of the socialist economy and in the further development of the socialist economic system, we have encountered and are still encountering many obstacles and *difficulties* . But, indicates T. Stalin, in contrast to the difficulties of the capitalist system, our difficulties "are difficulties *of growth,* difficulties *of moving forward* … This means that our difficulties are difficulties that *contain in themselves the possibility of overcoming them* ... The very nature of our difficulties, which are difficulties of growth, gives us *the opportunities* necessary to suppress class enemies. But to use these *opportunities* and turn them into *reality* , to crush the resistance of class enemies and to overcome difficulties, there is only one way to do this: to organize *an offensive* attack the capitalist elements *on the entire front* , isolate the opportunist elements in our own ranks..."[157]

Among the difficulties that the socialist offensive must overcome, the following are particularly important: providing enterprises *with labor* and its *organized* recruitment; *mechanization* of the production process; proper organization *of wages* and improvement *бытовых*of workers ' living conditions, proper *organization of work* and the fight against irresponsibility and depersonalization in work; preparation *of a new team leader.* the technical and engineering composition of the economy from among the working people, skilfully exploiting the turn towards socialism among the old specialists; implementing *the principles of economic calculation* and thus creating conditions for *intra-industrial accumulation* . All these most important tasks facing our socialist economy, which are necessary prerequisites for its further development, have been expressed in the six historical conditions formulated by Vol. By Stalin[158].

Let us focus first of all on the problem *of mechanization* of production and its role in the technical reconstruction of our national economy. "The mechanization of labor processes," says T. A. Tolstoy. Stalin is a new and *decisive force for us.* a force without which it is impossible to maintain either our pace or the new scale of production."

The socialist system of economy presupposes a complete reconstruction not only of its economic, but also of its *technical* base. This was precisely the meaning of Lenin's slogan: "Communism is Soviet power plus electrification of the whole country." Lenin set the same task when he spoke of the need for us to switch from the peasant horse to the "horse *of heavy machine*

---

156 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

157 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

158 И. Сталин, Новая обстановка — новые задачи хозяйственного строительства.

industry." This idea was emphasized in 1921 in his letter to Lenin by Comrade Lenin. Stalin, noting the exceptional importance *of the electrification plan* . Even then, T. Stalin saw electrification as "a really real and only possible technical production base" - in contrast to Trotsky's" left-wing "" heroic "plans for employing the labor of the unskilled peasant-working masses and the right-wing opportunist philistine" Manilovism " of Comrade Rykov, who criticized the GOELRO plan. Later t. Stalin emphasized that by electrification Lenin meant the transfer *of the entire national economy to a new technical base*, "to the technical base of modern large-scale production, connected in one way or another, directly or indirectly, with the matter of electrification." In his speech on the "six conditions," Comrade Stalin emphasized the task *of mechanizing*the production process.

The Party embodied these ideas of Lenin and Stalin in the next task *of mastering science and technology* . But technical reconstruction does not mean simply borrowing advanced capitalist technology from existing socialist state-owned enterprises. Technical reconstruction involves the creation of new socialist forms of technical and economic unification of industry and agriculture (industrial complexes, MTS, etc.). It presupposes the creation *of new branches* of industry and the complete technical independence of the country of socialism; it requires the planned *distribution* of the productive forces in the districts. Building the economic and technical base of socialism presupposes *further development* and the creation *of new models of equipment* in new socialist conditions. It also presupposes the combination of the most advanced techniques created by capitalism with *the socialist organization of labor* . Our technical reconstruction presupposes as its necessary precondition the socialist organization of labor.

The extreme importance of T.'s instructions. Stalin's six conditions put forward by him consist not only in the fact that they deal extensively with the question of the significance of mechanization of production for socialist reconstruction and with the question of labour power as the most important element *of the productive forces* of the socialist system (see Chapter 2). The enormous theoretical significance of the conditions of the socialist revolution Stalin's point is also that, at the same time, t. Stalin gives here the most profound characterization *of the socialist relations of production* , of the socialist *organization of labor* .

A characteristic feature of our socialist economic system is the complete elimination of unemployment. The socialist transformation of the peasant economy undermined the process of stratification in the countryside and gradually led to an end to the former flight of the peasant to the city. Both of these circumstances lead to the fact that it is no longer possible to provide industry with labor on its own accord, using the old "labor market". Therefore, the former *purchase and sale* of labor power on the market must be replaced by a new *socialist organization for the recruitment*of labor power — through contracts with collective farms, through trade union mobilization and the transfer of skilled workers to other districts, etc.

The socialist system also implies a complete change in the organization *of wages* . First of all, the worker in the socialist system of economy has ceased to create the former "surplus *value*" that the capitalists appropriated. Even in the transition period, the former "value" and "value" categories of the bourgeois economy lose their meaning. Lenin considered it correct that " value, as a category of the commodity-capitalist system... is least suitable during the transition period[159]." In socialist conditions, the place of surplus value is taken by the worker's surplus labor, which produces a socialist social product devoid of its former antagonistic form. Labor is no longer a *commodity* . Workers ' wages no longer depend on capitalist value and the price of labor, but on the general success of socialist construction, which leads to its steady growth. But the socialist system of economy is by no means based on the "equality" of all workers in the sense of full satisfaction of their *needs* , regardless of the nature and qualifications of the work performed by them *mpyda*. One of the most important conditions for securing the labor force for industry is the elimination of the" equalization " in wages — the payment of workers *by labor, by qualification* . Piecework payment, which under capitalism was a means of additional exploitation of workers, under socialism becomes

159 B. Ленин, Замечания на «Экономику переходного периода» т. Бухарина / Ленинский сборник IX — с. 389.

an important incentive for the worker's interest in increasing the productivity of his labor. Along with this, the general improvement *of the material and living conditions*of the proletariat (housing construction, public utilities, public catering) is also of great importance.

The socialist system of economy also presupposes, as necessary conditions, the correct organization of the *production process* itself , the correct *alignment of forces in the enterprise* and the establishment of strict *responsibility* of everyone for the work assigned to them. One of the primary conditions for the development of a socialist economy is the struggle against irresponsibility and "depersonalization" in the production process. Socialism means an even greater *increase in the responsibility* of workers for the quantity and quality of work performed in comparison with the requirements imposed on the worker by the capitalist; socialism implies a conscious struggle of workers against the irresponsibility that corrupts them, which is alien to the class psychology. The socialist organization of labor presupposes both quantitative growth and qualitative changes *in the command structure.* engineering and technical staff of the industry. "We can no longer make do with the minimum of engineering, technical and command forces of industry that we used to make do with," says T. Stalin: But we *don't need all sorts of people.* command and engineering forces. We need such command and engineering forces that are able to understand the policy of the working class of our country, are able to assimilate this policy and are ready to implement it conscientiously." Along with this important task — the creation by the working class of its *own industrial and technical intelligentsia* - the development of socialism requires a comprehensive "use" of the experience and knowledge *of the old technical intelligentsia* , its bold involvement in the work of socialist construction, and the setting up of the entire socialist organization of labor for *scientific purposes.* the basics.

Finally, the socialist system of economy presupposes the further development of the production base of socialism and its complete *victory* over the remnants of other economic systems. It presupposes its *extended reproduction* , the extended reproduction of socialist productive forces and socialist relations of production. Marxism has nothing in common with the petty-bourgeois "*consumer* socialism" that Trotsky now preaches, understanding socialism only as the satisfaction of immediate needs. Socialism is not "production for consumption... ""The worker," Comrade Molotov emphasized at the seventeenth Party conference, " has never denied and will never deny the necessity of allocating a part of the output of his labor for national needs, for creating reserves, etc. ...It is necessary to give a decisive rebuff to attempts *to separate consumption issues from raising production* , from carrying out politics industrialization"[160].

Capitalist reproduction is based on the accumulation of capital through the exploitation of workers, on the growth of the means of production at the expense of the share of variable capital spent on wages. Socialist reproduction is possible only in the presence of socialist *intra-industrial accumulation* . Therefore, a socialist system is unthinkable without strengthening the principles of self-financing, without eliminating mismanagement, without fighting to reduce production costs, without mobilizing domestic resources, without a strict economy regime, and without a series of measures that ensure socialist accumulation and reproduction.

But *development* The expanded reproduction of socialist relations requires other conditions as well. It presupposes *the unity of the economic basis* and its full coverage of the entire national economy, including the former small-scale peasant economy. This last circumstance, at a certain stage, was bound to determine our policy *of collectivization* in the countryside. "Our large — scale, centralized socialist industry," pointed out T. P. Tolstoy. Stalin, in his speech at the conference of agrarian workers, " develops according to the Marxist theory of extended reproduction, because it grows every year in its volume, has its own savings, and moves forward with leaps and bounds. But our large-scale industry does not exhaust the national economy. Our small-scale peasant economy not only does not carry *out an extended annual reproduction in its mass*, but, on the contrary, it is not always able to carry out even simple reproduction." Hence, in complete contrast to

160 В. Молотов, Доклад на XVII конференции ВКП(б).

*равновесия*Bukharin's theory of sector equilibrium, Stalin concluded that it was impossible to base socialist construction "on two *different* foundations" for a long time, and that it was necessary "to expand agriculture, *to make it capable of accumulation and expanded reproduction*, and thus to transform the agricultural base of the national economy." Hence, in contrast to the capitalist path of development of large — scale agriculture, t. Stalin put forward "*the socialist path*, which consists in planting collective and state farms in agriculture." Collective farms, as *a type*of economy, — pointed out T. V. Stalin, - represents "*one of the forms of socialist economy* Of[161]course, while emphasizing in every possible way, in contrast to the opportunists who declare the collective-farm form "petty-bourgeois," the socialist nature of collective farms, we must not forget the fact that the peasantry is moving towards socialism along special, *peculiar*paths that differ from those of the working class. Collective farms as a production-socialist type of cooperative, where the collective farmers themselves are the owners of the means of production, are different from state-socialist enterprises, from state-owned state farms, and from higher forms of socialist economy. But "the peculiarity of the ways of their socialist development not only does not make it difficult, but it alone can ensure the final victory of socialism[162]."

Finally, the socialist system of economy and the extended reproduction of socialist relations presuppose exceptionally *high and ever-increasing rates of development* of our national economy. Tov. Stalin pointed out in his report to the XVI Party Congress that the growth of the socialized sector "means a progressive increase in the capacity of the domestic market, an increase in the demand for industrial products on the part of workers and peasants. This means that the growth of the domestic market will *overtake* the growth of industry and push it forward to *continuous expansion* ." In this respect, a socialist economy is the exact opposite of a capitalist economy, in which the pace of development inevitably runs into a contradiction between social production and capitalist appropriation.

Both the right-wing opportunists and Trotskyists shouted about the "exaggeration and insufficiency" of our pace. Trotsky, in order to justify his earlier plans for "superindustrialization", now proves that high rates of development were only conceivable during the *recovery* period, and "with the completion of the recovery process, the growth coefficient will have to significantly decrease." Stalin contrasted this Trotskyist theory with the" fading curve " of the Bolshevik line *of the rising curve* of our rates. Stalin showed that this Trotskyist theory is *bourgeois* a theory that transfers the laws of capitalism to the socialist economy, and that this Trotskyist theory does not take into account the special quality of the socialist economic system, for which continuous growth of rates is both a necessary *prerequisite* and a necessary *result* extended socialist reproduction[163].

Speaking about the peculiarities of the socialist system of economy and its relations of production, it is necessary to dwell in more detail on the changed attitude to labor and on the task of educating *a new labor discipline* , as well as on the role *of the planned principle*in determining the laws of the socialist economy.

From the very first steps of its existence, the socialist system created *a new attitude to labor*, which the old capitalist society did not know. Such were the communist subbotniks, in which even during the period of war communism Lenin saw the germs of future communist labor. The forms of labor organization that the era of socialist reconstruction has now put forward are also completely new: socialist competition, shock workers, self-supporting through brigades, public tugboats, counter industrial finance plans, etc. In them lies the beginning of truly free communist labor, which is profoundly different from the bourgeois "freedom" of the worker to sell his labor power on the market.

One of the characteristic features of socialism is that people gradually begin *to get used*,

---

161 И. Сталин, К вопросам аграрной политики в СССР.

162 В. Молотов, Доклад на XVII конференции ВКП(б).

163 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

without any external compulsion , to observing *the elementary rules of the community*, the elementary rules of the public. Even during the transition period, the old attitude to work, which was brought up under the conditions of serfdom and capitalism, as a heavy, externally imposed duty, is dying out. Lenin saw this as one of the main and primary prerequisites for the possibility of the state dying out under communism. That is why even now *the education of a new labor discipline* is becoming the most important task, a form of class struggle against the old slavish attitude to labor, which must lead to the complete elimination of the forced character of labor characteristic of capitalist society. *It is one of the most important tasks of the Communist subbotniks , of socialist emulation and striking that the masses of the working people should cultivate the habit of working as a natural necessity*, as a free and natural manifestation of human strength and abilities. The bourgeoisie is shouting about "forced labor" in the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, it is only under the conditions of socialism under construction that labor is transformed from a means of enslavement into "a matter of honor, a matter of glory, a matter of valor and heroism" *(Stalin)* .

The main task of all forms of socialist labor organization is to greatly *increase labor productivity* compared to the productivity of labor created by capitalism. "Capitalism,"says Lenin," can and will be finally defeated by the fact that socialism will create *a new and much higher*productivity of labor."

The transition to socialism means, as Engels put it, "*a leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom*." This leap characterizes the new content that social and historical *laws acquire* under socialism. The latter does not mean, of course, that socialist society is not subject to economic necessity, to certain economic laws. But the laws of socialist economics are no longer of the same *spontaneous* nature. They are becoming laws that will increasingly be established and applied by people who are fully aware of their necessity. "The laws of their own social activity," says Engels, " which have hitherto opposed them as alien to them, and therefore have dominated them, will be applied by men *with a full understanding of the matter and in accordance with their own interests* . The subordination of a social organization that has hitherto *been imposed* on them by nature and history will now *become their own.* business. Only then will people fully *consciously create their own history* , and the historical factors they set in motion will increasingly produce the results they[164]want." The contours of this freedom are already being outlined in the transition economy, as *the planned beginning grows in it*. *Plan for building socialism* It is a law of movement and development of the transition economy, which changes the relationship between its structures and determines the unity of production relations during the transition period. The plan becomes *the only*defining moment of the laws of our economy, the form of further development of economic necessity after our country enters the period of socialism.

The development of socialism must lead to the elimination *of commodity* production, and with it eliminate the domination of the product over the producer and the reification of social relations, which form the basis of commodity fetishism. "The social relations of men to their works and the products of their labour," says Marx of socialism, " remain here *transparently clear*both in production and in distribution[165]." However, at the present stage of our development, it is still premature to talk about eliminating commodity production and trade. *Soviet trade*, radically *changing* in its social content, is for us a method that retains all its importance for the immediate period. We must wage a resolute struggle against the right-opportunist understanding of our Soviet trade as trade in the bourgeois-Nepman sense, and against the "leftist" rejection of Soviet trade and the opposition to it of the socialist plan and direct product exchange. Soviet trade does not contradict the plan, but, on the contrary, *presupposes and includes socialist planning of distribution and supply* . Soviet trade must prepare all the necessary prerequisites for the possibility of organizing a direct socialist product exchange in the course of the further development of socialist society. At the same time, the market form of communication between the organs of the socialist

164 Ф. Энгельс, Анти-Дюринг — стр. 252.

165 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 47.

economy will have to play a significant role in creating forms of socialist distribution.

Marx, Engels, Lenin never considered communism as an empty abstraction, as something" ready-made " that is born "immediately". For them, communist society is not a fixed and unchangeable thing, but something "that is constantly *changing and progressing*." They therefore distinguish *between the lower and higher phases of communism* . The development of the lowest phase of communist society is, in other words, the construction *of a complete socialist society* . The question of the structure of this lower socialist phase of communism is now of great relevance to us. When we compare the features that have emerged in our economic structure in connection with the entry of our country into the period of socialism, with the instructions given by Marx, Engels, and Lenin on this question, we state all the main features that characterize the further stages of the development of socialist society.

The success of the first five-year plan, the resolution of the XVII Party Conference points out, created in the Country of Soviets "*its own base for completing the reconstruction of the entire national economy* , the base of a socialist large-scale machine industry", made a radical change in agriculture and turned the Soviet Union "*into a country of the world's largest agriculture on the basis of collectivization, the deployment of state farms and the widespread use of machine technology* ". The victorious construction of socialism in the first five-year plan means "*the final undermining of the roots of capitalism in the countryside* , which presupposes the complete elimination of capitalist elements and the complete destruction of classes."

Summing up the results of the first five-year period in the "guidelines for drawing up the second five-year plan", the XVII Party Conference noted that these successes in socialist construction prepare the basis for further, even more powerful growth of socialism in the USSR. The directives issued by the party conference emphasize that "the main *political task* of the second five-year plan is *the final elimination of capitalist elements and classes in general, the complete elimination of the causes that give rise to class differences and exploitation, and the overcoming of the remnants of capitalism in the economy and consciousness of people, the transformation of the entire working population of the country into conscious and active builders of a classless socialist society* »[166]."

The directives of the XVII Party Conference reveal the whole dialectic *of the further* stage of development of the new socialist society. Socialism is *the abolition of classes* . The completion of the foundation of the socialist economy completely undermines the economic foundations of class exploitation. But it only marks *the beginning* a complete socialist reconstruction, only creating the basis for *a complete* complete the reconstruction of the national economy, which alone can ensure the complete elimination of the causes that give rise to class differences and exploitation. The first five-year plan creates *a unified socialist economy* and ensures the final and irrevocable victory of the socialist economy, both in the city and in the countryside. However, the final elimination of all vestiges of capitalism, both in the economy and in the consciousness of the working people, presupposes *the complete abolition of private ownership of the means of production* . But the final destruction of private property as the basis and source of class distinctions and class exploitation is possible only on the basis of bringing *a new technical basis of socialism under the socialist economy* , on the basis of an extensive *technical reconstruction* in all areas of the national economy. The main and decisive economic task of the second five-year plan is to create a state-of-the-art technical base for all branches of the national economy*основная и решающая хозяйственная задача*. Its implementation must lead to the complete guarantee of the Soviet Union's economic independence from the capitalist world in technical terms, and to the fact that already in the second five-year plan the Soviet Union will take the first place in capitalist Europe in technical and economic terms.

The leading role in the completion of technical reconstruction, as the directives of the XVII Party Conference emphasize, should belong to the Soviet *machine*-building industry . The

166 Директивы XVII конференции ВКП(б) к составлению второго пятилетнего плана.

development of mechanical engineering is particularly important not only because the basis of our economic construction should, as at the first stage, be the production of means of production — heavy industry. The leading role of mechanical engineering in the second five-year plan is explained by the fact that only on the basis of it *is the complete mechanization of the production process achievable* — one of the conditions of t. Stalin — and thereby ensure the genuine Bolshevik pace of further construction of socialism. The deployment of mechanical engineering and mechanization of all branches of the national economy will mean full provision *of labor* for our growing industrial giants. The completion of the mechanization of agricultural production will not only provide us with the surplus labor we need, but also create the technical prerequisites for eliminating the antithesis between town and country. The development of mechanical engineering and mechanization of production will mean a higher *technical qualification* of the labor force and the associated possibility of further *shortening the working day* and a huge cultural uplift of urban and rural workers. Of course *the most important element* What remains for technical reconstruction is the "electrification of the whole country" — the creation *of a new energy base*using new raw materials, fuel sources, water energy, etc.Only on this basis is complete mechanization and automation of production, complete technical reconstruction of the national economy possible. However, this crucial importance of electrification should not obscure the leading role that Soviet machine-building should play in the near future, without which the further development of our energy sector would be unthinkable.

Technical reconstruction is a condition without which it is impossible to completely *eliminate the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness* and a decisive rise in the cultural level of the working people. At the same time, the very solution of technical reconstruction tasks is unthinkable without simultaneous *cultural development.* without the realization of a general literacy of the population, without *the mastery of technology* by our economic cadres, without working on technical qualifications and creating cadres of a new technical proletarian intelligentsia, without overcoming the economic and cultural backwardness of individual nationalities. It is a dialectical *interplay of technical reconstruction and cultural revolution* It must ensure the transformation of all the working people of the Soviet Union into conscious and active builders of socialism. But both the technical reconstruction and the cultural revolution, as the directives for drawing up the second five-year plan point out, would have been impossible without the further growth of socialist accumulation, without a decisive *rise in the material well-being*of the working people. The expansion of trade turnover and the beginning of self-financing should stimulate the creation of economic reserves in our national economy and at the same time improve the material situation of workers.

Already during the first five-year plan, the elimination of certain fundamental contradictions characteristic of the development of the entire preceding class society and connected with the enslavement of the members of this class society by the conditions of the division of labor begins. Thus, the socialist reconstruction of agriculture sets the *stage for the elimination of the antithesis between town and country* , introducing advanced industrial technology into agriculture, bringing state and collective farms closer together by covering them with machine and tractor stations with urban industrial enterprises, and creating prerequisites for the destruction of private property not only in the city, but also in the countryside. A more regular and even distribution of the productive forces throughout the country, and a more systematic distribution of resources, also contribute to this destruction of the antithesis between town and country.*всей* стране, планомерное *размещение* industry, the construction of new socialist cities, the elimination of the "idiocy" of rural life by introducing a new socialist culture into the countryside, and so on. The second five-year plan should create conditions "*for the complete elimination of the opposition between the city and the countryside*."

The second five-year plan must decisively destroy the old relationship between town and country. At the same time, however, we must not forget that the *leading role* of the proletariat in the socialist transformation of the countryside remains intact, and that the *своеобразии*development of the peasant economy towards socialism is unique. The working class and the working mass of the

peasantry follow *different paths to socialism*, which are peculiar for the proletariat working in state-owned socialist enterprises, and for the peasantry, which mainly comes to socialism through production cooperation, through *a number of stages* in the development of collective farms (artel, commune). "The working class goes *ahead* of the peasantry, through *the highest*forms of socialist economy at this stage[167]."

The destruction of classes is possible only in the process of a socialist *offensive* , in the process *of a fierce class struggle* . "And in the future,"as the directives of the seventeenth Party Conference pointed out," it is still *inevitable that the class struggle will escalate* at certain moments, and especially in certain districts and sections of socialist construction." The class struggle leading to the complete destruction of classes consists not only in the most resolute rebuff to the resistance of the dying capitalist elements, in the struggle against right and" left " opportunism, which expresses this resistance of hostile classes, but also in overcoming the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois prejudices existing among *the working* people, in their socialist *re*-education . These new forms of class struggle and the new tasks of the proletarian dictatorship will be discussed in detail later (Chapter 5).

Along with the development of universal polytechnic education and the involvement of the broadest masses of working people in the administration of the state, another contrast characteristic of class society begins to soften — the contrast between *mental and physical labor* . However, the final elimination of this last contradiction requires such a gigantic development of the productive forces that it would be a "left-wing" leap to speak of it now as a task for the next few years. The annihilation of this antithesis must cover the entire period of development of the lowest phase of communist society.

Socialism is therefore the *lowest phase* of communist society because it bears the distinct imprint of the class society from which it emerges. According to Marx, communist society at this stage "is still covered in all respects — economically, morally, and mentally-*with the birthmarks of the old society.*" From this point of view, Marx and Lenin's characterization *of an expanded socialist society is of great interest* . Under developed socialism, the means of production belong to the whole of socialist society; classes are abolished, and with them class exploitation. But the development of the productive forces of social labor is not yet sufficient for a socialist society to fully satisfy *all and every need*of its members. Under socialism, it is still necessary to distribute the social product "*according to work* ", depending on the social *labor* performed by each worker. Each member of the company who performs a certain share of socially necessary work receives a certificate of this from the company and, according to this receipt, receives in the public warehouses *a corresponding amount of money.* Number of products: "*How many* he has given so much labor to society in one form, *so much* the same gets back — to another".

In this society, "equality" seems to reign, but in reality, with such a distribution of "work", there is still a certain actual *inequality* . Here *the same* scale is applied in determining labor and distributing the social product to *different* people — to people who are far from the same, not equal to each other in their strengths, mental and physical abilities, in their needs and interests. "Justice and equality," Lenin observes, " therefore the lowest phase of communism cannot yet produce." Here, in the words of Marx, the equal right of every worker to a share of the social product is "still bourgeois in its principle*буржуазное* right", i.e. it does not yet completely eliminate certain restrictions in distribution and consumption, and in this case certain inequalities between people who differ in their needs. The distribution made according to the equivalent — according to labor-presupposes the preservation of economic calculation, the preservation of certain *legal norms* , and therefore the preservation in a certain respect *of the state*, which would protect these norms[168].

All these thoughts of Marx and Lenin are of the greatest importance for understanding the period we are now experiencing and the further stages of socialism. They give us an opportunity to

---

167 В. Молотов, Доклад на XVII конференции ВКП(б).

168 К. Маркс, Критика Готской программы; В. Ленин, Государство и революция.

understand how bourgeois and petty-bourgeois is the slogan of "equality", which was once put forward by Lassalle in his consumer understanding of socialism and which has now been repeated by Trotsky and Zinoviev in relation to the transition period. The "leftist" desire for "equalization" in the sphere of money security and supply of workers at the current stage of development is equally unfounded, as is the "leftist" talk about the "withering away" of the state at the present stage. According to Marx and Lenin, even at the stage of developed socialism, certain inequalities must be preserved, the distribution of labor must be preserved, strict accounting and economic calculations must be carried out, and law and the state must be preserved. The party's recent measures to eliminate equalization and depersonalization in production, to introduce strict self-financing and to strengthen the Soviet state apparatus are not at all a step back to capitalism, as bourgeois and social-fascist theorists think, but a step forward along the path of the necessary development of the socialist formation.

The period of expanded socialism destroys the enslavement of man by social conditions of the division of labor, completely destroys class distinctions, educates a new labor discipline, and creates labor productivity that is higher than that of capitalism. The period of socialism will also mean a *gigantic development of the productive forces* , which will prepare the transition to *the highest phase* of communist society. The technical basis of communist society presupposes not only complete electrification and, on its basis, complete mechanization and automation of the production process, but also the use of huge new sources of energy. Communism presupposes not only the complete elimination of the remnants of social inequality and class differences in the economy and in the consciousness of the working people, but also the remnants of inequality in distribution, which caused the need to preserve the state and legal norms in the period of socialism. Only at this higher stage of communism will the enslavement of man by the division of labor completely disappear, the distinction between mental and physical labor will be completely eliminated, and labor itself will become the "first *need of life*." Only here will the narrow, one-sided specialization that hinders *the comprehensive development of human forces and abilities disappear* , and " the freedom of development *of everyone* will be a condition for the freedom of development *of all* ." And only here will the gigantic development of the productive forces make it possible to fully satisfy *all the needs*of social man, regardless of the measure of labor he produces.

"Only at the highest stage of communist society, after the subjugation of man to the division of labor that enslaves him disappears; when the opposite of mental and physical labor disappears; when labor ceases to be only a means of life, and becomes itself the first need of life; when, together with the comprehensive development of individuals, the productive forces and all sources of production grow up. only then will the narrow horizon of bourgeois law be completely overcome, and society will be able to write on its banner: "*Each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs* “»[169]."

Chapter 4. The Doctrine of Classes and the State and the class struggle under capitalism

4.1. Marxist-Leninist understanding of classes and class struggle

In the Great Initiative, Lenin gives the following, most detailed definition of social classes:

"Classes are large groups of people who differ according to their *place in the historically determined system of social production, according to their relation* (mostly fixed and formalized in *laws*) *to the means of production, according to their role in the social organization of labor* , and consequently according to the methods of obtaining and the size of the share of social wealth that they have at their disposal. Classes are groups of people from which one can *appropriate the work*

169 К. Маркс, Критика Готской программы.

*of the other*because of the difference in their place in a certain order of social economy[170]."

Lenin's definition is remarkable in that it deals most fully*with the*totality of the characteristics of social classes and at the same time connects them with each other, deducing all these various characteristics from *the basic* and most important features of class society and its economic structure. Bourgeois science often tries to completely deny the existence of class distinctions in the modern "democratic", i.e., capitalist, system. In this case, it reduces all class inequality to historical phenomena that took place only in the past: it either explains it as a struggle of races, or political violence, which was supposedly characteristic only of the slave-owning and feudal systems, or reduces it to legal differences of estates that took place in the historical past. But it is not always convenient to completely deny the existence of class inequality in modern bourgeois society, and therefore bourgeois theory tends to note only the secondary, external, additional characteristics of classes. It does everything possible to obscure or depict in a softened form *the main ones.* contradictions between classes arising from the internal structure of class society. It proves the inevitability of certain social differences, which are supposedly caused by the" natural difference "of people, the" struggle for existence "and the victory of the stronger ones, and finally explains it by the inevitable difference *in the functions* performed by different groups of these people in the"social organism". It follows that these social differences and class antagonisms must take place in *every society* .

Anti-Marxist theories of classes — some of which we will discuss in more detail later-look for the basic characteristics of classes in the mere political violence and legal privileges of some groups of people in relation to other groups, then only in the size of the share of social income received by classes, then in the method of receiving, in the source of income, then in the if there are some differences in property, then in the difference in the technical functions of people in the production process.

The Marxist-Leninist understanding of classes is entirely imbued *with historicism* . It points out that classes are not an eternal, unchangeable category, that classes arise only at a certain historical stage in the development of society. On the other hand, it points out that if the emergence of classes was inevitable at a certain historical stage, then it is due *to the internal development* of society itself, its *economic*development, and not to any external causes — not just political violence, not military enslavement, etc.

Marxism-Leninism sees the basis of class differences in the economic structure of class societies, in the different *places* occupied by a social group in *a historically defined system* social production, in a certain way of social economy. Along with the change in the mode of production, the system of production relations also changes, i.e., with the emergence of each new antagonistic social formation, new basic classes arise, which are inextricably linked with it and are destroyed along with the death of this economic formation. The place of each class in the social order of production finds its expression first of all in *the relation of this class to the means of production* this company. In other words, this class situation is due to the different distribution of the means of production among the classes, of which one economically dominant class is the owner of the means of production, while the other class is either completely "liberated" from the means of production (such as the proletariat), or is attached to them as a simple tool (slaves).

However, this is not just a property distinction between classes. As we have already seen, a different distribution of the means of production among people means that people are simultaneously placed under certain production relations. The different relations of classes to the means of production follow entirely from this *mode of production* . It entails, as its consequence, a different *role*of classes in the social organization of labor. The mode of production determines the different distribution of the means of production among the classes and the resulting different role of each class in the production process — the direct labor of the worker, the command role of the capitalist, etc.The role of classes in the organization of labor, in turn, contributes to the

---

170 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — стр. 249.

consolidation of this form of distribution of the means of production.

In bourgeois society, the capitalist mode of production determines *appropriation* the bourgeoisie of the surplus labor of the workers and at the same time entails *the command role* of the capitalist in the enterprise. These command functions of production management are delegated by the capitalist to a special category of employees (managers, directors, engineers, etc.). However, the capitalist is not the owner of capital because he directly or through these trusted persons manages industrial enterprises. On the contrary, he becomes the head of industry only because he, the capitalist, *is the owner* means of production. According to Marx: "The supreme power in industry becomes an attribute of capital, just as in the feudal era the supreme power in military affairs and in the court was an attribute of land ownership[171]."

The different place of classes in a historically determined economic order, i.e., their relation to the means of production and their role in the social organization of labor, determines the possibility for one class *to appropriate* the labor of another class — *class exploitation and the historical form of this exploitation* . The ruling classes, as monopolists of the means of production in one historical form or another, live off the exploitation of the oppressed classes, using to their advantage the lion's share of social wealth.

These are the most important, *basic* signs of social classes. But Lenin's definition is not limited to these basic features. Lenin also notes those additional characteristics of classes which in some cases individually attract the attention of bourgeois economists and sociologists, but which in reality follow entirely from the basic characteristics. They can be properly understood only in relation to the main features — the place of the class in the economic order, its relation to the means of production, and its role in the organization of labor. Such an additional feature, first of all *a political feature* — is the consolidation and registration of property distinctions by political power, and their protection by means *of laws* . If we did not take into account this political attribute of classes, we could easily fall into the position of pure "economism"; we would not understand the significance of the various forms of class struggle, the development of the economic struggle into a political struggle, and the role *of the class state* and class law in this struggle *права*.

Further, according to Lenin, this mode of production and distribution determines both *the method* of generating income and *the size* of the share of social wealth that goes to individual classes. If we take the source of income and the amount of that income by itself, they cannot give us a correct idea of classes. They can easily lead us to confound basic class distinctions. But if we take these additional features together with the main features mentioned above, then they undoubtedly also have a meaning for defining classes. They show us in what form the main differences between classes *manifest* themselves : what expression the main difference between classes finds in the way in which social wealth is subsequently distributed among them and in the sphere of consumption of the social product. These additional features of classes explain how, consequently, a different distribution *of the product* contributes to the reproduction and consolidation of existing inequality in the distribution *of the means of production* .

Class exploitation leads to *class struggle* . Within each antagonistic mode of production there is a class struggle for its *own interests* . The ruling class seeks to maintain and consolidate its monopoly position. A class oppressed by its place in the economic order and political organization, being in irreconcilable opposition to the ruling class, seeks to destroy this form of exploitation, and with it this totality of production relations, and seeks to replace them *with new* production relations. These *class contradictions*cannot be resolved within the limits of a given mode of production, because the mode of production itself rests on this form of class exploitation. The solution (but by no means reconciliation) of these class contradictions is possible only by destroying the old mode of production and the old class relations of production and replacing them with new ones.

The most important features of the Marxist-Leninist understanding of classes and class struggle are as follows.

---

171 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 310.

First, in contrast to the abstract, supra-historical view of bourgeois class science, which tends either to deny class distinctions or to perpetuate forever the existence of classes in bourgeois society, Marxism-Leninism connects the existence of classes and class society *only with certain historical forms of production* . Classes are *a historically changing and historically transient*category. Class society is not eternal: it has emerged at a certain stage in the development of social production and must again be replaced by a social system in which there will be no place for division into classes.

Secondly, Marxism, as we have already shown, looks for the basis of the division of society into classes and the main class characteristics in the *mode of production* itself , in the difference in the place occupied by classes in a historically defined system of production. The attitude of this class to the means of production and the role of classes in the social organization of labor, which is caused by differences in the distribution of the means of production and form of class exploitation, in turn, contributes to the further strengthening of the differences in the distribution of the means of production and the forms of class exploitation — these are the main features of the social classes from which derives the totality of their economic, political and ideological characteristics.

Third, a Marxist-Leninist understanding of classes *is necessary* It presupposes *the opposition of class interests, class exploitation, and class struggle as the driving force of historical development* . Bourgeois science, if it recognizes the existence of classes, denies the existence of irreconcilable class contradictions and the inevitability of class struggle. The bourgeoisie preaches the theory of class solidarity, class peace, and the possibility *of reconciling* class interests. Marxism-Leninism sees in the class struggle a necessary internal *driving force for the very historical development of production* in a class society, where the transition from one mode of production to another takes place in the process of class battles. Marxism emphasizes the inevitability of class struggle in a class society and *the irreconcilability*of the interests of opposing classes.

Every class society is built on this opposition of interests and on the struggle of two *main classes* , of which one class is the exploited class, and the opposite class, which exploits the surplus labor of the first class, exercises its economic, political and ideological domination in the form of its class *dictatorship* .

An exploited class protects its *class properties.* interests in the various forms *of class struggle* — economic, political, and ideological — waged by both classes. Applying this basic proposition to modern capitalist society, Marx and Engels showed the irreconcilability of the class interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. They showed the inevitability of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, the historical necessity of the victory of the proletariat, the necessity *of the dictatorship of the proletariat* for the transition to *a classless*society.

The new and decisive contribution made by Marx to the doctrine of classes and the class struggle can only be properly evaluated by comparing it with previous views on classes. The era of bourgeois revolutions clearly revealed to many thinkers the existence of classes and class struggle. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, there were not a few theorists who already saw the historical process as a class struggle — utopian socialists, bourgeois historians, and economists.

For example, Saint-Simon developed in detail in his works ideas about the class struggle. Engels calls Saint-Simon the son of the French Revolution, whose bourgeois aspirations were combined with the defense of the interests of the proletariat. According to Saint-Simon, France before the French Revolution of 1789 was divided into three classes — the nobility, the urban class and the"industrialists". The nobles were engaged in governing, while the urban class and industrialists worked and paid taxes. After the French Revolution, the nation, according to Saint-Simon, was divided into two classes. The urban class, or bourgeoisie, became the governing class, and industrialists continued to pay taxes.

Saint-Simon calls 24/25 of the entire nation" industrialists". Therefore, the industrialist of Saint-Simon is a manufacturer, a merchant, a carrier, a sailor working on merchant ships, a ploughman engaged in sowing, a carpenter, a locksmith, a blacksmith, etc. The sign by which Saint-Simon unites these different groups of people into one class of industrialists is that they all work. Saint-Simon does not single out the working class as an independent group. At the same time, Saint-

Simon's bourgeoisie and industrialists were completely different classes. Under the bourgeois class, Saint-Simon understood the military of non-noble origin, lawyers, raznochintsy and rentiers. This class did, according to Saint-Simon, the French Revolution, and it gained power.

The example of Saint-Simon's views shows the immaturity of class theory before Marx and Engels. The allocation of special classes is completely arbitrary and is based on whether a person "works" or not, produces or only manages. But why do some only work and others manage? To provide some explanation, Saint-Simon turned to the properties of human " nature." "The fact is confirmed," wrote Saint-Simon,"that every human being feels, to a greater or lesser extent, the desire to dominate all other people[172]." This desire of one person to dominate another appears in Saint-Simon as the determining and all-explaining reason. In his opinion, education is also such a superiority that allows you to unite the efforts of the rich, and this gives them an advantage in their struggle with the poor. "The proprietors command those who have no property because they possess it, but they possess it and command it because they have the superiority of the enlightenment as a class." And here, along with the correct remarks that the rich command the poor, this very fact is explained *by the enlightenment*of the rich, i.e., an idealistic solution of the problem is given. The influence of the enlighteners of the eighteenth century had its full effect on Saint-Simon, as well as on other utopians — Fourier, Owen.

Thus, if utopian socialists saw the existence of classes, they could not give a correct explanation of the class struggle. Utopians ignored the already existing working class and addressed their projects for improving the life of humanity to *all*classes. The utopians did not understand the historical mission of the proletariat, so naturally they could not come to the realization that the destruction of all exploitation was possible only through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Bourgeois *historians* of the Restoration period in France were able to show the historical development of the class struggle, and bourgeois *economists*(A. Smith, Ricardo) were able to partially reveal the "economic anatomy", as Marx puts it, of classes. Historians such as Guizot, Augustin Thierry and Mignet, who reflected the interests of the bourgeoisie in their historical works, clearly saw in the great bourgeois revolutions, the English and French, the manifestation of the struggle of the bourgeoisie with the landed aristocracy. However, they either limited themselves to studying the forms of land ownership and land relations, or explained the origin of classes by the earlier conquest of one people by another.

Finally, the greatest bourgeois *economists*, such as Ricardo, consciously take as the starting point of their research the opposition of class interests, contrasting wages with profit, and profit with land rent. But Ricardo naively imagined this class opposition, which is characteristic of a certain economic formation, as a necessary, eternal law *of all*social life.

As can be seen from these examples, the discovery of classes and the class struggle already took place in a number of thinkers before Marx. However, the only scientific understanding of the class struggle has been given *only by* By Marx and Engels. They were able to identify *the economic* basis of the existence of classes and *the historically transitory* nature of class society. They have shown the historical mission of the proletariat in modern bourgeois society; they have carried their recognition of the existence of a class struggle to the point of recognizing *the dictatorship of the proletariat* as a transition to *the abolition of all classes* .

So Marx wrote: "As far as I am concerned, I have neither the merit of discovering classes in modern society, nor the merit of discovering their struggle among themselves... What I did new was to prove the following:

1) that the existence of classes is connected only with certain *historical forms of struggle peculiar to the development of production* ;

2) that the class struggle inevitably leads to *the dictatorship of the proletariat* ;

3) that this dictatorship itself is only a transition to *the abolition of all classes*and to the establishment of a social order in which there will be no place for division into classes[173]."

---

172 A. Сен-Симон / Соч., Гиз, 1923 — с. 17.

173 К. Маркс, Письмо к Вейдемейеру от 5 марта 1852 г.

Further developing these propositions of Marx, Lenin says: "The doctrine of the class struggle was created not by Marx, but by the bourgeoisie before Marx, and is generally *acceptable to the bourgeoisie* . Who recognizes *only* If a person is not yet a Marxist, he may not yet go beyond the framework of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To limit Marxism to the doctrine of the class struggle is to curtail Marxism, to distort it, to reduce it to what is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. A Marxist is only one who *propagates* recognition of the class struggle before recognition *of the dictatorship of the proletariat* . This is the most profound difference between a Marxist and a small (and even large) bourgeois by the dozen. On this touchstone, you need to experience *the real* understanding and recognition of Marxism..."

"Opportunism does not bring the recognition of the class struggle precisely to the most important point, to the period *of transition* from capitalism to communism, to the period *of overthrow* the bourgeoisie and its complete *destruction* »[174]."

Continuing the work of Marx and Engels, Lenin gave a theoretical justification for the class struggle in the conditions of the modern, imperialist stage of the development of capitalism. Lenin revealed the role *of the party* of the proletariat in this class struggle and gave a scientific justification for its *strategy and tactics* in the era of proletarian revolutions. After the victory of the first proletarian Revolution, Lenin revealed new class relations and formulated new tasks of the class struggle in the transition period — in the era *of the dictatorship of the proletariat* .

The teaching of Marxism-Leninism on classes and class struggle is the concretization of the materialist understanding of history as applied to class society, and it is the foundation *of scientific communism* .

4.2. Classes and State

As we have already seen, the attitude of the ruling class to the means of production — this most important economic attribute of the class-is "for the most part *fixed and formalized in laws*." The ruling class is not content with purely economic compulsion, i.e., with the fact that the owners of the means of production, as owners, have the opportunity to appropriate the labor of another class, which is deprived of these means of production. The ruling class still creates a *special, additional* organization, in which all the power of its systematic class coercion in relation to other classes is concentrated. This *special* social power, this organized and concentrated force of the ruling class, this "special force for suppression" *(Engels)*, this "special club" *(Lenin)* the dominant class is *the state* . The state inevitably grows out of the class struggle as a product of the irreconcilability of class interests, as a new instrument of oppression of one class by another, with all its organs — the army, the police, the bureaucracy, prisons, taxes, etc.

The state, like classes, does not *last forever* . Like classes, the state appears only at a certain stage in the development of human society. Along with the development and change of the mode of production, the type of state also changes. Ancient, feudal, bourgeois states — these are the most important forms of the state that correspond to certain formations of class society. Under communism, along with the extinction of all the remnants of social inequality, the state will also die out. Like classes, the state is *a historical* category. Only the learned lackeys of the bourgeoisie try to prove that the state exists eternally and is a necessary form *of all government.* a public device. Some of these "scientists" try to find something like a state even in animals. All the efforts of bourgeois scientists are aimed at proving to the oppressed classes the necessity of the existence *of a bourgeois society.* states. They seek to convince the working class that it should not seek to overthrow the political rule of the bourgeoisie and destroy the bourgeois State machine.

Bourgeois scientists also argue that the state has nothing in common with egoistic class interests, that the state protects not the interests of any one class, but *the general* interests *of the*

---

174 В. Ленин, Государство и революция / Соч., т. XIV, ч. 1 — с. 323.

whole society. According to the definition of bourgeois science, all institutions representing the state-laws, courts, officials, the army, etc. - have as their goal the common, "popular" good. Finally, bourgeois scholars usually make no distinction *between the state and society* , between economics and politics. Thus, for example, according to the bourgeois theories of natural law, the state is an ideal, rational society; it arises through a social contract that people conclude among themselves.

The materialist understanding of history reveals the true *class* essence of the state. The state did not come into being because people agreed to limit their rights under a free contract in order to protect universal human rights, as Rousseau, Kant, and others thought. It is also wrong to explain the origin of the state by the external conquest of one people by another, or to see it as the product of a "moral idea," as Hegel did. "The state," says Engels, " is by no means a force imposed on society from without. Just as little does it represent the "reality of the moral idea," the " image and reality of reason," as Hegel asserts. The state is a product of society at *a certain stage of development* , there is a recognition that society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself, that it has split into *irreconcilable forces.* opposites, which it is powerless to get rid of. In order that these opposites and contradictions with opposing economic interests should not devour each other, and at the same time society itself, in a fruitless struggle, a *special* force was needed, *which apparently stands above all others.* a system that would moderate clashes, keep them within the boundaries of "order". This force that stands out from society, but puts itself above it, is the state[175]."

First of all, Marxism-Leninism *does not identify* society and *the state* — the economic structure of society and its political organization, which is, in Marx's words, the" official expression", the" official summary " of society[176]. In the mode of production, in the class relations of production, Marx and Engels saw the economic, class basis of the state. "The direct relation of the owners of the conditions of production to the direct producers," we read in Capital, " a relation whose every given form naturally corresponds to a certain stage in the development of the mode of labor, and therefore to the social productive power of the latter - this is where we always reveal the deepest secret, the innermost foundation of the entire social system, and, consequently, the *political form* of relations of sovereignty and dependence, in short, of any given specific *form of the state* »[177]." As a general rule, Engels observes, the state "is the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class , which through it also becomes *politically dominant*, and thus acquires *a new means* of subjugating and exploiting the oppressed class[178]."

The state is always *a class organization-an organization of the ruling class* . Political power, says the Communist Manifesto, " is an organized force of one class, with the aim of subjugating another class." The" common interests "that bourgeois statesmen claim are represented and protected by the state — public education, public health, protecting the "nation" from external enemies, and protecting the inviolability of the legalized "order" - all these tasks are performed by the state only to the extent and in the form in which and in so far as the ruling class is interested. class.

"According to Marx," Lenin explains, " the state is an organ of class *domination*, an organ *of the oppression*of one class by another; it is the creation of an "order" that legitimizes and strengthens this oppression by moderating the clash of classes. In the opinion of petty — bourgeois politicians, order is precisely the reconciliation of classes, and not the oppression of one class by another: to moderate clashes means to reconcile, and not to deprive the oppressed classes of certain

---

175 Ф. Энгельс, Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства — с. 177.

176 К. Маркс, Нищета философии, Письмо к Анненкову.

177 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. III, ч. 2 — с. 327.

178 Ф. Энгельс, Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства.

means and methods of struggle for the overthrow of the oppressors[179]."

In the person of the state, the ruling class acts as a collective whole, pursuing and defending its "private" class interests under the guise of "general" interests. At the same time, the State is concentrated class violence in some *special* form. It is a" special force for suppression " *(Engels)*, a special machine of oppression, a special social power that has separated itself from the entire mass of members of society and apparently stands above society. The state, Marx wrote, " is really understood as a government machine or state, since it forms *its own organism , separate from society, through the division of labor ,* собственный организм»[180]."

Engels develops the main features of this "*special force for suppression* ." The distinctive features of the state are: first, the division of populations is no longer based on clans and tribes, as in primitive society, but on *territorial*grounds. The power of the State extends to a certain territory and its citizens. Second, "*the establishment of a public authority* that no longer coincides directly with the population organizing itself as an armed force." This public authority consists mainly of *special detachments of armed men*(police, army). It further presupposes the presence of material elements of coercion, prisons, etc. Such power also consists of all kinds of "*coercive institutions*" — courts, legislative and administrative bodies, *and officials of* the government machine. A characteristic feature of this public power is also the imposition *of taxes on the population* for its maintenance. The more the class struggle escalates, the more the costs of the armed forces, the courts, prisons, and the maintenance of the bureaucracy increase. Taxes are already starting to fall short: the state makes *loans*and resorts to public debt.

The bureaucracy, *the bureaucracy* — this *organ* of public power — becomes *the bearer* of power, it turns out to be standing *above the state.* the company. Along with the management of the production process, in which people manage things, there is a special power of management, divorced from the direct production process — *the management of people* . Lenin at one time objected to Struve, who saw in the state only the existence of compulsory power. Lenin pointed out that coercion is also possible in a classless society. The most important feature of the state is the presence *of a special*layer of persons in whose hands power is concentrated, a special power that has separated from society and does not coincide with society, with the process of social production[181].

The concept of a state thus *does not coincide* with the concept of society. The main reason why philosophers like Hegel saw the state as the highest "rational" organism, standing above all the rest of the world, lies in the isolation of the state machine into a certain "independent organism", in the separation of the organs of management of people from the direct management of production.*над* society and determining the course of movement of the society itself. In reality, the government machine is always only a tool, a "club" *(Lenin).* in the hands of the ruling class.

"The state," says Lenin, " is the product and manifestation *of the irreconcilability* of class contradictions. The state arises where, when, and insofar as class contradictions *cannot be objectively*reconciled. Conversely, the existence of the state proves that class contradictions are irreconcilable[182]."

Considering the state as *a special* force for suppression, Marxism-Leninism at the same time emphasizes *the comprehensive dependence* of this special force on the rule of a certain class. The state is a product *of internal development.* the necessary development of class society at a certain historical stage. The type of state and its structure are entirely determined by the class structure of society. Therefore, the state is *a superstructure*over the economic foundation of society. The state is

---

179 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIV, ч. 2 — с. 301.

180 К. Маркс, Критика Готской программы.

181 В. Ленин / Соч., т. II — с. 81.

182 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIV, ч. 2 — с. 300.

the surest expression of relations between classes and an indicator of the irreconcilability of class contradictions at this historical stage.

All attempts by bourgeois scholars to portray the state as an *independent* organization that develops according to its own laws and stands *above the classes* or is an organ *сотрудничества*of class cooperation are fundamentally alien and hostile to the teachings of Marx and Lenin on the state. Only certain short periods are possible, Engels points out, when the balance of class forces fighting among themselves gives state power a certain independence in relation to the struggling classes: it then acts "as an apparent intermediary between them." As an example, Engels cites the Empire of Napoleon I and III. It should be noted that even in these exceptional cases, when the state received a certain degree of independence in relation to the struggling classes, this does not mean that the state was not ultimately determined by the nature of the development of the social economy. Marx also associated the Napoleonic monarchy with the interests of the small "parcel" peasantry in France at the beginning and middle of the XIX century.

A certain degree of independence in individual cases and the apparent mediation of State power between classes do not yet imply *надклассовогот*he supra-class character of this State. Lenin points out, for example, that the Kerensky government gained such a well-known independence when the Soviets, led by the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, "were already powerless, and the bourgeoisie was not yet strong enough to directly disperse them "*(Lenin).* . However, this by no means means means that we should see Kerenskyism as an extra-class or super-class government, and that it did not reflect the interests of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie.

Therefore, Plekhanov's attempt to portray the Russian autocracy from beginning to end as an *independent* force that organizes the course of the country's economic development, as an organ *of class cooperation* in the former Russia's struggle against external enemies, is completely erroneous. Plekhanov explains the origin of the Russian autocracy by the "natural conditions" of ancient Russia, the absence of natural borders that would protect it from the attack of steppe nomads, and therefore the need for a special body that would organize all classes of society to fight the *external* enemy. In setting itself these tasks, the Russian autocracy, according to Plekhanov, allegedly established serfdom, and so on. Plekhanov essentially repeats the old *liberal*theory of Russian historians-Chicherin, Klyuchevsky, Solovyov. Autocracy in Plekhanov's view is the same Hegelian "moral organism" that stands above society, the history of which is explained by its "*geographical basis* ". In reality, not external forces, but *internal ones* the reasons — the nature and forms of class exploitation-explain to us the nature of the Russian autocracy. Lenin, beginning with his early works, everywhere shows us the class, feudal, and feudal character of the Russian autocracy, and connects it with the "local system." Plekhanov's theory of the Russian autocracy, which, as we shall see later, Trotsky also follows, is a vivid expression of his political opportunism.

The entire history of mankind confirms that political power always belongs *to the economically dominant* class. The ancient state was primarily a slave state, since slaveholders and slaves were the first classes in human history. In the Middle Ages, the feudal state acts as an organ of domination of large landowners over serfs. The modern bourgeois state is a *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*-an instrument of oppression of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie.

"The essence of Marx's teaching," says Lenin, "is understood only by those who have understood that the dictatorship *of a single* class is necessary not only for every class society in general, not only for *the proletariat* that overthrew the bourgeoisie, but also for the whole *historical period* that separates capitalism from 'society without classes', from communism. The forms of bourgeois states are extremely diverse, but their essence is the same: all these states are in one way or another, but in the final analysis necessarily *the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie* . The transition from capitalism to communism, of course, cannot fail to produce an enormous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: *the dictatorship of the proletariat* »[183]."

---

183 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIV, ч. 2 — с. 324.

The existence of the State is thus inextricably linked to the existence of classes and class society. Like classes, the state *does not last forever* . Together with the class struggle, the state has emerged, and with the destruction of classes and the development of the highest phase of communism, State power must gradually *die*out. "A society that organizes production in a new way on the basis of a free and equal association of producers will send the entire state machine back to where it really belongs — to the Museum of Antiquities, next to the spinning wheel and the bronze axe[184]."

4.3. Origin of classes and States. Classes of pre-capitalist formations

Classes and class struggle arise only at a certain stage of the development of human society. In a note to the Communist Manifesto, Engels says that the division of society "into different and then opposite classes" begins with the disintegration of the primitive community. Consequently, primitive humanity knew neither classes nor class struggle. But in subsequent historical epochs, " we find everywhere a complete *division of society*into various classes, a diverse ladder of various social positions[185]."

Primitive human society is characterized by the fact that its productive forces were at an extremely low level of development. Low labor productivity rewarded man very poorly in his struggle with the surrounding nature and other primitive communities. Because of this state of all social production, there was *no economic basis for exploitation* man by man. Therefore, in primitive society there were no classes, no exploiters, no exploiters.

As we have already found out, thanks to labor and the production of tools, a person is distinguished from the animal state. Along with the differentiation of tools, there is also a division of labor between different people in the same society. Within the primitive community and family, this division of labor is based "on a purely physiological basis[186]." Within the family and clan there are old people, adults and children, men and women. All of them have different strengths, different experience and ability to work. Therefore, in the process of work, they are assigned various responsibilities. This initial form of division of labor is due *to natural* or, as Marx puts it, physiological causes. But each community lives in a different environment. Different communities differ in the way they produce, the way they live, and the nature of the products they produce. These naturally growing differences in communities imply the possibility *of a social division of labor* . Very often, the contact of communities and clans with each other has the character of military attacks. But military raids are not always accompanied by success: sometimes these raids end in defeat or compromises. Then there is no longer a unilateral takeover, but a rudimentary form *of exchange between communities* .

Thus, the exchange caused by the division of labor does not initially arise within a given community, but at the borders of contact between the gens, family, and community with other genera. The exchange between these communities establishes a certain connection and unity between them. Here the social division of labor arises between the initially independent spheres of production of individual communities, but through exchange they come into a coherent *unity* . In this way conditions are created in which *surplus labor,* which is used to create the exchanged surplus product , becomes profitable and possible, and in this way private property is strengthened along with exchange.

Along with this, a social division of labor begins *within the community itself* . Some of the most important social functions of general importance — military commander, priest, teacher, judge-are separated from the direct production duties of members of the community and assigned to

184 Ф. Энгельс, Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства.

185 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Коммунистический манифест.

186 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 330.

special officials. These authorized communities are beginning to acquire a certain degree of independence from the rest of society. Some independence of public positions in primitive communities is gradually increasing to the point of dominating society itself. The servant of society eventually becomes its master. But the social division of labor takes on a class-based character only with *the advent of private ownership*of the means of production.

The process of separation of social functions and the development of surplus labor and private property, intertwining and complementing each other, gave rise *to class society* .

For example, we can point to the ancient Hindu community, where there was already a conditional division of labor, but classes did not yet exist. There was a blacksmith, a carpenter, a cart driver, a potter, a barber, a shepherd. There was a special person who was in charge of the boundaries of the fields and made sure that the neighboring tribes did not violate these boundaries; there was a lock keeper who supervised their proper operation; there was a head of the community who combined the functions of a judge, police chief and tax collector; there was an accountant, priest, teacher, etc. All of these individuals performed community-controlled work that was necessary for the entire community. The community, in turn, was obliged to take care of maintaining their existence. In such a community there is a division of labor, but classes do not yet exist. Only later, when private ownership of the means of production appears along with surplus labor, when the rudiments of commodity economy are born and labor power acquires market value, only then does the *economic basis for the exploitation of man by man* appear . A group endowed with social powers begins *to appropriate and accumulate the surplus labor*of other members of society — and society splits into different classes.

This *is the twofold way in which classes arise* , as Engels points out. Together with the classes, *the state also emerged* . The social duties and powers of a group of primitive community officials represented the " germs of State power[187]."

Slavery it is the earliest form of human exploitation by humans. Slave society in the ancient world corresponds to the slave state. The lowest form of slave economy is patriarchal subsistence farming. The main element of productive forces is still the expenditure of human physical strength. With the development of the productive power of labor and the appearance of a surplus product, it became more profitable not to destroy the enemy defeated in the war immediately, but to force them to work for themselves. The development of productive forces gave rise to and caused the emergence of slavery. Slavery itself, which arose on the basis of the development of the productive forces, led to a further and broader division of labor between agriculture and industry. It has already been noted that the flourishing of ancient Greek culture is due to slave labor. Without slavery, ancient Rome would have been impossible. "And without the foundation laid by Greece and Rome, there would not have been. also of modern Europe" *(Engels)*.

Slavery emerged at a historically determined stage as a necessary consequence of the development of the productive forces. At a certain historical stage, the introduction of slavery was a necessary prerequisite *for economic progress* . It was progressive even for those who were enslaved. If at the previous stage a captured warrior was simply killed, then now at least his life was saved. Moreover, it would be a great mistake to think that the further back in the centuries, the more barbaric forms of slavery are. As long as the economy is still primarily subsistence, the possibility of exploiting a slave is still limited to the needs of the given economy. From the very nature of the production *does not follow* unlimited need for surplus labor. But it is a different matter when, with the development of productive forces, nations are drawn into world trade. In this case, the predominant purpose of using slave labor is to obtain *exchange value* . That is why Marx points out that as long as cotton production in the southern states of America was mainly aimed at directly satisfying needs, Negro slave labor was relatively mild and patriarchal. But from the moment when South America was drawn into world trade and became the world's supplier of cotton for the most advanced (for that time) English cotton industry, the excessive labor of the Negro became a system

187 Ф. Энгельс, Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства.

that reached the point where the Negro's strength was worn out for *seven years* of labor.

If up to a certain point slavery served to develop the productive forces, then later it became a brake on the latter. Thus the Roman Empire fell because slave labor reached its highest form of development and could not contribute to the further development of the productive forces. The slaves were deprived of the most basic living conditions. After unsuccessful attempts to overthrow the rule of Roman slaveholders (for example, the revolt of Spartacus), the slaves were defeated. There was no new class in society that would represent a new higher mode of production and that would take over the management of the restructuring of social production. The old ruling classes (patricians and merchants) *could not* and did not want to rebuild society. The slaves in their struggle *did not represent a new progressive mode of production* : they only sought to regain their freedom in order to turn the historical wheel back, to return to subsistence farming. Meanwhile, manufacturing in Rome was an expression of the needs of a higher mode of production. Therefore, the Roman Empire, once powerful, but eventually already decayed from the inside, fell under the pressure of the Germanic tribes.

Medieval feudalism replaces the slave economy *феодализм*. Feudal society is built on the class exploitation by the feudal landlords of the serfs who depend on them. But the forms of class exploitation under feudalism also change and develop with the development of the productive forces. The most primary form of exploitation under feudalism is *labor rent* . In the case of working rent, the direct producer (peasant) works several days a week for the feudal lord on his estate. At the same time, the peasant works with the help of tools (plow, cattle, etc.) that actually or even legally belong to him.

The working rent that the peasant gives to the feudal lord is a direct form of exploitation, undisguised by anything. Here the labor of the peasant for himself is separated both in space and time from that of the landowner. Therefore, in order for such a direct, undisguised exploitation to be possible, some additional *non-economic coercion is necessary* . Such non-economic coercion is *the political and legal subordination of the peasant to the feudal* lord . Marx writes about this as follows: "In all forms in which the direct worker remains the "owner" of the means of production and of the conditions of labor necessary for the production of the means of his own subsistence, the property relation will necessarily appear as *a direct relation of domination and subordination* - (emphasis added). - *Auth* .), therefore, the direct producer - as unfree: unfreedom, which from serfdom with corvee labor can be softened to a simple tax obligation[188]." Under feudalism, the peasant is not free and in one form or another is attached to the land as an appendage of the latter. The legal owner of the land, and therefore to some extent the peasants attached to it, is the landowner, the feudal lord. The most vivid form of expression of these feudal exploitation relations is *serfdom* .

Labour-rent or corvee is based on the weak development of the productive forces and on the primitiveness of labour itself. Along with the development of the productive forces, the very form of exploitation also changes. At a certain stage of development, it becomes more profitable for the landowner to receive a certain amount of products instead of working rent. Then the working rent is replaced *by the rent of products* . "Rent by products presupposes a higher and more cultured level of the direct producer, and consequently a higher stage of development of his labor and of society in general..."[189].

Whereas in the case of working rent, the peasant worked under direct compulsion of an assistant or his overseer, now the peasant works under the compulsion of certain social relations, fixed in the form of a law. Labor for the feudal lord and the landowner is no longer separated in space and time from labor for itself. In every hour of the peasant's labor, a part of the labor is laid down simultaneously for himself (as necessary labor) and surplus labor for the landowner. Under the new form of exploitation, the peasant and his family have somewhat more scope for producing

188 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. III, 1928 — ч. 2, гл. 47, с. 266.

189 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. III, 1928 — ч. 2, гл. 47, с. 270.

the necessary and surplus product. At the same time, there is also the *possibility of accumulation*for the peasant, the possibility for him to acquire more means of production in order to use them in turn to exploit other peasants. This creates the conditions for double oppression: on the part of the landowner and the crystallizing kulak. The peasantry begins to differentiate between the labourer and the poor, on the one hand, and the exploiting kulak, on the other.

The development of commodity and money circulation also takes the feudal estate into its orbit. The development of world trade brings new goods, thereby creating new needs. The old subsistence economy is being undermined from within. A well-known expression of this decomposition of natural economy was the substitution *of money rent for products*. Feudal forms of exploitation have developed all their capabilities. Together with them, the feudal forms of exploitation are already generating within themselves new, *capitalist* forms of exploitation — by the laborer's fist. The landlords are also beginning to shift from subsistence farming to capitalist agriculture-producing agricultural products *for the market*in their vast latifundia.

Taking advantage of their monopoly position, the landlords also create a state power that serves in the interests of feudal exploitation — the feudal state. The peculiarity of feudal relations consists in the fact that here political, state power has not yet completely separated itself from the direct economic coercion carried out by each feudal lord. The feudal lord, the owner of land, is also *a political* ruler. This circumstance also determines the entire organization of feudal society in the form of a political-legal and estate hierarchy. Feudal lords enjoy political and legal privileges over the peasants and the emerging urban bourgeoisie. Together with the clergy, they form *the upper classes* . Small feudal lords are subordinate to larger feudal lords. The largest feudal lord represents the national power: (prince, king, emperor). Autocracy in former Russia is a vivid example of a feudal state, which in the last period also represented the interests of modern, Russian and international imperialism.

Class contradictions and class struggles under feudalism are mainly between *the peasantry and the landlords* . The peasantry, driven to despair, often revolts against the landlords. But due to the fact that the bulk of the serf peasantry is dispersed and dispersed by the very mode of production, peasant uprisings are mostly local (local) in nature. A peasant uprising in one place is usually not supported by the rest of the country's peasantry. Taking advantage of this, the ruling classes of the country relatively easily coped with local peasant actions and suppressed uprisings. The experience of all peasant uprisings (*peasant wars*) confirms this particularly clearly. So it was in Western Europe, so it was in Russia (for example, the Pugachev uprising).

Lacking clarity and certainty in their political aims and attitudes, the peasant movement is often used to its advantage by the bourgeoisie fighting against feudalism. The revolutionary movement of the peasantry is just as spontaneous today in the colonial and backward countries — when the proletariat does not yet act as the hegemon and when it is not yet subordinated to the leadership of the Communist Parties. The local bourgeoisie (for example, the "National Congress" in India) tries to rely on the peasant movement, using the national discord and religious prejudices of the peasantry. The task of the local communist parties is to make use of the enormous revolutionary capabilities of the peasantry, to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat in the peasant revolution, and to link its struggle against feudal relations with the struggle against imperialism.

The peasantry, by virtue of its economic position under feudalism, is itself incapable of overthrowing the exploiting class. Only under the leadership and in alliance with the proletariat, as the experience of the Russian Revolution has shown, can the peasantry successfully fight against the exploiting classes.

4.4. The main classes of capitalist society and their historical development

In studying the class structure of slave-owning and feudal societies, we are dealing in both cases with *the main classes* of these formations, the mutual connection of which and the form of appropriation of surplus labor determine the slave-owning and feudal economy: slave owners and slaves, landlords and peasants. *Basic classes are those classes whose existence is conditioned by a*

given mode of production and which, by their interrelations, determine the nature of production relations and the economic structure of a given society.

For capitalist society, such basic classes are *the proletariat and the bourgeoisie* . Without their existence, without their connection in the process of production, without the exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, the capitalist mode of production itself is unthinkable.

These basic capitalist classes begin to develop even in the depths of feudalism. Feudalism, which is based on agriculture, also gives place *to handicraft* production. Simultaneously with the development of the guild craft, commercial capital is also developing in the depths of feudalism. A capitalist who unites a certain number *of wage workers under one roof* creates a capitalist form *of co*-operation . This capitalist form of co-operation develops as the opposite of peasant farming and independent craft production.

In this way, a class of wage-workers and a class of capitalists are already being created in the depths of feudalism. Capitalism develops mainly in the cities, as opposed to the remaining feudal countryside. Together with the development of large — scale industry, the bourgeoisie and its antagonist, the proletariat, are growing. The bourgeoisie gains one economic position after another, pushing the dominant class of medieval society into the background. In this course of historical development, the bourgeoisie made political conquests as well as economic ones. At the first stages of its development, the bourgeoisie appears as *a special class oppressed by the nobility*, concentrated mainly in the cities. With the development of guild craft, free artisans (as was the case in Italy and France, for example) created their own urban self-governing communities. This right was achieved either by direct *war* with their feudal lords or the fact that the communities *bought*off the feudal lords. During manufacturing, the bourgeoisie acts as the "*third estate*" in contrast to the nobility and clergy. The further manufacture develops, the greater the stratification of the third estate. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat stand out more and more clearly from it.

Finally, together with the development of large-scale industry, the bourgeoisie opposes the feudal nobility and overthrows its power. The developed productive forces of capitalist industry and the corresponding developed capitalist relations have come into conflict with the old feudal relations of production, with the privileges of estates protecting them, with feudal law and the State. Therefore, the task of the bourgeoisie was to seize State power and bring it into line with the established bourgeois economy.

Having seized power, the bourgeoisie pays all its attention to ensuring that the working class, called to life, does not destroy its rule. The bourgeois revolution replaces the old class of exploitative feudal *lords with a new class of exploiters*— the bourgeoisie. The ruling class that has come to power again needs the oppression of the proletariat. To this end, he does not break the old state machine, but only rebuilds it and adapts it to his interests.

Bourgeois ideologues always portray the bourgeois revolution as a struggle for *freedom, equality, and fraternity* . In reality, the bourgeoisie seeks to destroy only the feudal privileges that hinder its rule. By seizing power, the bourgeoisie destroys all feudal and patriarchal relations. "Mercilessly she broke the motley feudal threads that bind man to his hereditary masters and left no connection between people except naked interest, heartless purity. In the cold water of selfish calculation, she drowned the sacred impulse of devout reverie, chivalrous enthusiasm, and philistine sentimentality. It *has turned the personal dignity of a person into an exchange value* »[190]."

The bourgeoisie recognizes only one privilege — *that of the proprietor* . In an effort to abolish feudal privileges, the bourgeoisie proclaims " equality." But bourgeois equality is *actual inequality*, in which there remain the haves and the have-nots, the exploiter and the exploited, the bourgeois and the proletarian. The bourgeoisie seeks to destroy all feudal fetters that hinder the development of trade and industry. The bourgeoisie needs the free development of industry and trade, and that is why bourgeois ideologists proclaim *freedom* . But bourgeois freedom means *freedom for the propertied*and at the same time enslavement for the wage-workers.

---

190 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Коммунистический манифест.

In order to overthrow the rule of the feudal lords with the help of the proletariat and the peasantry, the bourgeois revolution presents the special interests of the bourgeoisie as *universal* interests, as the interests of the whole of society. The bourgeoisie seeks to present itself in the revolution not as a special class with its own interests, but as the representative of the whole people, as opposed to the ruling nobility. The bourgeoisie succeeds in this until the proletariat has developed into an independent class, has not yet grown to the consciousness of its *own*interests.

Meanwhile, it is precisely in bourgeois society that the contradictions between the ruling class and the oppressed classes (the proletariat, the poorest and middle peasantry) develop most acutely and profoundly. *Основой*They are based on the contradiction of capitalism — the contradiction between social production and private appropriation.

The owner of the means of production is a relatively small group of capitalists. The capitalists are confronted by a huge army of wage workers deprived of the means of production. Wage-labourers can only exist *by selling their labour-power*to the capitalists. They are "free" from all means of production. The continuous growth of the labor force displaced from production by the introduction of technical improvements in the form of a "reserve army of labor", the growth of unemployment, the constant tendency of the capitalist to lower the wages of workers — these are the consequences for the working class of the capitalist principles of freedom, equality, private property and selfish profit.

The working class goes through various stages of development in its struggle against the bourgeoisie*этапы*.

In the early period of capitalism, although the working class already exists , *it is not yet aware of itself as a separate, independent class* that confronts other classes with its interests. In this early period, the working class exists as a class "in itself" and for others (for the capital exploiting it), but not yet "*for itself*".

The struggle of the workers against the capitalists begins at the earliest stages. First, the workers fight the capitalist singly. Then there are the workers of an entire factory, or even an entire industry or locality. At this stage, the workers ' struggle is directed not so much against the capitalist mode of production itself as against its *external* manifestations. The workers see that the triumphant march of developing capitalism is bringing about the introduction of machinery, and therefore a change in the old modes of production, the displacement of labor, and an increase in unemployment. Therefore, the worker mistakenly believes that all evil depends on the use of machines in production. He turns all his hatred on cars. Workers destroy machines, set fire to factories, destroy foreign competing goods, and generally seek to return to the already obsolete position of a medieval workshop or manufactory worker. The workers do not yet understand *the class essence*of the capitalist mode of production. At this stage of development, the proletariat is a dispersed and dispersed mass throughout the country.

But with the growth of industry grows the strength and power of the proletariat. Large-scale industry concentrates thousands of workers in one enterprise. The school of collective labor develops *class solidarity* among the workers . Workers are beginning to realize that they, as a collective whole, have their *own special interests, which are opposed to the interests of capital* . The development of railways, telephone, telegraph, etc. accelerates communication methods. At the same time, the unification of workers from all over the country is much faster. The unification of workers, which would have taken centuries in the Middle Ages, takes place in a few years. Capitalism is conquering the world market. Together with the goods, workers are transferred from one country to another. The proletariat breaks the bonds of national borders and becomes a class *of the international*proletariat.

At this stage, the working class *is aware of* It opposes itself to other classes and, above all, to its antagonist, the bourgeoisie. Acting as a class for itself, it creates its *own political party* .

In order to protect their class interests, the workers form *trade unions* ; a political party is singled out from the most advanced elements of the working class *партия*, and the working class is united on an international scale — into *an International*.

4.5. Transitional classes under capitalism

In reality, there has never been and there is no such "pure" abstract society in which there are *only two* the main classes. For example, under feudalism, there were not only landlords and peasants, but also artisans, the merchant bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia were born.

In the same way, under capitalism there are not only capitalists and workers, but at the same time there are *peasants, landowners, small urban bourgeoisie, intellectuals and declassed elements*(lumpen proletariat). Let us consider each of these social groups separately and their role under capitalism.

4.5.1. Large landowners

Under feudalism, the landlords constitute the main and ruling class. In capitalist society, the dignity and significance of the human person is assessed only in proportion to the extent *of ownership of the means of production* . The landowner, where he remains from the feudal formation, is important insofar as he *is the owner of the land* . In other words, he is important in capitalist society not because of his knightly coats of arms and not because of his "blue blood", but because he is the owner himself, who, unlike the capitalist entrepreneur, receives not profit, but capitalist *rent* . Part of the former nobility under capitalism is forced to live by renting out their land either for factories or for rent to tenants; some landlords themselves become capitalists. Thus, under capitalism, the large landowners or agrarians, *although still preserved as a class*, lose more and more *their independent significance*, becoming capitalized landowners.

The fact that landowners still exist as a class also determines their *special class interests*, which are somewhat different from the interests of the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie. The manufacturer, who is forced to give a part of the surplus value in the form of rent to the owner of the land, opposes him in his class interests. On this basis, class contradictions arise between these two exploitative classes. The expression of these contradictions is the existence *of different parties*within the exploiting classes.

But all the contradictions between large landowners and capitalists within bourgeois society are *no longer fundamental and decisive* . Both the capitalist and the capitalized landowner are interested in preserving the existing mode of production. There may be certain disagreements between them, but neither class is interested in changing the existing system. History shows that all disagreements between manufacturers, merchants, and landowners immediately subside as soon as they come into collision with the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, which is striving to overthrow capitalist rule. In such cases, the exploiting classes are in touching unity, forgetting their differences for the time of common danger.

The further capitalism develops, the stronger the *coalescence of farmers and capitalists* . Some of the former landlords organize their own industrial enterprises, while others invest their capital in shares of capitalist enterprises, i.e., the landlords become capitalists in the same way. On the other hand, the capitalists also buy up more and more land plots from the ruined landlords and become simultaneously owners of land and factories.

Thus, under capitalism, landowners are *a transitional class*, gradually losing the importance of a special class. The confiscation of the landlords ' land for the benefit of the bourgeois state, the so — called *nationalization of land* — if it were carried out under capitalism-would not in any way affect the essence of the capitalist mode of production. It would only be profitable for the industrial capitalists and for the development of peasant farming, meaning the abolition of the landlord*'s absolute rent* . Lenin repeatedly explained that the nationalization of the land does not imply anything socialist and is a requirement *of the bourgeois revolution* . But the bourgeoisie does not dare so cruelly violate the" sacred " right of property. The program of the peasant bourgeois revolution and the demand for nationalization of the land are defended only by the proletariat. Only the proletarian revolution *along the way* implements this requirement as well.

4.5.2. The petty bourgeoisie. Differentiation of the peasantry (rural bourgeoisie and farm labourers)

Along with the bourgeoisie, the proletariat, and the remnants of the feudal nobility in capitalist society, we find *the petty bourgeoisie* (small and middle peasants, artisans, and artisans). In addition, the bourgeois elite in the countryside forms a special group in its position — *the rural bourgeoisie*(kulaks).

The petty bourgeoisie is a fairly large class. It outnumbers even the proletariat (at certain stages of the development of capitalism). The question therefore arises: but can the petty bourgeoisie, in particular the peasantry, play *a leading*role in the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society?

Marxism-Leninism shows that this point of view, which was defended in particular by our Narodniks, is utopian and reactionary. The petty bourgeoisie is primarily small producers, but the small producer manages the system of commodity economy. He has *ownership* of the means of production (whether it is a piece of land, or a small lathe, or some other instrument of production). Under capitalism, the small producer produces products *for the market* , i.e., it produces goods. The petty bourgeoisie is thus closely linked to the existing capitalist mode of production. But along with the similarity, small producers have a significant *difference* from the bourgeoisie. While the capitalist lives and develops his production at the expense of the surplus value obtained by the labor of the worker, the small producer is forced *to work*together with his family.

Capitalism, both in urban industry and in agriculture, applies advanced techniques that increase the productivity of labor. The small producer-the artisan, the peasant - who mostly works with primitive tools, is forced to compensate for the technical backwardness of his tools of production by an increased amount of work and increased tension.

Capitalist competition is a heavy burden on small producers and causes *economic differentiation among them* . Most of the small producers are going bankrupt. On the other hand, at the other pole, a small group of capitalists is growing up from among the small producers. Thus , in the countryside, together with the disintegration of the peasantry , two poles are formed: the rural *poor and farm labourers*, on the one hand, and *the kulaks*, hucksters, and usurers, on the other. Only in feudal society is the peasantry the *main* exploited class. In capitalist society, the peasantry is *no longer united* according to their social composition by class.

Even under feudalism, along with the development of the productive forces, *the differentiation*of the peasantry begins. Under capitalism, this differentiation takes on extremely broad dimensions. The once united peasantry under capitalism is increasingly splitting up into opposite poles. At one pole the mass of the peasant poor and the agricultural proletariat is being formed, and at the other the kulaks, or rural bourgeoisie, are growing up.

To *the rural bourgeoisie* these include "independent owners who conduct commercial agriculture in all its various forms"[191], large farmers, owners of commercial and industrial establishments in rural areas, and owners of commercial enterprises. The category of the rural bourgeoisie is specifically characterized *by the combination of commercial agriculture*, i.e., the production of agricultural products for sale on the market, *with fishing, hiring and exploitation* agricultural labourers and the surrounding peasantry. Lenin ranks the rural bourgeoisie among the *agrarians*and calls them small farmers or "dirty landlords", in contrast to the nobility — "noble landlords".

The stratification of the peasantry leads to the separation of the labourers, or *rural proletariat, at the other pole* . "Another new type," Lenin describes the process of development of capitalism in Russia, " is the rural proletariat - *a class of wage workers with allotments* . This includes the poor peasantry, including the completely landless ones, but the most typical representative of the Russian rural proletariat is the day laborer, unskilled laborer, construction worker or other worker with an

---

191 В. Ленин / Соч., т. III — с. 132.

allotment. The insignificant size of a farm on a piece of land and, moreover, a farm that is in complete decline (as is particularly clearly shown by the impossibility of existing without the sale of labor power (the"crafts" of the poor peasantry)), the extremely low standard of living, even probably inferior to the standard of living of a worker without an allotment — these are the distinctive features of this type[192]." Lenin referred to the rural proletariat as "not less than half of the total number of peasant households"[193] in pre-revolutionary Russia.

The middle peasantry occupies an intermediate position between the rural bourgeoisie and the rural proletariat, i.e., wage-labourers with allotments *среднее крестьянство*. The middle peasantry does not exploit the labor of others, maintaining a partly natural, but mostly simple commodity economy, selling a certain share of the products of its labor on the market. But it is becoming more *and* more differentiated, singling out the rural bourgeoisie at one pole and the poor and farm labourers at the other. Therefore, as capitalism develops and bourgeois society displaces the remnants of feudalism and serfdom, the peasantry ceases to be a single class.

The peasantry, Lenin pointed out, continues to be a single class in so far as "serf relations are still preserved." This is how Lenin distinguished four groups of land ownership in Russia before the revolution. The first group is the mass of poor peasant farms. This mass, which had insignificant allotments of land, was weighed down by the weight of the landlords 'latifundia, and the poorer peasantry was therefore interested in expropriating the landlords' property. The second group is the middle peasantry. This group owned an average amount of land that allowed farming without exploiting hired labor, but their land allotment was also completely insufficient. The third group is a small minority of the peasant bourgeoisie associated with capitalist land ownership. And finally, the fourth is the "serfdom latifundia" of the landlords. Combining all these forms of land relations into two large groups, Lenin drew the following economic conclusion: before the revolution, 10 million households of the peasant poor and middle peasants had 73 million dessiatines of land, and 28 thousand "noble and dirty landlords — 62 million dessiatines" *(Lenin)* .

Along with the petty bourgeoisie in the countryside under capitalism , there is also *the urban petty bourgeoisie*, which is also moving out of the feudal system — handicraftsmen and artisans. In the city, artisans and artisans are also becoming more and more differentiated. Most of them are proletarised, deprived of the means of production, and become wage-workers, while a small proportion are forced into the position of capitalist exploiter-entrepreneurs.

It is clear that the peasant bourgeoisie is in no way inclined to destroy the existing capitalist mode of production. The kulaks are interested in *preserving and developing capitalism in the countryside* . It is to this end that it fights against landed proprietorship. For the kulaks, the destruction of the remnants of feudalism and serfdom means strengthening the power of capitalism. The peasant bourgeoisie does not go further than this, and cannot go further.

The petty bourgeoisie occupies a different and contradictory position on this question. The process of decomposition of a small producer goes through a hard struggle. The small producer, feeding on the illusions of his dwarf economy, tries *to defend his individual economy* . To do this, he endures an extremely long working day, and hunger and material need. But the oppression of capitalism also affects the small producer. Capitalism, in Marx's words, denies "private property obtained by personal labor[194]." The capitalist state, by its taxes, levies, etc., aggravates the oppression of the capitalist system. Therefore, the small producer also tries to make a change in the existing capitalist relations of production. But the small producer seeks *to change the existing relations so that its existence as a small commodity producer is preserved* . The petty bourgeois seeks to stop the historical movement or even turn the wheel of history back to pre-capitalist relations. That is why his ideals of changing the existing capitalist relations of production are

192 В. Ленин / Соч., т. III — с. 130.

193 В. Ленин, Две тактики социал-демократов в демократической революции / Соч., т. VI — с. 170.

194 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 786.

utopian and *reactionary* .

While preserving the basis of capitalism — commodity production - the petty bourgeois seeks to eliminate only the inevitably destructive consequences of the development of capitalism. "Small producers are a *transitional class*," says Lenin[195]. As a transitional class, the small producers are hostile to the big bourgeoisie, and at the same time they are allied with it as owners of the means of production. That is why the petty bourgeoisie cannot play the role of a leading fighter in the struggle against the big bourgeoisie for the transformation of the existing mode of production. Small producers cannot play a leading role in the revolution. But the small producers (the rural poor and the middle peasantry) can, *under the leadership of the proletariat* fight both the remnants of feudalism and the bourgeoisie.

Although the small and middle peasantry is directly or indirectly bearing the brunt of capitalist exploitation, it is dispersed and fragmented by the very mode of production. Very often, the exploitation of the peasantry is entangled with medieval forms (remnants of serfdom, mining, etc.), various political and legal "charms". Taken together — the dispersion of the small producer, the remnants of feudalism, etc., very often prevent the peasant from seeing the capitalist essence of exploitation. Therefore, its struggle is directed not at the essence of capitalism, but only at *individual manifestations*of the capitalist system.

On the contrary, the proletariat, united by machine industry and concentrated in industry, comes to realize that it is being exploited not only by individual capitalists, but also by the entire *класс*bourgeois class and the capitalist *system* of production as a whole. In its struggle, the proletariat seeks to destroy capitalism and thereby eliminate *all*exploitation — including that of the middle and poorest peasantry by the capitalist system. That is why the factory worker is "*the foremost representative of the entire exploited population...*"[196].

The peasant cannot change the existing capitalist mode of production because "he himself has one foot on the very ground that needs to be changed[197]." It is obvious that capitalist society can only be changed by a class that has completely severed its connection with the ownership of the means of production. And when (Lenin foresaw this time) the working class, which has severed its connection with individual property, realizes its historical mission and acts as a leading force not only in the proletarian but also in the bourgeois democratic revolution, "then the' working ' peasantry, placed in backward and inferior conditions, will see 'how this is done'. and he will join his comrades..."[198].

If the peasantry is incapable of taking up the struggle against capitalism independently, without the leadership of the proletariat, then the artisans and handicraftsmen — representatives of the urban petty bourgeoisie-are equally incapable of carrying out this struggle*городской*.

4.5.3. Intelligentsia and other social groups

In addition to the proletariat, the urban and rural bourgeoisie, and the remnants of the big landowners, peasants, and artisans, we find in capitalist society a special group of intellectual workers — *the intelligentsia* .

Can we speak of the intelligentsia as a special independent social *class* ? This view, sometimes expressed by some of the "Marxists", we must resolutely reject. The intelligentsia *is not homogeneous in its class affiliation* .

Engineers, technicians, agronomists, veterinarians, doctors, etc. work both in urban industry

---

195 В. Ленин / Соч., т. I — с. 247.

196 В. Ленин / Соч., т. I — с. 199.

197 В. Ленин / Соч., т. I — с. 253.

198 В. Ленин / Соч., т. I — с. 253.

and in agriculture, and the place in the production system and the class role of different layers of the intelligentsia are completely different: for example, a lawyer serving the bourgeoisie or an engineer and a rural teacher. Common features of the most diverse groups of intellectuals are *the mental work they perform*, "spiritual production". But despite these common features, the intelligentsia is not a class-homogeneous group. Intellectuals do not occupy any *particular place* in the system of social production. Capitalism develops a particularly strong *antithesis* between *mental and physical labor* . While workers are forced to spend their entire lives doing nothing but manual labor, stifling all opportunities for intellectual development, under capitalism a special group of people is created who are engaged exclusively, or almost exclusively, in mental labor.

Therefore, if the intelligentsia does not occupy a certain strictly delimited place in the system of social division of labor, then it occupies one of the poles of the opposite between mental and physical labor. This peculiar situation determines the peculiarity of the intelligentsia as a social group.

Let us see what the attitude of the intelligentsia is towards *the means of production* . For the most part, the intelligentsia does not own the means of production. In this respect, the so-called technical intelligentsia, i.e., a group of intellectuals directly connected with the production process, occupies the same position in capitalist society as the proletariat. But the role of the intelligentsia (especially the technical intelligentsia) in the system of capitalist production is radically opposed to the role of the worker in production. While the worker is a direct producer who creates surplus value, the engineer and technician act as managers in production. For engineers, agronomists, and managers, the functions of managing production are combined with the functions of coercion and supervision of workers. The capitalist entrusts the functions of supervision to his representatives, represented by the technical intelligentsia. In this way, the intellectual acts as a representative of capital and as such opposes the proletariat. This special position of the technical intelligentsia, whether it is opposed to the proletariat or adjacent to it in its separate links, shows that the intelligentsia is not a special, separate class.

The different position of the intelligentsia also determines the peculiarity of different groups of intellectuals in *the ways and amounts of obtaining their share of social wealth* .

A part of the lower intelligentsia is exploited by capital. This part of the intelligentsia creates surplus value for capital (for example, paramedic personnel and ordinary doctors in capitalist medical institutions, reporters, writers in newspaper trusts, teachers of private capitalist educational institutions and educational institutions, etc.). This category of intelligentsia receives wages, although higher than those of the average worker, yet the economic nature of the method of obtaining a share of social wealth is the same as that of the worker. *The sale of their own labor* , intellectual and partly physical, is a source of wages here. The other is the highest part of the intelligentsia, although it also does not own the means of production, but, occupying a commanding position in production and in public life, performs the functions of capital by its proxy. Therefore, the higher intelligentsia is not only paid, but also *supported by the surplus value* extracted from the workers. The capitalist, directly or indirectly through the society, pays *an increased tax rate.* the salary of the intelligentsia in production, in the press, in universities, etc.

Finally, among the intelligentsia, there is also a group of "liberal professions" (for example, doctors, lawyers with private practice, single writers, artists, etc.) who act as artisans in social production*ремесленники*. They conduct their work individually, receiving remuneration from the individuals and institutions they serve. Under capitalism, this group occupies a position similar to that of the petty bourgeoisie. Therefore, this category, like the entire petty bourgeoisie, is constantly *being differentiated* . Some of them are beginning to expand their practice, starting hospitals with hired doctors, middle and lower medical personnel, organizing notary offices, publishing houses, etc.The other part is increasingly forced to resort to selling their labor force.

Such is the peculiar position of the intelligentsia in capitalist society, which makes it impossible to regard the intelligentsia *as an independent*class.

Lenin wrote that the bourgeois intelligentsia "*is not an independent economic class* and therefore does not represent any independent political force." But at the same time, it would be

wrong to think that the intelligentsia in a class society is *an extra-class or classless*group. In a class society, there can be no social groups standing outside of classes and the class struggle. In the same way, the intelligentsia, depending on what place it occupies in social production, what role it plays in the process of production and in social life, and with what classes it associates itself, is classified as one or another class.

The intelligentsia always links its destinies with the fate of the *class it serves* . Representatives of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia have repeatedly tried to portray the intelligentsia as a social group that stands above the class struggle and therefore is supposedly called upon to act as an "impartial judge" in the class struggle. In support of this, the Russian authors referred to the *Russian intelligentsia* , which emerged from various classes of pre-reform Russia and allegedly remained "silent", i.e., standing above limited class interests. In order to dispel this fog, Lenin pointed out, "we must compare the ideas and even more so the programs of our 'wordless intelligentsia' with the position and interests of these classes of Russian society." Then it will become clear that the Russian intelligentsia, in its ideological aspirations, did not really go beyond the interests of the class to which it belonged. "Wordlessness, "Lenin pointed out," does not in the least exclude *the class origin of the ideas of the intelligentsia*."

Based on this, Lenin divided the intelligentsia into bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, and revolutionary-socialist groups.

*The bourgeois intelligentsia*is connected with the bourgeoisie and serves it. "Is it really possible to deny," Lenin wrote, "that Russian universities and other educational institutions produce every year such an" intelligentsia " that seeks only someone who will feed it? Can it really be denied that the means necessary for the maintenance of this "intelligentsia" are now available in Russia only to the bourgeois minority? Will the bourgeois intelligentsia in Russia disappear because the " friends of the people "say that it" could " serve a non-bourgeoisie? Yes," it could", Lenin continued, " if there were no bourgeoisie and capitalism in Russia[199]."

This instruction of Lenin contains simultaneously two most important theses. First, that under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the bulk of the intelligentsia inevitably serves the ruling class and is therefore itself *bourgeois* . Secondly, the question of *the possibility of using the bourgeois intelligentsia*under the dictatorship of the proletariat is already raised here.

Since there is a petty bourgeoisie in society, an advanced ideological group of this class is inevitably formed in the person *of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia* . For example, narodism in Russia represented the ideology of the petty bourgeoisie. The intelligentsia was more capable of expressing "the interests of the broad mass of the bourgeoisie and the peasantry" *(Lenin)* . The petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, which is powerless in itself, draws its strength from the sources of the class with which its conditions of existence are connected. The petty bourgeoisie, by its very nature, *vacillates* between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This social essence of the petty bourgeoisie determines both the programs and the mode of action of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia. At the same time, this intermediate, vacillating position of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia creates *illusions* petty-bourgeois " democrats "who imagine that they stand above classes and class interests and speak for"the whole of society."

Only the proletariat, when it organizes itself into a class, creates its own party, unites around itself the consistently revolutionary, *revolutionary-socialist intelligentsia* , and distinguishes *the proletarian intelligentsia from its midst* . This category of intelligentsia links its entire life and activity with the proletariat. The representatives of the socialist-revolutionary and proletarian intelligentsia under capitalism are *professional revolutionaries* who stand out from among the proletariat and pass into the ranks of the proletariat from among other classes-the bourgeoisie , the petty bourgeoisie — and become ideologues of the new class.

These "few intellectuals," Lenin said of them, "go to the circles of propagandists of the Workers' Party… But of course such intellectuals go, if not to a heroic death, then indeed to a heroic

199 В. Ленин, Что такое «друзья народа» / Соч., т. I — с. 147.

life of hard labor as a poorly paid, half-starved, eternally overworked, exhausted to the point of impossibility party rank-and-file" *(Lenin)* .

In capitalist society, there are very few cadres of proletarian intellectuals who come directly from the ranks *of the working*class. Few single proletarians have the opportunity to get an education and engage in intellectual work. Some of them devote all their activities to the service of the workers ' movement. A section bribed by the bourgeoisie goes over to its side and betrays the interests of its class. Such, for example, are the social-democratic leaders, ministers, trade union bureaucrats, etc.

Along with the representatives of intellectual labor under capitalism, we find social *groups* associated with the existence *of the bourgeois state* : civil servants, civil servants, police, cadre officers, etc.The different position of these groups brings them closer to the petty and middle bourgeoisie and makes them for the most part loyal servants of capitalist society.

In addition to these classes and groups, there are other social groups in capitalist society that are also not independent classes by their economic status. Such, for example, *are the declassified elements* , the so-called lumpen proletariat (beggars, criminals, prostitutes, etc.). These elements are deprived of ownership of the means of production. Forced to live outside of a productive life, without a labor connection, these elements are an inevitable consequence of the capitalist economy. They are the least capable of playing a leading role in the revolution. Often these declassified elements are a blind force that the bourgeoisie uses *against the bourgeoisie.* revolutions.

4.6. The class struggle of the proletariat and its forms

Thus of all the classes of capitalist society the proletariat is *the only one* a consistently revolutionary class capable of revolutionizing the existing capitalist relations of production.

All other classes and groups in capitalist society are either directly interested in the preservation of capitalism, or they are destroyed as independent classes along with the development of capitalism and are unable to wage a revolutionary struggle against capitalism without the leadership of the proletariat. Only the proletariat, together with the development of large-scale industry, develops as a class, and its class interests find themselves in irreconcilable contradiction with the interests of the bourgeoisie.

In its struggle against capitalism, the proletariat, as Engels and Lenin point out, develops *three main forms of class struggle: economic, political, and ideological* .

While the capitalists, in their class struggle against the proletariat, enjoy all their economic dominance and the means of their state apparatus, the strength of the proletariat is its *organization, cohesion, and class consciousness* the need to overthrow the existing mode of production. The capitalists are no less aware of this than the workers themselves. Therefore, the capitalists strive by all means to prevent the organization of the proletariat. To do this, they use all sorts of means, up to *the state* interventions. The bourgeoisie bans trade unions, declares strikes illegal, bans political parties of the working class, drives these parties underground wherever they appear, bans and confiscates the seal of the revolutionary party of the working class, and so on.

But when, in spite of all these measures, the working class does organize itself in trade unions, creates its own political party, its own press, etc., then the capitalists try to break up the strength of the working class along with these measures and by other means-by *bribing certain groups of the working class*. They are beginning to better pay the highly skilled part of the working class. The bourgeoisie also applies political bribery in the form of admitting opportunist professional and political leaders who have gone over to its side to parliaments, municipalities, etc.

Opportunists distort the very concept of class struggle. They seek to limit the field of activity in the class struggle of the proletariat *to only one economic struggle* . For example, " economists "in Russia in the 90-900-ies believed that any clash between a worker and a capitalist — for" a penny on the ruble " — in itself is already a political struggle. The "economists" recognized only the rudimentary form of the class struggle, without understanding the qualitative peculiarity of its developed form, i.e., *the political*struggle. Similarly, the reformist trade unions in England consider

it necessary to limit the struggle of the working class to protecting its economic interests. They deny the inevitability of the struggle of the working class against the capitalist mode of production as a whole, and the necessity of political organization of the working class.

Lenin pointed out that such an understanding of the class struggle is *a liberal, not a Marxist, understanding* of it . Any liberal bourgeois will accept a tolerable situation in which the workers will fight for their *partial rights.* demands without turning the economic struggle into *a political* one .

But even when talking about a political struggle, the opportunists propose to fight only for small concessions — only for reforms. Within the capitalist system, the Social Democrats distort the Marxist understanding of the class struggle, because in essence they deny the need for a revolutionary overthrow of the rule of capital and the destruction of the bourgeois state machine. During the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Mensheviks became active defenders of the capitalist system and the bourgeois state.

"Liberalism," says Lenin, " is ready to recognize the class struggle even in the sphere of politics, but on one condition that it does not include the organization of State power[200]." The Marxist-Leninist conception of the class struggle necessarily presupposes *the political organization* of the proletariat in the person of its revolutionary *party* , the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, the destruction of the capitalist mode of production, the destruction of the bourgeois state — the struggle *for the proletarian revolution, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for communism* .

An essential condition of the revolutionary class struggle is *a revolutionary theory* . "Without a revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement" *(Lenin).*

Marxism-Leninism is such a revolutionary theory. This theory grew directly out of the practice of the revolutionary struggle as the experience of the working-class movement of all countries and as a reworking of all previous scientific knowledge on the basis of dialectical materialism. Without theory, a revolutionary movement loses " confidence, the power of orientation, and an understanding of the inner connection of surrounding events." Only revolutionary theory helps " practice to understand not only how and where classes are moving in the present, but also how and where *they should*move in the near future[201]."

A necessary component and form of the class struggle of the proletariat is its struggle in the field of theory and ideology-*the ideological*struggle. It is a struggle for the purity of the class consciousness of the proletariat, its class ideology, and against subjugating it to a bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology hostile to the proletariat. It finds its expression in agitation, in propaganda, in the workers ' press.

4.7. The Bourgeois State

In its struggle, the proletariat must overcome not only the economic resistance of the ruling classes, but also their political resistance, which is carried out with the help of the bourgeois state apparatus. The bourgeois state is a *special organ*of the bourgeoisie for suppressing the resistance of the proletariat.

Using the state apparatus, the bourgeoisie carries out the dictatorship of its class — its economic and political domination. In bourgeois society, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie assumes *various forms*of state, depending on the nature of the class struggle, ranging from bourgeois democracy to fascist dictatorship in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

For *bourgeois democracy* what is characteristic is the formal equality of citizens before the state, with the de facto rule of the minority over the majority, the rule of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people. Parliamentarism, universal suffrage,

200 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 399.

201 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 20.

freedom of assembly, freedom of the press — all these features of bourgeois democracy, which transform every member of bourgeois society into a "free" and "equal" citizen, actually serve the interests of capital.

The system *of parliamentarism and bourgeois suffrage*, under conditions of bourgeois" freedom "of the press and the corresponding "processing" and deception of the working people in bourgeois schools, churches, etc., fully provide the bourgeoisie with the necessary selection of "people's representatives". The system of parliamentarism serves the bourgeoisie in order to enable the proletariat, once a year or every three years, to express an opinion on which member of the ruling class, elected by universal suffrage, will oppress and oppress the working class. This is the essence of bourgeois parliamentarism. Bourgeois democracy is also characterized *by the division of power*into legislative (in parliaments), executive, and judicial branches. But in parliaments, they only talk with the special purpose of inflating the "common people"[202]. Real "state" work is done behind the scenes of parliaments: in the offices of ministers, in general staffs, in the offices of banks, on the stock exchange and in trusts. At the same time, the capitalists themselves should not always act as direct executors of the will of the bourgeoisie in certain state posts. This is all the more possible because in a bourgeois state, capital also *directly bribes state officials* and parliamentary figures and draws them to its side *косвенным*indirectly — by presenting profitable and lucrative positions in enterprises, banks and trusts to individual representatives of the state apparatus.

The bourgeoisie and the social fascists portray bourgeois democracy as the personification of eternal justice, as the exercise of the rights and "will" of the majority. In reply to this, Lenin shows that there is no democracy "in general", that this democracy is *bourgeois* democracy, that in bourgeois democracy we have *a special form of the state* , i.e., a form of oppression of one class by another, a form of suppression by the minority of the majority. This is the only correct, Leninist understanding of bourgeois democracy.

Does this mean that it does not matter to the proletariat whether there is an absolute monarchy or a bourgeois-democratic republic? No, the proletariat is not indifferent to the form of the State that exists in a given period of class struggle. If, for example, there is an absolute monarchy, it means that the feudal classes are still strong and enjoy power. Therefore, the proletariat has to fight not only the bourgeoisie, but also the remnants of feudalism and absolute monarchy.

If a bourgeois-democratic republic has become established, then the class contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie appear, so to speak, in their purest form; they are not complicated by the struggle against the remnants of the feudal classes and the monarchy. Therefore, in a bourgeois-democratic republic, the proletariat and its party must use bourgeois *universal suffrage as one of the means of mobilising the working masses* . By voting for the Communist Party, the proletariat shows that it has already realized the need for a revolutionary overthrow of the existing bourgeois State. This is all that universal suffrage can and does not give to the proletariat. Engels explicitly says that universal suffrage is only "*an indicator of the maturity of the working class* . It *cannot*and will never give more in the present state[203]."

Meanwhile, the social-fascists, who deny the dictatorship of the proletariat, are trying to convince the working class that the latter, by exercising universal suffrage, can *мирного*gain power by peaceful "voting". Therefore, the social-fascists argue, no violent revolution is necessary. Marxism-Leninism, even in its early stages of development, refuted the opportunist notion that the proletariat could change existing relations by peaceful means. Practice has confirmed the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theory of necessity and possibility *only in a revolutionary way* break capitalism. The October Revolution in the USSR is the best proof of the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theory. On the other hand, one can point to MacDonald's so-called "workers ' government" in England. This government was essentially no different from any other bourgeois

202 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XXI — с. 401.

203 Ф. Энгельс, Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства.

government, since its entire state policy was aimed at protecting the interests of capital and at suppressing the proletariat and colonial peoples. Therefore, for the time being, the capitalists tolerate the so-called workers ' or social-fascist government, willingly include social-fascists in the bourgeois governments, and use them to carry out their policies through the hands of social-fascist and similar "workers '" ministers. But if a "socialist" or "workers '"government or individual social-fascist ministers" in defiance of reason "or" in defiance of the elements " attempted to touch even one of the essential interests of capital, the bourgeoisie would immediately drive out such a government and such ministers.

The rule of the capitalists in the bourgeois state is maintained not only by parliamentarism, but also by such material means of influence as *the army, the police, prisons, and the courts* . All these organizations are in the hands of the ruling classes or officials who serve the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Freedom of the press in a bourgeois State is only freedom for the bourgeoisie, i.e., for the minority. For the proletariat, which does not have its own printing houses, newspapers, and magazines, "freedom of the press" in a bourgeois state is impracticable. We are not even talking about cases where the bourgeois state (despite the so-called "freedom of the press") confiscates and bans the communist press (for example, in Germany, America, etc.). All that has been said about freedom of the press also applies to the "freedom" of assemblies that are actually banned and dispersed by the police.

Thus universal suffrage, parliamentarism, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, etc., i.e., *all* forms of bourgeois democracy, are aimed at maintaining the rule of the bourgeoisie, i.e., an insignificant minority. Hence it is clear that *bourgeois democracy is nothing but a State form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie* .

That is why the working class, which overthrows capitalism, must break down the old state machine and replace it with a new one, and oppose *the dictatorship of the proletariat to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie* .

The bourgeoisie, having won State power, needed a State apparatus to suppress and oppress the working masses. The old feudal state apparatus was mostly suitable for this. The bourgeoisie has only slightly modified it, adapting it to the conditions of its own rule, but it has retained all its characteristic features as machines for the oppression of the exploited masses. The proletariat conquers State power in order to destroy all exploitation of man by man. The old state machine is not at all adapted for this purpose. Therefore, the proletariat, having won State power, cannot simply *improve* the old state machine. The proletariat must *break down and destroy the old bourgeois state machine* , and in its place create *a new*one — the proletarian state.

That is why Lenin says, further developing the teachings of Marx and Engels, that all previous revolutions have perfected the bourgeois state machine: "it must *be broken, broken* . This conclusion is *the main*, fundamental thing in the Marxist doctrine of the state."

"The revolution must not consist in a new class commanding and governing by means *of the old* state machine, but in *breaking* this machine and commanding and governing by means *of the new machine* »[204]."

4.8. The question of the attitude of social-fascists, anarchists, Trotskyists," left " and right opportunists to the State

On the question of the attitude towards the bourgeois state, Marxism-Leninism has long waged a struggle against social-democratic opportunism and against anarchism. Social fascism is characterized *by superstitious beliefs.* respect for the bourgeois state. The state is portrayed as a product of class cooperation, as a *kind of extra-class self-sufficient organization* that stands above the class struggle. The social-fascist Kunov returns to the Hegelian doctrine of the state as a "

204 В. Ленин, Государство и революция.

rational organism." Similar *extra-class, idealistic*theories of the state were developed in Russian literature by Plekhanov and Trotsky.

The social-fascists portray the matter in such a way that the proletariat will be able, by peaceful universal suffrage, to come to the government of the state, *to subdue it* take the old bourgeois state machine and use it to your advantage.

The social-democratic "theory" about the use of the bourgeois state machine is a clear distortion of Marxism and a denial of the basic thesis that the bourgeois state is an instrument of oppression of one class by another. At the same time, all social-fascists, from Bernstein, Kautsky, and Kunov to the renegade Trotsky, reject the dictatorship of the proletariat, fight it, and are the most active advocates of intervention against the Soviet Union.

Lenin, in his work "The State and the Revolution," showed the full extent to which the opportunists of the Second International perverted the question of the state in the pre-war period. In his special work The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Lenin showed that Kautsky, in his renunciation of Marxism, "was far ahead of Bernstein." Kautsky had to pervert Marx's direct and clear instructions in such a way that, according to him, Marx allegedly spoke of the dictatorship of the proletariat not as a "form of government", but only as a "state" that would take place when the proletariat reached *a peaceful settlement.* political power in the modern bourgeois state. Lenin revealed the whole political and theoretical confusion of this division of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a "form of government" and a "state." Lenin showed that all the opportunists of the Second International, including Kautsky, systematically ignored and ignored Marx's instructions about the need *to break down and smash*the bourgeois state machine. Kautsky was convicted by Lenin of direct fraud on this point.

In his latest work, The Materialist Understanding of History, Kautsky tries to "wriggle out" of the awkward situation in which he has fallen. It seeks to "prove" that Marx did not speak of the destruction of the bourgeois state in general, but only *of a special form of it, namely, the bureaucratic-militaristic form of the state* . Marx "did not have in mind the state,"writes Kautsky," but a bureaucratic — militaristic machine, and consequently only a special form of the state, a form of military — bureaucratic monarchy[205]."

Kautsky continues to take the point of view of the separation *of form* the state machine depends on its class *content* . The political meaning of Kautsky's perversion is as follows: Since Marx allegedly spoke of destroying the state machine only of a military-bureaucratic nature, it is impossible to break the state machine in bourgeois-democratic republics.

Kautsky also perverts Marx here. Kautsky suggests to Marx that only the military-militaristic form of the state should be" destroyed". Meanwhile, it is enough to look through the last chapter of the 18th Brumaire (about which Marx writes in a letter to Kugelmann) to make it clear that Marx is talking about the destruction of the bourgeois state machine in general, bourgeois *parliamentarism* .

Marx points out that "the overthrow of the parliamentary republic contains the germ of the triumph of the proletarian revolution." Revolution, according to Marx, does its job thoroughly: "First it creates parliamentary power in its most complete form, only to overthrow it later. And then, when this is achieved, the same fate befalls the executive branch." "All the revolutions," says Marx, " have perfected this machine, instead of breaking it." From the course of Marx's reasoning, it is clear that it is a question of destroying the bourgeois state machine, together with its *parliamentarism*and executive power, which reaches a bureaucratic-militaristic form. And here, too, the social-fascist Kautsky did not do without fraud!

The views of anarchists are opposed to social opportunism and social fascism *анархистов*. The anarchists demand *the destruction of every State* , without recognizing the necessity of a new State in the transition period, a proletarian State. The difference between communists and anarchists on the question of the State is as follows.

Anarchists talk about *an explosion* states, moreover, *of every kind* states. The Communists

---

205 К. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / Гиз, 1931 — с. 51. Подчёркнуто Каутским.

speak of the necessity *сломать*of breaking down the old bourgeois state machine. Communists, unlike anarchists, believe that the complete destruction of the state is possible, but only as a result of the destruction of classes, as a result of the establishment *of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat* and the construction of socialism, which gradually leads to *the withering* away of the state. Anarchists do not understand the significance of this real, basic condition for the destruction of the state. They demand in their theoretical works *the explosion*of the state "not today-tomorrow". In fact, they often turn out to be one of the pillars of the bourgeois system (anarchists in Spain).

Communists, unlike anarchists, believe that after gaining political power and destroying *the old* bourgeois state machine, the proletariat must *create a new*State machine. The new state machine is necessary for the proletariat: (a) to suppress the resistance of the exploiting classes; (b) to repel the attack of the international bourgeoisie on the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat; (c) to organize the masses of the poor and middle peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat; (d) to completely build socialism, destroy classes, and create the economic prerequisites for the complete withering away of the State.

This is the dialectic of the social process: for the actual destruction *of all the state needs a new type* of state , a dictatorship of the proletariat; it needs the strengthening of the proletarian state, which, by creating conditions for the destruction of classes, thereby prepares the prerequisites for its own *withering* away . The proletarian state is the organ of the proletariat's suppression of the exploiting classes. But the policy of the proletarian State *leads to the annihilation of all classes* . Together with the abolition of classes, after a new socialist discipline of labor is established and the need to defend the proletarian state from external enemies disappears, together with the gigantic development of the productive forces in communist society, after the principle of "to each according to his needs" is implemented, the state will also die out. The proletarian state *is dying* out in contrast to the old bourgeois state machine, which must be *destroyed* , broken down by the proletariat and replaced *by a new*one in the process of the proletarian revolution.

Anarchists do not understand this dialectic of the social process, and they do not clearly understand how to replace the old state machine. While rejecting the state of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, the anarchists, under the guise of "ultra-revolutionary" phrases, carry through essentially reactionary ideas that disarm the proletariat. By denying the role and significance of the State of the proletarian dictatorship for the destruction of classes and the building of socialism, the anarchists *disarm the proletariat* and they are objectively on the side of the exploiting classes.

In addition, the Communists demand that the proletariat be prepared for revolution by *using all the means of the modern bourgeois state*(bourgeois suffrage, bourgeois parliaments, etc.). At the stage of the bourgeois revolution, therefore, they are fighting against the remnants of feudal statehood, for a democratic republic, in which the process of class struggle is usually more widely developed. The anarchists do not recognize and deny any possibility of using the bourgeois state for the struggle of the working class.

The Communists are fighting both the social fascists, who are striving to preserve the old bourgeois state apparatus, and the anarchists, who do not understand the significance and role of the dictatorship of the proletariat for the construction of socialism.

It is characteristic that opportunist deviations from the general line of the party are inextricably linked with a mistaken understanding of the question of the State.

For example, even in the early period of his activity, Comrade Bukharin made *anarchist mistakes* on the question of the state. In 1916, in an article published in the journal International of Youth, Comrade Bukharin drew a distinction between revolutionary socialists and anarchists, but he saw this difference only in the fact that revolutionary social-democracy wants to organize new social production as centralized and *technically progressive* , as opposed to anarchists who want to organize a decentralized and therefore *technically backward production.* production. Tov. Bukharin ignored at that time the most essential difference between Communists and anarchists, namely, their different *attitude towards the transitional state* . Also in this article, t. Bukharin emphasized his "fundamental hostility to the state," *to every* state, i.e., he said the same thing as the

anarchists; he defended their theory *взрыва*of the state exploding, as opposed to the Marxist-Leninist theory *of the destruction of the bourgeois state.* states. Lenin wrote about this Bukharin error that vol. Bukharin did not notice the main difference between communists and anarchists — on the question of the state.

The same anarchist mistakes are made by vol. Bukharin also did this in another article on the state, written in the same period, but published today[206]. In his review of Lenin's The State and Revolution, Comrade Bukharin also clearly failed to take into account the colossal economic and political tasks facing the dictatorship of the proletariat and requiring the assistance of the proletarian state. The same thing was repeated in 1919 in a special article by vol. Bukharin's "Theory of the Proletarian Dictatorship"[207], in the chapter "General Theory of the State". Here, too, Comrade Bukharin does not say a word about the role and significance of the transitional State in preparing for the withering away of the State in general. He did not include the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat as an integral part of the Marxist doctrine of the State. The necessity of a state of transition, Comrade Bukharin did not determine *the internal necessity of a state of transition.* the need to build socialism, and the presence *of external*hostile forces, imperialist states[208].

Comrade Bukharin "forgot" the *role* of the proletarian state as the organizer of the peasant masses under the leadership of the proletariat in *the Soviet system* . In the future, these errors are called Bukharin's views took on an increasingly pronounced right-wing opportunist character. In his Theory of Historical Materialism, he portrays the state mechanically, as an additional *condition of equilibrium* between classes, as the "protection" of class society. After the victory over the bourgeoisie, the proletarian state becomes, according to Comrade Bukharin, an instrument of "civil peace" *сотрудничества*and class cooperation. In his report Lenin as a Marxist, Comrade Bukharin spoke of the "lowering of the state curve" under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Comrade Bukharin's theory of the state inevitably led to the disarmament of the proletariat in the struggle against the kulaks, complementing his theory of the peaceful growth of the kulak into socialism. Thus the early anarchist errors of vol. Bukharin's views on the question of the state were closely linked to opportunism in the collectivization of agriculture and the class struggle in the transition period.

The Trotskyist conception of the State was entirely imbued *with idealism* . The essence of Trotsky's theory of the state boils down to the fact that the state can arise and develop not as a product of irreconcilable class struggle, but as a result of the need for state self-defense against stronger neighboring states. It is not the class struggle that determines the development of the State, but the State itself is *a self-sufficient organization* that stands *above all others.* the company. Trotsky most clearly developed this view of the Russian state, which is close to Plekhanov's views,in his book 1905. Trotsky, like Plekhanov, tries to find an explanation for the social process of Russia's development in the external, *geographical*environment. The "geographical bias" is a characteristic feature of both Plekhanov's and Trotsky's extra-class theories of the state.

Along with the geographical environment, other external factors also played a decisive role in the development of the autocracy, according to Trotsky*внешние* forces — Russia's international relations with other states. More developed social and state relations in Western Europe "put pressure" on Russian social life. "With the relatively weak development of international trade, inter-state military relations played a decisive role. The social influence of Europe was primarily felt through the medium of military equipment[209]." In the course of the struggle with the more advanced Western European countries, the Russian state was formed, according to Trotsky. "In order to hold

---

206 Н. Бухарин, статья / Сб. Революция и право, Комакадемия, 1924.

207 Сб. Атака — с. 100.

208 Сб. Атака — с. 100.

209 Л. Троцкий, 1905 год — с. 18.

out against better-armed enemies, the Russian state was forced to start up its own industry and equipment[210]."

But industry and technology need funds. The state took these funds not only from the peasants, but, it turns out, also from the ruling classes. "With requests and threats, exhortations, and violence, it took money from merchants and monasteries. The peasants fled, the merchants emigrated[211]." "The autocratic state absorbed a disproportionately large share of the surplus product," i.e., "lived off the newly formed privileged classes and thereby retarded their already slow development[212]."

Thus, according to Trotsky, it turns out that the state is a kind *of extra-class organization.* the power of state defense against external attacks, which equally fleeces and *exploits both the ruling and oppressed classes* .

At the same time, the more centralized and independent the state is from the ruling classes, "the sooner it becomes a *self-sufficient organization standing above society* »[213]." Trotsky extends this understanding of the state not only to the Russian state alone. He believes that "to a certain extent, what has been said applies, of course, to every other European state[214]."

The chapter of Trotsky's book dealing with the peculiarities of the historical development of Russia (where the extra-class theory of the state develops) appeared for the first time in Russian in 1907 in the book "Our Revolution". According to Trotsky himself, it was caused " directly by the desire to historically justify and theoretically justify the slogan of the conquest of power by the proletariat, which is opposed both to the slogan of a bourgeois-democratic republic and *to the slogan of a democratic government of the proletariat and peasantry* »[215]."

Trotsky needed an idealistic, extra-class theory of the state in order to counter Lenin's slogan of the revolutionary — democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry with the Trotskyist slogan: "without a tsar, but a workers' government." Indeed, both this slogan and Trotsky's general idea of the state as a "self-sufficient organization" are closely linked to the Trotskyist underestimation of the peasantry in the historical development of Russia, to the Trotskyist tendency towards bureaucracy and administration, and to Trotsky's misunderstanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a form of alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat.

This idealistic understanding of the state and its role is also reflected in modern "left" opportunism, with its bureaucratic administration, jumping over the stages of the state's demise, and so on.

4.9. Class struggle in the age of imperialism

At the highest stage of the development of capitalism, after the transition from the epoch of industrial capital to the present stage of imperialism, the division of society into two large camps is particularly clearly revealed. At one pole, all the wealth of exploiters is gradually concentrated, while at the other pole, all the horrors of capitalist exploitation and poverty appear.

Under imperialism, all the factions of the ruling class are increasingly *rallying* against the

---

210 Л. Троцкий, 1905 год — с. 18.

211 Л. Троцкий, 1905 год — с. 19.

212 Л. Троцкий, 1905 год — с. 20.

213 Л. Троцкий, 1905 год — с. 23.

214 Л. Троцкий, 1905 год — с. 18.

215 Л. Троцкий, Наша революция — с. 296.

impending proletarian revolution. At the same time, the proletarian masses are increasingly opposed not *to individual* capitalists, but *to the entire capitalist mode of production and the bourgeois state* . At the same time, the movement of oppressed nationalities and colonies is joining the general front of the struggle against imperialism *угнетённых национальностей и колоний*. The revolutionary liberation movement of the peasant masses of the countries and colonies oppressed by imperialism transforms these masses into *reserves*of the proletarian revolution.

Against the background of the extreme aggravation of contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, *State power is becoming particularly important* . State power is increasingly assuming the character *of an open dictatorship of the bourgeoisie* . The most typical expression of this dictatorship is *fascism and the fascist state* . "The political peculiarities of imperialism," Lenin noted, " are reaction along the whole line..."[216]

As we have already explained, under imperialism imperialist *wars are inevitable* , since they are caused by the internal contradictions of imperialism itself. Therefore, under imperialism, armaments are being strengthened more and more, and spending on the army is growing. A respite between wars only means preparing for a new war. The burden of State spending on the army and armament falls entirely on the shoulders of the working class, the laboring strata of the peasantry and the small employees. Taxes are being increased, unemployment benefits are being reduced, and so on. The oppression of militarism adds an additional burden to the exploitation that the working class is experiencing. Class contradictions escalate to an extreme degree. But simultaneously with the aggravation of class contradictions and the growing division into two large camps, economic foundations are being created for the development *of opportunism among the upper working class* .

Imperialism delivers monopolistically high profits to the imperialist countries by plundering the colonies. This creates an economic basis *for bribing the upper strata of the working class at the expense of super-profits* . By bribing the upper strata with higher wages, providing "warm" places, and finally by direct bribery, the imperialist bourgeoisie creates opportunist strata among the workers who link their fate with "their own bourgeoisie."

This growth of opportunism is due to the betrayal of the Second International on the eve of the imperialist war, when the Social-Democrats voted for war credits and fought for the victory of "their own bourgeoisie." Finance capital, using its economic power, subordinates to its influence not only the medium and small, but, as Lenin notes, "the smallest capitalists and proprietors." This explains the "wholesale defection of all the propertied classes to the side of imperialism" *(Lenin).* . Imperialist ideology has also penetrated the ranks of the skilled upper working class, the so-called *workers ' aristocracy* . Opportunism also developed among the upper echelons of the trade-union movement, where the trade-union leaders, separated from production and from the immediate needs of the working class, became bureaucrats *and trade-union bureaucrats* . It also penetrated the ranks of the political *party*of the proletariat, and it led to the fusion of social-democracy with the bourgeois state. The leading cadres of social-democracy and the trade union bureaucrats, bribed by imperialism, became " direct agents of bourgeois influence on the proletariat and the best support of the capitalist system[217]."

However, this direct betrayal of social-democracy by the working class has also led to the proletariat becoming increasingly free from the influence and leadership of the opportunists, who have become social fascists.

The imperialist war (1914-1918) brought the destruction of the productive forces to its extreme limits. It " destroyed an enormous amount of the means of production and human labor, ruined the broad masses of the people, and imposed incalculable burdens on the industrial workers, peasants, and colonial peoples. It inevitably *sharpened the class struggle, which developed into hidden revolutionary actions of the masses and civil war* »[218]." The October Revolution of 1917

---

216 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIX — с. 160.

217 Программа Коминтерна.

218 Программа Коминтерна.

marked the beginning of the international proletarian revolution, a whole epoch of revolutions in colonial and semi-colonial countries.

The task of social-fascism is to split the revolutionary unity of the proletariat, to prepare a new attack by the imperialists on the U.S.S.R. under the banner of pacifist phrases about disarmament, and to prepare the working class for a new imperialist slaughter. The task of social fascism is to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie and to promote the ideas of class cooperation among the working class. To achieve these goals, Social democracy has two wings: the right wing and the "left"wing. "The right wing of social-democracy, which is openly counter-revolutionary, directly pursues the policy of fascism through the hands of social-democratic ministers and policemen; the 'left' wing is necessary for playing 'opportunism' verbally at critical moments for the bourgeoisie, for particularly subtle deception of the workers[219]."

Imperialism has sharpened class contradictions to the extreme. Revolutions in a number of countries after the imperialist war prompted the bourgeoisie to resort to new methods of violence against the proletariat. The old forms of bourgeois dictatorship (parliamentarism) were exposed to broad strata of the working masses. That is why the bourgeoisie resorts to the method of direct (naked) dictatorship — *fascism* . But " the regime of fascism is not a new *type* of state. It is *a form of bourgeois dictatorship*in the imperialist era. Fascism cannot be contrasted with bourgeois democracy as a fundamentally different political form[220]." The fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie hides behind a " national idea." At the same time, the bourgeoisie exploits the discontent and impoverishment of the petty-bourgeois and intellectual masses, drawing them by means of social demagogy into the fascist movement and into fascist organizations. Fascism sometimes also penetrates the working environment, using the most backward elements in it. The main task of fascism is to defeat the communist parties as the vanguard of the proletariat and thereby decapitate the impending revolutionary movement.

Class vs class are currently opposing each other. Under the influence of the most severe economic crisis, which is developing into a revolutionary crisis, the class struggle is intensifying all over the world. The victorious socialist offensive in the U.S.S.R. is having a tremendous revolutionary effect on the masses. The bourgeoisie is trying to get out of the crisis by putting all the burdens on the shoulders of the working masses, by plundering the colonies, and by preparing a war against the U.S.S.R. Therefore, the unfolding of the class struggle in the capitalist countries, the struggle for *a revolutionary*way out of the crisis, means not only preparing for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, but at the same time defending the U.S.S.R., the fatherland of the proletarians of the whole world. Both of these tasks represent an indissoluble single task. If the imperialists attempt to start a new imperialist war, and first of all against the U.S.S.R., the proletariat will have to turn the imperialist war into a civil war and overthrow its "fatherland" bourgeoisie. In the event of war against the U.S.S.R., the proletariat will have to defend its class fatherland — the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the country of socialism under construction.

The global economic crisis causes further revolutionization of the working class, increases discontent among small public and private employees, artisans and peasants.

The development of the class struggle in the context of the further development of the world economic crisis presents the broadest working masses with a decisive choice: "Either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie — or the dictatorship of the proletariat; or economic and political slavery — or the end of capitalist exploitation and oppression; or colonial oppression and imperialist wars — or peace and fraternal relations between peoples; or capitalist anarchy and crises "or a socialist economic system that excludes anarchy and crises[221]."

---

219 Программа Коминтерна.

220 Программа Коминтерна.

221 Из тезисов по докладу Д. Мануильского на XI пленуме ИККИ.

Along with the unprecedented attack of capital on the proletariat, *active resistance is growing* the working class. "The greatest battles are coming between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie." The real revolutionary upsurge is not an opportunistic upsurge that is associated only with a general crisis. This upsurge is prepared by the entire historical contradictory development of capitalism. The most revolutionary rise is uneven. "Some countries overtake others, then move back a little, allowing themselves to get ahead of yesterday's laggards. But in spite of this unevenness, the general line of development of the revolutionary upsurge as a whole follows an ascending line[222]."

4.10. The Party of the Working Class. Strategy and tactics of struggle

The political and theoretical leader of the proletariat in its class struggle is *the Communist Party* .

The more the revolutionary situation grows, the more the class struggle becomes acute, the more important the leadership of the party becomes.

During the reign of the opportunists of the Second International, during the period of pre-monopoly capitalism, *parliamentary forms of struggle*were considered the main forms. The opportunists did not attach to the party the decisive importance that it assumes especially in the conditions of open revolutionary struggles. The political organizations of the working class did not yet have the distinctive features and distinctiveness that profoundly distinguish their structure and forms of struggle from the political parties of the bourgeoisie.

The overwhelming majority of the parties of the Second International were more adapted to the parliamentary struggle than to the immediate tasks of organizing, educating, and revolutionizing the working class. The parties of the Second International proved not to be militant parties of the proletariat, leading the proletariat to seize power, but "instruments of peace," as Kautsky put it. The parties of the Second International were overwhelmingly on the side of their national bourgeoisie during the imperialist war. Only the Russian Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin, who had always pursued the revolutionary line of class struggle, consistently continued the struggle for revolutionary Marxism, developing and deepening the theory and practice of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Even in the pre-war period, Bolshevism laid the foundation *for a new type* of party organization, radically different from the majority of the parties of the Second International in its charter, in its program, in its strategy and tactics of struggle. Imperialism confronted the entire international working-class movement with new tasks that required a restructuring of party work. There was a need for a new type of militant parties of the revolutionary proletariat, modeled on the Russian Bolsheviks. Without perestroika of the party organization and party work, a successful struggle for power, a struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, would have been impossible. Such parties are *the Communist parties* .

The distinctive feature of the Communist Party is that, first of all, it is *the vanguard of the working class* , the political leader and fighting staff of the proletariat, which is inextricably linked with its class. Secondly, the party is *an organized* detachment of the working class, *leading* the entire struggle of the proletariat, organizing and directing it along the revolutionary path. Third, the party is *the highest form*of class organization of the proletariat.

Рабочий класс *The mass of the working class*is heterogeneous. Along with the workers who have been tested in class battles, there are also less stable elements in the ranks of the proletariat. In addition, the ranks of the proletariat are constantly being replenished by people from other classes. As long as there are classes and social inequality, there will also be a difference between the party and the non-party masses. Only the best, *most advanced*section of the working class makes up the party of the working class.

As the vanguard of the working class, the party is armed with revolutionary theory,

222 Из тезисов по докладу Д. Мануильского на XI пленуме ИККИ.

knowledge of the laws and prospects of social development. That is why the party confidently leads the proletariat. The Party, as an advanced section, sees further than the other strata of the working class; it is able not only to defend the minute interests, but also *to highlight the main ones* the tasks of the proletariat in its class struggle. This allows the party *to lead* the entire class, rather than being dragged along by backward sentiments. The party *manages* by arming the spontaneous movement of the masses with organization, revolutionary theory, knowledge, and self-control, and by raising *the spontaneous movement of the masses to a new level.* movement to the level *of consciousness* . Only opportunists belittle the role of the party and see it as a mere recorder of the spontaneous backward moods of the working class. The Communist Party does not confine itself to stating what the working masses think and experience. It raises the working class to the level of consciousness of its *common*class interests; it leads the working class, being its political and theoretical leader, and at the same time its fighting headquarters.

But while leading the working class, the party must not and cannot *detach*itself from the class. The Party is not only a vanguard, but at the same time an indissoluble part of the working class. There is a distinction between the party and the non-party masses, as between the advanced and more backward sections of the working class. But the distinction between a party and non-party members must not be transformed into a separation of the party from the class. If the party were to break away from its class, it would not be able to lead the working masses, but would become a closed sect.

This dialectical interconnectedness of party and class, based on mutual trust, is completely ignored by counter-revolutionary *Trotskyism* . Trotsky methodologically supports the theory of equilibrium in this question. Since the productive forces have outgrown the framework of the national-bourgeois state, Trotsky writes, the consciousness of the masses "has been thrown out of the relative equilibrium of the preceding epoch..." But the proletariat "has not yet consciously and selflessly taken the path of open revolutionary struggle; it is wavering, experiencing the last moments of unstable equilibrium[223]."

Trotsky portrays the proletariat as a passive, blind force that depends entirely on the conditions of the external environment, on external forces, and does not know its own internal development. According to Trotsky, the proletariat fights or tries to fight capitalism not because of the internal development of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production, but because of the impulses received from outside. "A decisive push from the left or right is sufficient," says Trotsky, " to move the proletariat for a certain period in one direction or the other. We saw it in 1914, when the combination of the imperialist governments and the social-patriotic parties at once threw the working class *out of balance and into the path of imperialism* »[224]."

According to Trotsky, the imperialist governments and social-imperialists are pushing the working class to the right, while the task of the Communist Party is to push the working class to the left. The relation between the party and the working class appears as a relation between two *external forces* , one of which pushes the other out of an unstable equilibrium. This lack of understanding of the unity of the party and the working class leads Trotsky and his lordly-contemptuous and at the same time arrogant-patronizing attitude towards the proletariat.

Trotsky's view of the relationship between the proletariat and its party in essence — if we discard Trotsky's phraseological husk — even during the first Russian Revolution was reduced to the following. The Russian revolutionary *intelligentsia*set itself "democratic" tasks — the overthrow of tsarism. But the question arises: how is this feasible? What class forces can complete this task? "How can we get the strength to resume the struggle against the autocracy?" The revolutionary intelligentsia came to the conclusion that the only such force was the proletariat. This means that we must rely on the proletariat. But this necessity for the revolutionary intelligentsia to rely on the proletariat requires a certain "tribute" — the intelligentsia must therefore recognize the "class

223 Л. Троцкий, Терроризм и коммунизм — с. 21.

224 Л. Троцкий, Терроризм и коммунизм — с. 21.

doctrine of the international revolutionary proletariat".

"This is the tribute," writes Trotsky, "that a section of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia paid and still pays to the class doctrine of the international revolutionary proletariat-to Marxism, which gave it, first of all, an answer to the 'democratic', not to the 'proletarian' question: 'Where can we get the strength to resume the struggle against the autocracy', but which gave it a political position? conscience under the control of class interests, as a fighter for political freedom[225]."

Trotsky also pictured the relationship between the party and the proletariat. For Trotsky, the party is above all the revolutionary intelligentsia, which sets itself "democratic" tasks and *uses them for its own purposes.* the proletariat to carry *out its*tasks.

It is quite obvious that not only is there no Leninist understanding of the relationship between the party and the proletariat, but the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution is essentially denied. What kind of hegemony can we talk about when for Trotsky the proletariat is only a certain passive force in an unstable equilibrium, which is used by the revolutionary intellectuals, paying him a "certain tribute". It is clear that Trotsky's conception of the relationship between the proletariat and its party denies the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution.

The party leads the class in extremely difficult conditions. The party must choose correctly the moments of its attack on capitalism, the party must be able to lead the masses to retreat when the situation demands it, and so on.

These tasks can be accomplished only if the party manages to bring discipline and planning to the struggle of the vast masses of the proletariat. All the more so must the party of the proletariat itself be organized and disciplined. It is itself an *organized detachment* of the proletariat. From the very beginning of the organization of the Russian Social-Democratic Party, Lenin tirelessly fought for organization and discipline in the ranks of the proletarian party. The Party is therefore built on the basis of a certain *charter* , as a single whole with the highest and lowest organs of leadership, on the principles of democratic centralism, with the subordination of the minority to the majority, and with the leadership of the lower organs of the party by its higher organs. The decisions of the majority are binding on the minority, which is obliged to carry out these decisions, as well as on the whole party, and in the same way the decisions of the party bodies elected by the majority are binding on all lower bodies.

Along with the party, other organizations of the working class are emerging. While waging the class struggle, the proletariat creates trade unions, co-operatives, factory organizations, parliamentary factions, cultural and educational organizations, etc. Most of these organizations are non-partisan. All these organizations are necessary for the proletariat to carry on the class struggle in various directions.

But in order for the trade unions, the co-operatives, and the cultural and educational organizations to direct their work towards a single goal — the seizure of power by the proletariat — in order for these organizations not to be confined within their narrow limits, but to always link their specific tasks with the main tasks of the working class as a whole-all this requires a single *party leadership* . The Party determines the general direction, the line along which all these organizations should direct their activities towards a single goal. By giving a general direction to the work of the non-party organizations of the working class, the party concentrates the experience of the class struggle in its entirety. The Party also concentrates within itself the best fighting forces of the revolution. In this sense, the party is *the highest form*of class organization of the proletariat.

The successful struggle of the proletariat requires a correct *party line* . The struggle on two fronts, with right and" left " opportunism, is a necessary condition for the successful struggle of the proletarian party. The party line is determined at every stage of the development of the class struggle by its propaganda, by the general tasks of its *strategy and tactics* .

The class struggle of the proletariat has its own special strategy and tactics. Depending on the conditions of development of the class struggle, both strategy and tactics change. For example,

---

225 Л. Троцкий, О партии в 1904 г. / Гиз, 1928 — с. 51.

during the period of opportunism of the Second International, the main tasks were to train and form proletarian armies in an environment of more or less peaceful development. As it seemed to the parties of the Second International, at that time there was no question of the immediate impending class battles for the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is why Social-democracy has not developed a complete strategy and developed new tactics and methods of struggle. The brilliant instructions of Marx and Engels on strategy and tactics were forgotten and distorted. The parties of the Second International reduced the tactics and strategy of the class struggle almost exclusively to the parliamentary struggle.

Only Lenin restored the instructions of Marx and Engels on the strategy and tactics of the class struggle. At the same time, Lenin did not confine himself to simply restoring the instructions of Marx and Engels, but developed them further, supplemented them with new propositions, and by combining all this into a coherent system of rules and guidance for the class struggle, thereby raised strategy and tactics itself to a new and higher level.

'Strategy' - defines a t. Stalin' - there is a definition *of the direction of the main attack* of the proletariat on the basis of this stage of the revolution, the elaboration of a corresponding plan for the disposition of the revolutionary forces (main and secondary reserves), and the struggle to carry out this plan throughout this stage of the revolution." At a certain stage of development, the strategy remains largely unchanged, but each given stage of the revolution corresponds to its own strategic plan. Along with the change in this stage, other tasks in the revolution appear, and at the same time the strategic plan changes.

As T. points out Stalin, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in Russia has passed through several stages of its development. The first stage was held from 1903 to February 1917. During this period, the main strategic task of the working class was to destroy the remnants of feudalism and overthrow monarchism. The main revolutionary force capable of carrying out this strategic plan was the proletariat. Its closest reserves and ally are the peasantry. It was necessary to isolate the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie, which was striving to master and lead the peasantry and wanted to liquidate the revolution by an agreement with monarchism. This basic strategic plan also defined the party's slogans in relation to all other classes. For this stage, the party put forward the slogan: "Together with all the peasantry against the tsar and the landlords, while neutralizing the bourgeoisie, for the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution."

The strategic plan for the entire first stage remained unchanged, *макmикa*but tactics during this period changed depending on the ebb and flow of the revolutionary movement.

"Tactics," T. points out. Stalin-there is a definition *of the line of conduct of the proletariat for a relatively short period* the ebb and flow of the movement, the rise or decline of the revolution, the struggle to carry out this line by changing the old forms of struggle and organizing new ones, old slogans with new ones, by combining these forms, etc." The strategic plan sets itself the task for a certain period, for example, to win the war with tsarism. Tactics sets itself less broad tasks: it is determined both by the general strategic plan and by the given correlation of class forces. Tactics are subordinated to the strategic plan and serve the tasks of fulfilling this plan, resolving certain issues of the class struggle.

The strategic plan for the period from 1903 to February 1917 remained unchanged, but tactics changed. In the period 1903-1905, the revolutionary movement was going uphill. Therefore, the party's tactics were offensive. Offensive tactics also determined the forms of struggle of the proletariat. During this period, we have local and general political strikes, demonstrations, boycotts of the Duma, armed insurrections, etc. At the same time, the forms of organization of the proletariat changed. During this period, the factory committees, strike committees, Soviets of workers 'deputies, the more or less open Workers' Party, peasant revolutionary committees, etc.appear. The revolutionary wave was subsiding. The Party, abandoning the same strategic plan, was forced to change its tactics in the period 1907-1912. The Party had to start a tactic of retreat, a tactic of preserving the revolutionary forces, leading them out of direct combat with minimal losses, in order to lead them back into battle with tsarism at a new upsurge in the revolution. The changed situation required a change in the forms of struggle and organization of the proletariat. So, instead of

boycotting the Duma, the party takes part in the Duma, uses it as a platform to explain the essence of the liberal-monarchist Duma, to mobilize the masses around the slogans of the Bolsheviks.

The party went underground because the mass revolutionary organizations were crushed by reaction, etc.

At the next stage of the development of the struggle - from March to October 1917. The main strategic plan was to overthrow the imperialist provisional Government, establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, and break through the ring of imperialist war.

This strategic plan also defined the main slogans of the party in relation to the war, the Provisional Government and the peasantry. At this stage of the revolution, the main slogan for the peasantry was: "Together with the poorest peasantry, against capitalism in the city and in the countryside, while neutralizing the middle peasantry for the power of the proletariat." The strategic plan for the entire second period of the revolution remained unchanged, while tactics changed several times depending on the balance of class forces.

4.11. Anti-Marxist class theories

The Marxist-Leninist understanding of classes presented above shows that classes *arose* at a certain stage of historical development; the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes shows that the emergence of classes was necessarily conditioned by the development of material productive forces, and that the same development of productive forces and the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, the establishment of its dictatorship, must at a certain stage lead to *the destruction*of classes. Meanwhile, as we have already shown, it is advantageous for bourgeois scientists to portray the situation in such a way that the existing capitalist mode of production and the existence of classes is an eternal and "natural" phenomenon. For this purpose, various bourgeois class theories are put forward — the theory of the "organic" division of labor in the social organism, the theory explaining the domination of the privileged classes by their "natural abilities" , etc.

The so-called theory of violence occupies a particularly prominent place among bourgeois theories *теория насилия*. The theory of violence attempts to explain the emergence of classes not by the material development of productive forces, but by political violence, the conquest of one people or race by another. Thus, Duhring believed that " the form of political relations is the basis of history, while economic dependence is a derivative phenomenon or a special case, and therefore always remains a secondary fact." Therefore, political violence, the enslavement of one person by another, according to Duhring, is the basis of exploitation in the economic activity of people.

In his objection to Duehring, Engels pointed out that violence is possible only when the productivity of labor has already developed, when there is a surplus product. Without this economic factor, naked violence would be meaningless. Before there can be forced appropriation of other people's labor and property, there must be inequality in distribution. At best, violence can redistribute what already exists economically. "Before slavery is made possible," says Engels, " a certain stage of production and a certain inequality of distribution are therefore necessary[226]."

A the emergence of private property was based on the development of productive forces. Consequently, classes owe their origin to the development of productive forces and private property. As class inequality developed, so did political inequality and violence. The theory of violence sees the driving force of historical development not in the material productive forces, but in political institutions. Without explaining anything, it violates the actual historical course of the emergence of classes and gives an idealistic explanation of history.

But even among the theorists who call themselves "Marxists", we encounter numerous perversions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes. All these perversions, with all their diversity, have one common aim: they all blur *the irreconcilability of the class struggle* between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and lead to *the denial of the dictatorship of the proletariat* .

---

226 Ф. Энгельс, Анти-Дюринг.

In general terms, these theories can be divided into two groups:

1) distributive class theories,

2) technical and organizational concepts of classes.

The most vulgar form of the distributional theory of classes is the statement that belonging to a particular class is determined *depending on the amount of income* . From this "quantitative" point of view, several classes can also be found among the proletariat, depending on the amount of income. In the same way, several classes can be counted among the bourgeoisie. The unscientific nature of this theory is self-evident. The political harm to the proletariat in this theory is that it tries to break the unity of the working class and blunt the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

A more subtle revision of Marxism in the definition of classes is the distributional theory, which sees the class-forming moment in *the sources of income* . Such is the character of class theory, for example, in the work of Kautsky, the most prominent social-fascist theorist. As early as 1903, Kautsky believed that *a community of sources of income*and the resulting community of interests and contradictions formed one or the other class. In his work Class Interests — Special Interests — General Interests, Kautsky defined classes as follows: "Now we see what constitutes different classes. Not only the community of sources of income, but also the resulting community of interests and the community of conflicting interests in relation to other classes, each of which seeks to reduce the sources of income of other classes in order to expand its own." Kautsky thus saw the class-forming moment in the community of sources of income and in the struggle of classes for these sources, forgetting that the community of sources of income itself is determined by the relation of people to the means of production, by a certain place in a certain historical system of production.

To understand the fallacy of Kautsky's position, it is enough to give a simple example: the worker receives wages from the capitalist by selling his labor-power. An artist working on advertising can also receive a salary from the same capitalist. Both the worker and the artist earn their wages by selling their labor. They share a common source of income: the sale of labor. However, one of them belongs to the proletariat, one of the main classes of capitalist society, and the other belongs to the intelligentsia-to the intermediate stratum. What does a factory worker have in common with an artist or bookkeeper in the same factory's office? What is common is that both live and work in a capitalist society, both are deprived of the means of production, both have the same source of income — the sale of their labor (physical and intellectual) power. But what is the difference between them? The fact that the worker stands directly at the machine, creating surplus value, occupies a certain *place* in the production process and performs *a different role in the social organization of labor*-in contrast to the artist or accountant. The capitalist squeezes everything possible out of the working class, often giving concessions to management and office personnel. Kautsky, in defining classes by their sources of income, blurred the distinction between the proletariat and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, employees, etc. Moreover, by excluding the place in the capitalist mode of production and its relation to the capitalist means of production from the characteristics of classes, it opportunistically obscured the main task of the working class — the destruction of capitalist property.

Moreover, for Kautsky, the various public interests are not all class interests. "The totality of the class interests that exist in a society does not yet constitute the totality of all the social interests that exist in it in general. Artistic interests, scientific interests, gender interests, etc. are very often not class interests[227]." Kautsky therefore believed that the party could not confine itself to defending class interests. In addition to class interests, according to Kautsky, the party must also defend the so-called social, *general*interests. Already in this work we thus have a theoretical justification of Kautsky's future social-imperialism, the idea of defending the bourgeois "fatherland" with its "public interests" during the imperialist war.

---

227 К. Каутский, Классовые интересы.

In his last work, The Materialist Understanding of History, Kautsky finds it necessary to "supplement" his bourgeois-distributional theory of classes. Kautsky here supplements his theory of classes by saying that, in contrast to vol. Bukharin ' emphasizes the point of distribution of the means of production between classes.

"The division into classes," writes Kautsky, " which are hostile to each other, begins not with the division of producers into managers and executors, but with the division of the members of society into those who own the means of production and those who do not own them. The problem of class formation is a question of disposing of the means of production, and at the same time also of the products produced with their help[228]."

But by emphasizing the importance of the distribution of the means of production, Kautsky only obscures the bourgeois character of his distribution theory. It still separates from the distribution of the means of production *the role of the class in the social organization of labor* , which, in unity with the relation to the means of production, determines the place of the class in the historically determined system of production. At the same time, Kautsky finally breaks with Marxism on the question of the origin of classes and the state. Kautsky considers Engels 'scientific understanding of the origin of classes and the state to be only a "*hypothesis*", devoting a special chapter to"criticism of Engels 'hypothesis". As a result of this criticism, Kautsky is slipping into the bourgeois *theory of violence* . From Kautsky's point of view, the emergence of classes, i.e., social differentiation, cannot be explained on the basis of the internal development of the community. The emergence of classes requires a military clash between one community and another and military enslavement. "Differentiation within a community does not arise from a progressive division of labor, but rather from the collision of one community with another. It cannot be explained on the basis of the internal development of a particular community[229]alone." "In order to explain the differentiation within communities, we have to go beyond a single isolated community. Only on these paths can we find the beginnings of class division[230]."

Kautsky concludes that the class division, poverty, and exploitation in Ireland and the East Indies are explained by "the policy of violence employed by foreign conquerors[231]." In the same way, Kautsky's state arises through conquest, when some "more warlike tribes attack other tribes." To consolidate their victory, the conquerors organize the state.

Another theorist of the Second International, Kunov, does not consider the distributional theory of classes correct. But it also seeks to obscure class differences and class contradictions. In Kunov's definition of classes, the presence of common interests in this class comes to the fore. But with Kunov, as with Kautsky, it goes without saying that there are also common interests for *the whole of society* , for "life together and activity in society are impossible without a certain order, and therefore all the members of society, insofar as they do not deny any social order at all, are interested in maintaining such an order[232]." It turns out that not only the bourgeoisie but also the proletariat are interested in supporting the "order" of capitalist exploitation!

According to Kunov, " Marx does not dispute the existence of some *organic solidarity of interests between classes within society* »[233]." For example, according to Kunov, the whole society is interested in prohibiting and preventing murder. But at the same time, Kunov is silent about the

---

228 K. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / Гиз, 1931, т. II — с. 12.

229 K. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / Гиз, 1931, т. II — с. 70.

230 K. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / Гиз, 1931, т. II — с. 70.

231 K. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / Гиз, 1931, т. II — с. 81.

232 Г. Кунов, Марксова теория исторического процесса общества и государства / т. II — с. 46.

233 Г. Кунов, Марксова теория исторического процесса общества и государства / т. II — с. 68.

daily and hourly slow murder of hundreds of thousands of proletarians in factories, about the starvation of the unemployed in the army, about the fact that the entire capitalist system as a whole is a system of mass murder. About all this Kunov does not say a word, preferring to lead the reader to another area: the area of "moral" assessments.

Is the proletariat interested in preserving the entire capitalist system and the state that supports it? The social fascist Kunov believes that "the working class is most strongly interested in state institutions, in state economic policy, and in the cultural development of the state[234]."

From Kunov's point of view, the class struggle can also be well conducted by parliamentary means, and "the use of brute force is by no means a necessary condition for the class struggle." Kunov, as an agent of the bourgeoisie, tries to conduct the "class struggle" within *the framework and limits of the existing state.* of capitalism. A "class struggle" that does not go *beyond the limits* of capitalism — that is the meaning of Kunov's teaching. For Marx, the class struggle *must transcend the old*economic formation and create a new society. This is the revolutionary content of the theory of class struggle. The opportunists direct their efforts to obliterate this revolutionary content and try to portray a "class struggle" that should not extend beyond the limits of the capitalist formation.

For the same purpose, Kunov confuses the proletariat with the Lumpen proletariat, which is as little revolutionary as the petty bourgeoisie. Kunov even went so far as to say that the proletarian and the worker are not the same thing. From the point of view of Kunov, the *proletariat* includes not only certain categories of workers, but also the nobles who have sunk to the point of tramplessness (such as the" baron "in Gorky's play "At the Bottom"), and the former factory owner who has nothing to live on, the poor minor official and some poorly paid minor employees, and unemployed artists and writers, the so-called "the intelligent proletariat", or "the proletariat of standing collars". But all these "proletarians", according to Kunov, *do not belong to the state.* to the working class. On the other hand, according to Kunov, a skilled worker who receives relatively high wages is not a proletarian.

Thus, Kunov tries to divide "workers" and "proletarians" into classes according to the principle: haves and have-nots, better or worse paid. Having separated himself in words from the distributional theory, Kunov in fact remains on the same point of view — he proceeds from *the size of income* .

The social-class meaning of this Kuhnian innovation is quite clear: the bourgeoisie needs to disperse the class cohesion of the worker. It therefore seeks to separate the skilled worker from the unemployed and unskilled. For this purpose, the bourgeoisie bribes the top of the working class, pays it a little higher at the expense of colonial plunder, and creates a working aristocracy. This is capitalist practice. The theorist Kunov "justifies" this practice and provides a theoretical basis for it. A complete unity of bourgeois practice and social-fascist theory is being created!

Distributional theories of classes, while emphasizing *one* of the points of class definition (the relation to the means of production), understand it in the sense of simple property differences. They reject the historically defined system of production based on class exploitation, they reject class contradictions. They also reject the role of the class in the social organization of labor. The *technical and organizational theories* of classes, which completely lose sight of the relation to the means of production as the basis of class exploitation, and which are alien to the historicism necessary in defining classes, fall into another erroneous extreme. These theories deduce belonging to a particular class based on the *technical role*in the social organization of production, which is performed by this or that person, from their "arrangement" in the technical process.

The most typical in this respect are the class theories of Bogdanov and T. Bukharin.

Bogdanov believed that classes arise because *organizational functions* in society are increasingly separated from *executive functions* . In primitive communist society, all members of the community did the same job. But with the development of technology, with the division of labor

234 Г. Кунов, Марксова теория исторического процесса общества и государства / т. II — с. 68.

and the growth of the community, there was a need for more complex calculations and organization of the production process itself. Along with the direct performers, groups of people who organize production and wars have grown up, headed by the patriarch. Gradually, this group of people, according to Bogdanov, was separated into a special caste, whose task was only to lead; the remaining members were supposed to be only performers. Thus organizational labor was separated from executive labor, and the ruling class and the oppressed class were formed.

Although Bogdanov's theory of the origin of classes speaks of the development of productive forces, Bogdanov's construction of classes proceeds not on *the basis*of the development of productive forces and the monopoly of class rule over the means of production, but on the basis of the separation of the organizational role from the executive one. The dominant classes became dominant because they played a leading role in the production process. Bogdanov sees class domination as a function, a consequence of its leading role in production. If this theory is applied to the classes of feudal capitalist society, it means that the capitalist became a capitalist because he once played a leading, organizational role in production. In fact, the capitalist acts as an organizer, a manager in the factory, only because he is a monopolist of his own means of production. The function of leadership belongs to him because he is a capitalist. The most leading role of the capitalist is derived from the capitalist mode of production itself, from the place of the capitalist in this definite historical order, from his relation to the means of production.

Bogdanov's theory of the origin of classes is based on his *idealistic* understanding of human experience and *his mechanistic*methodology based on equilibrium theory.

The theory of equilibrium also serves as a methodological basis for determining classes in T. Bukharin's work. Society and nature, as we have already seen, are in equilibrium with Comrade Bukharin. Similarly, in a society, the various elements are in equilibrium, because the various classes are " so *fitted together* that it is possible for them to exist simultaneously."

Comrade Bukharin deals with the equilibrium of classes. Instead *of the struggle* of classes, their perpetual motion and change, their frozen equilibrium is taken as the starting point*равновесие*. Bukharin believes that the class struggle is a violation of the balance. "Fighting is a violation of balance[235]." The initial principle is taken as a state of equilibrium of classes, then this equilibrium is broken and re-established on a new basis. In Comrade Bukharin's work, the class struggle appears as a derivative moment of the equilibrium between the environment and the system, between nature and society. Bukharin defines classes as *the technical arrangement*of people in the process of production, making the distribution of the means of production subordinate. These differently placed people are divided into classes. "And the basis of this division is a different role in the production process[236]."

T. Bukharin reduces the class social relations of people "to the placement of people in space." A certain arrangement of people in space establishes the relations of production: "Each person has, as we have already written,"says Comrade Bukharin," his own place, just like a cog in a clockwork mechanism[237]."

It is worth comparing Lenin's definition of classes and Comrade Bukharin's definition of classes in order to understand the mechanistic and eclectic nature of Comrade Bukharin's definition of classes. Defining classes, Comrade Bukharin puts the role in the production process in the first place as the decisive and main feature of classes*роль*. "By social class is meant the totality of people who play *a similar role*in production, who stand in the process of production in the same relations to other people, and these relations are also expressed in things (means of labor)[238]."

---

235 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — § 23, с. 75.

236 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — § 37, с. 157.

237 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — § 37, с. 160.

238 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — § 51, с. 313.

Comrade Bukharin sees the main difference in the role of this or that individual in the production process, while Lenin highlights the *place of this class in social production*and, consequently, the relation to the means of production. "The main feature of the difference between classes is their place in social production," writes Lenin, " and, consequently, their relation to the means of production. The appropriation of one or another part of the social means of production and their conversion to private farming, to farming for the sale of the product — this is the main difference between one class of modern society (the bourgeoisie) and the proletariat, which is deprived of the means of production and sells its labor power[239]."

At first glance, the difference between Lenin's and Bukharin's formulations may seem insignificant-purely verbal. It may be asked, "What is the difference between the phrase' a similar role in production ' and 'a place in social production'?" Let's explain with an example. Take the nascent kulak who hires a farmhand. The nascent kulak may work together with its farmhand, or even work as much as the farmhand. Their" spatial arrangement", their technical role in the production process, as Comrade Bukharin defines it, can be approximately the same. And, despite this, their *place is in the public organization of production* different. One is the owner of the means of production, produces goods for sale, exploits hired labor, and the other is deprived of ownership of the means of production and is exploited by the kulak. One is a village capitalist, the other an agricultural labourer. The kulak and his labourer occupy a completely different place in social production, and have a different relation to the means of production. Hence their class distinction. The definition of classes given by Comrade Bukharin smudges the most essential aspect of the definition of classes, and therefore it has served as the theoretical basis for right-wing opportunism.

Furthermore, Bukharin's definition of classes is based *on their similar role in production* it suffers from extreme abstractness and anti-historicity. Lenin's definition of classes primarily puts forward the place of classes in *a historically defined system*of production. It is not by chance that Lenin brings to the fore a historically defined system of social production. If we compare the slaves with the modern proletariat, then both the slaves and the proletariat do not own the means of production; the proletariat, like the slaves, is exploited; the labor of the working class, like the labor of the slaves, is the basis of the material well-being of capitalist and slave-owning society. In a word, we can point out many common points where the proletariat and ancient slaves play a similar role in the production process. But on this basis, in no case can these classes be identified. Why? Because these two classes exist in completely different historical systems of production. But Comrade Bukharin's definition suffers from its anti-historical and therefore abstract character.

Summarizing the errors of T. Bukharin on the question of classes, it is necessary to note the following:

1. His definition of classes is based on a mechanistic methodology, according to which classes are people who are technically placed in a special way in space and fit together like clockwork cogs.

2. The anti-dialectical theory of equilibrium as applied to the theory of classes leads to the fact that the class struggle is replaced *by the equilibrium of class forces* . This led to Bukharin's further opportunist theory of " the growth of the kulak into socialism."

3. Tov. Bukharin, in a slightly different form, continues the same Bogdanovian theory about the emergence of classes by separating the organizational role from the executive one. That is why Comrade Bukharin puts forward as a crucial point in defining classes their different role in the production process. Tov. Bukharin ignores the relation of exploitation of one class by another when defining classes. Trying to combine his anti-Marxist theory of classes with Marx's definitions, Comrade Bukharin mechanically and eclectically combines contradictory features and definitions.

4. While Lenin emphasizes a historically defined system of production and the place of a given class in this production, Comrade Bukharin's definition suffers from abstractness and anti-historicity.

---

239 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 3-е, т. V — с. 201.

All errors of T. Bukharin's class theory is inextricably linked to his right-wing opportunist mistakes in politics. The understanding of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry as a continuous series of concessions by the proletariat in its basic positions, the theory of gravity, the kulak's growing into socialism, and the theory of the balance of classes — all these political errors have their theoretical roots in the erroneous, anti-Marxist understanding of classes.

Trotsky's theory of classes occupies a peculiar position, characteristic *of both mechanismismand idealism*.

It is well known that the Trotskyist "theory of permanent revolution" rejects the peasantry as a revolutionary force marching under the leadership of the proletariat. The theoretical justification for this disregard for the role of the peasantry is Trotsky's anti-Marxist mechanistic understanding of the correlation of class forces. Trotsky agrees that numerically the petty-bourgeois elements of the city and countryside still occupy an extremely large place under capitalism. But, he points out, the development of capitalism leads to the fact that *the petty bourgeoisie loses its productive significance* . The mass of values supplied by the petty bourgeoisie to the total national income becomes proportionately and incomparably smaller than the sum of values supplied by big capital. The further the development of capitalism progresses, the more the share of the petty bourgeoisie of the city and countryside in the national income falls. Trotsky draws a completely incorrect conclusion from this: "Accordingly, it (the petty bourgeoisie of the city and countryside) fell. - *Ed* .) social, political and cultural significance"[240].

Trotsky believes that *the social role of the peasantry*is directly determined by the level of values that it contributes to the national income. This roughly naturalistic, mechanistic understanding directly links the economic power of a class to its productive activity in the social process. According to this "theory", if it is continued to its logical conclusion, it turns out that in the village itself, the well-to-do or even middle peasants should be more politically and culturally active than the poor and farm labourers.

Meanwhile, under capitalism, the acuteness of class contradictions and their political activity do not directly depend on the economic power of certain social groups. Trotsky, on the other hand, identifies "productive significance" with the social, political, and cultural significance of a class in public life. And since, according to Trotsky, the" productive significance " of the peasantry decreases, Trotsky inevitably comes to the conclusion that the peasantry is a *solid reactionary mass* .

"The peasantry," he writes, " is socially and culturally backward, politically helpless, and has provided support in all countries for the most reactionary, adventurist, chaotic, and corrupt parties, which in the last analysis have always supported capital against labor[241]." And from this Trotsky draws the idealistic conclusion that it is necessary for the proletariat to seize state power "independently of the petty bourgeoisie and *even against it* »[242]." The slogan of our party before October — "together with the poorest peasantry against capitalism in town and country, while neutralizing the middle peasantry for the power of the proletariat" - remained alien to Trotsky. We thus see that there is a close connection between Trotsky's mechanically idealistic theory of classes and his extra-class theory of the State. Both of them serve as theoretical grounds for the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution and the Trotskyist understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Trotskyism, in its understanding of classes, is in contact *with Menshevik idealism on a number of points* . Menshevik idealism is characterized by an abstract-logical and formal-idealistic approach to the solution of the class problem and to the treatment of the class struggle.

Menshevik idealism constructs an abstract-logical definition of class and, using the " self-

240 Л. Троцкий / Соч., т. XII — с. 35.

241 Л. Троцкий / Соч., т. XII — с. 36.

242 Л. Троцкий / Соч., т. XII — с. 36.

movement "of the concept "class", tries to deduce a concrete content from it. That is why representatives of Menshevik idealism inevitably abstract from the concrete *relations between*classes, from the concrete*historical*assessment of the development of these relations, and take the subjectivist-idealistic path in understanding the development of classes. So for example T. Deborin limits himself to the abstract-logical definition of a class, seeing in it a developing and struggling "collective"[243]. In another later work, he substituted the development of "collectivity" for the class struggle of the proletariat during the transition period, i.e., adopted the idealistic Bogdanov-Kuhn position. T. Karev's view of the existence of only one class under the dictatorship of the proletariat also shows its subjectivism and Trotskyist detachment from concrete class relations.

Menshevik idealists often see the basis of the definition of class in the distribution of the means of production, but they understand this distribution *empirically* , without connecting the relation of classes to the means of production with their role in the organization of labor, without connecting it with their place in a historically determined mode of production and with the form of class exploitation, and therefore they essentially slide The inability to apply the methodology of Marxism to the problem of classes and vulgar empiricism, along with idealism, also affect the attitude of Menshevik idealism to the question of the main classes and the intelligentsia. For example, one representative of Menshevik idealism believes that in capitalist society the proletarian intelligentsia, the proletariat, includes "huge cadres of lower and middle-class employees." The same author believes that "the very concept of 'proletariat' already contains the concept of 'bourgeoisie '"— here, behind the supposedly 'dialectical' unity, the class contradictions of both classes are blurred. In his work, however, we find the statement that the class consciousness of the bourgeoisie is superior to the class consciousness of the proletariat, because it is determined by its economic power[244]. The connection between this statement of Menshevik idealism and Trotsky's theory of classes is obvious.

A mistaken understanding of classes inevitably leads Menshevik idealism to a mistaken understanding of the state, when the class essence of the state is obscured in one form or another. For example, T. Luppol believes that " the state in *a certain sense* there are only weapons of class struggle in the hands of the ruling class." This limited interpretation of the State as an instrument of oppression "in a certain sense" leads to a denial of the class essence of the State. The state is not only "in a certain sense", but *is entirely*an instrument of class domination.

It should be noted that even more or less correct definitions of classes, if they do not accept the full depth of Lenin's definition of classes, inevitably contain errors.

For example, you can point to the point of view of T. Udaltsova[245]Street. Criticizing the theories of Bogdanov, Solntsev, and others, T. Udaltsov believes that *the distribution of the means of production* determines both the basis of the entire social system and the very essence of class relations. But T. Udaltsov does not connect this different distribution of the means of production with *the historically* determined *mode of labor* and the social-productive power of the latter, and therefore does not sufficiently emphasize the *role*of the class in the social organization of labor.

Therefore, the definition of t classes is Udaltsov differs significantly from Lenin's: "We call a social class a group of people united primarily *by the same position in the system of production* , i.e., primarily *by the same attitude to the means of production* (their distribution, which creates the main *antagonism* in the organization of production and society as a whole), and *the same functions in production itself that follow from this basic relationship, role in the social process of labor* ; united further *by the same position in the process of distribution of social capital.* income (which

---

243 А. Деборин, Наши разногласия, Диалектика и естествознание / 1930.

244 С. Гоникман, Теория классов и классовая борьба в капиталистическом обществе / Под знаменем марксизма № 2–3, 1930.

245 См. Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I.

reflects the main antagonism of the distribution of the means of production) and, finally, the opposition of their interests *to other groups,* which is realized in the process of class development[246]."

In T. Udaltsov's definition of classes, "*a historically defined system of social production* "falls out. Because of this, the very definition of classes becomes unrelated to a certain historical mode of production, it claims to be supra-historical. Setting aside the mode of labor and the degree of development of the productive forces that determine the economic structure of society, what *distinguishes* from one economic formation to another, i.e., from one economic formation to another. Udaltsov, of course, does not see historically different systems of social production. "All cats turn gray", and the very definition of t classes. Udaltsova suffers from extrahistoryness.

In conclusion, in connection with anti-Marxist theories of classes, we will focus on the question of the correlation of classes and *professions* .

Not only bourgeois authors, such as acad. Solntsev, but also some representatives of Menshevik idealism perpetuate the profession as *an eternal,* logical category. "A certain level of professionalism in the field of work," they point out, " is logically necessary[247]." Professions are considered by them as a product of the technical division of labor. At the same time, they forget that the profession *is not only* It is a product of the technical division of labor that *only in a class*society does the technical division of labor lead to professional fragmentation. A profession outside of class society is an abstraction that does not exist in reality.

Meanwhile, on the question of the profession, there are clear instructions from Marx, Engels, and Lenin. As early as in Deutsche Ideologie, Engels wrote that in a class society, the division of labor leads to the fact that " everyone has a certain, exclusive circle of activity, which *is imposed on him* and from which he cannot leave: he turns out to be a fisherman or a shepherd (by Marx's hand: or a critical critic) and must remain so if he is able to he does not want to lose his livelihood; in a communist society, where each individual is not given an exclusive sphere of activity and everyone can develop in any branch of labor, society regulates all production and precisely for this reason creates for me the opportunity to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, to fish in the afternoon, to engage in cattle breeding but to criticize food as I please — and I *don't become a hunter, a fisherman, a shepherd, or a critic* »[248]." The division of labor, as a result of the spontaneous development *of class* society, becomes a force that opposes man and compulsively imposes on him a specific field of activity. Under *communism* there can be no such gap between different branches of labor, since society here consciously regulates all production as a whole.

A profession or specialty is a product not only of the technical division of labor, but also *of the social* division of labor. Marx, in his Capital, when considering the division of labor, pointed out that even in manufacturing a deeper specialization takes place. Each craft (which existed before manufacture) is divided here into several more detailed specialties. At the same time, it is especially important that in the manufacture of each production, workers who do not have any specialty are allocated to a special group. *This lack of specialty becomes the specialty of entire groups of workers.* "By developing *a one-sided specialty to the point of virtuosity* at the expense of the ability to work in general, it turns *the very lack of any development into a special specialty* . Along with hierarchical levels, there is a simple division of workers into trained and untrained[249]."

The further the development of capitalism progresses, the stronger is the effect of this process of transformation into *a special*specialty assigned to certain strata of the working class, and at the same time the lack of qualifications in general. Modern Fordism, improving the technological

---

246 А. Удальцов, К теории классов у Маркса и Энгельса / Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 412.

247 Под знаменем марксизма № 2–3, 1930 — с. 26.

248 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 223.

249 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 328.

process, more and more uses poorly trained, or even completely untrained workers. For capitalism, this is important in the sense that the cost of training the worker is reduced. For capital, the very ability to work that can be exploited is important. Under communism, the division of labor in the technological process will, of course, take place, but this does not mean that a certain professional isolation will remain between people. Lenin also spoke in this sense when he said that communism would lead to the creation of fully developed and fully trained people.

"Capitalism," Lenin wrote, " inevitably leaves socialism a legacy, on the one hand, of the old *professional and craft distinctions that have been established for centuries* between the workers, on the other hand, trade unions, which can only develop very slowly, over years and years, and will continue to develop into broader, less guild-like, production unions (covering entire industries, not just guilds, crafts, and professions) , and then move through these production unions *to abolish the division of labor between people* , to the education, training and training *of well-rounded and well-rounded students.* trained people who know how *to do everything* . This is what communism is coming to, must come to, and *will come* to, but only after a long series of years[250]."

Chapter 5. The Dictatorship of the proletariat and the class struggle in transition

5.1. The dictatorship of the proletariat as the basic question of the proletarian Revolution

"The most important question of any revolution," says Lenin, " is the question of *State power.*" In the hands of which class power is concentrated, which class or classes should be overthrown, which class or classes should take power-this is "the most important question of any revolution[251]."

The law of revolutions is the absolute law of antagonistic social forms. The fierce class struggle, which reaches its utmost intensity in the revolution, leads to the overthrow of the former ruling class, the seizure of power by the revolutionary class, and its *dictatorship* , which is necessary for the final consolidation of its victory. "Anyone who has not understood the necessity of the dictatorship *of any*revolutionary class for its victory,"says Lenin," has understood nothing of the theory of revolution, or wants to know nothing in this field[252]."

If dictatorship is a necessity for the victory *of any* revolutionary class, then what is it but a complete betrayal of Marxism, a complete counter-revolutionary rebirth, that the Second International denies *the dictatorship of the proletariat* , a class that is carrying out "the most profound revolution in the history of mankind"?

The most bitter class struggle in the entire history of the world is undoubtedly the revolution of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, against the most developed form of class exploitation. "A revolution is a desperate class struggle that has reached its greatest intensity. Class struggle is inevitable - Lenin formulates this peculiarity of the proletarian revolution. "Either we must abandon the revolution altogether, or we must admit that the struggle against the propertied classes will *be the fiercest of all revolutions* »[253]."

The whole old exploitative world, led by the bourgeoisie, is opposed to the vanguard of the

---

250 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 3-е, т. XXV — с. 195.

251 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 343, 1931.

252 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVII — с. 349.

253 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVII — с. 349.

working people — the proletariat — armed with unprecedented economic and political power, relying on the influence of bourgeois culture and ideology. The bourgeoisie, as we have already seen in the preceding chapters, entangles and binds the petty-bourgeois masses with thousands of threads in all directions, skilfully using the enormous strength of their proprietary and mercantile traditions. The influence of the bourgeoisie also penetrates the proletariat; relying on its social-lackeys, it cultivates and educates the working-class aristocracy in its midst, and makes every possible use of the political backwardness of certain strata of the proletariat. All economic influence, all political, cultural, and everyday prejudices are being mobilized by the bourgeoisie against the revolution.

The proletariat must destroy the most developed and powerful form of exploitation — the capitalist one — and thereby put an end to all exploitation. But this form also corresponds to the most developed and powerful of all the political forms of class oppression that have ever existed before-*the bourgeois state* , "whose recognized task is to perpetuate the rule of capital and the slavery of labor[254]."

All previous revolutions, in which one exploitative class succeeded another, were limited to the fact that this new class *took possession of the old state machine* and he only continued to improve this apparatus of oppression of the working majority by the minority in his class interests. A revolution directed against all exploitation must obviously set itself a radically different task: the proletariat must *break* down, destroy, and destroy this apparatus, forged by the exploiters to ensure their rule over the exploited, and which can only serve the purposes of oppression and exploitation. In its place, the proletarian revolution must place the State of the dictatorship of the proletariat, *a new*political form within which all the tasks of the socialist revolution can only be solved.

You cannot win, you cannot overthrow the bourgeoisie, you cannot destroy classes, you cannot build socialism, without first breaking the bourgeois state, the bourgeois state machine. To deny this is to deny "the main thing, *the main thing* in the Marxist doctrine of the state." This means, at the same time, denying the entire teaching of Marxism about the proletarian *revolution* . "The revolution, "says Lenin," consists in the proletariat destroying the 'administrative apparatus' and the entire state apparatus, replacing it with a new one consisting of armed workers." "The crux of the matter is whether the old state machine (linked by thousands of threads to the bourgeoisie and thoroughly imbued with routine and inertia) is preserved, or whether it *is being destroyed and replaced by a new* »[255]one."

Marx and Engels built up all their enormous theoretical and practical political work by clarifying the conditions for the preparation and implementation of the proletarian revolution; they built it up in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. They regarded the entire process of proletarian development as a process of " a more or less hidden civil war taking place in the bowels of modern society up to the point when this war turns into an open revolution and the proletariat, by forcibly overthrowing the bourgeoisie, lays the foundation *of its state* »[256]."

Starting from this essential principle of Marxism, Lenin showed how Kautsky, the greatest of the theorists of the Second International, was preparing for a complete betrayal of Marxism, and then for a transition to the camp of counter — revolution. Lenin showed how, even in his best days, Kautsky sidestepped and glossed over the fundamental question of the revolution — the question of the state, of the necessity of destroying the bourgeois state machine, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., " he smeared *the most essential things* the difference between Marxism and opportunism in the question of the tasks of the proletarian revolution[257]."

---

254 K. Маркс / Соч. — с. 25.

255 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIV, ч. 2 — с. 391.

256 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Коммунистический манифест / Гиз, 1924 — с. 76.

257 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIV, ч. 2 — с. 382.

Classes, Lenin said, "will not disappear without the dictatorship of the proletariat[258]." "*To preserve the power of the proletariat*is our only principle[259]." "The dictatorship of the proletariat *is unavoidable, necessary, and absolutely obligatory*for leaving capitalism[260]." Recognition of the class struggle in general is worthless "if this recognition is not carried to the point of recognition *of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of withdrawal from capitalism* , of the most important thing, of the period *of transition* from capitalism to socialism, to the period of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and its complete destruction[261]."

Relying on these basic propositions of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, Comrade Stalin pointed out that Leninism, i.e., the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions in general, is *the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular.* With the seizure of power, the proletarian revolution is just beginning. The class struggle of the proletariat *does not end* with the establishment of its dictatorship and the creation of a new proletarian State. The overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat are only *one* of the tasks of the proletarian revolution. Its subsequent tasks are to destroy all possibility of class exploitation, to *destroy classes* , and to build *a new society* replacing the former capitalist formation. The dictatorship of the proletariat itself is only a transition to a new socialist system.

All these tasks cannot be carried out by the proletariat except in the conditions of the most acute class struggle. "The dictatorship of the proletariat, "Lenin pointed out, warning against trivializing its understanding by opportunism," is not the end of the class struggle, but *its continuation in new forms*." The proletariat cannot completely destroy the old relations of exploitation without a dictatorship. The new socialist economy does not mature in the depths of capitalist society. The proletariat has only to *build this economy* . This most important task underlies all the tactics of the proletarian dictatorship. The dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to destroy the bourgeoisie, which will not give up without desperate resistance and struggle; the dictatorship is necessary to eliminate the backwardness and diversity of forms of oppression of the working masses that are created in various ways under the rule of capitalism; the dictatorship is necessary for the re-education of the non-proletarian working masses by the working class, for the transformation of their small-scale dictatorship is necessary for the further communist education of the proletariat itself; dictatorship is necessary for the destruction of classes. "*The proletarian revolution, its movement, its scope, its achievements are clothed in flesh and blood only through the dictatorship of the proletariat* »[262]."

Lenin therefore spoke of a whole *period* proletarian dictatorship as the deepest turning point in world history. He brutally exposed both the right-wing opportunists, who did not see the dictatorship of the proletariat as a continuation of the class struggle, and the" archilevs " petty-bourgeois heroes, who tried to solve all the tasks of the revolution "in one fell swoop" without taking into account objective conditions, and who were discouraged by the prospect of a dozen or more years of the most stubborn, unprecedented hard struggle in *its new* , diverse forms. forms.

Lenin, who raised Marx's doctrine of the proletarian revolution to a new and higher level, developed and enriched accordingly the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which treats the fundamental content of the revolution. The doctrine of the class struggle in the transition period, of the allies of the proletariat in this struggle, of the forms and essence of the alliance with the peasantry, the elaboration of the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a new and higher

---

258 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 353.

259 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 1 — с. 330.

260 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 222.

261 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIX, ч. 2 — с. 324.

262 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма / 1931 — с. 41. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

type of proletarian democracy, the doctrine of the Soviet state form of the proletarian dictatorship, of the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a whole, of the role of the party in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the possibilities and possibilities of building socialism-here, in brief, is the most essential of all the new developments that Lenin has given in this field[263]. The question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the conditions for its conquest and consolidation, is, as T. S. Tolstoy points out, an important one. Stalin, *the basic*question of Leninism.

Due to the uneven and abrupt nature of capitalist development, the dictatorship of the proletariat is usually established as a result of the victory of the revolution in *individual*countries, while maintaining for the time being the rule of the bourgeoisie in other countries. When "exploiters are defeated only in one country, this is of course a typical case," Lenin emphasized, " for a simultaneous revolution in a number of countries is a rare exception[264]."

The proletariat, which took power in our country, *which is less capitalistically developed* than the surrounding countries, has triumphantly suppressed and continues to suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie. By establishing proper relations with various groups of working people and leading their struggle in alliance with the broad masses of the middle peasantry, by suppressing the resistance of the Kulak upper class in the countryside and relying on the rural poor, the proletariat built the foundation of a new socialist economy.

Lenin's theoretical justification for the possibility *of building and building socialism for the proletariat that has taken power in one country* has already been tested by the practice of the victorious proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. In this respect, the proletarian dictatorship represents the greatest initiative and creative force. Lenin's teaching on the revolutionary possibilities arising from the correct and different attitude of the proletariat towards the various strata *of the peasantry* , and on the use of these possibilities, and on overcoming in this way the internal contradictions of our economy-this teaching is important, but not fundamental, but *derivative* a moment in the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

If the contradictions of the country of the proletarian dictatorship can be completely resolved and overcome by the detachment of the world proletariat that has taken power in our country, then the guarantee against intervention on the part of the capitalist countries and against the eventual restoration of capitalism, that is, the *final victory of socialism*, cannot be secured by the forces of the proletariat alone , which This guarantee is given by the victory of the working class in a number of countries and by the further development *of the world economy.* revolutions. At the same time, the very existence of the country of the proletarian dictatorship and the successful construction of socialism in it is a necessary condition for the further development of the world revolution. The final victory of socialism in one country and the victory of the proletariat in other countries are closely and indissolubly linked, and this creates a solid foundation for international solidarity and the united struggle of the proletarians of all countries.

Like any other process, the dictatorship of the proletariat passes *through various periods* . Each period is characterized by its own specific features and the tasks that follow from them, which the proletariat must solve in this period in order to retain the dictatorship and prepare the transition to the next stage in the development of the communist revolution.

These are the most essential features of the general Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The October Revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. are a classic example of the application and vivid confirmation of the correctness of this doctrine.

Under the conditions of the proletarian dictatorship, the revision of Marxism-Leninism found its characteristic manifestation in petty-bourgeois liberalism and in petty-bourgeois radicalism, which emasculate from the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat its revolutionary class

---

263 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 274.

264 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XV — с. 466–467.

content, its true Marxist-Leninist understanding. Under the banner of external recognition of the dictatorship, the basic conditions of opportunism focus on the main thing — the revision of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of dictatorship-whether this opportunism is expressed openly by the right or by "left" phraseology.

Therefore, one of the basic conditions for the complete overcoming of all the perversions of the materialist understanding of history on the part of international Menshevism, Mechanismism, Menshevik idealism, etc., is a clear understanding that *the main* problem of historical materialism in the transition period is the problem *of the dictatorship of the proletariat* , its role and its tasks in the construction of socialism, expressed in the general line of the party.

5.2. The Dictatorship of the proletariat and the Soviet State

The Proletarian revolution differs radically from all others in that power here passes from the hands of the exploiting minority to the hands of the exploited majority. Here, for the first time, the working class draws into political life *the mass of the working and oppressed classes*, "who until now have been completely outside of political life, outside of history" *(Lenin)*.

"The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the concept *of the state*," says Comrade Lenin. Stalin. The dictatorship of the proletariat means *political domination* the working class, which is capable of organizing domination over the bourgeoisie and suppressing the resistance of exploiters, which does not and cannot share power with anyone. The fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a dictatorship only of the proletariat, which does not share power with other classes, is expressed in the fact that the leader of the proletarian state, the guiding force of the proletarian dictatorship, is *the party* working class, a communist party that *does not divide* with any other party in its leadership role. At the same time, in the person of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the first and last time, a State appears in which the contradictions between the main classes are contradictions on current issues, contradictions that can be overcome on the basis of their fundamental and decisive interest — to put an end to all class exploitation, to create conditions for the future withering away of the state itself. This is the profound essence of the proletarian state, which is no longer a state in the old, "proper sense of the word" *(Engels)*, i.e., in the sense of an instrument of class oppression and exploitation, an instrument of the suppression of the majority by the minority — which, being *a new type of state*, is at the same time "*a transitional form from the state to the non*-state "*(Lenin)* . In this sense, Engels spoke of the state of the proletariat as a " semi-state."

The aims of the proletarian revolution, the aims of the Communist Party, fully and completely correspond to the fundamental interests *of all* the working classes, and fully and completely correspond to the fundamental interests of the broad masses of the working peasantry. And *the government* the dictatorship of the proletariat, being of the same nature as the proletarian state, is *a workers 'and peasants*' government precisely because and in the sense that its policy fully corresponds to the fundamental interests of the main masses of the peasantry correctly understood, and that the true realization of the fundamental interests of the peasantry, through the socialist reconstruction of agriculture, is ensured solely by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Every truly popular revolution in which the majority of the people, i.e., the mass of the workers and peasants, comes forward with their own demands, is characterized by the desire of the workers 'and peasants' majority to smash the bourgeois state machine that oppresses them and to replace the apparatus that serves to oppress and exploit the masses with an entirely new apparatus, an entirely new organization of power capable of ensuring the interests of the exploited majority.

But the experience of a number of revolutions in the West and in Russia, summed up and illuminated in a Marxist way, teaches that a popular revolution can win only if the proletariat exercises its *hegemony* and leadership over the working masses, who, because of their fragmentation and disorganization, cannot secure their own liberation. The task of overthrowing, suppressing, and completely destroying the exploiters can be accomplished only if the people's bourgeois-democratic revolution develops into a proletarian revolution, if it leads to the dictatorship

of the proletariat— the class that is the only one capable of organizing the non-Proletarian working masses and firmly leading them to destroy all exploitation.

The proletarian state is the rule of the proletariat, under whose leadership the *entire mass* of the working and exploited *people suppresses the resistance of the bourgeoisie and builds a socialist economy* . That is why this state is no longer a state in the old "proper sense". This state still has to carry *out suppression* resisting former exploiters. "But the overwhelming organ," Lenin observes, " is already the majority of the population, and not the minority, as has always been the case — under slavery, serfdom, and wage slavery. And since the majority of the people themselves suppress their oppressors, then "special force" for suppression is no longer needed. In *this sense,* the state is beginning *to die* out . Instead of special institutions of a privileged minority (privileged bureaucracy, superiors, standing army), the majority itself can directly carry out this, and *the more popular it is* the more the functions of state power are fulfilled, the less the need for this power becomes[265]."

Thus , the essential feature *of proletarian democracy,* which radically distinguishes it from bourgeois democracy, is that it represents the democracy of the working majority of society and a dictatorship against the minority, against the former exploiters. The dictatorship of the proletariat no longer needs a special *apparatus of control, an apparatus of suppression that stands above the masses and is detached from the masses*. For the first time, State administration is carried out not by a handful of privileged military and civilian officials and bureaucrats-against the working masses, but *for the masses and the working masses* themselves, through such a system of mass organizations of the proletarian dictatorship. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat is a state that, for the first time in its very class essence, in the essence of its class socialist tasks, in the essence of its class organization, is closely connected with the masses of the working people. The development of proletarian State power is a process of attracting all the working people more and more widely and participating more and more fully in the exercise of the functions of State power*всех*; it is a process of all — round re — education and promotion-political, economic, and cultural-of all the working people, even to the most backward elements. This is proletarian democracy, which *secures the freedom* of assembly *for the working*people by taking away the premises of the bourgeoisie, the freedom of the press by taking away printing presses from the capitalists, and the freedom of the individual worker by expropriating exploiters, suppressing them, and completely destroying them.

The destruction of the bourgeois bureaucratic state apparatus is a prerequisite for the establishment of proletarian democracy. By carrying out this necessary task at once , the proletariat replaces *the old,* broken-down bureaucratic state machine *with a new* one . The essence of this new state machine has already been shown by the experience of the Paris Commune, which was the first to "attempt to smash the bourgeois state apparatus, as well as the official, judicial, military and police apparatuses, *and destroy them to the ground."* and replace them *with a self-governing mass organization of workers without separation of legislative and executive powers* »[266]." A theoretical generalization of the experience of the Paris Commune and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R., which developed, concretized, and enriched the great initiatives and principles that the Paris workers launched in 1871, gives an exhaustive idea of the form of real democracy for the working people.

Proletarian democracy puts an end to bourgeois *parliamentarism* , whose task is to divert the attention of the working people from the real arbiters of the fate of the bourgeois state — from the stock exchange, from finance capital, and from the bureaucracy that obeys them-by means of loud chatter and ostentatious legislative activity. The proletarian State is a self-governing mass organization of workers that *combines the functions of legislation and execution* . The working masses, organized in *soviets,* both legislate and govern through their *elected* and at any time easily replaceable representatives, who are closely connected with the masses and represent their real and

265 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIV, ч. 2 — с. 330–331.

266 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 38.

fundamental interests. The working masses, through their authentic representatives, both legislate and direct the suppression and extermination of exploiters, the organization of socialist production. *Representatives elected and replaced at any time legislate and implement their own decisions* and they are responsible for their actions, for their management, to their constituents. The whole mass is drawn in and learns the business of state administration from its own experience, and the proletarian vanguard directs the work of drawing all the working people into the functions of government, of re-educating them in this way without exception.

The Soviets represent this most expedient and perfect form of State organization of the proletariat. This is a form of dictatorship of the proletariat "discovered" by the mass movement of the proletariat, the meaning of which was brilliantly understood and elucidated by Lenin. The peculiarities of the proletarian dictatorship, which appeared in their undeveloped form in the Paris Commune and were then brilliantly captured by Marx, are already expressed in the Soviets in their developed form, enriched by the experience of the struggle, 1905 and the October Revolution in Russia.

The Soviets unite all the workers and the entire mass of the working people, representing a *State apparatus based on mass organizations of the working* people . Through the Soviets, which are the direct state form of proletarian class rule, and through the numerous organizations associated with them, as Lenin noted at the beginning of the transition period, "the leading role of the proletariat in relation to the peasantry is realized, the dictatorship of the proletariat is carried out, and a systematic struggle is carried out against the rich, bourgeois, exploitative, and speculative peasantry[267]."

All the activities of the party, all measures aimed at suppressing exploiters, strengthening the dictatorship, and building up socialism, pass through the Soviets and become the work of millions of workers and peasants. Via Soviets *party* It exercises its leadership over the broadest masses of the working people of the city and countryside, in attracting them to participate in the administration of the State, in re-educating these masses on the basis of their own experience, in transforming the working *people into legislators and executors, and into armed forces.* and people ready for self-defense. The masses themselves, the working majority itself, organized in Soviets, are suppressing the exploiters, establishing an economy "without the bourgeoisie, against the bourgeoisie", and are learning from their own experience to do this better and better. "The Soviet government," Lenin pointed out, " is an apparatus for the *masses to begin immediately to learn how to govern the state*and organize production on a national scale[268]."

The characteristic features of the soviets are the electability of *production units* (factories, state farms, etc.), the turnover of any elected employee, and the combination of legislative and executive functions. The Soviet organization ensures the disarmament of the bourgeoisie and the arming of the proletariat. It creates a Workers 'and Peasants*' Red Army,* built on the class principle and representing the armed force of the proletarian state — a force closely linked with the working people, a force to fight against the intervention of international capital, a force to suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie, a force to protect socialist construction.

In the organs of Soviet power, the proletariat has acquired the State form of its dictatorship that best expresses the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat and creates the basis for the complete victory of socialism. The transfer of power to the working people, the elimination of exploitation, and the absence of a special apparatus for suppression — these features, as Lenin put it, constitute the "living soul" of Soviet democracy[269]. The constant and unconditional participation of the broad masses in state administration makes the Soviet government "the most *powerful* and the most powerful power of all the state authorities that have existed up to now" *(Stalin)* . They

267 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVII — с. 140.

268 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XV — с. 154–155.

269 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XV — с. 154.

make it possible to completely *eliminate the bureaucracy* characteristic of the capitalist state. These features open up a wide field for the struggle for the full realization *of the possibility of real equality* , i.e., *the complete abolition of classes*and the significant development of the productive forces in communist society, when the state becomes unnecessary and dies away.

According to Trotsky, *bureaucracy is inevitable* under the dictatorship of the proletariat, since, in his opinion, this bureaucracy stems from the fundamental contradiction between the interests of the proletariat and the peasantry. Lenin saw the basis of bureaucracy in Soviet conditions quite differently. According to Lenin, this reason that gives rise to bureaucracy is primarily a *lack of culture* , the inability to draw the broad masses into the work of the state apparatus, as well as the remnants of bourgeois habits. The peculiarities of the Soviet state thus contain in itself all the prerequisites and possibilities *for overcoming the crisis.* bureaucracy. However, this overcoming of bureaucracy does not take place in the process of "peaceful" cultural construction, as the right-wing opportunists think, but in the process of a fierce *class struggle* , in which such moments as *the purge of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union are often used as a means of overcoming bureaucracy.* freedom from class-alien elements, the development of *self-criticism*, etc., play a crucial role.

From the very beginning, the organization of proletarian democracy undermines the very foundation of bureaucracy. Instead of a special bureaucratic apparatus, instead of a privileged bureaucracy, workers and labourers rule. The antidote, which fundamentally undermines the possibility of bureaucratization of the Soviet apparatus, is that immediately after the emergence of the proletarian state, a transition is made to the task *поголовного*of attracting all workers, all working people, to the exercise of State functions. The development of proletarian democracy will eventually lead to a state of affairs in which "under socialism, *everyone will rule in turn* and will quickly get used to the fact that *no* one governs" *(Lenin)* .

But this is the future outcome of a long historical process. Every step forward in the construction of socialism is a step forward in the destruction of bureaucracy, a powerful weapon in the hands of the class enemies of the proletariat. And when Trotskyists and " leftists "shout about the" feudal bureaucratic " disregard for the interests of the working people on the part of the apparatus of the proletarian state, about the inevitability of bureaucracy in a Soviet country, this is counter — revolutionary slander, this is a misunderstanding of the very essence of the Soviet system, this is a rehash of social-fascist arias.

But, on the other hand, we must also fight against the right-wing opportunist underestimation of the Soviets, against the infiltration of alien elements into the Soviets, and the struggle for *labor* the Soviet apparatus, the struggle to *strengthen it* the Soviet state. There can be no question of any kind of" self-reliance " in the construction of Soviets. Without a struggle against the class enemy, against all the forces and traditions of the old world, against lack of culture, without strenuous activity, without leading all the working masses, without a diverse and comprehensive uprooting of the roots of bureaucracy in the economic, political and cultural fields — without all this, the proletariat cannot enlist the working people in the cause of government.

The proletariat is waging a continuous and persistent struggle against bureaucracy, mobilising against this serious force of the exploitative camp the whole system of possible punitive actions. But the main and fundamental means of eliminating the phenomena of bureaucracy and bureaucratic perversions in the organs of the proletarian state is the growth *of the economic, political, and cultural level of the working masses themselves , the growth of their activity*, and their "daily participation in government."

So Lenin said: "We can fight bureaucracy to the end, to complete victory, only when the entire population participates in the administration… In addition to the law, there is a cultural level that cannot be subordinated to any law... Here we face a task that cannot be solved otherwise than *by long-term education of the masses* »[270]." Therefore, one can correctly understand all the features of

270 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 127–128.

the Soviet state as a transitional form "from state to non-state" only by familiarizing oneself with *the entire system*of proletarian dictatorship as a whole, with the whole set of mass organizations on which the dictatorship of the proletariat is based and in which proletarian democracy develops.

5.3. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the development of proletarian democracy. The system of proletarian dictatorship

Marxism-Leninism exposes with particular consistency and clarity the class content of social-democratic phraseology about *democracy* "in general" and about freedom and equality "in general". Marx, Lenin points out, "revealed *the material roots* of these abstractions." And consistently using the weapons of materialist dialectics, concretizing and developing further the propositions of Marx and Engels, Lenin develops the doctrine of democracy and the *difference between bourgeois and proletarian democracy*with exhaustive depth and completeness.

Social-fascist theorists teach that the problems of socialist socialization can be solved on the path of "democracy", i.e., *bourgeois democracy.* democracy, the class character of which they try in every possible way to obscure. The transfer of power to the proletariat and the proletariat's conquest of the "majority" must, in their opinion, proceed "by itself", in the order of a smooth and unhurried economic evolution, on the basis of the "freedom and equality" granted to the proletariat by bourgeois society. "What we are trying to achieve," says Kautsky, " is that this power should pass to them (i.e., to the proletariat) *on the basis of democracy* and it rested on the support of the majority. *Economic development itself,* which transforms large-scale production into the dominant form of production, takes care that the majority is on the side of the proletariat[271]."

So, everything is for the best in this best of all worlds — the world of capitalist democracy! A certain mysterious force, which the enlightened Kautsky calls not God, but "economic development," *is automatically created.* it must ensure the proletariat a majority and victory. Meanwhile, despite the social-fascist mysticism and mystification of the workers, it is well known what real bourgeois democracy and the reality of economic movement lead to in the world of modern decaying capitalism. The profound crisis that is currently raging there, and the unprecedented oppression and brutality with which the bourgeoisie is suppressing the proletariat's actions with the hands and clubs of the Severings and Wels, speak quite eloquently of this.

The theory of Marxism-Leninism teaches that the prerequisite for the working class to win over the majority of the population, the majority of the proletarian working masses, is the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and therefore *the destruction of bourgeois democracy* and its replacement by a new type *of proletarian democracy,* democracy for the vast majority. An understanding of the profound difference between bourgeois and proletarian democracy is also absolutely necessary when we speak of the relationship between the proletariat and *non-proletarian democrats.* by the working masses. Without this, the character of the class struggle in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be understood. Therefore, attempts to dissolve the real content of the proletarian revolution, the struggle of the proletariat for the abolition of classes, in formal and abstract concepts such as those of "*equality*" and "freedom "have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism*свободы.* The concepts of "equality" and "freedom", as already pointed out, are always in reality saturated with concrete class content. The bourgeoisie, which fights against the proletarian dictatorship, strives for the restoration, the restoration of the dictatorship of capital, the perpetuation of classes, the perpetuation of real inequality. Freedom and equality of bourgeois democracy are *freedom and equality for the exploiting minority* , freedom for the bourgeoisie to exploit the proletariat.

The class struggle of the proletariat, the real content of its entire struggle during the entire transition period, is a struggle for *the abolition of classes, i.e., for real equality* . This equality cannot exist as long as there are classes and class struggles, i.e., inequality. To achieve equality, the

271 K. Каутский, Большевизм в тупике — с. 67.

destruction of classes is necessary. The proletariat and the peasantry enter the transition period as different, distinct, *special*classes. Certain class distinctions between the industrial proletariat and the collective-farm peasantry still exist today and can only be eliminated during the next few years of socialist construction, together with the classes themselves.

Therefore, there is not and cannot be *complete equality* between the working class and the peasantry. The demand for such equality is a demand that the proletariat renounce *the leadership*of the peasantry, the line of class destruction, i.e., the struggle for real equality, and the struggle against all forces that strive to perpetuate classes.

"*There can be no equality between the worker and the peasant during* the period of transition from capitalism to socialism,"Lenin said," and those who promise it must be recognized as developing Kolchak's program[272]." "The Mensheviks say so: "The peasantry is the majority, we are pure democrats, the majority must decide." But since the peasantry cannot be independent, this means practically nothing more than the *restoration of capitalism* »[273]." It should be pointed out that even among the proletariat itself, although there is equality of economic status, there is not yet complete ideological equality. We find here varying degrees of consciousness, activity, discipline, and organization. We find in its midst the vanguard and more backward strata. The" leftist " demand for equality put forward by Trotsky and Zinoviev at one time is essentially a demand to renounce the leadership of the proletariat *on the part of the party* .

The totality *of organizations* that form *the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat* does not arise, like a pistol shot, at the moment when the proletariat, having taken power and destroyed the bourgeois state machine, builds its new one. The seizure of power itself would have been impossible without an organized struggle, without the creation *of various forms of mass organizations* that direct their forces to the struggle against imperialism, against the bourgeois state, and to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Every stage in the development of the forms of proletarian struggle and organization is a stage in the preparation of the proletariat for the fulfillment of its historical mission. "All these organizations are absolutely necessary for the working class under certain conditions, for without them it is impossible to strengthen the class positions of the proletariat in various spheres of struggle, and without them it is impossible to harden the proletariat as a force designed to replace the bourgeois order with the socialist[274]order."

This is how the working class prepares for its historical task, until at last this preparation is completed by an "open revolution" and the proletariat takes power into its own hands. Then the struggle of the proletariat is already being waged in new forms with the help of State power, and the whole set of organizations created by it is already acting in *a new capacity* , as *a system of the dictatorship of the proletariat* . Each individual organization faces a *number of new tasks*and submits a number of new functions.

Of particular importance for the dictatorship of the proletariat, as has already been pointed out, is *the organization and discipline* of the proletariat — the only working class trained and disciplined by the school of large-scale capitalist production, the school of strikes, and the school of political struggle against capital - the only class capable of assimilating and transmitting to all working people the gains of large-scale capitalist culture, and capable of breaking with with bourgeois-democratic psychology, with philistinism and philistinism, capable of organizing socialist construction, capable of carrying out the great tasks of its revolution by the greatest determination in the most difficult transitions and by the greatest sacrifices. *The main* feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat is *the leadership of the Communist Party* . Without this leadership, without the party and its discipline, none of the main tasks of the dictatorship could be solved by the proletariat.

Without the leadership of the proletarian Party, the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be

---

272 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 212.

273 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 1 — с. 326.

274 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 93.

preserved and consolidated. The preservation of the organization and discipline of the proletariat, the preservation of unity, solidity, and discipline in its party, is a struggle to preserve the very *essence*of the proletarian dictatorship. The Party is therefore waging a resolute struggle against the manifestations of declassification, against the influence on the proletariat emanating from other classes, against the manifestations of opportunism in the ranks of the party, against attempts to disrupt its unity and discipline as factors that undermine the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Party is *the main guiding force and instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat* . Defining a party as *a tool* The dictatorship of the proletariat includes all its other definitions; it reflects the highest stage in the development of the party, it reveals in its entirety its essence, its historical role, and the significance of its historical Bolshevik training.

A party that concentrates in its ranks all *лучшее*that is best in the proletariat, and is guided by a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory, appears in the period of the proletarian revolution as *the vanguard* leading the working class to seize power. The Party acts as a fighting headquarters, necessary for the overthrow of capitalism, for the conquest of power. The Party, as an organized group of the best, most advanced elements of the working class connected with the masses and leading in various mass organizations — a group bound by the iron discipline of proletarian revolutionaries — is the organizing core of the proletarian revolution, the core of proletarian power. The Party, as a class-conscious and organized group of advanced elements of the working class, is the best school for proletarian organizers and leaders. It is the only organization capable, thanks to its experience , organization, and authority, of bringing the necessary unity into the diversity of proletarian organizations*единство*, of subordinating all the various forms of their struggle *to the common goal* of undermining the power of capital. After the victory of the proletariat , the party finally appears as *the leader* of the proletarian *state* , directing and directing the activities *of all the mass organizations* that form the system of the proletarian dictatorship to solve the complex and diverse tasks facing the proletarian revolution.

Without the leadership of the party, the main thing cannot be achieved*главное* in the dictatorship of the proletariat — the organization and discipline of the proletariat, its victorious struggle against the bourgeoisie cannot be organized, the proper resistance to the corrupting influence of the petty-bourgeois element cannot be ensured, the work of re-educating the proletariat of the non-proletarian working masses and the work of re-educating the proletariat of the remaining elements in its own environment cannot be ensured, classes and institutions cannot be destroyed without a party. socialism.

"...The leadership of the party is *the main thing* in the dictatorship of the proletariat." "Without the party as *the main guiding force*, the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible to have any lasting and lasting[275]effect."

In the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there can be only one such party.*единственная* a party that does not share its leadership of the proletariat and the proletarian state with any other party.

Such a party can *only be the Communist Party* of the Bolsheviks, which is guided by Leninist tactical and organizational principles, is strong in its authority in the working class, leads the proletariat on the basis of its confidence in it, and wins this confidence not only by its ability *to teach the masses* , but also by its ability *to learn from the masses* . The Communist Party is strong for its close connection with the masses of the proletariat, as well as with the broad masses of all working people, for its ability to test its policy on the *опыте масс*basis of the experience of the masses , on the basis of the practice of a truly mass and truly revolutionary movement, for its ability to lead the masses to the right positions, allowing the majority mistakes made, the ability to firmly resist all influences hostile to the working class, and the ability to lead the proletariat and the entire working mass through all difficulties to the victory of socialism.

Партия как *In the period of the proletarian dictatorship, the Party, as the highest form*of

275 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 288, 296.

class workers ' organization, appears as the main guiding force, as an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Without such a tool, without such a guiding force, the proletariat cannot win.

But to be such a leading force, the party must represent a steely *unity of will and action* . Since the dictatorship of the proletariat is carried out primarily by the forces of the party, and since the party is the leader of the proletarian state, the need for *unity is particularly strong* political parties, the need for a single will, a single party center, the inadmissibility of groupings, factions, and factional centers. Bolshevik self-criticism, exposing the mistakes and shortcomings of party work, while educating and strengthening the party and its iron discipline, thereby strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The agents of the class enemy, *opportunism*in its various forms, seek to undermine party unity; opportunism acts under the guise of self-criticism, with such criticism that, instead of strengthening the party, it undermines the party system itself. Opportunism tends to form factional centers, and this always means a tendency to develop into another, and therefore counter-revolutionary, party. Opportunism, by shaking the unity of the party, shakes the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, the problem of unity, solidity, and iron discipline of the party under the conditions of a dictatorship appears especially as the problem of "*the basic condition* for the success of the dictatorship of the proletariat" *(Lenin).* . Therefore, the task of preserving the unity of the party and ensuring its role in the system of the proletarian dictatorship presupposes the necessity of purging the ranks of the party of opportunist elements.

The Party is "unity of will, *incompatible with the existence of factions* ... the Party is strengthened *by purging itself* of opportunist elements" *(Stalin)* .

One of the main weaknesses of the Paris Commune was that none of the factions of French socialism could be a party that clearly understood what its role and tasks were. Drawing on the experience of the Paris Commune and the subsequent workers ' movement, the Communist-led working class *in all parts of the world* It lays the foundations of a party capable of leading its class and all the working masses in the struggle for the abolition of imperialism and all slavery in general. "By educating the workers' Party, Marxism educates *the vanguard of the proletariat*, capable of seizing power and *leading the whole people to socialism* , of guiding and organizing the new system, of being the teacher, guide, and leader *of all the working people and exploited*in organizing their social life without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie[276]."

The name of this great international party is *the Communist International* . This party mobilizes the world proletariat and all the oppressed classes for an irreconcilable struggle against the party of the depraved working-class aristocracy, the party of perpetuating wage slavery-against the social-fascist Second International. All the parties of the Comintern, following the example of the CPSU (b), are steadily moving towards mastering the majority of the proletariat, towards creating the prerequisites for the conquest of the dictatorship.

"The proletariat needs a party in order to win and maintain the dictatorship. The Party is an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But it follows from this, " T. emphasized. Stalin — that with the disappearance of classes, with the withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the party must also die[277]out." The Party will be the last to die out, along with the development of the highest phase of communism, when all the remnants of social inequality that still remained under socialism will disappear.

However, *the leadership* that the party exercises in the system of proletarian dictatorship would be completely wrong to understand as *the dictatorship of the party* . Criticizing this point of view put forward by Zinoviev, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a dictatorship of the party, that the leadership of the party is based on *mutual* trust existing between the working class and its advanced vanguard, and that the leadership of the party can be properly carried out only through *the entire system of mass organizations*of the proletarian

---

276 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIV, ч. 2 — с. 317.

277 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 96.

dictatorship.

The main place in this system of proletarian dictatorship is occupied by the state organization of the proletariat — *the Soviets* . "The dictatorship," Lenin formulates, " is carried out by the proletariat organized in soviets and led *by the Communist Party*of the Bolsheviks[278]." The more correctly and successfully the work of this new type of state unfolds, the more deeply proletarian influence penetrates the non-proletarian working masses, and the more the entire mass of working people becomes connected with and supported by the workers ' state.

However, as we have already pointed out, the very character of the Soviet state would not be properly understood if we did not also take into account the role of all other proletarian organizations that ensure the development of proletarian democracy. In its work, the communist vanguard also relies on *the trade unions* , which under the dictatorship of the proletariat become an organization that unites the entire ruling class primarily in solving industrial and educational tasks. As a mass organization, which can be said to unite the entire proletariat-from its advanced communist detachment to the most backward elements, which are at the lowest level of class consciousness - the trade unions represent the organizational form through which the party is directly connected with the working class.

Trade unions are *a school of communism* . They are, first of all, a school of socialist production management; they are directly connected with production, they are organized precisely on a production basis, according to branches of production. Hence, from the trade unions, cadres for the organization of the socialist economy are growing. By linking the proletarian vanguard with the entire class, the trade unions are drawing the broadest circles of the entire mass of the proletariat into the work of socialist construction, and are instilling in the proletariat the beginning of a conscious and active attitude towards socialist production, of a conscious and active participation in the struggle for the growth and improvement of the socialist economy. In this way trade unions train and single *out cadres of builders of socialism* in all levels of government-from the grassroots up to senior managers throughout the country. All the work of the trade unions and all the actions of the working class are directed by the Communist vanguard towards strengthening proletarian state power and building socialism; by subordinating their activities to this basic task, the trade unions are fighting *against bureaucratic perversions* the workers ' state, which plays an extremely important role in this struggle and is linked to all branches of the state apparatus. The trade unions also penetrate into the countryside, organizing its proletarian and semi-proletarian elements, and thus spreading proletarian influence among the peasantry. The trade unions, which unite the party with the class, primarily along the line of production, are in their entirety "*the backbone*of the entire system of proletarian dictatorship."

"To govern the country and carry out the dictatorship without the closest connection with the trade unions, without their warm support, without their selfless work not only in economic but also in military construction," Lenin pointed out, " we, of course, would not have been able to do so not only for two years, but even for two months[279]."

Such is the role of trade unions in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Viewed in their historical perspective, these powerful schools of communism train well-rounded workers in the era of future communism. Through industrial unions, the transition to the "*abolition of the division of labor" will be carried out.* between people, to the education, training and training *of comprehensively developed and comprehensively prepared people* who know how to do everything. This is what communism is coming to, must come to, and will come to, " Lenin pointed out,"but only after a long series of years[280]."

Mass organizations such as the cooperative and the Komsomol are also of great importance in

278 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVII — с. 138.

279 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVII — с. 139.

280 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVII — с. 141.

the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat *кооперация и комсомол*. Of particular importance is *the Youth Union*, which is a mass organization of workers 'and peasants' youth and trains young cadres in all areas of political, economic and cultural struggle and socialist construction.

The greater the mass of small peasant farms in a country in which the proletariat has taken power, the greater the role *of the cooperative* . Co-operation is the basic organizational form of the rural movement towards socialism, the form through which the proletarian vanguard draws the masses of the working peasantry into the system of socialism under construction.

At the same time, along with *the production* co — operation of collective farms, the *consumer*co-operation also plays a huge role, the task of which is to improve the conditions of supply of workers. Thus, the role of cooperation becomes particularly important at the present stage of the struggle for the development of broad socialist construction.

Despite the diversity of the methods of work of the various mass organizations, these organizations still represent a *unity* , a single system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a complex proletarian apparatus that fights in various ways for one cause, moving towards one goal. And *the peculiarity of a particular period* in the development of the proletarian dictatorship puts a stamp on *the whole* system, puts forward before it the demand for regrouping its ranks and *changing the forms and methods of work*of its various organizations in a certain general direction.

In the conditions of direct struggle for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the conditions of civil war, the importance of violent struggle increases with particular force.*насильственной* sides of the dictatorship. "When it comes to war, everything must be subordinated to the interests of war, and the whole internal life of the country must be subordinated to war[281]."

Combat tasks in such a period prevail over construction and educational ones (although of course the combat tasks themselves cannot be solved without known construction and educational work). Accordingly, all proletarian organizations devote their main forces to securing the front; accordingly, they regroup their ranks and distribute their forces. Conditions are being created when revolutionary expediency requires all organizations in almost all branches of work to act quickly *in a military* manner , to carry out combat orders without delay, to militarize the forms of work in a certain way, and consequently to curtail the methods of internal party democracy, the methods of workers ' democracy in trade unions, etc., and the known organizational centralism required by the combat situation, etc. Such are the organizational forms and methods of work of mass organizations at a time when the proletarian dictatorship is ensuring a victorious exit from the civil war.

But these forms, in the new conditions prepared by them, are no longer suitable, and they are transformed from a form of movement and strengthening of the dictatorship into a brake on its development. It becomes necessary to change them. New forms of struggle and new methods of work are needed, since the other side of the problem of the proletarian dictatorship, and its most essential side, is becoming decisive-*economic construction* , the struggle for the solution of the economic problems set forth in the proletarian revolution.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat," says Comrade Lenin. Stalin-has its own periods, its own special forms, various methods of work. During the civil war, *the violent side of the dictatorship is particularly striking* . But this does not mean that there is no construction work during the civil war. Without construction work, it is impossible to wage a civil war. In the period of building socialism, on the contrary, *the peaceful organizational and cultural work of the dictatorship, the revolutionary legality,* etc., is particularly striking. But again, this does *not at all follow that the violent side of the dictatorship has disappeared*or may disappear during the construction period. The organs of suppression, the army, and other organizations are necessary now, at the time of construction, as well as during the civil war. Without the presence of these organs, the construction work of the dictatorship is impossible in any way secured. It should not be forgotten that the revolution has won so far only in one country. We should not forget that as long as there is a capitalist encirclement,

281 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XX, ч. 2 — с. 388.

there will also be a danger of intervention, with all the consequences that follow from this danger[282]."

The transition to broad forms of socialist construction is a transition to *new methods* of strengthening the activity, organization, and discipline of the proletariat, to new forms of struggle against the urban and rural bourgeoisie, to new forms of alliance between the proletariat and the rural poor and the middle peasant, to new forms of struggle against bureaucracy, to new forms of alliance with the proletariat and the working masses of the capitalist world. The rise in the material and cultural level of the working masses, the strengthening of the proletariat, and the strengthening of the party leadership lead to a strengthening of the activity *of mass* organizations, *to the growth of proletarian democracy, and to an increase in the activity of the masses*in the cause of socialist construction.

The strengthening of the trade unions, the "backbone of the proletarian dictatorship", is expressed in *the development of democracy within the union* , in the growth of organizational forms that involve the working masses in direct active participation in construction, in improving its forms, increasing labor productivity, etc. *выдвижение*for the re-education of new workers ' cadres and for the organization of proletarian influence and leadership in the countryside, etc.

On the basis of strengthening the proletarian leadership, *the revival of the Soviets is being carried out* in the city and village. Correct and successful work to revitalize the Soviets creates a solid foundation for consolidating the alliance of the proletariat with the middle peasantry and the struggle against the bourgeoisie. The restriction and displacement of capitalist elements takes place in a whole series of new forms of class struggle — along the lines of tax policy, along the lines of thwarting the speculative tendencies of the kulak and the private sector through appropriate pressure on the market, along the lines of developing state and cooperative trade, along the lines of organizing cooperative credit, and so on.

Deployment of Soviet *democracy in the countryside* In the early years of the NEP, the process was aimed at strengthening the alliance of the proletariat and the rural poor with the middle peasantry, and at strengthening the leading role of the working class, which relies on the poor, in this alliance. The proletariat wrestes the poor from kulak dependence by a system of economic, political and organizational measures, and organizes the poor to fight against the kulaks. The whole system of measures in the sphere of trade, taxation, co-operation, etc., which leads to the restriction and displacement of the kulaks and capitalist elements in general, is at the same time aimed at improving the material situation of the working peasantry, especially of the poor (for example, those who are completely exempt from taxes, etc.).

The ever — accelerating growth of socialist construction, the ousting of capitalist elements, the development of Soviet democracy, the strengthening and deepening of the leading role of the proletariat, and the growth of confidence in the party and the workers ' state-such is the fundamental and decisive trend that is making its way through all the difficulties of the class struggle.

Finally, the period *of socialist reconstruction*presents new tasks for the party, Soviets, trade unions, co-operatives, etc., and demands new methods of work. The trade unions are carrying out new forms of industrial work — social competition and strike work, counter-planning, self-supporting teams, etc.By involving the best drummers in the Soviets, Soviet democracy is being strengthened. The soviets are faced with new construction tasks, issues of urban economy and public utilities. The Soviets in the countryside promote collective and state farm construction. Step by step, the broad masses of the working peasantry are being drawn through co-operation into the system of socialism under construction, rising from the lowest cooperative levels to the higher ones. The growing power of socialist industry, the growth of Soviet farms, the growth of the leading role of the proletariat, the growth of planned influence on agriculture, the development of a cooperative society, the growing struggle and offensive against the capitalist elements — all this brings the broad masses of the peasantry to the highest, industrial and collective-farm forms of cooperation, to

282 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 284.

the direct construction of socialism in the countryside.

This is how the forces of communism fight against the forces of capitalism. This is how the dictatorship of the proletariat is carried out, and at the same time how proletarian democracy develops. In this way the state develops and becomes stronger *государство"in a new* way democratic (for the proletarians and the poor in general) and *in a new* way dictatorial (against the bourgeoisie)" *(Lenin).*

At the same time, it becomes clear from all the preceding discussion why and how proletarian democracy "immediately begins *to prepare* for the complete *extinction of all statehood* by attracting *mass organizations* of the working people to permanent and unconditional participation in public administration[283]."

There has never been a state so *powerful* in its very essence, as the dictatorship of the proletariat. Never before has there been a government that relies so directly on the mass organizations of the oppressed classes, that expresses the domination of the majority of the population over the minority. And at the same time the stronger *it becomes* the dictatorship of the proletariat, the stronger and more powerful the state of the proletariat becomes, the more the conditions are being prepared for its withering away in the future — *after the final victory of socialism and the building of a complete socialist society — for the withering away of the state in general* .

Emphasizing in every possible way that the very foundations of the system of proletarian dictatorship contain *the prerequisites for future extinction* At the same time, it is necessary to wage a struggle against all "leftist" theories that even now seek to speak of the state dying out in areas of complete collectivization, and so on.It is also necessary to fight against the right — wing opportunist theory of a "declining state curve" — as the class struggle "fades" - put forward by Comrade Bukharin. The dialectic of the development of the state is such that only as a result *of higher development and strengthening of the* the Soviet power and the entire system of proletarian dictatorship as a whole are being created with real prerequisites for future *extinction* states. The *more complete it is* proletarian democracy, the wider its coverage of all strata of the working people who are drawn into the construction of a socialist society through the Soviets and through the entire system of dictatorship, the closer this democracy is to its *withering* away . "The highest development of State power in order to prepare the conditions *for* the withering away of State power-that is the Marxist formula" *(Stalin)* . "Democracy is really complete, becoming a habit and therefore dying out," says Lenin. — *Full version* democracy equals *no*democracy. This is not a paradox, but the truth."

In criticizing Comrade Bukharin's point of view, Lenin pointed out the following three successive stages of the withering away of the state:

1) creating the habit of communist labor;

2) the death of enforcement agencies;

3) the death of the army and navy — after the victory of the revolution on a global scale.

The economic basis *of the full* Lenin did not see the withering away of the state in the mere transfer of the means of production to public ownership, which would take place entirely at the stage of a fully developed socialist society. For the complete extinction of the state , it is necessary to transform proletarian democracy and socialist discipline into *a habit*, and it is necessary to be able to satisfy all the needs of the working people without compulsion. Only at *the highest* stage of communism will the state finally die out, and with it democracy. "For *the full version complete communism is necessary for the withering away of the state* " *(Lenin).*

5.4. New forms of class struggle of the proletariat. Suppression of bourgeois resistance

283 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 45.

Let us turn to the main forms of class struggle that constitute the main content of the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Having won political power," says Lenin, " the proletariat does not stop the class struggle, but *продолжает*continues it until the destruction of classes, but, of course, in a different situation, in a different form, and by different means[284]." "We are going into battle, and this is *the content of the dictatorship of the proletariat* »[285]."

At the very beginning of the transition period, Lenin outlined the following *five new*forms of class struggle that characterize the era of the proletarian dictatorship:

1) *suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie* ,

2) civil war,

3) neutralization of the petty bourgeoisie, especially the peasantry,

4) using the bourgeoisie,

5) education of a new discipline.

These forms of class struggle outlined by Lenin undergo some modifications in further development-with the transition from the period of "war communism" to the NEP. The slogan *of neutralizing the middle peasantry,* which corresponds to the period of the seizure of power, is replaced by the slogan *of an alliance with the middle peasant* . The task of using bourgeois specialists is expanding. It becomes necessary to use the methods developed by capitalism — the exchange of goods and trade-to raise the country's productive forces, to strengthen the socialist sector of the economy. The education of a new socialist discipline becomes the most important aspect of a more general task — *the socialist reconstruction of the national economy* . However, each of these tasks that the proletarian dictatorship consistently faces — the binding of NEP, the creation of socialist *forms* of labor — remains *a form of class struggle* waged by the proletariat for the construction of socialism.

As already mentioned, the three main economic forms that make up the transition economy *are socialism, small-scale commodity economy, and capitalism* . Each of these forms is represented by a corresponding *class* . These classes are *the proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie* (especially *the peasantry*), and *the bourgeoisie* . However, the situation of all classes *changes significantly*under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The proletariat is a class that under capitalism is oppressed, deprived of the means of production, and after the victory of the proletarian revolution is transformed into *an economically and politically dominant class* . "It is no longer the proletariat *in the former sense of the word* , as it was in capitalist society[286]." It expropriates the capitalists and landlords and makes *land and the basic means of production the property of the proletarian State* . By occupying these commanding heights of the national economy, the proletariat suppresses the bourgeoisie, leads the peasantry, and builds socialism.

But the proletariat, which has taken power, could not have solved this problem without defeating the exploiting classes of landlords and capitalists, and without defeating the ruling class of capitalist society, the bourgeoisie. Its decisive and comprehensive *suppression* , its political and economic *defeat* , and its expropriation are necessary — as a decisive blow to the deepest economic foundation of its political authority and domination, and as a starting point for further revolutionary transformation of the economy. A rapid and radical defeat of the landlords and capitalists, and their exclusion from the large-scale production that they represented, is possible in a relatively short period of time. "The task of socialism is to *destroy classes* . In the first ranks of the exploiting class are the big landowners and industrial capitalists. Here, the work of destruction can quite easily be

---

284 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 249.

285 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 206.

286 В. Молотов, Доклад на XVII партконференции.

completed in a few months, and sometimes even in a few weeks or days[287]."

The capitalist bourgeoisie, as well as the large landowners and landlords who own the means of production adjacent to them, are deprived of political domination and expropriated. The bourgeoisie ceases to be *the main class* during the transition period. The overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and its suppression, however, *do not destroy* it . It remains *the main enemy* of the working class, and in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie the main class contradiction of the transition period passes through and develops. The victory of the proletariat only increases the energy *сопротивления*of the exploiters ' resistance: they resist throughout the entire transition period, and the more successful the proletariat's struggle for socialism, the fiercer and fiercer the resistance becomes.

The transition period is a period of struggle "between dying *capitalism* and emerging *communism* ," a period of irreconcilable struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the city and countryside. Tov. Stalin therefore particularly notes the following "the most general definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat given by Lenin": "The dictatorship of the proletariat is the class struggle of the proletariat that has won and taken over the political power of the proletariat against the defeated but not destroyed, not disappeared, not ceased to resist, against the increased resistance of the bourgeoisie[288]."

Kautsky, in his infamous book Bolshevism at a Dead End, in which he openly defends the Second International's line of intervention, the defeat of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. and the restoration of the dictatorship of capital, in particular bitterly laments the expropriated landlords and capitalists. The bourgeoisie, in Kautsky's words, has been transformed in the U.S.S.R. into a stratum of "pariahs and helots," "a stratum of boundless want and the deepest despair." The Bolsheviks, the learned Kautsky reports, were "devoid of all economic knowledge" and therefore refused "to give the capitalists a reward for the means of production expropriated from them." The Bolsheviks "simply took everything from the landlords, all the land, all the inventory" and deprived the poor landlords "of the opportunity to conduct even the smallest peasant economy." The situation of the capitalists also cannot console Kautsky:"just like the landlords, the capitalists were also expropriated." Kautsky cannot understand why, in addition to the "horrors" that have been committed, such as the defeat of bourgeois democracy, the establishment of a dictatorship, and the expropriation of the landlords and capitalists, he should further pursue a policy of suppressing the exploiters, since "they have been expropriated and *therefore no longer exist as a class, but as individuals are deprived of all rights." means*of influencing the population"[289]. Here, in these complaints of Kautsky's, is a complete picture of the complete "liberation" of the most prominent social-fascist theorist from Marxism, a complete perversion of the Marxist theory of classes and the class struggle.

Lenin never tired of emphasizing that in the event of a victory of the proletariat in one country — and this is a typical case — the exploiters, who rely on their vast international connections and influence among the backward part of the exploited masses, *are still stronger* the proletariat. In Lenin's words, the bourgeoisie "perfectly understands" that the proletariat *can fully* organize socialist production if only it succeeds in preventing and repelling conspiracies and attempts at intervention on the part of the international bourgeoisie. Realizing this, the international bourgeoisie tries to weaken the contradictions in its own camp between individual imperialist countries, organizes plots against the proletarian dictatorship and prepares military campaigns against it, and does everything possible to provoke, support and incite *civil war* .

The proletariat that has taken power immediately faces a number of urgent tasks connected with the suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie. The expropriation of exploiters is not only

---

287 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 1 — с. 323.

288 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVII, ч. 1 — с. 240–241 .

289 К. Каутский, Большевизм в тупике — с. 51, 68, 96. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

a necessary prerequisite for socialist construction, but also a powerful blow to the material strength of the bourgeoisie, to its influence, to its organizational resources. But former exploiters are still armed with numerous actual advantages. This includes a known part of the exploiters ' movable property remaining in their possession. This includes *money belonging to the bourgeoisie* , this "remnant of yesterday's exploitation", this "certificate for receiving tribute from all working people". This includes vast organizational experience, *management* experience , and the strength of the acquired bourgeois civilization. This includes the support of exploiters on the part *of the bourgeois intelligentsia* , especially at first, during the period of the proletariat's struggle for the consolidation of the dictatorship, when the bourgeoisie's hopes for restoration are particularly high. During this period, the intelligentsia supports the bourgeoisie, by which it has been trained and educated, by open struggle, sabotage, participation in conspiracies and sabotage, and by all the weight and role that the intelligentsia — especially the technical and military personnel — plays in public life. The internal forces of capitalism also include the social lackeys of the bourgeoisie-the Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries, etc. — who develop frenzied agitation against the dictatorship of the proletariat and actively participate in the plots and uprisings of the White Guards.

Especially important among the internal forces of capitalism is the strength *of small-scale production* , the strength of the habit of small-scale production, which has persisted for a number of years. "When we overthrew the capitalist institutions," Lenin said, " it turned out that there was still one force that held on to capitalism — the force of habit. An institution can be broken immediately with luck, but a habit can never be broken immediately with any luck[290]." In order to destroy the bourgeoisie, the proletariat still had to complete the more difficult and long-term part of the task - "to destroy small-scale production, *which inevitably gives rise to capitalism* , to destroy the difference between worker and peasant, *and to make all workers*" *(Lenin).* . The vacillation of the small producer, who was favored by the bourgeois upper class of the countryside, often threw him into the camp of the enemies of the proletariat.

All these internal forces of capitalism demanded a resolute and merciless suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie, and this suppression could only be organized by the proletarian state, which took the place of the broken, broken bourgeois state. The immediate arming of the workers, the organization of the militia, the Red Army, and other organs of repulse were necessary to prevent action and suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie. Without this, the dictatorship of the proletariat would not have been able to maintain itself; without this, its fall would have been as inevitable as conspiracies and various forms of intensified resistance on the part of the exploiters of the city and countryside, up to the point of civil war.

However, despite all the resolute and consistent measures taken by the working class in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the proletarian dictatorship , the forces of the bourgeoisie remained *stronger* , since it relied, in addition to its internal forces, on its *international relations*, on the forces of the world bourgeoisie. All the military power of international imperialism, the influence of the bourgeois press, the church, the agitation of international social-democracy-all these forces were directed against the country of the proletarian dictatorship.

The proletarian state was for a long time the only one in the ring of capitalist countries. Asked for: Under these conditions, how could the proletarian dictatorship preserve, strengthen and build socialism?

But the whole point is that the victorious proletariat finds not only enemies, but also allies, both in the external environment and within the country. Such an ally of the proletariat in its struggle against international capitalism is *the international proletariat* and the exploited working masses of all countries. With the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, the rest of the world increasingly began to differentiate itself into two poles, into *two main camps* : the camp of exploiters — the camp of all the forces of capitalism and the enemies of the proletariat, and, on the other hand, the camp of allies of the Soviet Union, a growing multi-million-strong camp

290 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 216.

of exploited workers and non-proletarian, but exploited working masses of the capitalist and colonial countries. The workers ' State stands before the world of the oppressed "as the torch of international socialism and as an example before all the working masses" *(Lenin)*, as the center of the greatest attraction.

Every step that strengthens the dictatorship of the working class strengthens *the cause of the entire international proletariat*, the cause of preparing for its world victory. The armed working class, organized in the Soviet state, organizing the Red Army, organizing defense in its own country, etc., is at the same time the greatest force in the unfolding of the international revolution. The strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat is at the same time the strengthening of the greatest bulwark against international reaction, the greatest support in the struggle for power of the workers of other countries.

In 1921, summing up the results of the three-year struggle waged by the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. for the preservation and consolidation of its dictatorship, Lenin, among the reasons that led to its victory, pointed out that the defeat of the working class would have been inevitable if the workers in all capitalist countries, even where they were under the influence of Messrs. they did not thwart the war against the U.S.S.R. of the world's richest capitalist powers, whose military power "immeasurably and unconditionally exceeded our military forces" and who supported Kolchak, Denikin and others. And Lenin says: "The workers of the advanced countries so determine the course of the war that it is impossible to wage war against their will; in the end, they thwarted the war against us *by passive and semi-passive resistance* . This indisputable fact precisely answers the question of where the Russian proletariat could have *obtained the moral strength* to hold on for 3 1/2 years and win. The moral strength of the Russian worker was that he knew, felt, and felt the help and support given to him in this struggle by the proletariat of all advanced countries[291]."

The support of the international proletariat and the working people of all countries is what gives the country of the proletarian dictatorship the greatest moral strength to resist the international front of capital. But this support would have been absolutely insufficient if the proletariat had failed *internally.* The countries of the proletarian dictatorship must overcome their internal contradictions by their own efforts and find an ally in the broad working masses of the peasantry.

5.5. The dictatorship of the proletariat as the leadership of the non-proletarian working masses. Proletariat and peasantry

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the organization of violence by the proletariat in order to suppress the former exploiters, and only exploiters, of course.

But, says Lenin, " not in *violence alone* the essence of the proletarian dictatorship *is not primarily violence* . Its main essence lies in *the organization and discipline* of the vanguard of the working people, its vanguard, and its sole *leader*— the proletariat[292]." Here Lenin puts forward two most important aspects that characterize the main essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat: the organization and discipline of the working class, and the leadership of the proletariat due to this organization and discipline *of the broad non — proletarian masses of the working* people .

In exercising its dictatorship , the proletariat leads the broadest masses *to build socialism*, and the main task of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to build and build a socialized, socialist economy *for the entire mass of working*people — workers and peasants. "It's about organizing in a new way the deepest economic foundations of the lives of tens and tens of millions of people[293]."

This is the source of great difficulties and at the same time the source of the greatest strength of the proletarian revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat is an indispensable condition and a

---

291 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 1 — с. 176.

292 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 226.

293 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XV — с. 196.

necessary tool for the working class to win over the *majority of the non-proletarian working masses* . The working class attracts the broadest working masses to its side by defending their deepest *economic needs*, benefits, and interests, while at the same time making the greatest heroic sacrifices. "The dictatorship of the proletariat,"says Lenin," means both the ability of the proletariat *to organize and lead all the working and exploited masses* , and the ability of the vanguard to make the greatest possible sacrifices and heroism for this purpose[294]." Having overthrown the bourgeoisie and established a dictatorship, the proletariat, in Lenin's words, must " finish off the influence of the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois compromisers among the majority *of the non-proletarian working masses*by revolutionizing their economic needs at the expense of exploiters[295]."

A long period of intense struggle and enormous sacrifices on the part of the proletariat was necessary to convince the non-proletarian working masses that the dictatorship of the proletariat was more profitable for them, that it was the only way out of exploitation and poverty for them as well. "The dictatorship of the proletariat," Lenin noted, " is the class struggle of the proletariat with the help of such an instrument as state power, a class struggle, one of the tasks of which is to demonstrate by long experience, by a long series of practical examples, to demonstrate *to the non-proletarian working strata* what is *most profitable for them* to be more in favor of the dictatorship of the proletariat than of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and that there can be no third[296]way."

Thus, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only an instrument for suppressing the resistance of the bourgeoisie; its main essence is that it is also an instrument *for attracting* the majority of the non-proletarian working masses to the side of the working class. But these various aspects and tasks of the proletarian dictatorship *are inseparable*from one another. Without a decisive struggle against the bourgeoisie, without the suppression of the bourgeoisie, the proletariat would not have been able to win over the majority of the working people and exploited, to realize their economic needs at the expense of the exploiters, and to build socialism together with them. On the other hand, without an alliance with the working masses, without their leadership, the proletariat could not have solved either the tasks of overcoming the resistance of the bourgeoisie or the tasks of positive socialist construction.

This main "essence" of the dictatorship of the proletariat is clearly expressed in the question of the relationship between the two *main classes* of the transition period — the working class and the peasantry. The essence of these relations is *the union of the proletariat and the middle peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat for the preservation of the proletarian dictatorship and for the ultimate destruction of classes* . "Without an alliance with the peasantry," says Lenin, "the political power of the proletariat is impossible , its retention is impossible... *The supreme principle of the dictatorship is to preserve the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry*, so that the proletariat can retain *its leading role and state power* »[297]." "An agreement from the point of view of the working class, "he notes in the same place," is only permissible, correct, and fundamentally possible when it *supports the dictatorship of the working class* and is *one of the measures aimed at the destruction of classes* »[298]." The line of proletarian *leadership* of the peasantry is a line aimed at *the support* of the peasant masses for the proletarian dictatorship, a line aimed at *the destruction*of classes.

A correct understanding of the class struggle during the entire transition period is possible only through *concrete action.* to study the conditions under which a "special form of class union"

---

294 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XX, ч. 2 — с. 405.

295 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XV — с. 450.

296 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XV — с. 453.

297 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XV — с. 331.

298 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 257.

develops between the proletariat in power and the non-Proletarian and semi-proletarian working masses, by elucidating the various stages and forms of relations between these two classes that develop in the context of fierce and diverse resistance to the bourgeoisie. "This," says Lenin, " is a special kind of alliance, formed in a special situation, namely, in the midst of a furious civil war; it is an alliance of firm supporters of socialism with its wavering allies, sometimes with "neutral" ones (in this case the alliance turns from an agreement on struggle into an agreement on neutrality), an alliance between *economically, politically, and socially unequal parties, spiritually by classes* "[299].

The form and content of the union of the proletariat with the peasantry *is not something fixed and unchangeable* . At various stages of the development of the struggle for power, for its consolidation, for the unfolding of socialist construction, serious shifts and changes took place in the situation and relations between the proletariat and the peasantry. This required a change in the methods of leadership of the peasantry and in the attitude of the proletariat towards its various groups. The different class positions of certain strata of the peasantry at different stages of the revolution also caused the proletariat to treat them differently. The latter was expressed in the well-known three successive slogans, which expressed in the most general form the line of the proletariat's attitude towards the peasantry.

The class position of the peasant *poor* , the semi-proletarians of the countryside, made the connection of the working class with this most exploited and oppressed section of the countryside particularly close. Its class position made the poor a staunchest *ally* the proletariat in the socialist revolution and the most solid *support*of the working class in the countryside. The more resolute the crackdown on the big landowners and the bourgeoisie, and the more rapid and tangible the economic and political assistance that the poor received in this case, the greater and more solid the conditions were created for their resolute support of the proletariat.

The class position *середняка*of the middle peasant caused his inevitable vacillation between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The petty bourgeoisie, Lenin pointed out, also occupies an intermediate position in the transition period. The peasant, the small proprietor- " this is a class that *hesitates . He's part owner, part hard worker. It does not*exploit other workers ' representatives. For decades he had to defend his position with the greatest difficulty, he experienced the exploitation of landlords and capitalists, he endured everything, and at the same time he is an owner[300]."

The whole point of socialism , as Lenin categorically put it, was that the proletariat *should correctly distinguish between the working peasant*, who was drawn to the proletariat , whose fundamental interest was in freeing himself from exploiters, *from the peasant-owner,* from the peasant-merchant , who was drawn by habit, *an old-fashioned conservatism,* to managing on the basis of frequent ownership and free trade. This latter, according to Lenin, generates capitalism "constantly, daily, hourly, spontaneously and on a mass scale."

The task of the proletariat during the transition period was to make this distinction correctly, to be able to draw the working peasantry under its leadership into the system of socialism under construction, to create all the economic prerequisites for destroying the difference between worker and peasant, and to destroy classes.

All the possibilities of this are given by the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it was impossible to turn them into reality at once. This was the work of a whole series of years, during which an intense struggle developed between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie for the leadership of the peasantry. "If capitalism," Lenin said, " wins the revolution, it will win by taking advantage of the darkness of the peasants, by bribing them, by enticing them to return to free trade[301]." Only by establishing a correct attitude towards the working people of the countryside did

---

299 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 241.

300 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 147.

301 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 218.

the proletariat secure its victory over the bourgeoisie on this decisive front as well. "10-20 years of correct relations with the peasantry," Lenin foresaw, " and victory *on a world scale* will be assured , even if the proletarian revolutions are prolonged, which are growing."

In the earliest period of the struggle for the socialist revolution, in the period of the direct struggle of the proletariat for the conquest of its power, the working class could not yet see the middle peasantry as its ally in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. The task was simply to prevent the middle peasant from leaning over to the bourgeoisie, or at least *to neutralize*the middle peasant. "Neutralization,"Lenin defined at the time," consists of persuasion, example, learning by experience, suppressing evasion, violence, and so on[302]."

The proletariat marched against the tsarist autocracy together with *the entire* peasantry, which was interested in destroying feudal relations. In the period of the October Revolution, the proletariat was already marching only with *the poorest* peasantry, with *the resistance* kulaks, in *case of fluctuations* from the middle peasantry. By engaging the middle peasantry in the struggle against the oppression of the imperialist state apparatus, the struggle against imperialist wars, against exploitation, against usury, against the oppression of tested capital, the expropriation of landlords and capitalists after the seizure of power, the abolition of rents, the increase in cultivated land, etc., the proletariat overcame the contradictions of the owner in relation to the wage worker. While attracting the middle peasants and persuading them, it was necessary at the same time to carry out firm political observation of their actions, it was necessary to strictly check their intentions, firm measures were needed, such as organizing poor people's committees that would not allow the Kulak to take over the middle Peasants, and would not allow the middle Peasants to go over to the Kulak side. This is the policy of neutralizing the peasant during the proletariat's struggle for power. In this way the task was carried out of "making this middle peasant a social stratum that, if not actively helping the revolution of the proletariat, at least does not interfere with our work" *(Lenin).* .

The kulaks , the rural bourgeoisie, are an implacable enemy of the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship. In the conditions of the struggle for power, an alliance with the poor and the neutralization of the middle peasantry presuppose a resolute struggle against the kulaks, against their influence, a resolute suppression of their resistance, their exploitative tendencies, their conspiracies and uprisings. This is how the alliance of the proletariat with the poorest peasantry unfolds, how its alliance with the rural poor against the urban and rural bourgeoisie unfolds, while neutralizing the middle peasant, at the first stage of the conquest and consolidation of power.

New conditions put forward new tasks and set old ones in a new way. And the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry at the new stage are developing *in a new* way . The policy of neutralizing the middle peasant was abolished after 1918. Already in 1919, Lenin put forward the slogan *of a lasting alliance with the middle peasantry* . In order to transfer small-scale dispersed peasant farming to large-scale socialized agriculture, it was necessary first to deploy large-scale industry as an intermediary link on the road to collectivization of the countryside. The construction of socialism in its very essence could only be the work *of the entire working* mass, its decisive majority. And this required *mass experience* , mass testing in practice of the benefits and advantages of social production over individual production, a long struggle and huge cultural work to overcome the old habits, traditions, and conservatism of the small proprietor, and to re-educate him culturally and politically by the working class.

Therefore, a necessary condition for the development of a socialist economy during the recovery period was the combination *of socialist* industry, owned by the proletarian state, *with small-scale commodity economy* through state-regulated *trade* . On this basis, the proletariat exercised economic and political leadership over the mass of peasant farms and prepared for a profound socialist transformation of small-scale farming. The latter was prepared for by the growth of large-scale industry and the rise in the material well-being of the overwhelming majority of the non-proletarian working masses.

---

302 Ленинский сборник III — с. 494.

The bourgeoisie, due to its defeat and expropriation of the main instruments of production, became a secondary class during the transition period, although it remained *the main enemy* of the proletariat in the course of the development of the class struggle unfolding during the transition period. *The main classes* of the transition period are *the proletariat* and the class of small commodity producers, small proprietors — *the peasantry*in its main middle peasant mass. Not only did the number of typical middle peasant farms not decrease during the recovery period, but, on the contrary, it increased. It has increased as a result of the growth and strengthening of a part of the poor peasants ' farms at the expense of exploiters and thus increasing the middle peasant mass of the peasantry.

Freed from the oppression of the imperialist state apparatus, from imperialist wars, from various forms of exploitation by finance capital, from ruinous taxes, etc., the mass of exploited peasants strengthened and expanded their economy at the expense of the landlords and kulaks. In Russia, the vast majority of landlords ' land was divided among the peasants. The nationalization of the land, the movement of the kombeds, and dekulakization-all this led, despite the process of differentiation, to a very significant growth of the middle peasant peasantry, to the fact that *the middle peasant became the central figure of the village* .

The proletariat's struggle for the suppression of exploiters, their defeat, the consolidation of the power of the working class, the successful establishment and regulation of trade, the successful development of the proletariat's struggle for the link between socialized economy and the peasant economy, the power of the proletarian state, the improvement of the material situation of the working masses shaken by the civil war, the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie along these lines — all this contributed *to the growth of the the working class and its party* among the broad working masses. This created the conditions and grounds for *a lasting alliance with the middle peasantry* .

Lenin, at the Third Congress of the Comintern, stating that the working class had thoroughly dealt with the landlords and capitalists, called the peasantry "*the last capitalist class*." Trotskyism tries to interpret this proposition of Lenin's in such a way that it regards peasant farming as capitalist. Right-wing opportunism completely ignored this position, considering the peasant as a worker, forgetting that he is at the same time an owner. Both of these attitudes were in fundamental contradiction with Leninism. The bulk of the middle peasant farms, by their type, are a form *of simple commodity economy, not of capitalist economy* . But a simple commodity economy, in contrast to a socialist economy, is built on *the basis of private ownership of* the means of production, and in this respect it *is of the same type*as a capitalist economy[303]. Hence, from this petty-proprietorship basis, the "commodity-*capitalist*tendency of the peasantry" was born, opposing the "*socialist* tendency of the proletariat". That is why Lenin called the peasantry "the last capitalist class" and "the deepest foundation of capitalism"; that is why he noted that the class of small commodity producers distinguishes kulaks, capitalists, and the bourgeoisie from its midst. "Peasant farming," Lenin said, " continues to be small-scale commodity production. Here we have an extremely broad and very deep, very solid *base of capitalism* . On this basis, *capitalism is preserved and revived again*in the fiercest struggle against communism[304]."

However, the middle peasant economy, while on its private property basis being of the same type as the capitalist economy and inevitably generating and isolating capitalist elements, is nevertheless not capitalist in itself, but a simple commodity economy, *small-scale property* economy, non-exploitative. In this peculiarity of the middle peasant economy lies the possibility *of an economic union* between the proletariat and the middle peasantry.

At the same time, during the entire transition period, the proletariat and the middle peasantry remain*неодинаковыми* "economically, politically, socially, and spiritually unequal"classes. There are contradictions between these main classes*противоречия*, and hence, in a certain respect, a

303 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 619.

304 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 349.

struggle .

The proletariat builds its economy on the basis of collective ownership of the instruments and means of production. The peasantry conducts small-scale commodity farming on the basis of private ownership of the instruments of production. The proletariat disposes of socialized large-scale industry and all its commanding heights, and conducts a policy of distributing social income, a price policy, a tax policy, etc., in such a way that, in the fundamental interests of both classes, the victorious growth of the socialist sector is ensured as their prosperity rises. The small producer, on the other hand, as a private proprietor and trader, strives for the maximum possible price increase for the products of its own production, free from regulation, and as a buyer is inclined to pay the minimum prices, which beat the cause of socialist construction, for the products of large-scale industry. Similar contradictions arise between the proletarian state and the peasantry in terms of tax policy, etc.

Thus, the proletariat, which relies on power, on the socialized means of production, occupies these commanding heights, and pursues, in the fundamental interests of both main classes, a policy of increasingly embracing the entire national economy by socialist planning, is confronted with certain counter-conservative tendencies of dispersed small-scale farming. We thus see that *there are contradictions between the proletariat and the peasantry, and that there is a struggle*based on these contradictions.

But this is a struggle based on contradictions *that can be overcome* , contradictions on current issues, it is a struggle *within the framework of the alliance* of the proletariat and the middle peasantry, which is conditioned *by the commonality of their fundamental interests* .

The whole point is that both of these basic classes *are working* classes bound together by the common and fundamental interest of all working *people to free themselves from exploitation* , from oppression and poverty. Under capitalism, the small commodity producer, the peasant, faces two paths: he becomes a proletarian or a capitalist. But an insignificant minority of the peasantry inevitably becomes capitalists, kulaks. The peasantry is the class whose bulk, under the rule of the bourgeoisie, is plunged into poverty, exploited, and suffers from crises and wars. This is the class whose bulk, in the course of capitalist development, inevitably moves along the path of proletarianization, joins the ranks of the proletariat, and transforms itself into the proletariat.

When *the Trotskyists*and" leftists "claimed that the main classes of the transition period were the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, or the proletariat and the peasantry" exploited "by the latter, or that in the transition period there was only one main class — the proletariat, this also expressed their lack of understanding of the" dual " nature of the peasantry and their complete lack of understanding of the ways and means of the proletarian revolution in general.

On the other hand, the assertion of right-wing opportunism also had nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism *правого оппортунизма,* according to which, once the dictatorship of the proletariat is given and the proletariat and the peasantry are given as the main classes, socialism is already possible "by itself", without a struggle against the bourgeoisie and without firm leadership on the part of the proletariat as a wavering ally.

The bourgeoisie and the landlords were defeated, but, as we have already seen, *they were defeated.* exploitable classes are not yet *destroyed* classes. Thus, under the conditions of NEP, a large section of the bourgeoisie — the class of rural capitalists, *the kulaks-is preserved* . Weakened both quantitatively and economically in the peasant economy, the kulak retained a great deal of direct influence on small-scale production. It represented the main and most rapidly growing force in the ranks of private capital, which, on the basis of exchange relations, regained to a certain extent its strength and influence over the middle peasantry in the first years of NEP.

Both "leftists" and rightists blurred *the dual* nature of the peasantry. We already know that the peasantry is not socialist in its economic position. The proletariat could only ensure the socialist development of the peasantry by its correct leadership. It was necessary to completely abandon the revolutionary-Marxist understanding of classes and the dialectic of the class struggle in order to repeat, as the right-wing opportunists did when they paraphrased Kautskyite arguments that socialism grows of its own accord, fatally, and that the non-proletarian classes (even the exploitative

ones) will grow into socialism themselves, as favorable "objective conditions"will take care of and "merciful economic development". In fact, the proletariat won the possibility of successfully building socialism in its *struggle against the bourgeoisie* for hegemony, for *the leadership of the non-proletarian working masses* . And in order for the working class, not the capitalists, to be victorious in this struggle for the leadership of the peasantry, and in order for the possibility of the victory of socialism to become a reality, the proletariat, under the leadership of its party, had to prevent *and overcome*the existing contradictions and the possibility of a split between it and the middle peasantry.

The struggle of the proletariat against the urban and rural bourgeoisie is a struggle to *involve the broadest masses of the peasantry in the work of socialist construction* , in the system of socialism under construction *широчайших масс крестьянства*. "We... can," t said. Stalin - and ... we must build socialism together with the main masses of the peasantry[305]."

The proletariat could build socialism together with the middle peasantry because it was only in the fundamental interests of both classes to put an end to exploitation. The bourgeoisie, relying on power, on large-scale production, on capital, and on the economic, political, and cultural dependence of the countryside on the bourgeois city, condemned the weak, fragmented, and inevitably economically backward peasant farms for the most part to impoverishment, downtroddenness, and lack of culture. The proletariat, relying on power, on socialized industry, on all the commanding heights, on the leading political, economic, and cultural role of the proletarian city, draws the middle peasant peasantry into *cooperation* . From the path of ruin and lack of culture, the peasantry turns to the path of raising the material cultural level of its main mass. The proletariat puts forward a "new principle of organization of the population" in co-operation, displacing the influence of the kulaks by means of co-operation, drawing the middle peasantry into the system of socialism under construction, beginning with the most accessible and understandable exchange forms of co-operation and rising to its highest production and collective farm forms, thus opening up the "pillar road of the countryside to socialism"in co-operation.

Together with the success of complete collectivization , the party puts forward new slogans in relation to various groups of the peasantry — the slogan *of eliminating the kulaks as a class* on the basis *of complete collectivization*, the slogan of transforming the collective farmer peasant into *the main and most solid support*of the working class in the countryside.

The Proletariat It must *build socialism together with the main masses of the peasantry, directing their socialist transformation* , turning them into a solid pillar of socialist construction.

"By building socialism," pointed out Comrade Lenin at the Fourteenth Party Congress. Stalin — we must operate not only on millions, but also on tens of millions of people from the countryside. Otherwise, we cannot build socialism. Socialism is not only taking over the city. Socialism is an economic organization that *unites industry and agriculture on the basis of the socialization of the means and instruments of production* . Without the unification of these two branches of economy, socialism is impossible[306]."

A special form of the class struggle of the proletariat and its leadership of the non-proletarian strata during the entire transition period *is the task of employing old bourgeois specialists* .

The proletariat inherits from the bourgeois system specialists, workers in the economy and in all areas of culture, people who were formerly "in charge" and were placed in a privileged position in terms of material and all other advantages over the working masses, whom these "in charge" people, brought up under the exploitative system, are accustomed to treat with contempt, to look down on "from the top down". The proletariat must *make use*of their vast economic and technical experience, their knowledge, and their culture.

However, the more economically and culturally backward the country in which the proletariat has taken power, the greater the share of small-scale production in the national economy, and the

---

305 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 336.

306 И. Сталин, Доклад на XVI съезде партии.

more serious the destruction suffered by the economy in the course of the imperialist and civil wars, the more difficult it is for the working class to quickly organize "that situation of national accounting and control from below, which *inevitably it would have subdued and attracted specialists* ." Old bourgeois specialists, after the first years of sabotage of proletarian power, naturally do not immediately become devoted, conscious participants in socialist construction. Along with improving their *material status* Therefore, it is necessary to work on their long-term *re*-education . Already the experience of the first years of NEP showed the need for the proletariat to be class vigilant in relation to the old "specialists" and to take creative initiative in training cadres of new proletarian specialists.

The success of socialist construction is gradually leading to *a turn*in the mood of the old intelligentsia towards socialism. The task of making full use of the old technical intelligentsia by the proletariat and creating its own intelligentsia from among the working class is put forward in the reconstruction period as one of the most important conditions for socialist development.

5.6. The Dictatorship of the proletariat and the struggle to build socialism

At each new stage of the development of the proletarian dictatorship, its main tasks and goals — *the building of socialism* in the country of the victorious working class and thereby the *elimination of class distinctions* and classes in general-become more and more clearly revealed. However, the realization of this most important of the three tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat does not proceed "by itself", but in the process of a fierce *class*struggle, which is also reflected in the ranks of the party, in the process of combating opportunist interpretations of the general line of the party.

The victory of the Proletarian revolution has so far taken place in only *one country.* a country that occupies, it is true, one-sixth of the globe, but in a country with an overwhelming majority of the peasant population, less technically and economically developed than other advanced capitalist countries. The consolidation of the Soviet order took place in a hostile capitalist environment, and the first years of NEP were marked by the ebb of the revolutionary wave in the capitalist countries and the temporary stabilization of capitalism. At the same time, the new economic policy, which was designed to raise the country's productive forces by assuming a certain degree of freedom of trade and, consequently, of capitalism under the control of the proletarian state, inevitably entailed a certain increase *in internal contradictions* . The problem of socialist construction presented itself to the proletariat as a problem of "who is who?", as a question of a fierce class *struggle* , as a question of the struggle between *the established socialism* — in the person of nationalized industry, Soviet power, etc. — and the dying but still fiercely resisting *capitalism*.

Successfully overcoming all these external and internal difficulties, the party developed socialist construction. By the time of 1925-1927, the private capitalist elements in trade, handicraft industry, etc., had been driven out of their havens and were sinking. But their desperate resistance raised doubts among the wavering elements of the party about the very *possibility of building socialism in one country* , when we do not yet have the victory of the world revolution. On the basis of these doubts and vacillations, which reflect the sentiments of the ousted private capitalist elements and the urban petty bourgeoisie, the opportunist bias with which the party was first forced to fight has matured and which later developed into a clearly counter — revolutionary trend-Trotskyism is being revived and developed *троцкизм*.

As T. points out Stalin, Lenin, during the imperialist war, in 1915, especially vividly emphasized the position that" the victory of socialism is possible "initially"in one, separately taken, capitalist country." Even then Trotsky objected to this proposition of Lenin's, declaring: "It is hopeless to think... that, for example, a revolutionary Russia could stand up in the face of a conservative Europe." Naturally, the turn to a new economic policy was regarded by Trotskyism as a "restoration of capitalism", as a departure from the tasks of socialist construction. Trotsky expressed these sentiments in 1922 in the preface to 1905 and in the afterword to the Peace

Program, declaring that "the contradictions in the position of the workers' government in a backward country with an overwhelming majority of the peasant population can *only be resolved on an international scale*in the arena of the world revolution," and that "a genuine upsurge in the situation of the workers' a socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe."

As if anticipating these Trotskyist sentiments, Lenin pointed out as early as 1921: "10-20 years *of correct relations with the peasantry - and victory is assured* on a global scale, even if proletarian revolutions are prolonged, they are growing[307]." And in his famous article "On Co-operation" (1923), Lenin once again noted that we have "everything necessary for building a complete socialist society." We have here directly opposite attitudes of Leninism and Trotskyism, based on a completely *different assessment of the class forces* in our country, the role of the party, and the role of the entire system of proletarian dictatorship. The question of whether it is possible for us to build socialism by our own efforts, as Comrade Lenin pointed out. The question of *the relationship between the proletariat and the peasantry* , of overcoming certain contradictions between these two main classes in the transition period and on the basis of their common core interests. For Lenin, it was a question of "proper relations with the peasantry"; Trotsky, on the other hand, proceeded from "contradictions in the position of the workers' government in a backward country with an overwhelming majority of the peasant population." Certain contradictions that inevitably exist between the proletariat and the main mass of the peasantry — these contradictions are surmountable from the point of view of Leninism, they are insurmountable from the point of view of Trotskyism, which covered its bourgeois interests with "left" phrases.*буржуазные* trends.

In the preceding exposition, we have already dwelt in detail on the main propositions of Trotskyism and its theory of permanent revolution, and on its theory of NEP. The Trotskyists did not distinguish between class groups among the peasantry. The Trotskyists proceeded from a lack *of understanding of the dual nature of the middle peasantry* , from the idea of the peasantry as a solid reactionary mass. The Trotskyists did not understand that in addition to the contradictions between the proletariat and the peasantry, there were "common interests on fundamental questions of development," that "there *are two ways of developing agriculture*-the capitalist way and the socialist way," that the first way means impoverishing the majority of the peasantry, and that therefore " both the proletariat and, in particular, the peasantry are interested in so that development follows the second path, the socialist path[308]." The Trotskyist line was designed for the economic suppression and exploitation of the peasantry, for the denial of an alliance with the middle peasantry and the possibility of building socialism. The Trotskyist line was that of developing agriculture "by capitalist methods," as Trotsky himself put it[309]. This was a line aimed at ruining and impoverishing the bulk of the peasantry, a line aimed at splitting with the peasantry and thereby undermining socialist construction.

This perverse Trotskyist conception of the relationship between the proletariat and the main mass of the peasantry was further expressed in a lack *of understanding of the social basis* of the proletarian dictatorship, in a lack *of understanding of the entire system of the proletarian dictatorship* in its various components. The dictatorship of the proletariat, according to Trotsky, is directed not only against the bourgeoisie, *but also against the peasantry* ; it is not a special form of alliance between the working class and the non-Proletarian working masses in order to build socialism, but a war against the peasantry; it is not the rule of the working majority over the exploitative minority, but *the rule of the proletarian minority over the majority of the peasantry* . It is quite clear that in Trotskyism we had a comprehensive rejection of the basic content of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The bourgeois and capitulatory essence of Trotskyism has found its

---

307 В. Ленин, Конспект брошюры о продналоге / 1921.

308 И. Сталин, К итогам работ XIV конференции ВКП(б).

309 Стенографический отчёт XVI съезда ВКП(б) — с. 1058.

expression in a complete lack *of understanding of proletarian democracy* , in a lack of understanding of the great creative force that it represents. The Trotskyist "doctrine" of *the party*was a doctrine of the destruction of the party. The defence of factions, the rejection of proletarian discipline, the idea of the party as a motley conglomerate of groupings — cries of democracy, but in reality a bureaucratic disregard for the party, for genuine inner — party democracy-these were some of the most characteristic ideas of Trotskyism on this question.

The very concept of the leading role of the party in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat was replaced by the concept of party rule among the Trotskyists and the group of Zinoviev and Kamenev who later joined them *господства партии*. Trotsky spoke bluntly of " the domination of the Communist Party in the Soviets[310]." Instead of correctly defining the relations between the party and the working class, the working class and the entire working mass, based on mutual trust, instead of leading the masses, instead of educating and persuading them as the basis of this leadership, Trotsky, Zinoviev, etc. they put forward the principle of" dictatorship " of the party, its violence against the working class and the working masses, and put forward coercion as the basis of relations between the party and the class, the party and the masses.

Trotskyism completely failed to understand the new creative role that cooperation plays in the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat *кооперация*as the main organizational form of the rural movement towards socialism. Trotskyism did not understand the role *of the trade unions* , their role as a school of communism in the system of the proletarian dictatorship. Trotsky proposed that the leadership of the trade unions by the party should be replaced, as Lenin pointed out, by bureaucratic twitching. Trotskyism replaced the leadership of trade unions based on the method of persuasion with bureaucratic command of them based on the method *of coercion* , not realizing that "we then correctly and successfully applied coercion when we were able to first put the basis of persuasion under it[311]." Trotskyist understanding *of the Youth Union* it led to the opposition of the young stock to the old Bolshevik Guard, hardened in the battles against opportunism. Here it led to the undermining of the leading role of the party, to the undermining of the communist education of the youth by our party.

Finally, Trotskyism showed a complete lack of understanding of the character *of the Soviet state*as a State form of proletarian dictatorship. Trotskyism saw in the Soviets only an instrument of suppression, and not a form of manifestation of the activity of the broad masses of the working people. Trotsky therefore believed that the bureaucracy of the Soviet state was an inevitable phenomenon, since there was a contradiction between the proletariat and the peasantry. Trotskyism shouted about the" degeneration " of the Soviets and at the same time denied the significance of the slogan of reviving the Soviets in the countryside.

Trotskyism thus represented a complete perversion of the principles of proletarian democracy, a complete lack of understanding of the system of proletarian dictatorship, and a complete lack of understanding of the sources of the powerful creative initiative force that the dictatorship of the proletariat represents. "At that time," said t. Stalin-just as Lenin regarded the proletarian dictatorship *as the most proactive force*, which, having organized a socialist economy, must then go to the direct support of the world proletariat, to the struggle against the capitalist world, the opposition, on the contrary, considers the proletarian dictatorship in our country as *a passive*(our italics) force, living under the fear of the immediate loss of power "in the face of conservative Europe"[312].

The Trotskyist denial of the possibility of building socialism in our country — as T. V. Tolstoy showed as early as 1924. Stalin-meant not only "disbelief in the revolutionary possibilities of the peasant movement", but also "*disbelief in the strength and capacity of our revolution* , disbelief in

---

310 Л. Троцкий / Соч., т. XII — с. 107.

311 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 1 — с. 19.

312 И. Сталин, Об оппозиции — с. 413.

the strength and capacity of the Russian proletariat"[313]. The phrase "world revolution" concealed *the capitulatory,* defeatist nature of Trotskyism, capitulationism in its understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The" left " phrase concealed the bourgeois essence of Trotskyism. The Trotskyists "were only *the mouthpiece, first of all, of those private capitalist elements of trade*, etc., which were rapidly sinking during the period 1925-1927" *(Molotov).*

The Party resolutely rejected the Trotskyist slogan of artificially fomenting class struggle in the countryside. Having taken into account the results of the" left " mistakes that led to the middle peasantry taking the side of the kulaks, the party set its main task at this stage "to rally the middle peasants around the proletariat, to win them over again" — for this purpose, to ensure that peasant farming is integrated into the general system of Soviet economic construction through cooperation, to draw a line on *reviving the soviets* in the countryside and to plant the seeds of Soviet democracy in the countryside, capable of organizing and directing the increased activity of the peasantry in a socialist direction.

The so — called new Zinoviev-Kamenev opposition of 1925-1926 also followed the path laid out by Trotskyism, and naturally it later descended into a bloc with Trotskyism. Zinoviev, in his work Leninism, tried to portray *the peasant* question as the" main question " of Leninism, forgetting that the fundamental content of Leninism is *the dictatorship of the proletariat* . At the same time , Zinoviev and Kamenev fell into the position of *underestimating the middle peasantry,* as well as underestimating the role of the cooperative in drawing it into the construction of socialism. Kamenev identified the middle peasantry with the Kulaks. Zinoviev spoke only of the "neutralization" of the middle peasantry, thus returning to the party's slogan at the time of the seizure of power and not understanding the peculiarity of the new stage. Naturally, Zinoviev and Kamenev did not *understand the significance of all three main tasks* and , accordingly, the *three sides of the dictatorship of the proletariat*, they did not understand the role of mass organizations, the role of soviets in the system of the proletarian dictatorship. They argued that the dictatorship of the proletariat "is not an alliance of one class with another" *(Kamenev)* ; they substituted the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the party in the system of its links *for the dictatorship of the party (Zinoviev)* . Zinoviev and Kamenev completely failed to understand *the ambivalence between the two groups.* declaring NEP "state capitalism", they did not see in NEP the policy of the proletarian state, designed to win the victory *of the socialist elements and build the foundation of the socialist economy* . Having thrown out the" leftist "demagogic slogan of" equality "— which can only be realized as a result of the destruction of class society and which, during the transition period, expresses the" egalitarian " sentiments of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, and their desire to limit the dictatorship of the proletariat — Zinoviev and Kamenev at the same time concealed behind this slogan their capitulancy in the question of building a new state of society. socialism in our country. They recognized the possibility *only of building* socialism in our country, but considered the idea of being able *to build it a "national limitation"*. In the future, the Trotskyist opposition bloc had to logically come to the conclusion that the party and the Soviets were "degenerating", that our apparatus was being" bureaucratized", and so on.

The ideological exposure of the Trotskyist and Trotskyist-Zinovievist opposition once again emphasized *the unity of all three sides of the dictatorship of the proletariat* : the dictatorship as a class struggle aimed at suppressing the exploiters, the dictatorship as an alliance with the main mass of the peasantry with the proletariat playing a leading role in this alliance, and the dictatorship aimed at *building socialism* in our country and thereby leading to the destruction of all classes, of any class inequality. Thus the perspective became even clearer *перспектива*, and the basic class goal of the entire proletarian struggle was revealed. Exposing the "leftists" also allowed the party to find out the *ways and means* that should have led at this stage to the strengthening of socialist principles in our economy. The Party has shown that the" revolutionary " phrases of the Trotskyist bloc about the need for "superindustrialization" were actually combined with proposals to increase

313 И. Сталин, Октябрьская революция и тактика русских коммунистов.

tax pressure on the peasantry, with proposals to raise the selling prices of manufactured goods, that all these measures would lead to a complete disorganization of the national economy, to a break with the middle peasant, that the "superindustrializers" were actually combined with proposals to increase the tax pressure on the peasantry, with proposals to increase the selling prices of manufactured goods. they were accomplices *of opponents*of socialist industrialization.

Already in the course of the struggle against the "left" opposition, it became clear that "our socialist production is already *leading and beginning to subdue*small-scale production," that in the "struggle of the socialist elements of our economy against the capitalist elements, the former have an unquestionable preponderance of forces against the latter and are moving forward step by step, overcoming the capitalist elements of our economy..."[314]. By the Fifteenth Party Congress (late 1927), it became obvious that the national economy of our country was growing rapidly, that our country was becoming *an industrial* country, and that this development was moving towards *socialism* . It also turned out that while our socialist industry is surpassing the capitalist countries in terms of its rate of development, the rate of development *темпы развития*of our *agriculture is still unsatisfactory* , and agriculture is beginning *to lag* behind urban industry, depriving the latter of its raw material base and posing a threat to its further development. The reasons for this backwardness in agriculture lay in the dispersion of agricultural production and the excessive backwardness of our agricultural machinery in this regard. This led to the next practical task of our construction in the countryside: "The gradual transfer of dispersed peasant farms to the rails *of united large-scale farms* , to social *collective cultivation of the land*on the basis of the intensification and mechanization of agriculture..."[315].

Our country has resolutely embarked on the path of socialist reconstruction *of the entire* national economy. But along with the success of building socialism-due to the dual and contradictory nature of NEP-already by the Fifteenth Party Congress , a certain *growth of the kulaks in the countryside was revealed*, which required increasing pressure on the kulaks. The further success of socialist construction has clearly shown that the class struggle is not disappearing with our successes, but, on the contrary, *is becoming even more acute* , and that the capitalist elements of the city and countryside are putting up a fierce *resistance* The strengthening of the kulaks 'resistance to the socialist offensive (sabotage by bourgeois specialists, resistance of the kulaks to grain procurements, opportunism of the bureaucratic elements of the state apparatus, etc.). The strengthening of the kulaks' resistance to the socialist offensive found its expression in the formation *of a right-wing deviation in the ranks of our party*. The advance of socialism manifested itself in this *struggle,* which the party launched against right-wing opportunism as *the main danger*of a new stage of socialist construction.

The mistakes of right-wing opportunism have been described by vol. Stalin in the sense that the right expressed the sentiments of the rural *kulaks*and those remnants of the capitalist elements of the city who sought to maintain a "balance" between the socialist and capitalist sectors of the national economy, which opposed the market element and individual peasant economy to the socialist economy that displaced them. The mechanistic methodology, and in particular the notorious "equilibrium theory" of Comrade Bukharin, was extended by him to the transition economy, to the correlation of classes in it, to the Soviet state, to the entire system of proletarian dictatorship. It has served as a valuable methodological basis for right-wing opportunists.

Earlier, we have already covered in more detail the most important points of the right-wing opportunist concept. The lack of understanding of the dialectic of class struggle and the role of the proletarian state in the development of the transition economy are distinctive features of right — wing opportunist views on the question of classes and the state. Instead of talking about the intensification and intensification of the class struggle, the rightists (Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky) talked about its elimination, about "civil peace." In the first place, the right-wing opportunists did

---

314 И. Сталин, Ещё раз о социал-демократическом уклоне.

315 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

not see *the two-sided* nature of NEP and the fact that the certain freedom of trade allowed under NEP, provided that the state and the monopoly of foreign trade play a regulatory role in the market, does not yet mean *complete* freedom of trade, and, consequently, freedom to develop on this basis the kulaks, Nepmanov, etc. At one time, he pointed out that "in the Soviet Republic, the social system is based on the cooperation of two classes: workers and peasants, to which *допущены на известных условиях*the 'Nepmans', i.e., the 'bourgeoisie', are now admitted on certain conditions[316]." The rightists did not interpret this idea of Lenin's in the real sense that for a certain period the existence of the bourgeoisie and its participation in national economic life were allowed under certain conditions, i.e., under its unconditional submission to the laws of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The right saw in the bourgeoisie, in particular in the kulaks, a necessary participant in the construction of socialism, a peaceful collaborator of the proletariat, which, although "to a certain extent" is an "alien body", is nevertheless gradually and peacefully "growing" into the system of socialist economy. Thus, according to Comrade Bukharin, peasant cells of the Kulak type will form "links in a single chain of socialist economy. On the other hand, kulak cooperative nests will also *grow into the same system through banks, etc*., but they will be to *a certain extent an alien body* similar to, for example, *concession*companies[317]."

"The destruction of classes *by means of the fierce class struggle of the proletariat* — such is Lenin's formula. The destruction of classes *by the extinction of the class struggle and the growth of the capitalists into socialism*— such is Comrade Bukharin's formula[318]." The latter was associated by the right with their abstract approach to the peasantry, in which they did not see *class differentiation*in the peasantry, did not see the commodity-*capitalist* tendency of the peasantry. The right forgot about the dual nature of the middle peasant. They preached an alliance with the peasantry at all costs, any alliance with the peasantry and with the entire peasantry, and not that form of alliance with the middle peasant, not that path of socialist development of the countryside which strengthens the dictatorship of the proletariat. Hence, the rightists drew conclusions about the need to develop *individual*peasant farming as opposed to state and collective farms, and about the implementation of a policy of "gravity" in collective farm construction. State farms and collective farms are not "the pillar road to socialism," Comrade Bukharin declared.

The semi-anarchist mistakes of the right in the question of the role *of the Soviet state in the development of the transition economy were quite in harmony with the right-wing opportunist theory of the "fading" of the class struggle*. "According to Comrade Bukharin, the working class must be *fundamentally*hostile to any state, including the state of the working class[319]." Even in his review of Lenin's book The State and the Revolution, Bukharin took the position of a petty bourgeois who did not take into account the positive tasks of the proletarian dictatorship. In The Economy of Transition, he suggested that the coercive functions of the proletarian state would die out before the habit of communist labor was established. Bukharin completely failed to take into account *the role of the proletarian dictatorship in the education of a new industrial discipline* , and did not understand that the education of a new socialist discipline is a new form of class struggle. Comrade Bukharin's eclectic position on the question of trade unions, when he tried to play the role of a "buffer" between Leninism and Trotskyism, is also well known. These errors are T. Bukharin's protests were further developed in the tt. Bukharin and Rykova are opposed to the use of administrative influence by the state against the kulak, in an attempt to impose a new regime on the Kulaks. Tomsky to insulate the trade unions from all influence on the part of the party, because the right-wing opportunists do not understand the tasks of Bolshevik self-criticism. Thus, like the

316 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 2 — с. 124.

317 Н. Бухарин, Путь к социализму и рабоче-крестьянский союз.

318 И. Сталин, О правом уклоне в ВКП(б).

319 И. Сталин, О правом уклоне в ВКП(б).

Trotskyists, the right showed a lack of understanding of the role and significance *of all the links in the proletarian dictatorship system* .

The failure of the right to understand and obscure the class character and role of the proletarian dictatorship led them to recognize the *possibility* of building socialism as a purely abstract possibility, without recognizing the actual *ways and means* that could turn this possibility into *reality* . In fact, this" recognition " of the right amounted to the same *denial*of the possibility of building socialism in our country.

The Party exposed Trotskyism and right-wing opportunism as agents in the party-proletarian milieu of classes that are hostile to the socialist offensive. The party's struggle against the Trotskyist and right-wing opportunist understanding of classes and the state during the transition period, and their decisive defeat, is a necessary condition for further success in socialist construction and for building the foundation of a socialist economy.

5.7. The problem of class destruction and new tasks of struggle

The completion of the foundation of the socialist economy and the entry of the Soviet country into the period of socialism does not mean that the classes have already been liquidated, that the class struggle of the proletariat has already ended. Only as a result of the success of the second five-year plan will we have "*the final elimination of capitalist elements and classes in general, the complete elimination of the causes that give rise to class differences and exploitation*."

The class struggle at the new stage by no means subsides: in some areas, especially in the subsequent period, it may and will continue to escalate, but it takes *on new forms* . The question of classes and their interrelations confronts us *in a new* way, and we also approach the tasks of the class struggle of the proletariat in a new way. The period of the advance of socialism on the entire front presents the whole system of the proletarian dictatorship with new tasks and presents new forms of class struggle. Only this fierce class struggle of the proletariat will ultimately lead to *the destruction* of classes. "For the complete abolition of classes," Lenin wrote, " it is necessary not only to overthrow the exploiters — the landlords and capitalists — not only to abolish their property, but also to *abolish all private ownership of the means of production*, it is necessary to abolish both *the distinction between town and country* , and *the distinction between men of physical* and men *of intellectual labor* . This is a very long case. In order to achieve it, we need a huge step forward in *the development of the productive forces* , we need to overcome the resistance of numerous remnants of small-scale production, we need *to overcome the enormous force of habit and inertia* associated with these remnants[320]."

In full accordance with these instructions of Lenin, the directives of the seventeenth Party Conference for drawing up the second five-year plan, emphasizing all the importance of the technical reconstruction of our economy for the *abolition of all private ownership of* the means of production, set forth the task of destroying the antithesis between town and country, and point out the need to overcome the remnants of capitalism*экономике* , но и в *сознании* people. As for the elimination of the antithesis between mental and physical labor, this is a task of an even longer period.

Let us briefly discuss some of these new tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which are at the same time new *forms of class struggle* : (a) the socialist transformation of the peasantry, the elimination of the kulaks as a class, and the elimination of the distinction between town and country; (b) the task of creating the industrial and technical intelligentsia of the working class and thus preparing for the future elimination of the c) on social competition and striking as forms of education of the new socialist discipline of the working class.

When we say that entering the period of socialism presents us with a new perspective on the relations between classes, we have in mind first of all those class shifts that are marked in *the*

320 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVI — с. 749.

relations of the proletariat to the various groups of the peasantry . If, in the period of the bourgeois revolution, the proletariat marched *with the entire* peasantry against the landlords; if, in the October Revolution, the proletariat marched together with the poorest peasantry against the urban and rural bourgeoisie, "neutralizing" the middle peasantry; if, finally, after 1918 and during the entire preceding stage of NEP, the party adopted a new slogan-*alliance* with the middle peasant, *reliance* on the poor and The period of entry into socialism puts forward new relations and new slogans — the transformation of collective farming into the central figure of agriculture, the *main and most solid support* of the working class in the countryside, and *the elimination of the kulaks as a class* on the basis *of complete collectivization* .

The destruction of the class presupposes *the socialist transformation of the bulk* of the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat. To destroy classes, "Lenin pointed out," it is necessary not only to overthrow the yoke of the landlords and capitalists. "In order to abolish classes, we must *abolish the difference between the worker and the peasantry* , and make all *workers*. This task is incomparably more difficult and, because of necessity, lengthy... It can only be solved by an organizational restructuring of the entire social economy, *by the transition from individual, isolated, small-scale farming to a socialized large-scale economy* ..."[321] The essence of the changes taking place at the new stage in the peasantry lies primarily in the fact that *the reconstruction of the entire social economy is based on the* agriculture creates *prerequisites* In order to eliminate the distinction between worker and peasant, it is necessary that a significant part of the main mass of the peasantry takes the path of large-scale social economy, *collective*economy.

Collective farms have already become the main producer not only of bread, but also of agricultural raw materials, and they are increasingly taking the main place in the field of animal husbandry, etc. Collective farming has thus become the *central figure of our agriculture* ; the role of individual farming is becoming secondary. In this way, a significant part of the middle peasantry that has already joined collective farms is undergoing *a change in its very economic and class essence* : the position of the collective-farm peasantry in the process of production and in the relations of production is changing, the attitude of this part of the former middle-class peasantry to the means of production is changing, and its role in the social organization of labor is also changing. This change follows the *line of eliminating the class distinctions between the peasant and the worker* . In so far as we regard the production co-operation of the peasantry as a type *социалистическогоо*f socialist economy, the collective-farm peasantry is already losing its former dual nature of worker and owner, and is already drawing much closer to the proletariat.

The great turning point in our development is that *the collective farmers are no longer a peasantry in the old sense of the word* . A number of the most important class features that were characteristic of the main mass of the peasantry before the "great turning point", which gave us grounds to speak of the middle peasantry as a class, namely, features "according to their place in the historically determined system of social production, according to their relation (mostly fixed and formalized in laws) to the means of production." production, according to their role in the social organization of labor, and consequently according to the method of obtaining and the size of the share of social wealth that they have at their disposal" *(Lenin)* — to date, they have changed significantly.

Previously, the poor and middle peasant occupied a place in the historically defined system of social production, i.e., in this case, under the conditions of the transition period and the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a representative *of small-scale commodity* economy, as a bearer *of private ownership* of the tools and means of production, in contrast to the proletarians, who build the economy on the basis of collective state ownership of the tools and means of production. Now the peasant-collective farmer is a class whose place in the system of social production has changed significantly, since he, too, is now *the bearer*of one of the forms of socialist economy, cooperative ownership of the main tools and means of production.

---

321 В. Ленин, Экономика и политика в эпоху диктатуры пролетариата.

Previously, the main mass of the peasantry, owing to certain relations to the means of production, its role in the social organization of labor, and the methods and amounts of obtaining a share of social income that follow from this relationship, was in such a relation to the proletariat that certain contradictions between the proletariat and the peasantry could manifest themselves (on current issues, on questions of prices, etc.). By transforming the middle peasant into a collective farmer, these contradictions are largely eliminated, and the collective farmer becomes *a solid pillar*of Soviet power in the countryside.

The transformation of the "collective farmer into the central figure of our agriculture" increasingly draws the bulk of the peasantry into *the channel of the planned organization* of the national economy, into the channel of its organized links with consistently socialist industry, and represents a gigantic step forward in the direction of embracing the entire national economy as a whole in the socialist plan. All this shows that the entry of millions of small commodity producers into collective farms means that they have shed a number of the most important features of their former class nature. This means that there is already a *fundamental* difference in its class nature between the middle and poorer peasantry, as a class before the collective farm, and the collective-farm peasantry. Now, after the success of collectivization, a stronger economic base for communism has been created. The victory of socialism in our country from the point of view of its internal forces is fully assured. *Mechanization process* In the next five-year plan, it should contribute to the complete elimination of all differences between peasant economy and urban industry, to the transformation of peasant labor into *a type of industrial labor,* and thus to the elimination of the age-old contrast between town and country.

That is why the point of view that deals with the new "class formation" without taking into account the ongoing process of class destruction is incorrect, and believes that in the person of the collective farmer we simply have the formation of a new class category in our country. However, it would be a departure from Marxism-Leninism if we identified the collective farmer with the proletarian, if at the present stage we did not understand the significant *differences* that still exist between the proletariat and the collective farm peasantry as *a class still distinct from the proletariat* . This would mean giving up the leadership of the socialist transformation of the peasantry. Collective farms, as the lowest form of socialist economy, are distinct from state enterprises *of a consistently socialist type* the type represented by the proletariat. The socialist character of collective farms does not mean that there are no *elements of class struggle* in them. Inasmuch as we also have a certain economic inequality within the collective farms, inasmuch as the collective farmers still have a certain non-socialized part of the economy, and inasmuch as the peasant is by no means exempt from individualistic management habits and skills on the second day after joining the collective farm, elements of class struggle also take place within the collective farm movement. It would be quite wrong to deny the existence of certain bourgeois and petty-bourgeois individualistic tendencies in the collective farms, which manifest themselves in relation to grain procurements, etc., and the need for a serious struggle against these tendencies. But when we speak of class struggle on collective farms, we must understand *the qualitative difference* that exists between class struggle *outside the collective farm and in the depths of the collective farm* between the situation when the kulaks as a class have not yet been liquidated, and the situation when great progress has already been made in liquidating the kulaks as a class. The class struggle based on the appropriation of labour by one social group by another is one thing, but the elements of the class struggle as a remnant of old relations after the destruction of the very basis of exploitation are quite another.

From this it is clear that we can no longer regard the peasant poor as *the only support* of the proletariat in the countryside. The poor remain the mainstay of the working class outside the areas of complete collectivization, and the collective-farm peasantry, as the sixteenth Party Congress emphasized, becomes *the main and most solid support*of the proletariat, since it is the economic base for socialist construction in the countryside. In areas of complete collectivization, the poor must be confronted with the question:"For or against the collective farm." And the poor man who fights against collectivization ceases to be the support of the proletariat in the countryside.

The slogan of reliance on the collective farm peasantry *does not remove it* and the old slogan of an *alliance with the middle peasant* . Individual peasant farming continues to play a well-known role in agriculture, although it plays a subsidiary role. The individual middle peasant remains an ally of the proletariat. It is wrong to think that the vacillation of the individual middle peasant and his lack of immediate determination to join the collective farm should alienate this middle peasant from the union, from the bond with the working class. On the contrary, we can and must regard the individual middle peasant, as well as the poor who have not yet joined the collective farms, as *future collective farmers*; we must prove to them the superiority of agriculture and demand that they voluntarily join the collective farms. "In the second five — year plan — we can say this with confidence-the entire working mass of the peasantry will be organized into collective farms, and thus there will be an end to the petty ownership that has prevailed in the countryside for many centuries" *(Molotov).* . Such an attitude by no means means implies a "free flow" in collective farm construction: the process of collectivization is *a process of class struggle* , of the struggle of the proletariat and collective farm assets against kulak influences, against the furious resistance that the kulaks offer to collectivization, a struggle against the vacillations of the middle peasant. The general line of the party has nothing in common either with the right-wing opportunist "gravity" in collective farm construction, or with the "left-wing" "administration" and "decree-making", with the excesses that took place at the first steps of complete collectivization.

It is obvious that the attempt of some comrades, such as Comrade Larin, to regard collective farms as *a bourgeois*, non-socialist form of economy was completely wrong. It is also wrong to deny the socialist quality of collective farms on the basis of certain individualistic and even kulak survivals and influences, on the basis of certain property inequalities in the collective farms, and therefore certain contradictions and elements of class struggle within the collective farms — if only we are talking about genuine collective farms and not kulak pseudo-collective farms. "Of course, there are contradictions in the collective farms," said Comrade Lenin. Stalin, speaking out against such theories. — But can we deny that collective farms as a whole, taken together with their contradictions and shortcomings, collective farms as *an economic* fact, represent in the main a new path for the countryside, the path *of socialist development* in *contrast*to the kulak capitalist path of development" ... "Isn't it clear that only the blind cannot see the difference between the class struggle on the basis of collective farms and the class struggle outside the collective farms[322]?"

However, when we speak of collective farms as one of *the socialist* forms of economy, as the highest type of production-socialist cooperation, we must not forget the *difference* that still persists *between collective* farms with their cooperative form of ownership and *state* — owned enterprises (for example, state farms), where the proletarian state is the full owner-enterprises *of a consistently socialist type. type* . We must emphasize all *the unique ways in which the peasantry develops towards socialism* . "The working class," Comrade Molotov said at the seventeenth Party Conference, " goes *ahead* of the peasantry through *the highest* forms of socialist economy at this stage. From the peculiarities of the position of the working mass of the peasantry in the past , the peculiarities of its paths (a number of *additional transitional stages*, longer periods, etc.) to a classless, socialist society follow." In this connection, the party's instructions that the lowest stage of the collective *farm, the artel*, remains its main type for the immediate period and that the task *of organizational and economic strengthening of the collective farms is particularly important*. A decisive struggle is needed both against the right-wing opportunist drift in collective farm construction, and against the "leftist" violation of the principles of voluntariness and jumping over the artel directly to the commune or the transformation of collective farms into state farms. Only the gradual inclusion of state-*owned machine and tractor stations in the collective*farms will create the prerequisites for their transition to further stages of development and the approximation of collective farms to enterprises of a consistently socialist type.

But the process of complete collectivization of the peasant economy will create the

322 И. Сталин, К вопросам аграрной политики в СССР.

prerequisites for the solution of another important task of the class struggle — in relation to the last, capitalist group of the peasantry, to the rural bourgeoisie, preserved and strengthened after the overthrow of the capitalists in the city — the *kulaks* . Before the period of complete collectivization, the policy of the proletariat in relation to the kulaks consisted in restricting *kulak exploitation and ousting the kulaks* . However, it was assumed that the kulaks as a class would still *survive*for a certain period (hence the law on hiring labor in the countryside, the prohibition on dekulakization, etc.). At that time the Proletarian dictatorship had no strongholds in the countryside, in the form of a broad network of collective farms and state farms, on which it would be possible to rely in carrying out a decisive offensive against the kulaks Questioner: besides, the capitalist production of bread at that time could not yet be replaced by the socialist production of it. Therefore, the calls of the Trotskyist — Zinovievist opposition "to attack the kulak" could not be considered in any other way-in the figurative expression of Comrade Lenin. Stalin-as a "declamation against the kulaks", as a "policy of scratching with the kulaks", and not as a policy of a truly Bolshevik offensive.

The success of continuous collectivization brings *a radical change* in the party's policy on this issue. The next task of the class struggle in the countryside is *to eliminate the kulaks as a class* . In order to overcome the kulak influence and its resistance to collectivization, it becomes necessary and already possible — thanks to the success of the same collectivization in the production of bread — "to break the resistance of this class in open battle, *to deprive*it of the productive sources of its existence and development." "In this — in the words of T. Stalin — and this is the " turn from the old policy of restricting (and ousting) the capitalist elements of the countryside to the new policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class[323]." At this turn, the party overcomes both the "left" - opportunist declamation about "pressure" on the kulaks, and the right-opportunist dreams of "peaceful growth of the kulak into socialism" and the right-opportunist complaints about the" inadmissibility " of applying administrative measures to the kulaks, dekulakization, etc.

For the complete abolition of classes, Lenin points out, "it is necessary to abolish not only the distinction between town and country, but also the *distinction between physical and intellectual labor.*" The Party has not yet put forward this task at the immediate stage of our development, since it will take several five-year plans to fully solve it. However, the new stage of socialist construction introduces some new features to this question as well. By putting forward the task of destroying the remnants of capitalism not only in the economy, but also in *the consciousness* , the party creates preliminary prerequisites for the elimination of this centuries-old gap, which is characteristic of the entire class society. Here, too, the preparations for the elimination of the old contradictions of class society go hand in hand with the tasks and needs of the new stage of building socialism in our country. A special form of class struggle is the general problem *of cadres* , the problem *of* polytechnism in higher education; in the process of a fierce class political and ideological struggle, the task of creating *the industrial and technical intelligentsia of the working class* is also solved .

The process of socialist industrialization can only rely on certain *qualified cadres* of the working class, the urgent need for which increases with each new stage on the path of our socialist development. They must be *technically qualified* personnel with sufficient general development to master the most advanced techniques. They must be *communist-minded* cadres capable of consciously defending the interests of the proletarian revolution and socialist construction. The problem of training such workers is fully solved by the principle of polytechnization of education, which Lenin laid down as the basis and correctly understood*политехнизации*. Under the polytechnic education system, the younger generation of workers is given the basics of the communist worldview and general polytechnic knowledge, and at the *same time special*training is provided for the right workers from among them. The correct attitude towards the indissoluble link between school and production was carried out here by the party in the struggle both against the openly right-wing aspirations to preserve the old verbal school, and against the" left-wing "denials of the importance of school training, with theories of the" dying out " of the school, etc. the

323 И. Сталин, К вопросу о политике ликвидации кулачества.

possibility of combining with purely physical labor and intellectual labor: the nature of social workloads, self-education, scientific circles, the system of working invention, workforces, promotion and socialist part-time work in the state apparatus, etc. In all these conditions of organizing everyday life, social work and reasonable recreation, the prerequisites for the future elimination of the gap that has existed up to now between physical and social work are already laid. mental work. However, we will be able to come to a complete and direct solution of this problem only after the technical and economic basis for the existence of classes has been destroyed.

Of particular importance at the present stage of socialist construction is the task of training new cadres *of specialists* from among the working class, the task of creating *the industrial and technical intelligentsia of the working class* , which was resolutely set forth by Comrade Lenin. As one of the necessary conditions for further economic development. Tov. Stalin pointed out that not only can we no longer manage with the same minimum of old specialists, but that "we *do not need all sorts of specialists."* command and engineering forces… Our country has entered a phase of development in which the working class must create its own industrial and technical intelligentsia capable of defending its *interests in production as the interests of the ruling class* »[324]."

The task of making proper use *of the old specialists* , the old technical intelligentsia, retains all its importance even at the present stage. However, there is a question about *the number* of these specialists and the *quality* their work. The previous minimum of specialists ceases to meet the needs of socialist construction. The intensification of the class struggle connected with the socialist offensive revealed wrecking groups, class-hostile to the proletariat, in the ranks of the old specialists. The defeat of wrecking organizations and the tremendous success of socialist construction have given rise *to signs of a turn towards socialism among the old intelligentsia*, and the use of this turn is one of the most important conditions for socialist development. Experience has shown how much the correct use of the experience and knowledge of old academicians, professors, engineers, as well as numerous foreign specialists working in our country can help in this regard. But a lot of *re-education work is needed here* old specialists, to draw them into the construction of socialism, to turn them into loyal allies of the working class.

The new phase of development requires the command and engineering cadres of industry to be able *to draw the line of class struggle in the production process* as well , and to be able to defend the interests of the working class in this class struggle in the sphere of the production and technical process. This can be fully ensured only if the cadres of new specialists are created from among the proletariat itself. This task, as well as the task of combating class-alien influences among the old specialists, is in complete contrast both to the views of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, which placed all its hopes only on bourgeois "fellow travelers" of the working class, and to Comrade Bukharin's right-opportunist views on the intelligentsia as an "intermediate" non-class category.

Comrade Stalin particularly emphasizes the fact that the ranks of the new proletarian industrial and technical intelligentsia will be recruited not only from among workers who have received higher education. The industrial and technical intelligentsia - according to the words of T. It must also be recruited "from the practical workers of our enterprises, from skilled workers, from the cultural forces of the working class in the factory, in the factory, in the mine.*практических работников* The initiators of the competition, the leaders of the shock brigades, the practical inspirers of the labor upsurge, the organizers of work on various construction sites-this is the new *stratum of the working class*, which should form *the core of the working class intelligentsia together with the comrades who have passed higher school* »[325]."

"As the capitalist elements are destroyed," Comrade Molotov said at the seventeenth Party Conference, "the roots of every class division in society are being torn out, and consequently the liquidation of all classes, and thereby *of the working class itself, is being prepared*."

From all that has already been said, it is clear that the task of destroying classes necessarily

---

324 И. Сталин, Новая обстановка, новые задачи хозяйственного строительства.

325 И. Сталин, Новая обстановка, новые задачи хозяйственного строительства.

also presupposes the *re-education and transformation of the proletariat itself* , and the overcoming of its " enormous force of habit and inertia." "In the course of this struggle and socialist construction, the working class itself is being re-educated, singling out from its midst ever more active and conscious builders of socialism, and hardening itself in the struggle to overcome bourgeois and petty-bourgeois sentiments both in the main milieu and in the entire mass of the working people" *(Molotov)* . This task is particularly important because the ranks of the proletariat are constantly growing, filled up with people from the countryside, the small proprietors of yesterday. And here, in particular, the importance of educating the working class in the habit of "*exemplary communist work*" and the role of social competition and striking as its advanced forms for combating raggedness and idleness, depersonalization and irresponsibility in the production process grows.

We have already spoken about *social competition and percussionism* as new forms of industrial relations that arise during the transition period. It is not difficult to see that the socialist competition and the strike movement are saturated from beginning to end with a certain *class content* , that they represent *new, special forms of the class struggle* of the proletariat. In these forms of organization of labor we have a direct concretization of that new special form of class struggle which Lenin in 1919, in his plan for the pamphlet on the dictatorship of the proletariat, designated as *the education of a new discipline* and which at the same time represents the path to *the destruction of all classes* .

Marx and Engels wrote as early as in Deutsche Ideologie that the communist revolution is directed in general against *the former kind of activity and eliminates labor and the rule of all classes together with the classes* themselves: "this requires *a mass change of people,* which is possible only in a practical movement, in *a revolution* ", that "the overthrowing class can only purify itself in a revolution *get rid of all the filth of the old society*and be able to create a new society[326]." By the" elimination of labor "referred to by Marx and Engels, they meant the transformation of labor from a heavy duty into a pleasure, into a" first urgent need."

Lenin later described the economy of the proletarian dictatorship as "the struggle of the first steps of communistically unified labor" against small-scale commodity production and the capitalism that has been preserved and is emerging on its basis. And in the Great Initiative, Lenin emphasized the enormous importance of communist subbotniks as "one of the most important aspects of communist construction." In the communist subbotniks, Lenin saw "the beginning of a revolution more difficult, more essential, more radical, more decisive than the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for it is a victory over property, licentiousness, and petty — bourgeois egoism, over these habits that capitalism has left as a legacy to the working class and the peasantry. When this victory is consolidated, then, and only then , *will a new social discipline,* a socialist discipline, be created, then, and only then, will a return back to capitalism be impossible, communism will become truly invincible." "The communist organization of social labor,"Lenin said," will be based on the free and conscious discipline of the working people themselves." Its bearer and guide is the proletariat, which-in Lenin's words-must lead the entire mass of working people "on the path of creating a new social bond, a new labor discipline"...[327]

Social competition and striking are new, higher forms of the same communist attitude to work, a new, conscious socialist discipline. But the formation of a new communist discipline, *the habit of communist work* , which is transformed from a burden into an urgent need, into a pleasure, is unthinkable without *борьбы*the proletariat fighting the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, with the direct influence of the class enemy, who is trying to disrupt the new labor discipline, without the proletariat purging itself of the "dirt" of the old society. The influence of the entire system of proletarian dictatorship-the party, trade unions, and soviets-plays a

---

326 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, О Фейербахе / Архив Маркса и Энгельса — стр. 226; См. также «Анти-Дюринг» и др.

327 В. Ленин, Экономика и политика в эпоху диктатуры пролетариата, Великий почин / Соч., т. XVI.

significant role here. Not only agitation, propaganda, social education, comradely courts, but also strict responsibility of everyone for the work performed and awareness of their responsibility is a necessary part of the education of a new discipline. Therefore, in complete contrast to Bukharin, it was precisely in the formation of habits and communist labor that Lenin saw the first necessary condition for the possibility of the death of the proletarian state.

The struggle against depersonalization in the organization of labor, with the equalization of wages, the strict implementation of personal responsibility and self — financing-these are the new forms of class struggle through which the proletarian dictatorship should contribute not only to a huge increase *in labor productivity*, but also to the education of a new communist *discipline* . Such is the dialectic of the development of the class struggle on the road to the abolition of classes. The underestimation by right and "left" opportunism of social competition and udarism as forms of mobilising activity and educating the working class, their lack of understanding in this connection of the importance of the struggle for self-financing, the struggle against depersonalization and egalitarianism, "leftist" slogans of equality, and so on-these are the characteristic opportunist perversions of the general party line, which we have to fight on the basis of at the present stage. At the same time, the right-wing danger, as the XVII Party Conference emphasized, remains *the main danger*for the entire nearest period. At the same time, it is necessary to combat all relapses of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, all "leftist" skulls and rotten liberalism in relation to them.

The system of proletarian dictatorship in all its links contributes to the realization of all these most important tasks of class struggle and socialist construction, which were put forward by the period of socialist reconstruction. As we have seen, the Soviet State plays an extremely important role in carrying out these tasks *государство*. "In setting out the task of eliminating classes," Comrade Molotov said at the seventeenth Party Conference, " we cannot and should not yet raise the question of the uselessness or withering away of the state. On the contrary, at this stage it is still a question of *strengthening*the proletarian state, of strengthening its power." All sorts of right-opportunist underestimations of the role and significance of the influence of the proletarian state in destroying the antithesis between town and country, in fostering a new socialist discipline, as well as "leftist" theories of the "withering away" of the Soviets in areas of collectivization, etc., indicate a direct undermining of the system of the proletarian dictatorship as the greatest and most proactive force in building socialist society.

Chapter 6. The role of public consciousness and forms of ideological struggle

6.1. Social existence and public consciousness

The Marxist theory of the historical process, emphasizing the determining role of the material existence of people, provides the only scientific explanation of the origin and role of social consciousness, its content and forms of its development. The Marxist explanation of the origin and role of ideas refuted the traditional *idealistic*theories of the ruling classes, which attributed to ideas a self-sufficient and decisive role in the historical process and "viewed history as a whole and in its individual parts as a permanent realization of ideas[328]."

How does historical materialism explain the course of the historical process and what place does social consciousness occupy in this historical process, *in what forms does the ideological struggle* take place ?

Marx gives a classic answer to this question in the famous formulation of the preface to the Critique of Political Economy: "The totality of production relations forms the economic structure of society, *the real foundation* on which the legal and political superstructure rises, *to which the forms*

328 Ф. Энгельс, Людвиг Фейербах / 1928 — с. 63.

of social consciousness correspond . The mode of production of material life *determines the process* of social, political, and spiritual life in general. *It is not the consciousness of people that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, social existence that determines their consciousness.* With a change in the economic basis, the entire vast *superstructure above it is transformed more or less quickly.* When considering such revolutions, one should always keep in mind *the difference* between the material upheaval in the economic conditions of production, which can be defined with natural scientific accuracy, and *the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophical* — in short, *ideological forms in which people perceive this conflict in their consciousness and in the name of which they are fighting* ."

To give a Marxist, scientific explanation of social consciousness, to explain the development of ideological forms — this means: first, to reveal *the dependence* of ideologies on social existence and, secondly, to understand *как*exactly how social existence is reflected in them.

The dependence of social consciousness on social existence is fully revealed in the materialistic approach to social life. Materialism proceeds from the basic difference between the production process of people's material life, i.e., their material existence, on the one hand, and the reflection, awareness of this existence, on the other. "People's existence is a real process of their life. Consciousness can be nothing but conscious being[329]."

The main difference between material and ideological relations lies in the fact that people's material relations were formed and created — at least before the victory of the proletarian revolution — in spite of their consciousness and will. "Social relations," says Lenin, " are divided into material and ideological relations. The latter are only a superstructure over the former, which are formed *in spite of the will and consciousness of man* »[330]."

The difference between ideological relations and material-production relations, which are formed in spite of the will and consciousness of people, should not be understood simplistically, i.e., in such a way that people's material production activity proceeds without *the participation* of consciousness. Every social action of people is performed with the participation of consciousness. The history of human society is made by conscious people, not by dummies. Consciousness is an integral and necessary part of social activity. "People's minds *certainly reflect* everything that motivates them to act, but *how*it is reflected depends on the circumstances[331]."

The basic law of the historical process, which is expressed in the fact that people's social existence determines their consciousness, is very often *simplified, vulgarized* , and turned into a caricature of Marxism, mainly by bourgeois critics of Marxism and their willing or unwilling agents, the vulgar materialists. This simplification consists in the fact that material social existence, which determines consciousness, is understood as the immediate everyday living conditions of a person and, even more simply — the interests of his stomach.

In this regard, it is concluded that heroism, self-sacrifice, disregard for personal interests, for example, the heroism of fighters of peasant wars, figures of the French Revolution, heroism and fanaticism of scientists who went to the stake, torture and poverty in the name of truth (Giordano Bruno, Galileo, Spinoza)'- that all this is in no way inexplicable from the so-called "materialism". Hence the bourgeois critics conclude that Marxism clearly contradicts the facts!

The classics of Marxism *have never denied ideal motives* , including those of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois revolutionaries, fighters for science, and so on. The task of historical materialism is not at all to deny or recognize these motives, but to understand and explain them.

An example of a Marxist explanation of the dependence of consciousness on being can be found in Marx's excellent analysis of the petty-bourgeois nature of Proudhon's ideology, given in a letter to Annenkov.

---

329 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 216.

330 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. I — с. 60.

331 Ф. Энгельс, Людвиг Фейербах / 1928.

"The petty bourgeois in modern advanced society," Marx wrote, " by virtue of his very position becomes a socialist on the one hand, and an economist on the other, i.e., he is blinded by the splendor of the big bourgeoisie and sympathizes with the sufferings of the people. Deep down, he prides himself on being nonpartisan, on having found a true balance that has the pretense of being different from ordinary mediocrity. Such *a petty bourgeois deifies contradiction, because contradiction is the basis of his being* ."

He himself is nothing but a social contradiction embodied in action. It must justify in theory what it is in practice. The ideal motivations are at work in Proudhon's work. However, whether he is aware of it or not, his ideology is objectively a classic expression of the contradictory existence of the petty bourgeoisie.

For Marxism-Leninism, the basic materialist proposition *about the determining* role of being is not an abstract a priori formula. On the contrary, this very law of materialistic knowledge grew out of the process of changing capitalist reality by the revolutionary class *practice* of the proletariat. The materialist point of view on the dependent role of consciousness and ideology can be correctly understood only on the basis of the dialectical-materialist view. The dialectical nature of this basic law of the historical process is due to its inseparability from the revolutionary practice of the proletariat, from all other elements of Marxist theory, and its organic connection with Marx's scientific communism. "Communism for us is not *a state* that must be established, not *an ideal* that reality must conform to," Marx and Engels wrote in their earlier work. We call communism a real movement that destroys the present state. The conditions of this movement follow from the prerequisites that are now present in reality[332]." The material presuppositions of capitalism determine the communist ideal, and not vice versa (as the utopian socialists thought), and this ideal itself takes on a concrete form only in the process of real movement, i.e., in the process of the proletarian struggle.

The class struggle of the proletariat and its class consciousness generated by the conditions of capitalism tell us quite clearly that social existence determines social consciousness. The development of Marxism proves especially clearly that this basic theoretical truth of Marxism is incomprehensible without the practice of the proletarian struggle. The whole history of Bolshevism and its struggle against deviations expresses the basic truth, correctly understood and put into practice, about the dependence of social consciousness on social existence. The class consciousness of the proletariat is not *passive* It is a reflection of calm existence, but *an effective knowledge* that is born in *the struggle* itself, "for," Lenin points out, " it *is participation* itself (i.e., participation in the struggle of the proletariat. *Авт.*By the mere fact of its appearance, it raises both consciousness and organizational instincts."[333].

Lenin's struggle for the role of the party and its organization, for paragraph 1 of the party's charter at the Second Party Congress, etc., is a classic illustration of how *practical the party is.* Dialectically, Lenin understood and applied this materialistic law of history. Lenin knew that without participation in the work of the party, the understanding of the party program and party theory could not be correct and stable.

The first economic five-year plan created as a plan and the victorious struggle for its implementation showed how consciously and in practice the proletariat realized that social existence, i.e., the building of the foundation of socialism, determines and entails the flourishing of so-called "spiritual culture".

"Materialism in general," says Lenin, " recognizes an objectively real being (matter), independent of consciousness, sensation, etc., of humanity. Historical materialism recognizes social existence as independent of the social consciousness of humanity. Consciousness is only a reflection here and there*отражение* being, at best, an approximately correct (adequate, perfectly accurate)

---

332 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 223.

333 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. V — с. 364. Подчёркнуто Лениным.

reflection[334]of it."

Here the question arises: how should this reflection be understood, "is it an accurate, correct reflection of being?"

Reflection being in ideologies, especially in a class society, is not always an accurate and correct reflection and cognition of this being. Religious consciousness, religious ideology can never be recognized as a true, correct copy of the real world. However, even in the most mystical and fantastic religious ideas, it is possible and necessary *to reveal their earthly core* — the objective relations that gave rise to this idea. The task of Marxist research is to reveal in any form of social consciousness — religion, art, science — only its inherent, *special*, specific type of reflection of material existence, and moreover *different for different classes* , in order to deduce from these relations of real life*вывести* corresponding forms of public consciousness.

Every idea or system of ideas is a *specific area* of social life, not mechanically reducible to the material social existence that gave rise to this idea and of which it is a reflection. Ideologies, on the other hand, do not represent an *independent*domain detached from human existence, but, on the contrary, "an idea is as real as the object of which it is reflected in the brain[335]." The idea is not a fiction, not a bare invention, no matter how fantastic it may be, but *a real reflection* processes of social life. The very vitality of an idea is determined by its content, i.e., its reflection of material social processes.

Consciousness is always, in one form or another, a reflection of being, but *the way in which it is reflected is very different for different classes* . This is how Lenin describes the reflection in the minds of capitalists of their existence: "Each individual producer in the world economy is aware that he is making some change in the technique of production, each owner is aware that he is exchanging some products for others, but these producers and these owners are not aware that they are thereby changing social existence[336]." In contrast to bourgeois consciousness, the consciousness and ideology of the proletariat *is correct* they reflect social existence. "We have many enemies," says Lenin, " but they are divided or do not know what they want… We know what we want[337]."

In one of his letters, Engels pointed out that Marx's critics "lack dialectic" for a correct understanding of the relationship between the economic basis and superstructures, social existence and social consciousness.

The superstructure, including the social consciousness of people, ideologies are not a passive consequence, not just the result of the action of the basis. Once they arise, they themselves have *the opposite effect on this basis. The power, significance and role of the reverse influence of superstructures* and ideology are always linked to the given historical conditions; the force of the reverse influence of ideology increases or decreases depending on *the extent to which human practice, revolutionary activity, is consciously involved in the process of changing social life based on an understanding of its laws* .

Thus, for example, the introduction of NEP signified a materialistic realization by our party of the fact that with the economy destroyed by the imperialist and civil wars and with millions of peasants ' scattered households, it is impossible to start socialist construction directly, but it is necessary to work in a roundabout way. This meant a deep awareness of the dependence of our political capabilities on material existence. Practical activity based on this awareness has led to the fact that today, in the last period of NEP, we are directly building socialism and have already completed the construction of the foundation of a socialist economy.

The dialectical understanding of the interaction of bases, superstructures and ideologies has

---

334 В. Ленин, Материализм и эмпириокритицизм — с. 275.

335 В. Ленин, Материализм и эмпириокритицизм.

336 В. Ленин, Материализм и эмпириокритицизм.

337 В. Ленин / Соч., т. VIII, ч. 1 — с. 231.

nothing in common with the so-called theory of various *factors* , which was defended by the Russian school of subjective sociology. Superstructures and ideologies acquire the power of reverse influence not because of their independence and their apparent independence from social existence, but, on the contrary, because of the organic connection between being and consciousness and the understanding of this connection.

Although Plekhanov sharply criticized the theory of factors, there are also errors and inconsistencies in his understanding of the interaction of economics and ideologies. Unlike Lenin's dialectical understanding of this problem, Plekhanov did not understand clearly enough that the reverse influence of social consciousness, as well as of superstructures in general, on the basis can be radically different, that it can be *conservative and revolutionary* and that the revolutionary influence of ideology is impossible without its maturation in the struggle of the revolutionary classes. Plekhanov here enters on the path of social-democratic *khvostivism*, which is essentially *fatalistic* understanding the role of consciousness and the role of the party. The consciousness of the working class, according to Plekhanov, is developed as a result of its calm maturation, accumulation of experience, etc. "The calmness of our proletariat indicates only that in its midst spontaneity gives way to consciousness, and this is the first condition for the success of the revolution[338]." Here Plekhanov echoes Kautsky. "Clarity,"says Kautsky," keeps the rising classes from coming out prematurely[339]." Plekhanov and Kautsky understand the development of proletarian consciousness, its role and interaction with the existence that gave rise to it, "in a contemplative way," *outside of revolutionary practice*; Lenin always emphasized, in contrast to Plekhanov and Kautsky, that proletarian consciousness is inseparable from its revolutionary *practice* , that it is only in it that proletarian consciousness matures and develops. "Months of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry,"Lenin pointed out," will do more than decades of peaceful, numbing atmosphere of political stagnation[340]."

The ideologies of the hitherto dominant exploitative classes had the opposite effect on existence, in *a conservative*, reactionary, retarding direction (for example, religion and all kinds of stagnant traditions). "Once established," says Engels, " religion always retains a certain stock of ideas inherited from earlier times, since tradition is a great conservative force in all areas of ideology[341]."

The main reason for the conservatism and conservative influence of ideologies was, firstly, that these ideologies are a reflection of the social existence of people and as a reflection they are able to maintain their existence for a certain period and when the existence that brought them to life has already changed. Changes and upheavals in the economy do not occur simultaneously with changes in superstructures. "With a change in the economic basis," says Marx, " *more or less rapidly* the whole huge superstructure above it is also changing[342]." "The main factors of economic life," says Engels, " also usually act *for a long time*in silence, before breaking out with sudden force. A clear understanding of the economic history of a given period is never immediately available to contemporaries."

Secondly, the reason for the conservatism of ideology lies in the existence of a class that has left the world stage as the dominant class (for example, the landlords under the bourgeois system), but nevertheless has not completely disappeared and lives with its old ideology, and influences the ideology of the new classes in a conservative way. It must not be forgotten that all the hitherto

---

338 Г. Плеханов / Соч., т. XV — с. 200.

339 К. Каутский, Пролетарская революция — с. 105.

340 В. Ленин / Соч., т. VI — с. 140.

341 Ф. Энгельс, Людвиг Фейербах / 1928 — с. 71.

342 К. Маркс, К критике политической экономии. Предисловие. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

dominant classes were exploitative classes. Therefore, although the bourgeoisie, for example, initially waged a struggle against the ideology of feudalism, including religion and religious prejudices, however, after becoming the ruling class, it used the same religion against which it fought, and adapted it to deceive the working class in bourgeois society. In addition, the bourgeoisie very often enters into political and ideological compromises with the remnants of monarchy and feudalism. For example, in England, the form and ideology of royal power are preserved, although the economy of England is much higher than that of republican France, and although the English king has much less rights than the French president.

6.2. Public consciousness, psyche, and ideology

Religious beliefs, the bourgeois concept of freedom, the proletariat's consciousness of its own interests — all these phenomena, which manifest themselves in one form or another in the minds of individuals , are presented to them as the subject of their *own,* individual experience. Why should different experiences, ideas, and ideas of individuals in the political, moral, and religious spheres be defined as *social* people's consciousness?

Social consciousness does not possess any independent, metaphysical essence, as many bourgeois sociologists think. It exists only in the minds *отдельных*of individuals, not in the transcendental realms, and not in the special realm of collective psychology. But at the same time, public consciousness is not *a simple sum* individual consciousnesses. On the one hand, social consciousness exists only through individual consciousnesses; on the other hand, individual consciousness itself always manifests itself only as social consciousness. Without a dialectical understanding of the general, the particular, and the individual, the question of individual and social consciousness and the relation between them cannot be clarified.

Social consciousness arises as a result of people's relations to each other in an active struggle with nature. The social consciousness of people arose not because each individual person, as a being gifted with a supposedly spiritual nature, began to think independently, imagine, feel, and realize, but because the social life of people consists of constant relationships and interactions of people, primarily in the process of their material activities. This is constant *communication* people, without which there is no society, are brought to life by the appearance of such inherent properties of social life (at its very early stages) like *languages and consciousness* . "Language is as old as consciousness; language is practical, existing for other people, and therefore also existing for real consciousness itself, and language, like consciousness, arises from the need to communicate with other people... *My relation to my environment is my consciousness.* Where any relation exists, it exists for me; the animal does not relate to anything, for the animal its relation to others does not exist as a relation[343]." The attitude of people is possible only in human society, and it generates the consciousness of people as their social consciousness.

No matter what individual tones the feelings and ideas of individuals may be colored, no matter what individual power they may possess, the very fact of feeling and being aware of them is always social and possible only in society. "The essence of religion," says Marx, " is reduced by Feuerbach to the essence of man. But the essence of man is not an abstraction inherent in the individual. In its reality, it is the totality of social relations[344]."

Does this mean that social consciousness and individual consciousness are identical phenomena? They are identical and at the same time different. Since the content of individual consciousness is always social, these concepts are identical. However, social consciousness is very diverse and diverse, it is differentiated primarily by the content of ideas, ideas, and emotions of various social *classes* . Then, even representatives of the same class within a single class consciousness *по-разному*experience and perceive different aspects of reality in different ways. The

343 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 247.

344 6-й тезис К. Маркса о Л. Фейербахе.

chemist Lavoisier, the artist David, and the politician Robespierre lived at the same time, in the same epoch of the Great French Revolution, and were each in their own field representatives of the class interests of the bourgeoisie, but each of them had a different range of interests, ideas, and feelings from the other in their own special orientation, which of course did not exclude class activity. commonalities of their consciousness.

It should be noted that the founders of Marxism usually speak of " public consciousness "and *ideologies*as its special"forms". Plekhanov, on the other hand, readily uses the term "social psychology" or "psyche" (it also appears in Plekhanov's well-known five-term formula of historical materialism). From Plekhanov's point of view," ideologies "are formed and created on the basis of a certain social" psychology", which, according to Plekhanov, is nothing more than the prevailing moods and ideas of people in a given period, on the basis of which certain ideologies already grow.

If the question were only a question of terminology, a question of word usage, it would not be particularly difficult. The term social "*psychology*" or, more correctly, social "*psyche* ", which spread in the last third of the last century (with the light hand of bourgeois idealism and empiricism), does not mean essentially anything else than the same social "*consciousness* ". However, there is no doubt that the latter notation is theoretically more correct. The use of the term "psyche" opens the way for an idealistic "teaching" about the "subconscious" and even "unconscious psyche" (the teaching of the idealist Bergson, Freudianism). It eased the way for the enormous influence of Freud's reactionary theory, according to which the" subconscious "and" unconscious " play a crucial role in human consciousness.

But it's not just a matter of word usage. The drawback and fallacy of Plekhanov's distinction between social "psychology" and "ideology" lie, first, in the fact that Plekhanov to a certain extent *biologizes*, thinks naturalistically, the very concept of social psychology, and, secondly, in the fact that he *is non-dialectical* He understands the relationship between psychology and ideology, and Plekhanov's first mistake is connected with the second.

Sometimes giving good examples of Marxist analysis of art and literature (for example, primitive peoples, bourgeois art, etc.), Plekhanov always emphasizes that the social psychology of a particular class, as it is given and has already emerged, has one common root: "*the psychology of a given epoch* is not difficult to understand, and anyone who understands it will be convinced of this. at least get a quick look at the facts[345]." By declaring that ideology is still based on a special field of social psychology, Plekhanov does not sufficiently reveal *the class ideological content* conditioned consciousness. It is dominated by biologism with *eternal psychological laws* human nature (the law of "antithesis", imitation). For example, the change of the aristocratic direction to the bourgeois in French dramatic literature of the XVII and XVIII centuries. Plekhanov explains the operation of the psychological law of "antithesis," and this, of course, obscures the class antagonism of these literatures. Plekhanov does not understand that in the internal contradictions of art (for example, in the contradictions of Tolstoy's work), *the class*character of literature and art itself manifests itself, and to explain these contradictions there is no need to resort to special laws of psychological antithesis.

Such an understanding by Plekhanov of social psychology and ideology opens a chasm between them, makes it impossible to understand their mutual transition, their development. That is why Plekhanov failed to reveal the contradictory process of the struggle and maturation of class ideology within the " psychology of the epoch — - in its struggle with other class-hostile ideologies.

If Plekhanov does not see a dialectical transition between social consciousness and its ideological forms, then for Comrade Bukharin this transition from psychology to ideology appears as a mechanical, purely quantitative transition: "Social psychology,"he declares," is a reservoir for ideology." Ideologies differ from social psychology by "a greater systematization of their elements, i.e. thoughts, feelings, sensations, images, etc. What does ideology systematize? It systematizes what is little or no systematization, i.e., social psychology. *Ideologies* are *clumps of social*

345 Г. Плеханов, Основные вопросы марксизма — с. 74.

psychology »[346]."

Bukharin's concept, by turning ideology into a systematized "bundle of social psychology", which itself is supposedly not systematized, mechanically simplifies the whole problem. It turns out that social consciousness, psychology, is a certain entity that is not penetrated by ideas, which is, as it were, next to ideology. Bukharin does not understand *the unity* of" psychology " and ideology, i.e., the dominant, guiding role *of ideas* in the entire field of public consciousness.

To confirm the correctness of his definition of social psychology as a "bundle" of ideology, Bukharin cites the example of the proletariat's still vague class-related feelings, moods, and views at the dawn of the working-class movement; these moods only mature much later and take on the ideological form of the political program of the working class, leading to the formation of an independent worldview of the proletariat. It is true, of course, that the working class was not at once clearly aware of its own interests and the aims of its political struggle, which were distinct from the bourgeoisie. But it would be wrong to conclude from this (as Bukharin does) that in the early period of its struggle the working class possessed only a social "psychology" and only later found itself on the "ideological" level. Even when the working class has not yet come to a clear consciousness of its class ideas in the economic and political struggle, its vague desires, feelings, indignations and protests against the existing oppression and exploitation represent the germs of a new ideology. *Lenin saw in the spontaneity* of the proletarian movement *a nascent form of consciousness* . On the other hand, "the spontaneous working — class movement,"Lenin said," can only create (and inevitably does) trade unionism, and the trade unionist policy of the working class is precisely the bourgeois policy of the working class[347]." The consciousness of the working class at this stage is still contradictory, and it easily falls under the influence of the prevailing bourgeois ideology.

Proletarian consciousness is not born simply as a" bundle " of social psychology, i.e., of proletarian spontaneity (for this very spontaneity of proletarian consciousness speaks of the domination of bourgeois ideology), it is born in the struggle against those hostile ideological ideas and moods which, without this struggle, could have dominated the state of the proletariat's minds. "Any belittling of the socialist ideology," Lenin points out, " *any removal from the party* They speak of spontaneity, but the spontaneous development of the working-class movement leads precisely to its subordination to bourgeois ideology."[348].

The development by the proletariat of its own particular ideology, its own worldview, was preceded by a certain mood of the minds of the working class, i.e., by the lowest stages in the development of this ideology; however, this proletarian psychology is not some formless "psychology"; it is saturated with the internal struggle between the bourgeois and the emerging proletarian ideology, while the working class from the "class in itself" has not yet turned into a "class for yourself".

Marx and Engels constantly say that ideologies are *forms*of social consciousness. The dialectical correlation of form and content precludes the recognition of any formless social psychology, just as there is no content-free form of it, i.e., ideology. In other words, social psychology does not exist as a chaotic, formless "state of mind", next to "clumps", with "formed" ideologies, as it turns out according to Bukharin. Form is not something external to the content, it is not squeezed out of its content as a lump, it is an internal structure of the content itself and is inseparable from it.

The juxtaposition of feelings and emotions with thoughts and ideas is associated with an incorrect, mechanical juxtaposition of social " psychology "and"ideology". The mistakes of Plekhanov and Bukharin in this matter served as the source for the mistakes of some modern literary would-be theorists. Voronsky, Pereverzev, and others. they argued that the writer, poet, and

---

346 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — с. 269.

347 В. Ленин / Соч., т. V — с. 193.

348 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. V — с. 149.

artist create their work only on the basis of social psychology, i.e., on the basis of "immediate" impressions that have not yet taken shape, have not yet been defined ideologically.

To summarize: the social consciousness or "psychology" of people is not only a system of ideas and thoughts, but also feelings and moods associated with them (for example, the ideology of the proletariat is associated with a sense of hatred for the capitalist system). In the historical development and maturation of the ideology of the new revolutionary class, its consciousness passes through various qualitative stages: from vague constructions and thoughts that break with the influence of the ideology of the ruling class, up to a clear and precise scientific and political formulation of class tasks. This can be clearly traced in the development of the class consciousness of the proletariat from its vague ideological beginnings to its highest stage — Marxism-Leninism.

6.3. Relative independence of ideologies

The question of the relative independence of ideologies can be properly understood only if we proceed from the social *division of mental and physical labor* characteristic of a class society. "Society," says Engels, " generates a certain general function, which it cannot do without. The people designated for this purpose form a branch of the division of labor within society. At the same time, they also acquire special interests, and in contrast to those who authorized them, they *become independent* in relation to them[349]."

Class ideologies arise as a result of the development of classes and class struggle, which also entails the social division of labor along the lines of mental and physical labor. "The division of labor,"Marx points out," becomes really a division of labor only when there is a division of material and spiritual labor." From this point *on, consciousness can* really imagine that it is something *other* than the consciousness of existing practice. From the moment consciousness really begins to imagine something, without really imagining anything, from that moment it is able to free itself from the world and pass on to the formation of "pure theory", theology, philosophy, morality, etc[350]." In class society, the development of these ideologies is, as it were, detached from the generative ones Both their material causes and ideologies are effectively separated into relatively independent domains. This separation does not, of course, create a real complete independence of consciousness from being, but it does lead to *a relative independence* in the development of ideology. Every superstructure and ideology "by virtue of its inherent, or rather once acquired, gradually developing independence" *(Engels)*acquires its relatively separate character.

Changes and upheavals in the economy occur, as we have already noted, simultaneously with changes in superstructures and ideologies. The relative independence of ideology is manifested in the fact that, for example, the change and development of philosophical systems and trends, ultimately determined by the level of development of the economic basis, at the same time depend on *the level* of development of philosophy itself, as well as on the political and other ideological characteristics of the country and era in which this philosophy develops. Engels illustrates this relative independence of ideology with the example of the development of philosophy as follows: "As *a special area* of the division of labor, the philosophy of each epoch has as its premise a certain material of thought, the material that was passed on to it by its *predecessors*and from which it proceeds. This results in the phenomenon that economically backward countries can play a leading role in philosophy: France in the eighteenth century in relation to England, on whose philosophy the French relied, and then Germany in relation to the first two. But both in France and Germany, philosophy and the general flourishing of literature were the result of economic development at that time."

From what Engels said, it follows that all the peculiarities, zigzags of development and the very flourishing of philosophy in Germany, while Germany was an economically backward country

349 Ф. Энгельс, Письмо к Конраду Шмидту.

350 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 22.

(beginning of the XIX century: Kant, Hegel, L. Feuerbach), cannot be deduced directly from the economic development of Germany alone. Without understanding that once an ideology has emerged, it has a certain *relative* independence, which*can only*be explained in the final analysis by economic development, it is impossible to understand the peculiarity of ideological development in a class society. For a classless socialist society, this question is presented differently.

The separation of intellectual labor from physical labor in a class society and the relative independence of ideologies that prevails from this lead to the fact that ideologies in a class society, in the minds of its ideologists, turn into *completely independent ones* entities.

For example, the bourgeoisie fought for the victory of the bourgeois democratic system because it was primarily required by the interests of the bourgeoisie's own economic development, but in the minds of the masses of working people employed by the bourgeoisie, this struggle was presented as a struggle for the highest political, moral and other "ideals". That is why Marx says in the preface to the Critique of Political Economy that when considering revolutions, it is necessary to distinguish between the material upheaval in the economic conditions of production "and the ideological forms in which people perceive this conflict in their minds and *in the name of which they fight*." The illusory independence of ideologies arises because the true motivating forces and reasons that make people fight for certain political ideals remain hidden for them. Engels characterizes this phenomenon as perverted ideological thinking. "Ideology is a process that the so-called thinker performs, although with consciousness, but with false consciousness. The true motivating forces that set it in motion remain unknown to it… Since it is a process of thought, it derives both its content and its form from pure thinking… for to him every human action seems *ultimately to be based* on thinking, because it is accomplished *through*thinking[351]."

Every social action is performed by people with the participation of consciousness, but in the conditions of a class society, this consciousness is often perversely and incorrectly attributed the role of the creator of reality. The appearance of an independent ideology in the minds of people is closely related to the fact that it is born in a class society. Class society, and especially capitalist society, is enormously deepening and expanding the division of mental and physical labor. Capitalism, on the one hand, creates a multi-million-strong army of people (the proletariat) whose lot is physical labor, or rather, even the monotonous, monotonous functions of labor. On the other hand, the same capitalism creates and increasingly differentiates numerous branches of ideological labor, generates "pure" ideologists, people of so-called intelligent labor. This ideological labor in capitalist society is increasingly detached in form from its material basis. By perceiving their ideas, their ideological thought process, as not dependent on any class forces and phenomena of social life, but on the contrary, subordinating this life to themselves, ideologists thereby attribute *a universal*character to class ideas. The class role of the ideology of the ruling class consists precisely in distorting and obscuring the true meaning of the origin of its ideas, in passing off the class as the universal, as the human.

The fact that the perversion of ideological thinking reflects the class character of ideology, Lenin clearly shows by the example of ideological deception and obscuring the essence of imperialist war. The objective content of the war is a continuation of the policy of "imperialism", i.e., the plunder by the bourgeoisie of the "great powers" of other nations; the" subjective " prevailing ideology is "national" phrases used to fool the masses[352].

Otherwise, not in a Leninist way, he explains the same phenomenon. Deborin, revealing a purely mechanistic understanding of the correspondence of class ideologies to the basis. "The first task of a Marxist," writes Deborin, "under these conditions (i.e., the conditions of an imperialist war) was to 'remove' the ideological form, expose its falsity, and reveal the true content of the war, which at the same time meant *bringing social consciousness and ideology into one or another*

351 Ф. Энгельс, Письмо к Мерингу.

352 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 361.

correspondence with the objective content, with social existence."[353].

Deborin's erroneous assessment of the ideology of the imperialist war is not accidental, but is connected with the whole opportunist assessment of imperialism noted above. Deborin's extra-class approach to superstructures and ideology, and his demand for their mechanical conformity to the basis, were long ago exposed by Lenin in his struggle against the Mensheviks.

Bourgeois ideology is a distorted representation of social existence, created in the interests of the ruling exploitative class, especially in the period of its decline. However, one cannot conclude from this (as is sometimes done) that since the ideologies of the oppressing classes perversely and incorrectly reflected reality, Marxism-Leninism, as a theory that correctly knows the world, is not an ideology.

To adopt such a point of view means, first of all, to forget that although ideologies are subjectively detached from being, yet in the ideology of class society *reality is reflected* and recognized in a peculiar way, and not only perverted. Secondly, it is forgotten that by ideology Marx, Engels, and Lenin understood not only the perverted reflection of the world in people's knowledge, which is characteristic of *class* society, but that ideology is in *every* society a form of reflection and cognition of reality. Therefore, it is wrong to deny the proletarian ideology on the sole ground that it correctly reflects and cognizes the world. Third, this point of view does not take into account that, in a certain sense, the most perverse character of ideological thinking correctly reflects *the contradictory*character of class reality.

Class reality, especially in capitalist society, is complex and contradictory, and its inherent inconsistency is perverted consciousness. The most striking example of such a perverted consciousness, without which the very process of commodity-production relations in capitalist society is unthinkable, is *commodity fetishism* .

"Here," says Marx, " the products of the human brain *are presented as independent beings* , endowed with their own lives, standing in certain relationships with people and with each other. The products of human hands play the same role in the world of goods. This is what I call fetishism, which is inherent in the products of labor, once they are produced as commodities, and which is therefore *not separable* from all commodity production[354]."

So, on the one hand, commodity fetishism is such a perversion in the minds of people of real relations, which is similar to religious fantasies, but, on the other hand, this perversion itself is an inseparable property of commodity production. It is impossible to separate the fetishistic form of consciousness from the character of capitalist production itself. Similarly, bourgeois preaching about the universal character of morality, bourgeois democracy, is not only a perversion of social relations that soars high in the ideologies of people, but it is at the same time a necessary concomitant element of these relations and the class rule of the bourgeoisie. "If in all ideology people and their relationships seem to be placed on their heads, as in a pinhole camera, then this also *follows from the historical process of their life*, just as the reverse image of objects on the retina follows from the direct physical process of their life[355]."

Speaking of the perverse nature of class ideology, we should also not forget that every class in society, including the bourgeoisie, could not exist and rule without a relatively correct knowledge of the world. The bourgeoisie as a class could not have established its economic domination without the development of natural sciences and technology, and these latter are unthinkable without a correct knowledge of the processes of nature. "...Every ideology is historically conditional, "says Lenin," but it is certain that every scientific ideology (as opposed to religious ideology) corresponds to objective truth, absolute nature[356]."

---

353 А. Деборин, Ленин как мыслитель — с. 86.

354 К. Маркс, Капитал / т. I — с. 33–34.

355 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 216.

356 В. Ленин, Материализм и эмпириокритицизм.

However , the fact that *every scientific ideology* (as opposed to religious ideology, for example) *corresponds to objective truth* does not mean that in a class society a scientific ideology is created without any kind of perversions or ideological twists. In their historical development, both natural and especially social sciences reflect class struggles and class tendencies towards ideological distortion of truth.

6.4. Class character of ideology. Pre-capitalist ideologies

Social existence determines social consciousness, so in a class society every ideology has *a class* character. "On the various forms of property, on the social conditions of existence," says Marx, " a whole superstructure of various and peculiar feelings, illusions, concepts and worldviews rises. The whole *class*creates and forms all this on the basis of its material conditions and, accordingly, social relations[357]."

In the revisionist literature, this question is raised vaguely and incorrectly. Even if one recognizes the class character of ideologies, one forgets that class *consciousness is the most important thing.* different classes *различным*are reflected in their ideologies in different ways, and that therefore the class content in ideologies, as well as the relations of different ideologies to each other and to the economic basis, are not the same and even opposite. Bogdanov's simplified understanding of ideologies is particularly striking, as he clearly idealistically sees ideology as an "organizing form" of being associated with the "organizing" class.

Bogdanov's theory of ideology undoubtedly influenced Bukharin's understanding of the role of ideologies. For Comrade Bukharin, ideologies become " *equilibrium conditions* that restrain the internal contradictions of human systems[358]." If ideologies are "equilibrium conditions," then the essential difference between bourgeois and proletarian ideologies disappears. Meanwhile, the very character, the very way of reflection in proletarian ideologies is qualitatively different from bourgeois, since proletarian ideologies are able *to correctly*, without fetishism and perversions, reflect and recognize reality. It is precisely this fundamental difference that Comrade Bukharin obscures in his formulation of the question. At the same time, analyzing various ideologies, science, and philosophy, Comrade Bukharin comes to the conclusion that their development "ultimately depends on *technical development."* development of society, depending on the level of development of the productive forces"[359]. Engels "'in the last analysis" is here perverted by Bukharin, for the level of productive forces is identified and reduced to the level of development of technology.

Emphasizing the equal role of bourgeois and proletarian ideologies as" conditions of equilibrium "of society, their "correspondence" to the economic basis "and, ultimately, their dependence on the technical development of society", Comrade Bukharin forgets that the class character of ideology often manifests itself not in the mechanical correspondence of ideology to the basis, but in *contradiction* between ideology and its economic basis, in the contradictions between both competing ideologies. Moreover, Bukharin's understanding of ideology as a "condition of equilibrium" does not give us a correct idea of the role of the ideology of the ruling exploiting class as *the dominant*ideology.

An analysis of the ideologies of ancient, feudal, and bourgeois societies proves that the main features of the worldview of all these social formations were the class product *of the ruling classes* . "What does the history of ideas prove," Marx and Engels pointed out in the Communist Manifesto, " if not that mental activity is transformed along with material activity? The dominant ideas of the

---

357 К. Маркс, 18-е Брюмера Луи Бонапарта — с. 33–34.

358 В. Ленин / Соч., т. VIII, ч. 1 — с. 231.

359 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Коммунистический манифест.

time have always been only those of the ruling class[360]."

It is only in the course of the class struggle of the oppressed class against the ruling class that a new ideology of this class grows up, with the help of which it fights against the class that oppresses it. Thus the proletariat, in its struggle against the bourgeoisie, created its own proletarian Marxist ideology.

Why, then, can the thoughts of the ruling class also be dominant thoughts in the ranks of the oppressed classes? Because, Marx replies, "the class that is the dominant *material* force of society is at the same time its dominant *spiritual force."* by force (underlined by Marx. - *Author*). The class that is able to dispose of the means of material production has at the same time, thanks to this, the means of spiritual production. Thus, *at the same time, it generally dominates the thoughts of those who do not have the means for spiritual production* . The dominant thoughts are nothing but the ideal expression of the dominant material relations[361]." The dominant character of the thoughts of the ruling class is further expressed in the fact that the ruling class, being a minority, always tries to present its thoughts as universal and obligatory — *universal* (which is especially characteristic of bourgeois ideology). The ruling class tries *to objectify*its ideas, it gives them an independent meaning, so that it can be said "that in the era of the domination of the aristocracy, the concepts of honor, loyalty, etc. prevailed. In the era of the rule of the bourgeoisie, the concepts of freedom, equality, etc[362]."

The attribution of absolute truth, universality, and conformity to human nature to concepts is particularly characteristic of *bourgeois ideology* . Rather, the class content of bourgeois ideology manifests itself most clearly in a superclass form. This supposedly super-class and" universally valid " form of bourgeois ideology, like any other ideology of the ruling class, plays a different role in different periods of the existence of this class. The bourgeoisie, in its struggle against feudalism, against medieval darkness and ignorance, against the domination of religious mysticism, put forward the ideas of enlightenment, the development of science, and the slogans of political freedom. Since the bourgeoisie was a relatively revolutionary class during the struggle for power, its ideas partially corresponded to the interests of the majority of society. "The revolutionary class," Marx and Engels wrote on this occasion, " appears not as a class, but as the representative of the whole of society, simply because it is opposed to a certain class*всего общества* … This is possible for him, because his original interests are still strongly connected with *the general interests*of the other non-ruling classes, which, under the pressure of the situation of the past, have not been able to develop into the special interests of a special class[363]."

The bourgeois ideas of that time were advanced ideas that moved humanity forward, which of course does not exclude the fact that they were *the class*ideas of the bourgeoisie itself. The bourgeoisie's portrayal of its ideology as "supra-class" plays a completely different role when the bourgeoisie has become a reactionary class, especially during the period of decline and decay of capitalism. The ideology of the bourgeoisie becomes a form of struggle against the ideology of the new class — the proletariat, a struggle that has reached its greatest irreconcilability and acuteness in our time.

However, even before the development of bourgeois ideology, the history of class society puts forward a whole series of class ideologies that corresponded to certain class formations and contributed to strengthening the rule of exploitative classes. An early class social formation that has already developed a definite worldview and rich culture is *the slave-owning*social formation.

Economic and political features *of the ancient world* The whole worldview of the ancient

---

360 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Коммунистический манифест.

361 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 34.

362 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 34.

363 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I.

Greeks and Romans was also marked by a special imprint of the world. In this era, humanity has made giant strides forward in terms of a huge rise in culture. The religious worldview formally retains its power, but essentially gives way to art, philosophy and science (ancient Greece), political ideology and law (Rome). The development of an enterprising class of free traders, artisans, and navigators — all this radically changes people's consciousness, expands its horizons, loosens the shackles of a religious worldview, entails a radical change in people's ways of thinking, imagining, and feeling, and develops freethinking *and individualistic* features of their ideology. Because of this, ancient Greece was the cradle of materialistic philosophy (Democritus, Epicurus) and the birthplace of the sciences. Until now, most of the scientific terms and sciences themselves have Greek and partly Latin names. Both the philosophy and art of the ancient Greeks, especially in the early period of their growth, are imbued with the primary forms of materialism and dialectics. In the midst of the rapid change and movement of modes of production, in the midst of the rapid rise and fall of colonies, cities, "tyrannies" and republics, in connection with the development of commodity production and exchange, the Greeks correctly and for the first time grasped the world as a moving whole. "This original naive but essentially correct view of the world," says Engels, " was inherent in ancient Greek philosophy and *was first expressed in the Greek language.* Heraclitus: everything exists and at the same time does not exist, because everything flows, everything is constantly changing, everything is in a constant process of arising and disappearing[364]."

In close connection with the development of the class struggle in ancient Greece, not only early materialism was born, but also idealistic philosophy (Plato). The period of decline of Greek culture, the period of parasitism and decay of the ruling class on the basis of the increasingly powerful development of slave labor, entails the growth of idealism. In the end, this process culminated in the emergence and victory of the Christian religion.

If, on the one hand, ancient idealism ideologically prepared Christianity, then, on the other hand, ancient materialism, ancient art, ancient Roman law and the state served as material for the subsequent development of the worldview of the bourgeoisie in the era of the development of commercial capital. The new class content of the bourgeois worldview first flowed into the old furs, into the old ideological forms. The so-called Renaissance and humanist era (XV and XVI centuries), when the development of commodity production destroyed the old feudal relations, was imbued with the spirit of imitation and worship of the culture of the ancient world. This fact also shows that, despite the fundamental difference between these historical periods, they had something in common in the nature of the social relations of class domination and exploitation, and in the spiritual culture that expresses itself on this basis.

The worldview and culture of feudalism represent the complete opposite of ancient society, meaning *a regression* in comparison with the culture of the ancient world: stagnation in the development of sciences, complete subordination of philosophy and art *to religion* . "For this time," says Engels, " science was only a humble servant in relation to the church, which was not allowed to cross the boundaries established by faith, in short, it was everything but science[365]."

At the dawn of bourgeois society, within feudalism, the struggle between the peasantry and the emerging bourgeoisie, being essentially a purely political struggle, took the *form of a religious struggle*for the supremacy of various religious dogmas (the struggle of Huss, Luther, Calvin, and in general the entire epoch of the so-called religious reformation, the religious slogans of the peasant war, peasant riots, and uprisings of the Middle Ages).

It was only the era of the Great French Revolution that freed the struggle against feudalism from religious uniforms and vestments.

6.5. Main features of the bourgeois worldview

364 Ф. Энгельс, От утопии к науке — с. 25.

365 Ф. Энгельс, От утопии к науке — с. 68.

6.5.1. Bourgeois democracy and fascism

The bourgeoisie, in its struggle against feudalism, creates its own lines of thought. The vast diversity and variety of forms of ideologies are characteristic of bourgeois society, reflecting, first, the conservative influence of the ideologies (for example, religion) of the former ruling classes, which partially preserved their existence even under capitalism; secondly, this diversity reflects the struggle of various class groups within the bourgeoisie itself (small, medium, large industrial,etc.). Third, it reflects the greater mobility, variability, and richness of the ways and forms of the capitalist economy. "Constant revolutions in production, incessant upheavals in all social relations, perpetual motion and perpetual uncertainty distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all that preceded[366]it."

The economic individualism of capitalist society finds its corresponding reflection in *the individualism of bourgeois thinking* . Bourgeois individualism is at the same time a peculiar form of expression of various conflicting interests of various groups of the bourgeoisie. Social laws confront the bourgeoisie as alien and incomprehensible. The expression of the spontaneity of the social laws of capitalist society is political "freedom"," freedom " of the individual in general, free competition, which manifests itself not only in the field of economics, but also no less clearly in the field of so-called spiritual culture. The main leitmotif of bourgeois philosophy, art, and literature is the juxtaposition of the personal and individual to the social and the lack of understanding of their unity. Commodity fetishism, brilliantly revealed by Marx — is the basis of all *the ideological fetishism of the bourgeoisie*, for which the main mystery and fetish is its social life, the laws of capitalist society.

Political ideology of the bourgeoisie-*bourgeois democracy* found its most classical expression in the ideology of the rising French bourgeoisie. Democracy, i.e., the struggle for political "freedom and equality," is characteristic of the bourgeoisie in its struggle against feudalism. However, this struggle has evolved in different countries and has led to more or less adaptation by the bourgeoisie of the remnants of the feudal system to their own interests (for example, in England there were very many of them). In the last epoch of its development, i.e., in the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the ideology of the bourgeoisie takes on a new form — *fascism* . There are States that have created a complete ideology of fascism (for example, Italy), and countries like Germany in which the ideology of fascism, i.e., *open*bourgeois dictatorship, is still combined in a peculiar way with the remnants of bourgeois democracy and social fascism.

Marxist analysis of the history of bourgeois democracy reveals that this ideology corresponded to the class existence of the bourgeoisie because the bourgeoisie, being the "third estate" within the class society, could not destroy the fetters that bound it without destroying the old class legal forms, without fighting for political freedom. Bourgeois political democracy, based on the rule of private property, actually means the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the freedom to exploit labor power, and at the same time means a form of deception of the oppressed class by means of democratic illusions.

Thus, bourgeois democracy, on the one hand, represents "an enormous historical advance in comparison with feudalism" *(Lenin)*, which the proletariat must make the most of-never for a moment forgetting, on the other hand, the bourgeois character of this democracy, its historical conventionality and limitations, and not sharing superstitions and faith in the "state", not forgetting that the state, even in a democratic republic itself, and not only in a monarchy, is nothing but a " machine for the suppression of one class by another[367]."

Lenin's dialectic in the struggle against the deception of bourgeois democracy consists in the fact that Lenin understood the historical progressive significance of bourgeois democracy and its ideology, the significance of using bourgeois parliamentarism in the class struggle of the proletariat

---

366 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Коммунистический манифест.

367 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. XV — с. 608.

(Lenin's struggle against the Russian "Otzovists") , and at the same time, unlike opportunists of all kinds, Lenin tirelessly exposed the deception of bourgeois-democratic illusions.

*The big bourgeoisie*and its direct politicians are well aware of the value of their words and phrases. "The big bourgeois has been through fire, water, and copper pipes; he knows that a democratic republic, like any other form of state under capitalism, is nothing but a machine for the suppression of the proletariat[368]."

The petty bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia are often further removed from "the acute class struggle, from the stock exchange, from real politics" *(Lenin).* . That is why the petty bourgeois, in his economic position and in all the conditions of his life, is less able to assimilate this truth, and holds on longer to the illusions that a democratic republic means "pure democracy", "a free people's state", an extra-class or super-class people's power, a pure manifestation of the people's will[369]. The petty bourgeoisie has a consciousness that is most susceptible to the illusions of capitalist democratic ideology. Moreover, it creates these illusions itself, thereby actively helping the bourgeoisie in its democratic deception of the masses.

Social-democracy also strengthens the illusions of bourgeois democracy in the minds of the masses, thus fulfilling the role of the most active assistants of the bourgeoisie. "Thanks to it (democracy)," says Kautsky, for example, " a peaceful form of this (i.e., proletarian) revolution becomes possible, without bloodshed, without violence. In a democracy, the revolution itself does not appear so unexpectedly and does not produce many new fighters and new programs, as it does in bourgeois revolutions."

The practice of the fascist state during the period of decaying capitalism also found its ideological reflection in the new political and sociological views of the bourgeoisie. However, this does not mean that fascism, as an ideology of open dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, in contrast to the supra-class illusions of bourgeois democracy, quite openly proclaims the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. This ideology of the dying bourgeoisie, like all its other ideologies, along with open terror proclaims new political slogans, in the name of which dictatorship and terror are allegedly carried out. "To replace class consciousness," says the fascist F. Moriono, " with national consciousness, to prove to the workers that it is in their interests to turn from group egoism to national solidarity — that is the task of fascist syndicalism." Fascism openly proclaims the failure of liberal-bourgeois methods of action and the need for a strong state dictatorship and terror, but it does so ostensibly *in the name of nations, the state, and even "socialism*. "

6.5.2. Bourgeois morality

The same features of a class, bourgeois worldview characterize *bourgeois morality* . Classes in the course of their development put forward certain norms of behavior, relationships between people and the ideological expression of these norms — "morality" or "morality". In a class society, morality expresses various class interests.

The ruling class tries to present its views and concepts in the form *of universal, obligatory* ones . He also tries to attribute this general obligation to morality as an ideological expression of people's behavior. Feudal morality openly, in connection with the class division of society, fixed and affirmed the unequal relations and duties of the feudal lord and the peasant. The absolute character of such morality was given by religion: this is how God wants it, who created inequality on earth and destroys it in heaven.

The morality of capitalist society is deeply linked to religion; the bourgeoisie does not renounce the religious sanctification of its morality, especially in times of decline. At the same time, however, the bourgeoisie develops its own distinctive moral principles and views. Just as in political ideology and morals, the bourgeoisie proclaims *ideal, eternal, binding*norms of moral behavior for

368 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. XV — с. 562.

369 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. XV — с. 562.

all people. By practically implementing class "morality," i.e., by pursuing its own interests, the bourgeoisie tries to attribute a universal character to morality.

The bourgeois character of morality is most clearly manifested in the break between the moral *ideal and reality* : the more ruthless, frank, and cynical the class oppression and exploitation, the more magnificent and beautiful the phrases about eternal moral truths, duty, etc., in other words, the class essence of bourgeois morality manifests itself precisely in the fact that it *is thoroughly hypocritical*. Bourgeois morality found its brilliant exponent in Kant. From the point of view of Kantian morality, people apply certain perfect moral norms of behavior, adhere to moral views, and make moral assessments of their own behavior and the behavior of others because there is an eternal, perfect measure of these imperfect actions and views located on the other side of experience — *a categorical imperative*, an eternal duty and an ideal. In life, people can and should approach the eternal moral ideal, but they will never reach it: the realm of the ideal and reality is broken, although reality is subordinated to the ideal. The human conscience, its remorse, is its practical manifestation and expression of the eternal moral duty that operates and lives in man. Thus, in his philosophy, Kant justifies the hypocritical deception of bourgeois morality: "universality" and "universal humanity" in words, class actions in practice. "The further civilization advances," says Engels,"the more it is forced to cover up with the cloak of love the abnormal and negative phenomena that it necessarily generates, to embellish them or falsely deny them, in a word, to introduce conventional hypocrisy into practice."

By studying the variability of class norms and their dependence on class struggle and class interests, Marxism proves that there *were no eternal, unshakable moral norms and laws* . The proletariat must expose them as bourgeois deception and hypocrisy.

A clear, consistent Marxist-Leninist formulation of the question of morality, which removes the fetishistic veneer from bourgeois morality, is unacceptable to the "Marxists" of the Second International. Revisionism and social fascism proclaimed the necessity of combining Marxism with Kantian philosophy and with Kantian morality. At present, most ideologists of social fascism adhere to Kantian morality: Max Adler, Kautsky, Forlander-thus once again proving their not only political, but also ideological subordination to the bourgeois worldview.

Such theorists as G. Plekhanov and especially his student L. Axelrod are also strongly influenced by Kant's understanding of morality. Plekhanov identifies with Marxism Darwin's biological teaching about the origin of the sense of beauty and the sense of morality. Plekhanov essentially takes the point of view that in the psychological nature of a person, *the primary role of the human being in the development of the human being is to create a new reality.* the capacity for aesthetic and ethical feelings is inherent, and in the process of social development, under the influence of the development of productive forces and the class structure of society, these views change. According to Plekhanov, " inherent in *human nature* the possibilities of aesthetic and ethical norms and feelings change in reality under the influence of the conditions of his environment, and they (i.e., conditions) explain that a given social person (i.e., a given society, a given people, a given class) has these aesthetic tastes and concepts, and not others." By attributing to human nature an innate capacity for ethical and aesthetic feelings, Plekhanov, on the one hand, gives a hand to Darwinian biologism in explaining social phenomena, on the other hand — to Kant's moral "categorical imperative".

Plekhanov's point of view on the origin of morality, which definitely coincides with Kant's, is further developed in the Kantian direction by L. Axelrod in his theory of "universal *simple laws of law and morality* ". Following Plekhanov, Axelrod believes that along with class morals and class norms, there are also some simple *universal*norms that relate to the "simple rules" of human behavior and social life. "Despite class ethics," says Axelrod, " and the relative nature of law and morality, humanity has developed over its long social and historical life common norms of mutual existence… Without recognition and submission to these simple laws of law and morality, human existence is unthinkable[370]." The simple laws of law and morality led Plekhanov and Axelrod to a

370 Л. Аксельрод, Марксизм и этика — с. 227.

classically bourgeois, hypocritical, chauvinistic assessment of the facts of the imperialist war, which had nothing in common with Marxism or the proletariat. "By invading neutral Belgium," Axelrod wrote, " Germany violated the generally binding laws of law and morality, recognized not only by all civilized humanity, but also by certain groups of savages[371]."

The possibility of such a statement of the question of certain general features of all human morality was long foreseen by Engels, who answered it precisely from the point of view of the class analysis of this morality. "From the moment private property was developed," said Engels, " in movable property, all societies built on the principles of this private property must have had a common moral commandment: thou shalt not steal. But does this make the commandment an eternal, moral commandment? Not at all. As if they were ridiculed in a society where all reasons for theft are eliminated, where only the mentally ill can steal, as if they were ridiculed there by a moral preacher who would decide to solemnly proclaim the eternal truth — do not steal[372]."

Nor are the Menshevik idealists, and especially so many others, free from mistakes in questions of ethics. Deborin. Deborin is not very original in these mistakes. He repeats Kautsky and Plekhanov, devoting too much space to a certain "social and moral instinct, feeling, and impulses[373]." Deborin, like Plekhanov and Kautsky, deduces social instinct or social feeling from animals that lead a herd life. "Conscience, duty," says Deborin, " in general, moral consciousness is nothing more than an expression *of the social connection that has developed over thousands*of years between people of a given tribe, clan, class, or society on the basis of collective labor[374]." By this provision, t. Deborin does not give a completely consistent, class-based explanation of morality, because social connection and solidarity are not universal, but class — based, i.e., *different*: therefore, there can be no question of developing a sense of duty and conscience "in general" over the course of thousands of years. The example of Deborin's explanation of ethical questions shows how the mechanistically biological point of view in moral questions not only does not contradict, but also gives a friendly hand to Kant's categorical imperative and hegelizing idealism in ethics.

Clearly mechanistic mistakes on the question of morality were made by Comrade Bukharin. These errors correspond to his mechanistic "equilibrium theory". The class character of all morality for Comrade Bukharin is expressed not in the fact that it represents the interests of the ruling class, but mainly in the fact that moral norms are *the conditions for the equilibrium* of a given society. "In general, we can say that these rules outline the course of behavior in which a given society or class or group is preserved, where the individual's immediate interests are subordinated to the interests of the group. These norms are thus *equilibrium conditions* that restrain the internal contradictions of human systems[375]." It is clear that such a" balancing " formulation of the question means that Bukharin essentially blurs *the class*meaning of all morality, just as Plekhanov and Deborin do.

Unlike bourgeois and any other exploitative morality, *proletarian morality* does not sanctify private property and does not treat with hypocrisy the question of preserving the life of its class enemy, especially in times of acute revolutionary struggle. The proletariat does not stand on the point of view of abstract moral expediency or inexpediency. For proletarian morality, there are no absolute norms of behavior and laws in themselves, regardless of their specific historical situation and the class struggle of the proletariat. Proletarian class morality, as well as the struggle of the proletariat, is all the more *superior* to any other morality, since it leads to a classless communist

---

371 Л. Аксельрод, Марксизм и этика — с. 227.

372 Ф. Энгельс, Анти-Дюринг.

373 А. Деборин, статья / Под знаменем марксизма № 1, 1928.

374 А. Деборин, статья / Под знаменем марксизма № 1, 1928.

375 Н. Бухарин, Теория исторического материализма — с. 176. Подчёркнуто Бухариным.

society, which destroys all exploitation of man by man. But the path to this society is difficult and harsh, and no simple moral laws, no matter how much Axelrod wants it, can determine this path. On the contrary, moral conduct itself *is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle*of the proletariat. "There is still too much left in the world," says Lenin, " that must be destroyed with fire and iron for the emancipation of the working class, and if anger and despair grow among the masses, if there is a revolutionary situation, prepare yourself to create new organizations and use such useful instruments of death and destruction against your government and your people. its bourgeoisie[376]." Therefore, neither Marx nor Lenin wrote any abstract moral prescriptions, seeing in them only a deception and fraud of the working class. Instead, Lenin openly said that " our *morality подчинена*is completely subordinated to the interests *of the class struggle*of the proletariat, our morality is derived from the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat[377]."

6.5.3. Bourgeois science

During the period of the bourgeoisie's struggle for power and the rapid growth of capitalist society, technology and science, especially natural science, flourish.

The peculiarity of science as a type of ideology is that it learns the world through *concepts* . The reflection of the world that is given in science differs from any other form of social consciousness in that it most correctly and adequately reflects its subject in a generalizing form. Scientific knowledge of the world is achieved in the process *of practical application.* the impact of people on nature and society, i.e. in the development of their material and productive activities.

Science is not a system of ideas, concepts created by mankind as a result of pure reflection and contemplation of the world. On the contrary, more than any other ideology, science arose in the process of practical labor activity of people, in the struggle of man with nature, in close connection with the development of production. There is not and cannot be a correct scientific theory that does not grow out of *practice* the material productive activity of human society, which itself would not include this practice. Even science, understood in the narrow sense of the word, i.e., the very process of scientific discoveries of laws and hypotheses, is impossible without practice, without experiments, without laboratories and equipment corresponding to scientific technology, etc. But the practice from which science is born should be understood more broadly, not only as a direct experimental and laboratory scientific practice. The sciences, especially the natural sciences, as we have already pointed out, developed in the closest connection and interaction with *technology* . "If a society has a technical need," Engels wrote, " it provides much more help to science than 10 universities… In Germany, unfortunately, they are used to writing the history of science as if it had fallen out of the sky[378]."

Technological and economic growth rapidly pushed forward the development of science. Industrial revolution and machine production would have been impossible without the development of natural sciences. In this sense, the *natural sciences* themselves, especially mechanics, physics, and chemistry, are part of this industrial revolution and are developing hand in hand with technological progress.

Despite this clearly historical character of science, bourgeois scientists maintain that science is *надклассовой*a supra-class, universal ideology. Do not a whole series of scientific discoveries and achievements, they ask, serve the proletariat as well as the bourgeoisie, such as the use of electricity, radio, telephone, etc.? determined by these discoveries, it goes to the bourgeoisie. However, the correctness and objectivity of science do not make it extra-curricular. The class-bourgeois character of science consists primarily in the fact that the necessity for industrial

376 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. XIII — с. 176.

377 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. XVII — с. 321.

378 Ф. Энгельс, Письмо к Штаркенбергу.

development of the bourgeoisie gave rise to physics, mechanics, and chemistry — or rather, the class interests of the bourgeoisie determined the necessity for the development of the natural sciences. The bourgeoisie could not rule without the natural sciences. The class character of science is also confirmed by the fact that the greatest ideologists of the bourgeoisie were helpless to explain *social*phenomena. Neither the French materialists, nor Hegel, nor Feuerbach, nor the sociologist Auguste Comte, nor the bourgeois economists Ricardo and Smith were able to understand the internal contradictions of capitalist society, its transitional character, nor were they able, as ideologists of the bourgeoisie, to sign the death sentence to capitalist society, because to correctly, objectively and scientifically understand the process of social life — this is a very difficult task. it means seeing the demise of capitalism. Only the proletariat in Marxism-Leninism could have created such a theory.

The metaphysical, formally logical method of thinking of the bourgeoisie also leaves a certain imprint on the development *of natural sciences* . It has a harmful effect on the results of scientific research-on physics, chemistry, biology. The epoch of imperialism reveals a crisis of bourgeois natural science, which was brilliantly shown by Lenin in his "Materialism and Empirio-criticism". This influence of the metaphysically idealistic method of thinking on the development of the natural sciences can be traced, for example, in modern physical idealism, in the development of biology, etc.

The bourgeoisie talks a great deal about the inviolability of its science of nature, thus trying to obscure its class meaning. Many of the "Marxists"also fall for this rant about science. Thus, in the ranks of our mechanists, there is a very strong tendency to separate social theories and philosophy from the natural sciences with a stone wall, presenting the former as anti — scientific, and the latter, the natural sciences, as scientific and in themselves dialectical and materialistic, which therefore do not need any special dialectical-materialistic philosophy. Such an anti-dialectical, mechanical view of bourgeois science undoubtedly means a transition to bourgeois positions. Axelrod, Timiryazev, Varyash, and others are sliding down to these positions. The mechanistic understanding of modern bourgeois natural science fundamentally contradicts the class assessment of this science.

6.5.4. Bourgeois art and Literature

In order to understand the class character *of art and literature* created by the bourgeoisie, it is important to understand what is the peculiarity of art as an ideology, in contrast to science, philosophy, etc .If science knows the world in concepts, then art reflects, knows the world in *images*. The nature of images and forms of expression of art is very multifaceted. Art can give them in the form of painting, sculpture, dance, music, and finally express them in words. However, despite this difference between science and art, the latter also reflects and cognizes the world in a figurative form (the form of imaginative thinking). In images, it generalizes various phenomena of reality in a peculiar way, reveals the essence of these phenomena, its contradictions and development trends.

However, in our literature, we do not always have clarity and clarity on this issue. For example, Comrade Bukharin believes that art "is the systematization *of feelings* (emphasis added) in images." "The direct role of art as a means of socializing these feelings, transmitting them, and spreading them in society is also clear." Therefore, Comrade Bukharin fully agrees with Tolstoy that art is a means of emotional "infection". In this definition of art, Comrade Bukharin incorrectly metaphysically separates *feelings* people depend on their *thoughts* and ideas, because there are no feelings that are not connected with a certain ideological content. Goethe's "Faust" or Tolstoy's "War and Peace" evoke certain feelings in the reader when they are read, because they themselves express them in images. But at the same time, these are deeply *ideologically*rich works, in which certain philosophical and political views are held, and a peculiar knowledge of public life is expressed. And although Tolstoy believed that art primarily infects emotionally, but his own work refutes his own formula, because his works not only infected emotionally, or rather only to the extent that they served as a special form of knowledge, in which they expressed certain political and philosophical

views. The understanding of art as a" systematization of feelings " is essentially connected with the bourgeois understanding of art, it is at the same time a guarantee for it, because the bourgeoisie tries to present art as a special sacred temple, far from ideology, politics, philosophy, and class struggle.

The" deepening "of Bukharin's theory of art and literature is Voronsky's theory of the artist's" direct " vision of the world. The very nature of bourgeois art refutes this point of view, for it is profoundly political. *The class* character of the bourgeois theory of art and literature consists precisely in the fact that the Chinese wall (in words, of course) *separates*art from life, puts forward the slogan: "Art for art's sake", and presents it as a realm of pure and sublime emotions. In the field of literary bourgeois theories, this tendency is an expression of the class hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie.

The development of bourgeois art and literature perfectly confirms and illustrates the fact that art is a kind *of thinking in images* . The art and literature of the rising revolutionary bourgeoisie are deeply saturated with ideas, they do not depart from reality, from political ideas, but precisely express them with an artistic brush and word. This active and ideological character of bourgeois literature is already evident in the period of the so-called literary and artistic "classicism" in the dramatic literature of the seventeenth century, represented by Corneille, Racine and Moliere. At this time, bourgeois ideology is already beginning to supplant feudal ideology in terms of content, without yet creating its own forms.

Classicism and pseudo-classicism are being replaced by bourgeois Romanticism of the 18th and first half of the 19th centuries. (Schiller, Goethe, Byron, Hugo), and then realism in literature (Balzac, Flaubert, Zola, Dickens). Here the domination of capitalism, the growth of the power of the bourgeoisie, and at the same time the contradictions of bourgeois society, its vulgarity, its positivism, and its creeping empiricism find their most vivid and comprehensive expression. Despite the materialist tendency, the greatest realists of the bourgeoisie (Balzac, Zola) remained at the mercy of the traditional metaphysical methods of thinking and perceiving reality, remained at the mercy of the search for abstract truth, good, evil, etc., a contemplative-materialist attitude to life, and even if by the power of their artistic talent and ingenious insight they sometimes came out beyond the limits of such an attitude to life, they were in contradiction with themselves. Therefore, the work of the most brilliant representatives of bourgeois literature is most *internally contradictory* .

This most characteristic class trait of bourgeois literature and art is perfectly revealed by Engels in the work of Goethe and by Lenin in the work of Tolstoy.

"In Goethe," says Engels, " there is an incessant struggle between the poet of genius, who is disgusted by the squalor of his environment, and the sensible son of a Frankfurt municipal councillor or a Weimar minister, who sees himself compelled to make a truce with society and get used to it. Thus Goethe is now great, now petty, now a proud, mocking, world-despising genius, now a cautious, unassuming, narrow philistine." A striking internal contradiction, also characteristic of the brilliant realist Tolstoy, is revealed by Lenin: "The contradictions in Tolstoy's works, views, teachings, and school are really glaring. On the one hand, a brilliant artist who gave not only incomparable pictures of Russian life, but also first — class works of world literature, on the other hand, a landowner who makes a fool of himself in Christ. On the one hand, a remarkably strong, direct and sincere protest against public lies and falsehoods, on the other hand, a "Tolstoyite", i.e., a worn-out hysterical squish called a Russian intellectual… On the one hand, a merciless critique of capitalist exploitation, exposing government violence, the comedies of the court and state administration, revealing the full depth of the contradictions between the growth of wealth and the conquests of civilization and the growth of poverty, savagery and torment of the working masses, on the other hand, the foolish preaching of 'non — resistance to evil' by 'violence'[379]." The inner inconsistency, the impossibility of resolving and reconciling these contradictions in bourgeois and petty-bourgeois literature, especially in the works of its greatest artists, was manifested precisely

379 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XI — с. 114.

because the great artist sees the exploitation, the abomination of his own system better, more deeply, and further, and at the same time, being himself a product of this system, an exponent of the ideas of the ruling class, does not unable to correctly understand the very evil of exploitation and unable to correctly see the ways to destroy it.

In the present period of decline and crisis of capitalist society and its entire culture, the bourgeoisie is no longer in a position to put forward revolutionary, objectively positive ideas that could fertilize bourgeois art. Bourgeois art, as well as the whole system, is decaying and tending to ruin. This is most clearly expressed in *the departure of bourgeois art from reality* , which thereby best exposes bourgeois reality. The slogan: "Art for art's sake", aestheticism, expressionism, the development of "meaningless" art forms (especially in painting, music, and poetry), the flourishing of decadence, symbolism, futurism, mysticism, and other" isms " of bourgeois art-basically, all these decadent literary trends express an attempt by the bourgeoisie to hide,to withdraw, and to create a new world. not to see reality, which, if you look at it closely, portends its demise. Away from content, ideas, more virtuosity and admiring the pointless *form*— this is the leitmotif of modern decadent bourgeois art and literature. But this supposedly pointless form of bourgeois art illustrates very clearly and objectively the degeneration of the bourgeoisie, and thus its ideology.

6.6. Marxism-Leninism-the ideology of the proletariat and its role in the socialist system

From the analysis of the development of ideologies in capitalist society, we can draw the following basic conclusion: the ruling classes, in particular the bourgeoisie, were unable to understand or understand the laws of social life. On the contrary, they were interested in obscuring these laws.

The proletariat as a class is brought up by history itself for the revolutionary transformation of the entire capitalist system, so it is not only interested, but also capable of correctly understanding and recognizing the true laws of social life. Such a correct understanding of the laws of social life is provided by Marxism.

The distinctive feature of Marxist ideology, unlike all previous ideologies, consists primarily in the correct reflection of the basic laws of social life. But this very understanding of the laws of social life required a radical change in the methods of thinking; it was possible only on the basis of dialectical materialism. Marxism for the first time creates the science of society through a revolutionary revolution in the methods of thinking. Marxism as the ideology of the proletariat is an organically connected unity of political, philosophical, economic, etc.teachings, i.e., a single theory, consistent and monolithic. Even in the German Ideology, Marx and Engels showed that the truth of communism grows out of the laws of the development of reality itself. The scientific nature of Marxism consists primarily in understanding the dependence of all theories, including Marxism itself, on the social existence of people, i.e., its scientific nature lies in its materialism. However, the materialism of Marxism is not a passive-contemplative objectivism, but a revolutionary-dialectical one. It is possible to correctly know and reflect reality in a materialistic way only in the process of its practical change. Objective knowledge in Marxism is inseparable from the class character and partisanship of its theory. Dialectical materialism asserts that there can be no correct knowledge of modern society without an active struggle against it for the realization of socialism, i.e., without proletarian partisanship. The theory of the proletariat is a tremendous force in the historical process, because it takes hold of the masses (Marx), but it can only take hold of the masses in the revolutionary struggle of these masses themselves. "As for calling the masses to action," says Lenin, " calling them to action, not in the general, but in the concrete sense of the word , *can only be done on the spot of action* , can be called by the one who himself is going now[380]." Marxism has proved that the correctness of our ideology is a necessary prerequisite and a necessary component

380 В. Ленин / Что делать? — с. 176.

of a revolutionary change in the world.

The revolutionary scientific theory of the proletariat is not only a reflection of reality, but also a tool for changing it. Lenin, in a comment to Hegel's Science of Logic, says: "The idea of *the transformation of the ideal into the real*is profound."

The vulgarization of Marxism on the part of the theorists of the Second International consisted precisely in the fact that they completely slipped into the bourgeois point of view of the fatalistic, mechanistic understanding of the laws of capitalist society revealed by Marx. This perversion follows the line of complete oblivion of Marx's dialectic. Lenin's stage in the development of Marxism is characterized by the fact that Lenin, both in practice and in theory, developed Marxism in the direction of a dialectical understanding of the unity of the objective laws of social life with revolutionary practice, which changes these laws.

A clear materialist understanding of the ways and means by which revolutionary possibilities and revolutionary action are realized on the basis of this understanding — this is the revolutionary scientific role of proletarian ideology. "The philistine," says Lenin, " is satisfied with the indisputable, holy, and empty truth that it is impossible to know in advance whether there will be a revolution or not. The Marxist is not satisfied with this; he says: "Our propaganda and the propaganda of all socialist workers *is one of the determinants of whether there will be a revolution or not* "»[381]." Such philistines were likened to the Mensheviks and Social-Democrats, who had emasculated the revolutionary soul of Marxism and its dialectic and turned Marxism into a collection of dead dogmas. "Marxism teaches," Kautsky said, " that at a certain stage of capitalist development, socialism comes with *the necessity of a law of nature* . But it also inevitably follows that socialism is impossible at an earlier stage of development[382]." Not to mention the fact that Kautsky understands the "higher" or "lower" stage of capitalism fatalistically, but what particularly trivializes and distorts the revolutionary essence of Marxism is a clear lack of understanding of the role played by the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat in the development of its practice. "Determine with complete accuracy *before* a battle, says Lenin, whose forces have "already outgrown" those of the enemy *can never*be fought. Only pedants can dream of this. The concept of "*outgrown*" forces of the enemy forces includes *a clear consciousness* tasks *of the struggling* ones "[383]. In contrast to the social fascists, Lenin clearly and clearly points out that the concept of maturity, regularity and possibility of revolution and the construction of socialism includes the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat, which is born in the process of struggle. "The Soviet system," says Stalin, " offers enormous possibilities for the complete victory of socialism, but possibility is not yet reality; in order to transform possibility into reality, a whole series of conditions are necessary, among which *the party line and the correct implementation of this line* play *a significant role* »[384].

A materialist understanding of the ideology of the proletariat means waging the same two-front struggle that the party is waging in the field of political struggle and on all sectors of the front of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, both against the" left "fantasizing, the adventurism of utopians, against the phraseology of" left " opportunists who tear their revolutionary plans and ideas away from real historical possibilities, and against opportunism, fatalism, khvostism (of which social-democracy is the most prominent representative, and its sub — echo in our conditions is the theory of the right deviation), which distorts and distorts Marxism.

Relying on Marxism-Leninism as its ideology, the victorious proletariat in the Land of Soviets is changing reality. In the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist construction, the

---

381 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XII, ч. 1 — с. 216.

382 К. Каутский, Пролетарская революция — с. 216.

383 В. Ленин / Соч., т. VIII — с. 231.

384 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

development of society takes place under *the conscious and planned* leadership of a party armed with this theory. Humanity's leap from the realm of necessity to the realm *of freedom*is actually taking place right now, for social laws confront us not as alien, mysterious forces, but as forces correctly recognized and subordinated to the conscious will of the proletarian party. This is the fundamental difference between proletarian and bourgeois ideologies.

6.7. Building Proletarian Culture and tasks of the Cultural Revolution

The construction of a socialist society is possible only on the basis of high technical and cultural achievements. This society of higher technology and culture can only be built by the proletariat.

In capitalist society, the proletariat is placed in barbaric conditions of life. Within capitalist society, the proletariat cannot, therefore, create a new proletarian culture. How, then, can the proletariat develop its own proletarian culture as a prerequisite for a future communist culture, if this culture cannot mature within capitalist society in the same way as, for example, the elements of bourgeois culture have matured within feudal society?

Marx and Engels repeatedly stressed that the proletarian revolution is necessary for the proletariat, not only because otherwise it is impossible to overthrow and destroy the bourgeoisie, "but also because the overthrowing class can only *be cleansed of all the filth*of the old society in a revolution and become capable of creating a new society[385]." The proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are a period in which the proletariat not only destroys the remnants of the former classes, but also creates the material and cultural prerequisites for a classless society, because in this period the proletariat, by most radically remaking the world, thereby remaking its own nature. Only the seizure of political power by the proletariat puts *the cultural revolution on the order of the day* . The Mensheviks also completely ignore the dialectical-materialist truth that, in the final analysis, revolutionary practice itself also decides the question of cultural maturity, and therefore it is a decisive indicator of this maturity. "Only in the experience," says Lenin — " of revolutionary movements *that are untimely, private, and fragmented* and therefore unsuccessful, the masses will gain experience, learn, and gather strength[386]." Hence Lenin draws another conclusion: that in the days of revolutionary action the masses acquire a much greater cultural maturity than in the decades of peaceful stagnation. Considering Sukhanov's specific question about the cultural maturity of the proletariat as a prerequisite for proletarian revolution, Lenin replies: "If the creation of socialism requires a certain *level of culture* (although no one can say *what* this "level of culture" is), then why can't we start *from the beginning by conquering the prerequisites in a revolutionary way* to reach a certain level, and then, on the basis of the workers 'and peasants' power and the Soviet system, move to catch up with other peoples[387]." Thus, the basic and decisive prerequisite for the creation of culture is created by the proletariat not in capitalist society, which alienates it from *all* culture or infects it with the corrupting influence *of its* own culture, but by the very *fact of the proletarian*revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. To think that the presuppositions of a new culture and a radical change in the people brought up by capitalism can somehow mature of their own accord outside the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat is to resolve the question of proletarian culture while remaining in the position of bourgeois culture, i.e., not to resolve it at all. Or it means talking about the artificial creation of proletarian culture somewhere in laboratories and greenhouses, as Bogdanov and Bukharin suggested.

"What distinguishes Marxism," says Lenin, " from the old utopian socialism is that the latter wanted to build a new society not out of those mass representatives of human material that are

---

385 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 227.

386 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XII — с. 197. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

387 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII, ч. 2 — с. 117–120.

created by bloody, dirty, predatory shopkeeping capitalism, but *out of specially virtuous people bred in special greenhouses and greenhouses* . This ridiculous idea is now ridiculous to everyone and has been abandoned by everyone, but not everyone is willing and able to think out how it is possible and necessary to build communism *out of mass human material*, corrupted by centuries and millennia of slavery, serfdom, capitalism, petty fragmented management, the war of all against all for a place on the market, for a higher price prices for food or labor[388]."

The conquest of power by the proletariat is in this sense a *decisive* prerequisite for the creation of proletarian culture: first, it makes it possible, by destroying the economic power of the exploiting classes, *to destroy their ideological* power and influence on the proletariat, and secondly, it creates new material opportunities and prerequisites for *the creation of proletarian culture* itself .

How exactly does the struggle for the creation of proletarian culture proceed after the victory of the proletarian revolution? Having defeated the bourgeoisie politically and economically, the proletariat does not yet defeat the ideological forms of its rule. If the economic roots of the rule of the bourgeoisie, in the form of the kulaks, for example, are not completely and immediately destroyed, but are gradually uprooted only during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, then in the cultural and ideological sphere — as in the more conservative sphere — the rule and influence of the bourgeoisie is even more pronounced. Therefore, the ideology and culture of the exploiting classes, the power of their influence and their resistance to the proletarian dictatorship, is a real force, a real front of the class struggle, which manifests itself in various forms and with varying intensity of activity throughout the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "*The force of habit of millions*," Lenin said, "*is the most terrible force*": it is precisely this force that the bourgeoisie consciously activated and directed its sharp edge against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The strengthening of petty-bourgeois and bourgeois ideology, and even a certain growth of it, had a particularly strong effect in the first period of NEP, when the capitalist elements of town and country were still relatively developing. These elements were also reflected on the ideological front of the class struggle — in the ideology *of Smenovekhovism and* Ustryalovism, i.e., clearly bourgeois ideologies. Their attitudes were expressed as follows: the Soviet government is leading to advanced, cultural capitalism; let's help it in this, opposing its socialist initiatives. During this period, the influence of bourgeois theories in our country was still very strong, especially in the field of natural sciences. The class enemy, taking advantage of the difficult situation of the class struggle during the NEP period and the lack of proletarian cadres on the ideological front, launched an open ideological offensive against the dictatorship of the proletariat (the past practice of ideological "creativity" of our academies of sciences — Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian in the first years of NEP — is the best proof of this). However, the NEP period meant not only the relative economic strengthening of capitalist elements, but also the growth and strengthening of bourgeois ideology, which takes advantage of our cultural backwardness. At the same time, the NEP period meant *an offensive* the growth of Leninism in practice and theory, the ever-increasing development and penetration of Marxism into all sciences in which Marxist-Leninist theory is gradually gaining complete hegemony.

This situation modifies the forms of struggle of the class enemy on the ideological front, especially in the last period of NEP, in the period of a decisive socialist offensive along the entire front against the class enemy, in the period of a sharpened class struggle. Sophisticated forms of direct sabotage in the economic and political sphere during this period were combined in a peculiar way with *sabotage in the scientific field* : under the guise of Marxist phraseology, Rubinism grew in political economy, Kondratyevism on the agrarian front. Hostile class influence in the "Marxist" garb was also evident in the literary theories of Pereverzev, Voronsky, and others. The most characteristic manifestations of the influence of bourgeois ideology in various fields of theory, especially philosophy, were mechanismismand Menshevik idealism.

---

388 Записки Института Ленина, т. I — с. 93.

A characteristic feature of the remnants of bourgeois influence on our ideology is the separation *of theory from practice*, which is very clearly expressed in the fact that the problems of the Soviet economy were completely ignored, the problems of the theory and practice of the proletarian literary movement, the problems of Leninism, and the modern combat problems of historical materialism were ignored. This passage itself expressed a practice, but a practice alien to the proletariat. For example, the Pereverzian vulgarization of Marxism followed the line of a crude mechanistic, essentially fatalistic understanding of the reflection of class existence in literature. Pereverzev expressed the Menshevik worldview quite consistently in his literature. At the same time, for Pereverzev, vulgar materialism is combined with idealism; literary and artistic creativity in general is realized, according to Pereverzev, only on the basis of class psychology, which is separated from ideology. We have already pointed out, when criticizing Plekhanov's views, that in this opposition of ideology to psychology, the latter becomes a subconscious domain in the spirit of Bergsonian or Freudian idealist theory. This idealistic understanding of artistic creation is particularly pronounced by Voronsky, who shares this view with Pereverzev in his theory of "direct vision" of the world, of the immediate impressions of the artist and poet — a theory that essentially disarms proletarian literature in the face of bourgeois influences, because it *denies the possibility of a "direct vision" of the world. proletarian ideology plays an active role in its creation* .

The ideological front is developing not as a peaceful, smooth, cultural construction, but as a front of fierce class struggle, in which the enemy sometimes resorts to very sophisticated techniques clothed in "Marxist" phraseology, which require special vigilance on the part of the proletariat.

The question of proletarian culture and the ways of its development is, on the one hand, the question of *the relation of the proletariat to the inheritance of bourgeois culture*, and, on the other hand, the question of *the socialist* essence *of proletarian culture* . And this last question also includes the problem of the *transformation*of millions of workers and peasants into conscious builders of socialism in the process of socialist construction and the cultural revolution. The question of proletarian culture is essentially a question of the development of the totality of forms of proletarian social consciousness.

It is not surprising that we have developed many anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist theories on the question of building proletarian culture. The two extreme anti-Marxist poles on this question are represented by the Bogdanov-Bukharin and Trotskyist points of view, and between them, or rather an eclectic combination of these points of view, are the views of Menshevik idealism on the cultural revolution.

Bogdanov*'s theory of proletarian culture*is linked to his entire idealistic theory of ideology and culture. "Culture," says Bogdanov, " is reduced to a set of methods and means of organizing people's social life[389]." Bogdanov separates the organizational functions of culture and ideology from the material existence of people.

Ideology and the so-called spiritual culture as a whole have no organizing role, if they are considered independently of the determining role of the basis and the class struggle. The culture of the dying bourgeoisie is tossed about in insoluble contradictions and vividly expresses the anarchy, the collapse of capitalist society. Bogdanov, however, in accordance with his organizational schemes of "feudal" and "bourgeois culture," quite abstractly invents a scheme of proletarian culture. It is based on collectivism, the properties of which Bogdanov speaks about regardless of the concrete situation of the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In a word, since every culture "organizes" the social life of people and every class has a culture, the proletariat also needs to develop a special culture according to some ready-made abstract collectivist principles and with its help "organize" the life of the proletariat.

This Bogdanovian theory of "proletarian culture" is idealistic, schematic, and thus utopian: it suggests that special virtuous people, raised in special greenhouses of Bogdanov's ideas, create a proletarian culture. Bogdanov does not understand that the culture of the proletariat itself is a kind

389 А. Богданов, Пролетарская культура — с. 317.

of front in the class-political struggle of the proletariat. According to his scheme, it turns into a narrow bourgeois *culturalism* . That is why such an understanding of proletarian culture — outside of its historical development and outside of the class struggle — was easily accepted by mechanismismand right-wing opportunism in the person of Bukharin.

Bogdanov tried to realize his utopia of proletarian culture in our conditions in the organization of the so-called proletkult, whose ideas Lenin very sharply opposed. Lenin criticized and exposed Bogdanov's and Bukharin's ideas of proletarian culture along two lines: first, because Bogdanov's understanding of proletarian culture *is unhistorical* . It throws overboard the significance of bourgeois culture for the proletariat. It forgets that it is possible for the proletariat to overcome bourgeois culture only in the process of conquering its achievements, only in the process of critical study. "Without a clear understanding that only *an accurate knowledge of the culture created by the entire development of mankind and only its processing can build a proletarian culture*— without such an understanding, we will not solve this problem[390]." Secondly, Lenin's critique of Bogdanov and Bukharin in matters of culture emphasizes that proletarian culture does not represent a narrow "culturization", that it cannot submit to far-fetched schemes, but specifically grows out of *the practice of revolutionary alteration* The proletariat of capitalist society is the front of the class struggle in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This understanding of proletarian culture was expressed in the program of the Communist International adopted by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. "The working class only during the transition period, only after it has won state power, only by destroying the bourgeois monopoly of education and *taking over all science* , only *through the experience of the greatest construction work*, does it remake its own nature. For the mass generation of communist consciousness and for the cause of socialism itself*, a massive change of people is necessary* which is possible only in a practical movement, in a revolution."

If Bogdanov's theory of proletarian culture consists in an idealistic understanding of this culture, then *the Trotskyist* formulation consists in a complete *rejection of proletarian culture*on the grounds that "before the proletariat leaves the stage of cultural apprenticeship, it will cease to be a proletariat[391]." Trotsky saw the task of the proletariat only in making it "*state-owned".* master the elements *of the old* culture." Despite the apparent diametric opposition in the conclusions of both theories, methodologically their points of view are related. Bogdanov and Trotsky create their theories without taking into account and understanding the stages of the growth of proletarian culture during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat: the former has a far — fetched schematic construction of proletarian culture, the latter has a far — fetched denial of it, which is inextricably linked with the Trotskyist denial of the possibility for the proletariat to build socialism. Both theories imply disbelief in the creative initiative of the proletariat, proceed from forgetting the class struggle during the dictatorship of the proletariat, and do not understand how this culture is born and developed in the practice of socialist construction. Social competition, striking, a new attitude to work as "a cause of honor, a cause of glory, a cause of valor and heroism" *(Stalin)* — these are phenomena that have grown out of the creativity of the masses themselves, which form *an element of proletarian culture* .

Proletarian culture is not separated by a Chinese wall from the future *communist* culture, just as in general the entire class struggle of the proletariat is its struggle to build socialism. However, after gaining power, the proletariat *builds* its proletarian, socialist culture not in a peaceful environment, but in conditions of fierce class struggle. The proletariat critically reworks all the experience of human culture, creates elements of a new socialist consciousness in the struggle against the "force of habit of millions", against various manifestations of bourgeois influence and sabotage on the cultural front. To deny the socialist character of the cultural revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat means, firstly, to deny the initiative and creativity of the proletarian masses in the struggle for socialism, and, secondly, to deny that this creativity during the

390 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XII — с. 314.

391 Л. Троцкий, Литература и революция.

dictatorship of the proletariat manifests itself in the class struggle and is aimed at building a socialist society. The Trotskyist point of view on the question of culture is closely related to Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution. Right-wing opportunism, which does not see the real ways and means of creating proletarian culture, ultimately means capitulation in *practice* before *bourgeois*culture. The arch - "left" Trotskyist formulation of the question, which denies proletarian culture in the name of a socialist culture of the future, actually coincides with right-wing capitulation to the bourgeoisie on the question of culture and with the right-wing opportunist blurring of the class struggle.

*Menshevik idealism*in its views on the Cultural Revolution and the construction of proletarian culture (*Deborin, Luppol*) It combines Bogdanov's and Trotskyist views on the question of proletarian culture. Tov. Deborin devoted a number of articles to the question of the cultural revolution and proletarian culture ("Revolution and Culture", "Marxism and Culture"). The main characteristic of these articles is abstract-in the spirit of Bogdanov-arguments about the "collectivist" spirit of proletarian culture. Deborin shares with the Trotskyist formulation of the question the complete absence of a concrete class analysis of the culture created by the proletariat during various periods of the dictatorship of the proletariat. T. Deborin does not have a specific statement of the problems of the cultural revolution. The whole problem of proletarian culture is reduced by Comrade Deborin to such abstract propositions: "Culture itself still remains to be created, of course it will be created together with a technical revolution, with a change in the basis of the social system. The foundation of the new culture is formed by the socialist mode of production, a society without classes and state power[392]." Out of T.'s field of vision. The dictatorship of the proletariat, *the class struggle*and its role in the creation of proletarian culture completely out of the question for Deborin.

Comrade Luppol's mistakes on the question of proletarian culture make an even stronger bias towards the Trotskyist understanding of culture. Luppol, having taken Lenin's critique of Bogdanovism on the question of proletarian culture in a one-sided, non-dialectical way, comes to a complete rejection of proletarian culture: "*logically* and sociologically correct and distinct will *be the opposition* capitalist and *communist cultures* ." These conclusions are undoubtedly based on a lack of understanding that proletarian culture is not an external appendage to the dictatorship of the proletariat, but its necessary form, created in the process of a brutal class struggle.

Proletarian culture is developing before our eyes, critically perceiving and overcoming the achievements of bourgeois culture and thereby creating the beginnings of a new socialist culture. In fact, one side of this process is inseparable from the other. The proletariat inherits the achievements of capitalist technology and the natural sciences from bourgeois culture and processes them critically. The proletariat exposes and rejects all ideological deception, class illusions, fetishism and hypocrisy of bourgeois thinking and culture, and builds its ideology on a correct understanding of the processes of social life and its own activities. Our right, for example, does not proclaim itself to be superclass, universal, but openly declares its class role and openly implements it. The same thing is expressed by the political ideology of the proletariat, proletarian morality, etc.

A clear, correct understanding of reality in proletarian ideology, which is not obscured by any illusions and twists, is possible only through conscious dialectical-materialist thinking. Proletarian culture has already made a number of major gains in all sectors of the ideological front, although there is still a certain lag in our theoretical work in some areas from socialist practice. This backwardness can be eliminated only by an indefatigable and irreconcilable struggle for dialectical materialism. Self-criticism is needed here without any reservations. All sorts of theories about proletarian psychology, proletarian "direct impressions", on the basis of which it is necessary to create proletarian literature and morality, mean nothing more than the surrender of positions before the elements of bourgeois culture.

A cultural revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat does not mean that the

---

392 А. Деборин, статья / Революция и культура № 1, 1927 — с. 11.

proletariat simply overtakes and surpasses the bourgeoisie in cultural terms "in general". Our cultural revolution creates a new content and *quality* of culture, a new character of the relationship between the basis and the superstructure, because the correct practical knowledge of reality in proletarian ideologies is closely connected with *the planned* , i.e. *conscious*(for the first time in history) direction of the development of this reality. The economic, technical and cultural plan (the economic and cultural five-year plan) is becoming increasingly important, radically distinguishing our economy and culture from the anarchic commodity-fetishistic market character of bourgeois economy and culture. The possibility of a planned leadership of the material basis of socialist construction and the development of culture refute Menshevik and right-opportunist fatalism and adaptability in understanding the laws of social reality.

One of the main features of this new culture is also the fact that for the first time in the history of mankind, the development of spiritual culture does not lead to strengthening (as it has been so far), but ultimately will lead us to *the elimination of the division between mental and physical labor* , will lead to the disappearance of one-sided, narrow, spiritually crippled separating people. The implementation of universal primary polytechnic education, the rapid growth of workers ' education, courses, technical schools, and even technical higher education institutions directly attached to enterprises, radically breaks the narrow framework of only school education, destroys the verbal school from the lowest to the highest, and thus means preparing for the future destruction of the distinction between mental and physical labor.

The dialectic *of the cultural revolution* being carried out by the proletariat consists precisely in the fact that "the proletariat , the lowest stratum of modern society"[393] can win the best achievements of previous cultures and create its own higher proletarian culture only by cultural uplift of the broadest working masses, thereby creating for the first time a socialist culture. "The usual bourgeois notion that socialism is something dead and frozen is infinitely false," says Lenin… In fact, only in socialism will there begin a rapid, real, real *mass* movement, with the participation of the majority of the population... forward in all areas of public and private life."

Along with mass character, the new socialist discipline and communist attitude to work are one of the main signs of the new life under construction and proletarian culture: its growth is indicated by social competition and shock resistance, which are developing powerfully in our construction. The wider the scope of our construction, the more it becomes clear that what is decisive in the success and victories of this construction is the disciplined, hard-working work, the enthusiasm and responsibility of the masses, of the entire working class, created by each shock brigade. From the field of economic activity, team collective work penetrates in our country into the field of theoretical work, destroying and destroying the arbitrariness, individualism and anarchy of bourgeois spiritual creativity. However, proletarian forms of work do not in any way diminish the role *of individual responsibility* , creativity and initiative, on the contrary, they strengthen it to a much greater extent. The construction of a new life by the proletariat in practice concretely solves the problem of the eternal struggle and hostility between the personal and the social, which is insoluble in capitalist society.

The struggle waged by the party, the press, and the proletarian public against *depersonalization and egalitarianism* represents the new proletarian attitude to work, the clarification of the role *of the personal and social* in it ; and this is an integral element of proletarian culture.

The construction of proletarian culture makes it possible to give the only correct answer to the question of the relation that must exist between the proletarian, *international content* of culture and its *national forms* . The slogan of national culture has a reactionary meaning under the rule of the bourgeoisie. This slogan gets a completely different meaning under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin and Stalin do not regard proletarian and socialist culture as a culture devoid of national forms. Nations do not disappear, nor do they die out immediately, even in a socialist

393 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Коммунистический манифест.

society. Therefore, - says T. The period of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. is a period *of flourishing* national cultures, socialist in content and *national in form* . The flourishing of national in form and socialist in content cultures under the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country *in order to* merge them into one common socialist (both in form and content) culture, with one common language, when the proletariat will prevail *all over the world and socialism will enter into everyday* life-this is precisely the dialectic of Lenin's formulation of the question about national culture"[394].

As we enter the period of socialism, when the proletariat has completed building the foundation of a socialist society, the struggle for Marxism-Leninism on all our ideological fronts, the struggle for *the partisanship* of our ideology, takes on a special significance. The directives of the XVII Party Conference for drawing up the second five-year plan set us the task of " overcoming the remnants of capitalism in the economy and *consciousness* the transformation of the entire working population of the country into *conscious*and active builders of a classless socialist society." The task of the cultural revolution is inextricably linked with the tasks of technical reconstruction and the abolition of classes. Mastering technology and resolutely raising the cultural level of the entire mass of working people is a necessary prerequisite for the success of socialism.

The bourgeoisie tries to present our ideological and cultural struggle as political and theoretical despotism, as a violation of elementary freedom of thought, as Bolshevik casteism. It does not understand the solidity and unity of the proletarian worldview, it does not want to recognize that theoretical freedom in capitalist society means theoretical confusion and hypocrisy, the domination of illusions that are beneficial to the bourgeoisie, with which the bourgeoisie deceives the masses.

Recently, even some bourgeois ideologists are beginning to understand the superiority of a unified proletarian worldview in contrast to the hopeless "free confusion of bourgeois ideologies." This was reflected, for example, in a review of the speeches of Soviet scientists by Professor Berlan, a participant in the International Congress of Science and Technology (held in London in June — July 1931). "The Russians," writes Berlan, " were a phalanx of the only armed Marxist dialectic; they did not meet with an organized opposition, but instead only an undisciplined crowd, unprepared and armed with poorly chosen individual philosophies."

The proletariat is a class that, according to a firm plan, consciously creates life on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory. He does not tolerate any liberalism in the field of ideology here. Whatever cries of Marxist "despotism" may be uttered — the real bloody and shameless despotism of bourgeois deception will be destroyed.

Chapter 7. Marxism-Leninism as Militant Atheism

7.1. Marxist-Leninist understanding of religion

Religion is a special incorrect, fantastic reflection in the public consciousness of people's relations to each other and their relations to nature, which at certain historical stages are formed beyond their conscious control and under the domination of external, natural or social conditions. This reflection of social existence therefore takes the form of a belief in the existence of a supernatural spiritual world, unearthly powerful forces supposedly standing over people: God or gods, devils, spirits, etc.In class society, religion is an instrument in the hands of exploitative classes to protect the existing exploitation and stupefy the exploited classes.

"Religion is nothing but a *fantastic reflection* in the minds of those *external people* the forces that *dominate*their daily existence, a reflection in which earthly forces take the form of unearthly, supernatural ones, "Engels wrote in Anti-Duhring. We read the same thing in Lenin's

394 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

article "Socialism and Religion": "*Powerlessness* the exploitable classes in their struggle with exploiters inevitably give rise to a belief in a better afterlife, just as the impotence of the savage in his struggle with nature gives rise to a belief in gods, devils, miracles, etc."

Belief in the existence of God, in the existence of the spiritual world, or, in other words, the animistic element, is an essential feature of every religion[395]. Engels, objecting in Ludwig Feuerbach to Feuerbach's attempt to construct a special religion without animistic content, wrote: "If religion is possible without God, then alchemy is possible without the philosopher's stone." Just as medieval alchemy was impossible without the Philosopher's Stone, so *religion is impossible without faith in God* . At the same time , it is precisely because of their animistic content that religions play *a class*, exploitative role. "Religion is the opium of the people" ("Religion is *the opium*of the people"[396]) - this is the basic thesis of Marxism, which both Marx and Lenin emphasized. Lenin, who raised the Marxist study of religion to a new level by revealing with all his ruthlessness the abominable exploitative role of religion and indicating methods of combating it, repeatedly emphasized in his articles the exploitative essence of the idea of God. In a letter to Maxim Gorky in December 1913, he put the question particularly clearly: "The idea of God *has always* lulled and dulled the 'social feelings', replacing the living with the dead, *always* being the idea of slavery (the worst, hopeless slavery). The idea of God has never "connected the individual with society," but has always *connected* the oppressed *classes* with the belief in *the divinity*of the oppressors."

Marxism-Leninism, considering religion as one of the ideologies, deducing it from certain social relations, emphasizing *its transitory, historical* character. An incorrect, distorted reflection of social relations in ideology occurs when the social relations themselves are incorrect and distorted. As Marx wrote in the famous chapter of Capital on "commodity fetishism and its mystery": "The religious reflection of the real world can disappear altogether when the relations of people's practical everyday life are expressed in *their transparent and reasonable connections* with each other and with nature. The structure of the social life process, i.e., the material process of production, will throw off its mystical misty veil only when it becomes the product of freely socialized people and is under their *conscious and planned control* »[397]." As the new socialist relations supplant the old social forms, the mystical, religious reflection of the real world will also disappear.

The helplessness and impotence of human society before nature and social relations, the impotence and helplessness of the exploited classes in the struggle against the exploiters — this is what generates and supports religion[398]. The exploiting class finds in religion an instrument for defending exploitation and for stupefying the working people. The use of religion as a means of protecting exploiters and intoxicating exploiters is what fuels, among other general causes, religious sentiments in the exploiting classes.

"All and all the oppressing classes," Lenin wrote, " need two social functions to protect their rule: the function of an executioner and the *function of a priest* . The executioner must suppress the protest and indignation of the oppressed, the priest must draw out prospects for them (this is especially successful without vouching for the "feasibility" of such prospects) — mitigating

---

395 Анимистический — от слова «анимизм» — вера в существование духов (от латинского anima — душа).

396 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, К критике гегелевской философии права. Введение / Соч., изд. 2-е, Госполитиздат, т. I, 1955 — с. 415. — *Верст.*

397 Ф. Энгельс, Анти-Дюринг — с. 179, 1922, а также программа ВКП(б), § 13. (судя по всему это ошибочная сноска, текст цитируется из «Капитала», цитату можно найти в К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс, Капитал / Соч., изд. 2-е, Госполитиздат, т. XXIII, 1960 — с. 90. — *Верст.*)

398 В. Ленин, О социальных корнях религии в капиталистическом обществе в статье «Об отношении рабочей партии к религии», а также высказывания К. Маркс, К критике гегелевской философии права / Соч., т. I, 1923 — с. 3; Капитал / т. I, 1920 — с. 48; Ф. Энгельс, Анти-Дюринг / 1922 — с. 179.

disasters and victims while maintaining class rule, and thereby *reconcile them to this rule* , discourage them from revolutionary actions, undermine their revolutionary sentiments, and destroy their revolutionary activities".

"When society," says Lenin in another article, "is arranged in such a way that an insignificant minority enjoys wealth and power, and the mass constantly suffers privations and 'heavy duties,' then it is quite natural *for exploiters to sympathize with religion*, which teaches them to endure the earthly hell 'without a murmur' for the sake of a supposedly heavenly paradise[399]."

When speaking of religion, it is absolutely necessary to keep in mind both of these most important distinguishing features, which are inextricably linked: its *class character.* the content, the class exploitative role and its mystical form, the animism contained in religion, the belief in *God* , in supernatural forces. Forgetting about the class role of religion, we take the position of bourgeois "freethinkers"and " enlighteners". If, moreover, one ignores the belief in the deity as the most important feature of religion, and names all sorts of feelings and ideas as religion, one can easily find oneself on the path *of reconciliation*with religion.

Religion consists of three elements-religious or mystical ideas, moods or feelings, and actions or rituals. "Religion," says Plekhanov, " can be defined as a more or less coherent system of ideas, moods, and actions. Representations form the mythological element of religion, moods belong to the realm of religious feeling, and actions belong to the realm of religious worship or, as they say, cult." Plekhanov goes on to show that the mythological element in religion is animistic in its content, but that animistic ideas do not constitute religion in themselves. Only when combined with certain actions and feelings are they a religion[400].

It should be noted that Plekhanov, while revealing the formal aspect of religion in detail, says very little about its *class* essence. In this respect, as in the questions of the struggle against religion, he not only does not develop the propositions of Marx and Engels further, as Lenin did, but essentially stands on *the enlightenment*point of view, like the bourgeois freethinkers who fought against religion, but did not carry their struggle to the point of recognizing its class role.

Plekhanov's approach, far removed from Marxism, is characteristic of the question of primitive religion and the religions of class society. For example, Plekhanov describes the emergence of state religions in the following terms: once a government has emerged, certain relations between the ruling and the governed arise. The rulers are recognized as having the duty to take care of the welfare of the governed; the governed are recognized as having the duty to obey the rulers. In addition, where there are certain laws, naturally there are also their professional guardians: legislators and judges. And all these relationships between people get (why?! - *Auth.*) its fantastic expression in religion. The gods become heavenly kings and heavenly judges.

In these considerations of Plekhanov's, not a word is said about the class role of religion, about its development in the course of the class struggle. Plekhanov approaches religion primarily and primarily as *wrong* theories about nature and society, forgetting its class exploitative role. Lenin wrote in his article "On the Relations between the Workers 'Party and Religion":

"Marxism always regards all modern religions and churches, all and every religious organization, as organs of bourgeois reaction, serving to protect the exploitation and stupefy the working class." Plekhanov, on the other hand, turns the question to another plane with regard to the questionnaire taken by the magazine Sotsialisticheskoe Dvizhenie on the question of the attitude of the socialist parties to clericalism. "And the theory — modern scientific socialism,"he says — rejects religion as the product of an erroneous view of nature and society, and condemns it as an obstacle to the comprehensive development of the proletariat[401]." This is not a Marxist-Leninist attitude, but an educational approach. This enlightening approach is closely linked to Plekhanov's

---

399 В. Ленин, Крах II Интернационала, Политическая агитация и классовая точка зрения.

400 Г. Плеханов, О так называемых религиозных исканиях в России / т. XVII — с. 261.

401 Г. Плеханов / Соч., т. VIII — с. 378–379.

entire teaching on religion.

But even further from the correct Marxist understanding of religion are attempts to treat it in a way that distracts not only from its class role, but also from its inherent animistic idea of God. These attempts lead to the protection of religion, and the perpetuation of religion as something inevitable and necessary for human society. In such cases, one aspect of religion, one feature of it, is usually taken. There are, for example, bourgeois definitions of religion that treat feeling as the main and defining moment of religion. The German pastor Schleiermacher, who defended religion in the early nineteenth century, argued that " true religion is a sense and taste for the infinite." Schleiermacher even claims that every healthy feeling is essentially a religious feeling, such as the feeling of love between spouses. In the work of a scientist who discovers general laws in particular phenomena, Schleiermacher again sees the desire for the eternal and infinite, i.e., he discovers religion. Hence, of course, Schleiermacher can easily claim that religion is eternal and indestructible.

Leo Tolstoy's attempt to identify his religion with morality is equally apologetic. In every more or less developed religion, we find elements of morality: religion directs people's actions in one direction or another, cultivating certain moods in them. But this does not mean that morality itself is a religion. Morality can exist independently of religion. Certain norms of behavior will also exist in a communist society. Leo Tolstoy sees it differently; in all religions he tries to find the same moral teaching, which he considers the basis of religion. From this he draws a conclusion about the value and eternity of religion.

Feuerbach, while criticizing the old religious ideas, tried at the same time to justify a new "religion without God." Like Schleiermacher, he sees feeling as the basis of religion. Engels wrote on this occasion:"Feuerbach does not want to abolish religion at all; he wants to supplement it." According to Feuerbach, religion is a cordial relationship between people based on feeling — a relationship that has hitherto tried to find its true content in a fantastic reflection of reality, but now finds it directly and directly in the love between "I"and " you". Religion, purified and transformed, is thus elevated to an eternal category, since human relations based on mutual inclination: love, friendship, compassion, etc., will always exist.

Joseph Dietzgen and later A. B. Lunacharsky tried to identify *socialism with religion* . Dietzgen, who himself fought against scientific clericism, at the same time wrote in Religion and Social Democracy: "Until now, religion has been the lot of the proletariat. Now, on the contrary, the cause of the proletariat takes on the character of a religion, i.e., it becomes a dogma accepted by believers with all their heart and soul." Religion, therefore, is idealized by Dietzgen and falls into the category of eternal categories. Lunacharsky, in the era of reaction, after the 1905 revolution, was fascinated by the decadent ideas of "God-seeking", declaring bluntly:"So we affirm that religion is alive and will live forever." He believed that Marxists should "*adore*" the highest potencies of humanity — "all-consciousness, all-bliss, omnipotence" - and see them as "God". T. Lunacharsky therefore regarded the doctrine of the class struggle of the proletariat as a religion, and not as a science; at that time he took the position of Machism, which denies the objective character of laws in nature and social life and stands on the point of view of relativism, the absolute relativity of scientific conclusions. Lunacharsky wrote about science: "In fact, science has no guarantees of the unconditionality of its laws at all. Mill is right in this respect when he says: The Earth will rotate on its axis in 10 years and in 100 years-we are expressing only the greatest degree of probability[402]." Therefore, according to Lunacharsky's theory at that time, one can only believe in socialism, one can believe in the great potential forces of humanity, but one cannot scientifically prove the victory of socialism.

At present, it is also not uncommon for bourgeois scholars and White Guards to refer to Marxism-Leninism as a religion and the Communist Party as a religious sect.

Engels strongly warned against" etymological tricks " with the extension of the concept of

---

402 А. Луначарский, Социализм и религия — с. 41–47.

religion. Lenin considered the fascination with God-seeking and calls for a "socialist religion" to be the greatest vulgarity. A grave mistake is also made by those bourgeois thinkers who want to see science as the religion of the future. So Guyot in his book "Unbelief of the future" wrote:: "We can say that science is a religion that returns to reality, finds its proper path again, finds itself again, so to speak" (p.186). With such an identification, religion is deprived of its most basic feature-the belief in the existence of a supernatural world. Only the Marxist-Leninist conception of religion is the only scientifically correct one, and therefore becomes a powerful tool in the proletariat's struggle against religion and the Church.

7.2. Dialectical materialism as a philosophical justification of atheism

The philosophy of materialism deals a crushing blow to the religious worldview. Materialism absolutely denies the existence of a supernatural, spiritual world. By proclaiming the eternity of matter and its motion, materialism eliminates the idea of" creation " of the world. Materialism reveals the laws of causality prevailing in nature and human society, which eliminates the possibility of any miracles. In Materialism and Empirio-criticism, Lenin cites Bishop Berkeley's arguments about matter. "On the basis of the doctrine of matter or corporeal substance," he says (i.e. Berkeley), " all the godless constructions of atheism and the denial of religion were erected… There is no need to tell us what a great friend atheists have always been to material substance. All their monstrous systems are so obvious, so absolutely dependent on it, that once this cornerstone is removed, the whole edifice will inevitably fall apart."

But only *dialectical* materialism is a completely consistent theory of atheism, i.e., godlessness. Mechanical materialism cannot give a correct, complete theory of atheism; being unable to solve a number of questions, it leaves room for loopholes to popery. The history of atheism shows that the defenders of religion tried to refute the correctness of materialism, based on criticism of *the mechanistic*attitudes of some atheists.

Take for example the problem *of development* . The defenders of religion see the diversity of the world and the regularity of its phenomena as proof of the existence of God. There are so-called "proofs" of the existence of God: cosmological and teleological. The first consists of the statement that the world itself could not have come from anywhere and therefore God created it; the second "proof" consists of the statement that God necessarily exists, since everything in the world is arranged perfectly and purposefully. How is the problem of development solved in dialectical materialism and mechanical materialism? From the point of view of dialectical materialism, the diversity of the world is the result of its complex development with the transition of some qualities to others, and the qualities have their own specific laws. Mechanical materialism provides a different picture of development. The problem of the transition from quantity to quality and back again, the problem of the "leap", is eliminated by mechanical materialism. It all boils down to the mechanical movement of molecules, atoms, and electrons, and from this movement we must finally be able to explain the life of society, since the whole world is essentially one quality.

From this point of view, there is no need for development, for evolution as such, it all comes down to the mechanical connection of atoms. This connection can occur both in an instant, and over the course of centuries, millennia. The mechanical nature of such a connection is not eliminated due to the duration of the term. But in this case, the whole world with its greatest diversity is explained as the result of some random combination of matter. For example, the great materialists of antiquity who fought against religion, Democritus and Epicurus, took a mechanistic point of view on the formation of the world.

In the eighteenth century, the atheist Holbach also deduced all the diversity of the world from the mechanical motion of matter, without indicating the transition of one quality to another, and the emergence of special fundamentally different forms of motion. Modern mechanists, such as T. I. Stepanov, Serebryakov, and others, hold essentially the same point of view. It is not difficult for religious advocates to fight such a theory, especially in the light of the latest developments in natural science. For this struggle, they introduce a "reasonable beginning" as the organizers of

peace.

Let us then take the mechanistic solution of the problem of the relationship between being and thinking. The history of materialism knows several ways to solve this problem mechanically. Their essence is again reduced to the negation of" quality", to the negation of" leap", to the inability to understand such a unity of opposites as the unity of being and thinking. The Greek materialists Democritus and Epicurus reduced the unity of opposites to the identity of thought with being. They see thinking as the result of the movement of the atoms of the "spirit", the most mobile and light, resembling the atoms of fire. They explain the process of cognition by the fact that the images emitted by objects enter a person and act accordingly on the "spirit"and " soul". The dream is the result of these same images. Therefore, we can conclude that if a person sees gods in a dream, then they really exist. Thus, thanks to the mechanistic solution of the problem of the relationship between being and thinking, Democritus and Epicurus extended a hand to the real priest.

Take Spinoza's atheism further. Where Spinoza's mechanical materialism sticks out, the significance of the theological and theological implications of his philosophy increases. Spinoza solves the problem of thinking and extension mechanically. By deriving attributes from a single substance, Spinoza asserts that each attribute — including thinking — is primordial and infinite in its own way, and cannot be deduced or explained from another. The category of leap, the transition of quantity to quality, the unity of opposites in Spinoza's doctrine of attributes is eliminated. Hence the conclusion about the eternity and independence of thinking, i.e., the spiritual world.

Following Hegel's idealism, Deborin's Menshevik idealism, of course, also failed to produce a complete system of atheism. The Deborin school failed to turn Hegel's idealistic dialectic on its head, to understand it in a materialistic way. In Hegel, the self-developing idea contains all categories within itself, as befits absolute reason, i.e., the Lord God, with whom Hegel identifies the idea. It was impossible to simply accept the Hegelian method without a materialistic reworking, as the Deborinites did. Hence the formal, idealistic approach of the Deborins to categories, emphasizing their self-development, i.e., their constant abstraction from reality. Hence the identification of the reality *of being with the ideas*of being, which introduced the spirit of clericism into the writings of the Deborinites, despite the materialistic terminology. Without overcoming the materialistic Hegelian dialectic, the Deborinists could not completely break mechanical materialism and could not, of course, give a complete system of atheism. Only dialectical materialism, Marxist-Leninist philosophy, which is based on all the achievements of scientific knowledge, provides a logically complete system of atheism, leaving no loopholes for priests.

As for *the idealistic* philosophical systems, all of them, due to their animistic content, are more or less outright clerical and are used by the defenders of religion for apologetic purposes. The same must be said about *agnosticism* in all its forms. Without solving the basic question of the relationship between thinking and being, and trying to prove the fundamental impossibility of such a proof, agnosticism leaves this question to be solved *by faith* , which is the main method of religious thinking. Kant's agnosticism in the Critique of Pure Reason fits perfectly with his religion in the Critique of Practical Reason. The Machist "economy of thought" also leads the Machists to sing the praises of religion. In Materialism and Empirio-criticism, Lenin dwells on the struggle of I. Dietzgen against the "certified lackeys of popery"' against conciliatory charlatans with all the nicknames of spiritualists, sensualists, realists, etc., etc.:" The "scientific popery" of idealistic philosophy is a simple threshold to direct popery, "he wrote," and it seriously strives to achieve this goal." help out the religious priests." "Especially in the field of epistemology, the lack of understanding of the human spirit is such a lousy pit that both priests lay their eggs[403]in."

7.3. Origin and development of religious beliefs

Dialectical materialism provides not only a philosophical justification for atheism, it not only

403 В. Ленин, Материализм и эмпириокритицизм — гл. VI, § 4.

refutes the existence of the spiritual world, but also is the surest methodological tool in solving the question of how *the very belief* in the existence of the spiritual world came about. The Marxist-Leninist theory of the origin and development of religious beliefs is, among all other theories, the only correct and logically complete atheist theory. Theories *of the origin of religion* associated with idealistic philosophy, built on idealistic methodology, inevitably carry idealistic wormholes and open loopholes for clerical behavior.

In Kapital, Marx wrote about Old Asian and ancient societies: "These old social-productive organisms are incomparably simpler and clearer in their structure than the bourgeois one... The condition of their existence is the low stage of development of the productive forces of labor and the corresponding connectedness of human relations within the framework of the process that creates their material life, and at the same time the connectedness of all their relations to each other and to nature. This *real connectedness* is perfectly reflected in *the ancient natural and folk religions* ."

Religion, as shown by proto-archaeological and ethnographic data, originated in pre-class society, in the era *of primitive communism* . The "real connectedness" that Marx speaks of in connection with Old Asian and Ancient society is also a distinctive feature of primitive society, where the helplessness of the primitive savage before the forces of nature and the oppression of natural-tribal ties are evident. The primitive community, in its struggle against nature and other communities, binds the activities of its members with hundreds of prohibitions(taboos), regulates their every step. Primitive religion is a fantastic reflection of this "connectedness" in the form of belief in spirits, supports and reinforces it. Thus, in primitive society, as in later economic formations, the basis for the emergence of religion is socio-economic relations. This does not mean that for all aspects of primitive religion, for example, for certain magical rites, it is necessary to look for explanations in economic reasons. But all these "primitive stupidities," as Engels puts it in a letter to Conrad Schmidt[404], could only be sustained in the system of ideology on the basis of primitive social relations. They played a certain socio-economic role, maintaining and consolidating in the primitive community the "connectedness" of people's relations to each other and to nature.

What were the external forms of primitive religion?

The religious beliefs of the Australians, who are currently the most backward people on the globe and have a totemic organization of society, are *totemism*, closely related to animism, with the spiritualization of all objects and with magic. Since totemic beliefs are an ideological superstructure on top of already rather complex economic relations and certainly represent a phenomenon later than animism, we can conclude that it was animism and magic that formed the primitive form of religion. We are forced to this conclusion by the archaeological excavations of the earliest burials, which indicate the existence of a belief in existence after death. Animistic ideas and primitive magic had to arise on the basis of the low economic condition of the primitive community, they were a reflection of the impotence of the community before nature, a reflection of the oppression in which the primitive community kept all its members.

There were many external reasons for the emergence of faith in the existence of souls and spirits.

Such phenomena as sleep, fainting, death, dreams, and even such things as a shadow, a reflection in water — could lead under certain conditions to the idea of the existence of a" double"," soul", spirit. But all these phenomena also began to work in a certain direction only under a certain state of the productive forces, only on the basis of certain social and economic relations. Primitive

---

404 Ф. Энгельс в письме к Конраду Шмидту от 27 октября 1890 г. писал: «В основе этих различных неправильных представлений о природе, о строении самого человека, о духах, волшебных силах и т. д. лежит по большей части отрицательно-экономическое: низкое экономическое развитие доисторического периода имело в качестве своего дополнения, а порой даже в качестве условия и даже в качестве причины, ложные представления о природе. И всё же хотя экономическая потребность была главной пружиной двигающегося вперёд познания природы и с течением времени всё более становилась такой пружиной, всё же было бы *педантством* искать для всех других первобытных глупостей экономических причин».

religion, which populated the surrounding world with souls and spirits that supposedly connected all the relations of people to each other and to nature, was thus a fantastic reflection of the real connectedness of people in a primitive community.

The first period of the existence of human society was certainly a period without religion, and there were no animistic ideas at that time. The appearance of a person in a dream was most likely perceived as the appearance of a real person. There were no facts of frequent and systematic observation of mortally wounded animals losing their blood. This could lead to the belief that there is a quickening power in the blood, the soul. All these facts began to work in the direction that contributed to the emergence of the idea of the "soul" at the stage of economic development when parking lots appeared, when the development of primitive technology made it possible, along with gathering, to start running *a hunting farm* . Comparing the decomposed corpse of a kinsman in a parking lot with its appearance in a blooming form in a dream could lead to the idea of the existence of some kind of double that lives after the death of a person. A number of other facts led to the opinion that this double during the life of a person lives in himself, that sleep, illness, fainting is a state when the "soul" leaves the body. Then, by analogy with man, souls were attributed to all objects of nature in general. Impotence before nature, a life full of danger led to the belief that the world is filled with evil spirits, bringing various misfortunes, diseases, and death. Chukchi people, for example, believe that the evil spirits " kelet "(singular Kele — "killer") attack people, lying in wait for lonely travelers. According to the beliefs of the Golds, evil spirits — "alba buseu" - lure people to remote places in the forest, into pools, steal people's souls, cause all sorts of diseases, etc.

With the development of the productive forces, the division of labor by age and sex becomes more and more profound; leadership functions are transferred to the older generation, the custodian of the economic and production experience already accumulated by this time by the community. Old people-grandfathers — managers of the production process, advisers, teachers of the younger generation. Such should also be the spirits that become the souls of deceased grandfathers-ancestors. *Ancestral spirits*are invisible guardians of traditions, customs, and rules. Violation of the rules of economic and production experience often led to misfortune, to death. This is explained as revenge on the part of the ancestral spirits.

According to ethnographic data, the generation of old people in modern Australian society, which has a totemic structure, enjoys greater rights and privileges compared to the generation of hunters, teenagers and women.

To keep such an order of things intact, there are few ways of direct influence. In Australian society, the death penalty is applied for violating prohibitions or expulsion from communities, which is actually equivalent to the death penalty — the spirit world comes to the rescue, vindictive and demanding, invisibly present, seeing everything, and therefore it is impossible to hide the violation of laws and regulations.

In addition, in primitive religion we find *magical actions* . Primitive magic refers to actions that are based on the belief that something similar or similar can cause something similar (similarity magic) or that an action on an object that was in contact with another object or is part of the latter has an effect on this second object (contact magic). Magic is called negative or negative when it is forbidden on the basis of it*запрещают* perform certain actions. Examples of positive similarity magic include the way African Negroes cause rain. The chief or sorcerer climbs up on the roof of the hut and pours water on the ground, fully expecting that rain will fall from the sky in the same way, because similar things cause similar things.

Magic grew out of the same socio-economic relations as animism. In general, the whole system of magical actions and prohibitions is for savages the greatest school of drill, thanks to which the established order of things remains unshakable. Negative magic (taboo), which prohibits women and young hunters from eating many types of prey, etc., benefits the older generation, which is therefore interested in maintaining and consolidating this system of magic as a whole. There is no doubt that the development of magic was influenced by hunting practice, with the imitation of animals and birds while sneaking up on them. For example, the Australians, when hunting emus, held a bird's head on a stick above their head. In magic, a person does not beg the spirits, but forces

them to act at will. Magic does not yet know the whims and personal will of spirits. Magic occurs at a time when a primitive community completely owns and subjugates all its members, including the older generations.

We have presented the animist theory of the origin of religion in the light of Marxism-Leninism. The bourgeois researchers of the origin of religion, Taylor and Spencer, as well as followers like Wunt and Fraser, although they provide us with a wealth of factual material on the history of religion, stand on *an idealistic*point of view. The origin of animistic ideas is portrayed by them as the result of a mental process that takes place in the head of a "savage philosopher".

But the most serious errors and perversions in the understanding of animistic theory are also found in Plekhanov, Kunov, Stepanov, and Bogdanov.

Plekhanov addresses the question of the origin of animism in his first article, " On the So-called Religious Quest in Russia." Plekhanov does not give a truly Marxist analysis here. It says nothing about socio-economic relations in primitive society, about the relations of people to each other in the process of production. Plekhanov confines himself to mentioning the weak development of the productive forces, but does not indicate how this weak state of the productive forces determines the relations of production in primitive society.

Nor does Plekhanov mention anywhere the *social*role played by the original religion. Plekhanov, in his first article on religion, writes: "At a certain stage of cultural development, animistic ideas and related moods merge with morality, in the broad sense of the word, i.e., with people's concepts of their mutual duties[405]." According to Plekhanov, it turns out that at first animistic ideas were not influenced by the socio-economic life of the primitive community. They arose, according to Plekhanov, as a result of the savage's reflections and reasonings, for the sake of some "pure knowledge", for the sake of satisfying his curiosity. Plekhanov's reasoning, as we can see, is idealistic; this is how Taylor also explained the emergence and development of animistic ideas. Plekhanov writes about primitive man: "His productive forces are poorly developed; his power over nature is negligible. At the heart of all fantastic explanations of the life of nature is *a judgment by analogy* . When a person observes his own actions, he sees that they are preceded by corresponding desires, or — to use an expression closer to his way of thinking — that these actions are caused by these desires. Therefore, he thinks that the phenomena of nature that struck him were caused by someone's will. The supposed beings whose will causes the phenomena of nature that affect him remain inaccessible to his external senses. Therefore, he considers them similar to the human soul, which, as we already know, is immaterial in the sense indicated above, and so on."

Kunov, in his book The Emergence of Religion and Faith in God, makes the same mistake as Plekhanov. It says nothing about the economic structure of primitive society, nor does it address the question of what role religion plays in primitive society. Coons associate the origin of animism with hunting in the following way: hunters, observing a mortally wounded animal, saw that with the loss of blood, life goes out of the animal; from this they concluded that some kind of life force, soul, is placed in the blood. Dreams, fainting spells, epilepsy, and other similar phenomena reinforced the belief in the existence of souls. With this explanation, in Kunov, as in Plekhanov, *religion breaks away from economic relations* and becomes a theory that has no direct bearing on the economic life of the primitive community.

In fact, the same positions were also held by T. V. Tolstoy. Stepanov. In his Essays on the Development of Religious Beliefs, we would look in vain for discussions of the relations of production in primitive society. Nothing is said about the social role of animism. As for magic, it is completely silent about it. And Kunov, etc. Stepanov's works deal with the economic and technical aspects that influenced the emergence of the idea of the "soul". Kunov talks about hunting, Stepanov about parking lots, hunting, and the use of tools. But neither of them says anything about the relations of production, the community itself, or its economic structure. The mechanistic approach, vol. Stepanova clearly affects in this case. Primitive society is not considered as a definite

405 Г. Плеханов / Соч., т. XVII — с. 230.

qualitative peculiarity, an organic whole; one side of it, although very important, is taken mechanically, namely, *the technique*of the mode of production. Stepanov also makes the same mistake in the question of the origin of totemism, when he again says nothing about the relations of production.

A. Bogdanov made an attempt to give a social justification for animism, making a so-called *authoritarian position.* theory[406]. Tov. Bukharin, who, as is well known, is strongly influenced by Bogdanov, declares in his Theory of Historical Materialism that he subscribes to Bogdanov's theory. The authoritarian theory is basically reduced to the statement that animism arises only under the patriarchal-generic system. The surrounding world is perceived by people in the process of developing their " socially organized *experience* ", by analogy with the social relations that, according to Bogdanov's theory, patriarchs-managers, *организаторы*labor organizers and *the performing*mass enter into. All natural objects and people are therefore thought of as performing masses, while the role of organizers is played by the" souls " of all natural things. The idealism of this Bogdanovian theory was brilliantly revealed by Lenin in his "Materialism and Empirio-criticism", which showed that belief in goblins and brownies, although it is a "generally valid" "socially consistent experience" of the broad masses, does not correspond to objective reality, that such an explanation does not speak about real social relations and the exploitative role of religion. Ethnography refutes Bogdanov's theory with the facts of the existence of animism among peoples before the patriarchal-tribal system, for example, among Australians who have a totemic organization of society.

In addition to Taylor-Spencer's animistic theory of the origin of religion, there are a number of other bourgeois theories. In the middle of the 19th century, the English scientist Max Muller came up with a naturalistic theory, the essence of which boils down to the statement that the object of the original religious cult was *the forces of nature*, that religion began with the worship of the sun. Ethnographic data have shown that this theory is untenable: the forces of nature do become objects of deification, but at a later stage of economic development than primitive communism, namely, among agricultural and pastoral peoples.

In recent decades, new reactionary theories of the origin of religion have been put forward. Thus, the fathers of the so-called "proto-monotheistic" theory, Andrew Lang, and after him Father Schmidt, who now wears the red cardinal's hat, assert that primitive religion is pure monotheism, the belief in one God, "the all-knowing, all-powerful creator and organizer of the world, the bearer of the moral principle." This theory is a disguised proof of the existence of God. Close to the theory of pramonotheism is the "preanimistic" theory, which asserts that animism was preceded by a belief in the existence of an impersonal force. Impersonal power is everywhere, it enters into all objects: people, animals, plants, stones, etc., in some objects more, in others less. It is easy to see that such an impersonal force is not much different from the impersonal reason of the pantheists, from the impersonal god of love Tolstoy. Ethnographic data show that the belief in "power" itself that exists among some primitive tribes develops from animistic beliefs.

In a few words, we will focus on the theories *of biological diversity.* these theories derive religion from the" innate " qualities of man.

Such, for example, is Freud's psychological sexual theory, which has already been mentioned (Chapters 3, 6)[407]. According to Freud, religion grows on the basis of the natural instincts of man that are held back by human society: the instinct of reproduction, the instinct of destruction and violence, and perhaps even the second instinct is a variation of the first. Thus the conclusion about the eternity of religion is self-evident. The head of the primitive horde, as Freud tells us, drove out all the growing males from the horde in order to live alone with the women, but then was killed by the young males. The latter began to fight constantly over women, and then they established — as a testament of the murdered father — not to touch the women of their kind. The love and hatred felt

406 Впервые эта теория изложена в книге А. Богданова «Из психологии общества».

407 См. З. Фрейд, Тотем и табу.

for the father were transferred to the animals that were "totems". This sexual theory of the origin of religion contradicts ethnographic evidence. Freud's claim that there was once a human horde consisting of an adult male, a dozen females and children is also not confirmed either in ethnography or in proto-archeology.

Theories of the biological order may seem materialistic at first glance, but they are essentially idealistic, because they do not actually deal with society. These theories start from *the psychology*of the individual, which arises and develops on the basis of some unchanging biological property[408].

We cannot dwell here in detail on the development *of the cult of animal* patrons of the tribe (totemism) and on the transition from the worship of these animal spirits to *the cult of ancestors* . Let us only note that along with the development of the clan system, the dependence of people on the head of the clan is also reflected in religion. With the development of agriculture and cattle breeding, ancestral spirits first borrow certain features from natural phenomena, and then become nature *gods* . Dependence on nature gets a fantastic reflection in the form that one spirit mainly begins to "manage" the sun, another-rain and thunderstorms, the third-wind, etc. The peasantry, suppressed by the exploitation of feudal lords and the elements of nature, created for themselves whole "states" of spirits — specialists in agronomy and veterinary medicine. The helpless position of the Russian peasantry, exploited for centuries by noblemen-landlords, who performed before nature with primitive great-grandfather's equipment, found a fantastic reflection in the belief in the existence of various saints: Frol and Lavr — horse breeders help in the veterinary part. Yegor is a cattle herder, Nikita is a goose herder, and so on. In agronomy-Natalia-ovsyannitsa, Nikita-reporez, Nikola-kochannyi, Elena-long flax, Praskovya-trepalnitsa, etc.

The ongoing unification of tribes into state organizations, with the rise of a single tribe and the role of conqueror and unifier, is fantastically reflected in the corresponding changes in the spirit world. The gods of the conquering tribe become the main gods. The gods of subordinate tribes are given the role of minor gods or relegated to the position of heroes.

But the state religions of the ancient world, like all religions of the exploitative system, performed at the same time another function — they raised the class consciousness to the height of a divine institution.*классовое* inequality, all the horrors of slavery, the exploitation of the free working masses, their political disenfranchisement.

Thus the class division of ancient Indian society, which condemned Plebeian sudras and pariahs to perpetual servitude and bondage, was openly sanctified by Brahmanism, which taught that Brahmins came from the head of Brahma, wars from his hands, the Vaisya caste from his thighs, and sudras from his feet. Brahma has nothing to do with the despicable "pariahs", and therefore they are lower than animals, just touching them already defiles a noble person. Ancient Greek feudal princes mercilessly exploited the working peasantry, traced their ancestry directly from the gods and goddesses. They called themselves" the best " (aristoi), while the workers were "the worst" (kakoi). We see the same thing in the ancient Egyptian religion. It was said of Pharaoh that he was the same god, that he "lives from the being of every god, that he devours his entrails."

For *the feudal society*of the Middle Ages, a god in the form of a suzerain king, with a retinue of minor gods, angelic forces and saints, is typical, a god who personifies feudal inequality and exploitation based on serf labor. The sanctity and inviolability of the principle of feudal inequality is emphasized by the fact that the supernatural world is just as strictly divided by rank as the earthly world. For example, the angelic forces around the Christian medieval god are divided into nine categories: seraphim, cherubim, angels of power, angels of the throne, archangels-angels, etc.

Already the state religions of the ancient world contained the germs of monotheism and monotheism. One of the ways of development of monotheistic ideas was the reflection in religion of the organization of despotic monarchies of the ancient world. So the victory of Thebes in ancient Egypt over other powerful cities highly exalted the god Amun. He is already considered the eternal

---

408 К биологическим теориям можно присоединить и взгляд, разделявшийся одно время М. П. Покровским, видевшим причину происхождения религиозных верований в «страхе смерти», якобы присущем животным и человеку.

creator of the world, he is the lord of the gods. We see the same thing in the ancient Babylonian religion. The victory of Babylon puts the Babylonian god Marduk in the first place.

The *Jewish*god, the militant and vengeful Jehovah, was also a reflection of the despotic organization.

But the decisive role in the development of ideas about the one God was played by the commodity economy with the spontaneous forces of its *market* . The blind element of the market dominates people. The physically imperceptible, fateful and terrible power of commodity production over the society that created it is reflected in the belief in an abstract, impersonal God, all-encompassing, all-seeing and all-powerful. The masked character of the most severe exploitation and slavery in capitalist society in the form of free labor, "democratic freedoms" corresponds to the religious teaching about the equality of all people before the Lord.

These features of the religion of capitalist society were subtly noted by Marx. He wrote in Kapital: "A society of commodity producers is characterized by a social-productive relation, which consists in the fact that the products of labor are here commodities, i.e., values, and that individual private works are here equated with each other in this uniform form as equal human labor — for such a society *the most appropriate form of production is the social-productive relation. the form of religion is Christianity*with its cult of abstract man, especially in its bourgeois varieties, such as Protestantism, deism, etc." This is also what Engels says in Anti-Duhring: "At a further stage of development, the totality of natural and social mysterious forces is transferred to one omnipotent god, who in turn is only a reflection of abstract man."

This reflection of the abstract man found its fullest expression in *Christianity* . But, speaking about the latter, it is necessary to remember that Christianity itself, in accordance with changes in socio-economic relations, took one or another of its various forms. There are significant differences between the original Christianity, its medieval forms, such as Catholicism and Orthodoxy, and later emerging bourgeois varieties of Christianity, such as Protestantism or Deism.

But these differences, of course, do not prevent Christian religions, like any other religion, from playing the most abominable role of protecting and justifying exploitation. "Primitive Christianity is basically the religion of a disintegrating slave economy, "Engels wrote in the Obituary of Bruno Bauer. — "In all classes there must have been a certain number of people who despaired of material liberation and sought compensation in spiritual liberation — solace in the consciousness that saved them from utter despair." Among these people, who longed for solace and longed to escape from this real world to the ideal world, most of them were recruited from slaves. It was during this general economic, political, intellectual, and moral decay that Christianity emerged. Early Christianity, which was spread primarily among the lower strata of the people, the ancient proletariat and slaves, who were hit hard by the economic crisis, was an ideology of decline, helplessness and despair. By calling believers to the heavenly kingdom, Christianity left the earthly kingdom untouched; on the contrary, it taught them to see in the sufferings and hardships of life, which depended on the order of the earthly kingdom, a means to salvation. The fantastic image of the sufferer-god, who voluntarily accepted death and triumphed only after death, reflected the helplessness of the oppressed classes of Greco-Roman society in the era of the collapse of the slave economy, who were unable to come out to fight against the existing order with truly revolutionary measures.

Kautsky, in his works The Origin of Christianity and the Forerunners of Socialism, idealized Christianity and religion, ascribing a revolutionary character to the original Christianity and considering that all evil in Christianity comes only from the church, the clergy. This distinction between the role of religion and the church is typical of social democracy and is *a reconciliation with religion*as such. Christianity, which preached the freedom of the spirit, led to the enslavement of the body, sanctified slavery, violence and exploitation. That is why, where commodity relations have developed widely, Christianity has become the most proven tool in the hands of exploiters for enslaving and stupefying the working masses[409].

---

409 К. Каутский в своей работе «Происхождение христианства» выводит первоначальное христианство из революционного движения античного пролетариата. Вопреки научным изысканиям мифологической школы,

The same roots in *the class system* The structure of society can also be traced back to the origin of the other two most widespread religions along with Christianity: *Buddhism and Islam* . Buddhism, with its rejection of all struggle and life in general as a source of frustration and suffering, was in its original form an expression of the disintegration of Hindu feudal society and the development of commercial capital that took place in the IV–V centuries BC.

The Buddhist religion, with its doctrine of renouncing the class struggle, also reflected the sentiments of the working masses, who were powerless to fight against the oppression of exploitation. The Buddhist "nirvana" obscures the class struggle, sanctifying helplessness and submission as the highest ideal. This is why Buddhism is now enjoying generous support from the ruling class in such capitalist Eastern countries as Japan.

Islam, the third most widespread religion, was the ideological expression of the social and economic upheavals that took place in Arabia in the sixth century. The unifying tendencies of commercial capital found ideological expression in a new religion that promoted the belief in a single god instead of tribal ancestral gods. Commercial capital subjugated and enslaved both the nomadic Bedouin and neighboring peoples. Allah was given the characteristics of a high merchant: "God bought their lives and their possessions from the believers, paying them paradise for them." Islam is always on guard of the exploitative system. The Qur'an teaches: "Do not look with your eyes at the benefits that we give to some families of them, this flower of the distant life" (XX, 131).

Like any other religion, Islam defends the exploitative system, sanctifies the old foundations of everyday life and life, and therefore is now being used by the enemies of the proletariat as a proven tool in the struggle against socialist construction, against the five-year plan.

It is clear from the foregoing that the" idea of God, "as Lenin wrote to Gorky, has always" bound the oppressed masses together by faith in the divinity of the oppressors," consolidated the oppression of the working masses, reconciled them to oppression and exploitation, and extinguished the class struggle. But at the same time, there are facts in history when liberation and revolutionary movements were carried out under the flag of religion. Lenin wrote about this in the same letter to Gorky: "There was a time in history when, despite such an origin and such a real significance of the idea of God, the struggle between democracy and the proletariat took the form of a struggle between one *religious idea* and another, but even this time has long passed. Now, in Europe and in Russia, *every* defense or justification of the idea of God, even the most subtle and well-intentioned, is a justification of reaction."

Why and how did this happen? The struggle of bourgeois democracy against feudalism was the struggle of one exploiting class against another. Since the religion of feudal society sanctified and consolidated the feudal order, the revolutionary bourgeoisie was forced to turn to the criticism of religion, despite the fact that religion sanctified the principles of private property and exploitation. This criticism led some ideologists of the bourgeoisie to atheistic conclusions. But class interests forced the new exploitative class to cling to religion as an instrument of exploitation. In this respect, Voltaire's enlightenment philosophy is typical and characteristic of all periods of the class struggle of capital against feudalism. Voltaire's hatred of the Catholic Church, so clearly

---

доказавшей, что никакого исторического Иисуса не было, по Каутскому, евангельский Иисус якобы действительно существовал и погиб во время уличной схватки в Иерусалиме. Его приверженцы рассеялись по всем странам греко-римского мира, неся повсюду революционные и коммунистические идеи… Но коммунизм христианства не имел под собой экономической почвы, и первоначальные христианские общины — результат благочестивого измышления Каутского, не соответствующий исторической действительности — проделывают якобы своё диалектическое развитие и переходят в свою противоположность — в институт материального могущества епископов и клира. К. Каутский в своей работе проделал своеобразную аберрацию исторических перспектив. Революционное движение нашего времени он переносит на две тысячи лет назад и на вымышленных событиях прошлого, якобы вычитанных им из таких исторических документов, как евангелия и «Деяния апостолов», пытается показать безрезультатность и бесполезность революционных мероприятий. Проф. Виннер («Возникновение христианства») выводит христианство из подпольных организаций еврейских финансистов того времени. Рожицын, следуя за Виннером, в «Золотой легенде» пытался доказать, что первоначальное христианство возникло среди знатных и богатых кругов древнего общества.

expressed in the exclamation "ecrasez I'infa & #770;me "("crush the reptile"), perfectly combined with his militant attitude towards atheism, which undermined all religion. Voltaire made no secret of the fact that religion is the strongest rein for the people.

The new exploitative classes fought for an order of the world that did not eliminate the roots of religion, but rather strengthened them. That is why most often the struggle of bourgeois democracy against feudalism, which provoked criticism of feudal religion, was itself *waged in the form of a religious struggle* . Thanks to the dominance of religious thinking in society, criticism of the existing socio-economic order and the religion that supports these orders was also conducted in a religious form, in the form of a struggle for a better religion.

There have been instances in history when the nascent proletariat waged a class struggle under the banner of religion. And at the present time, the backward strata of the proletariat are trying to conduct it in the form of Christian socialism, participation in Christian trade unions, etc.All these facts show the weakness and lack of class consciousness of the proletariat or its individual strata, and show that in this case the proletariat is under the influence of a class-alien ideology. As a result, religious slogans and attitudes disorganize the working masses, distract them from the real class struggle, and in essence play a counter-revolutionary role, not a revolutionary one.

7.4. Bourgeois and proletarian atheism

Atheism — a worldview that denies the existence of a supernatural world-also has economic relations as its cause. Atheistic ideas and systems developed in the course of the class struggle. Thus, the atheistic ideas of the ancient Greek world were an ideological expression of the power struggle waged by the commercial capital of antiquity with the land-owning feudal nobility.

English materialism and atheism of the seventeenth century, as Engels pointed out, was of aristocratic origin, an expression of the struggle of the upper aristocracy against the believing bourgeoisie, which won victories. But in the main, the atheism of the new age grew out of the struggle of the new capitalist class coming to power against the feudal world. However, bourgeois atheism as the ideology of the new exploitative class could not produce a consistent atheistic system; it bears the characteristics of half-heartedness and compromise.

Engels, in his Essays on the Critique of Political Economy, reveals the socio-economic reasons for the half-hearted and inconsistent nature of bourgeois atheism: "The eighteenth century," wrote Engels, " the age of revolution, revolutionized economics as well, but just as all the revolutions of this century were one-sided and entangled in contradictions, just as abstract spiritualism was opposed to abstract spiritualism. materialism, monarchy as a republic, divine law as a social contract, and the economic revolution have not succeeded in transcending this contradiction. Everywhere the same presuppositions remained*; materialism did not touch* the Christian contempt and *humiliation of man*, but instead of the Christian god, it opposed nature as the absolute to man; politics did not even think of investigating the presuppositions of the state as such; it did not occur to economics to raise the question of the legitimacy of private property."

The bourgeois atheism of the new age has a narrowly enlightening character. Bourgeois atheism does not come out of *the idealistic*circle of ideas about the origin of religion, its roots and ways to fight it. Religion is the deception of priests who have exploited the ignorance of the masses - this is the starting point of bourgeois atheism in its practical activity. Lenin wrote in his article "On the Attitude of the Workers 'Party to Religion" about bourgeois atheism: "Why does religion persist in the backward strata of the urban proletariat, in the broad strata of the semi-proletariat, and also in the mass of the peasantry? Because of the ignorance of the people, the answer is a bourgeois atheist, radical, or bourgeois materialist. Hence, down with religion, long live atheism. Spreading atheistic views is our main task. The Marxist says: not true. Such a view is a superficial, bourgeois-limited culturalism."

The essentially idealistic system of bourgeois atheism can and does lead to purely administrative measures of struggle against religion. Since bourgeois atheism considers that the

deception, the fraud of priests over the ignorant masses, being fixed by law, creates a religious system, the struggle against religion is drawn in a very simplified form. Instead of laws that establish religion, you need to make a couple of laws that prohibit it, and everything will be over. Thus, at the time of the French Revolution, petty-bourgeois politicians who acted in the spirit of this theory issued a decree replacing the feudal Catholic religion with a new, bourgeois religion of reason. The first paragraph of the decree of the Convention of 18 Floreal II on the cult of the supreme being read: "The French people recognize the existence of a supreme being and the immortality of the soul."

Anarchist projects to " ban " religion derive their theoretical origin from the same range of ideas. The left-wing twists in the anti-religious struggle that took place in our country during the construction of socialism have nothing in common with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the struggle against religion and, on the contrary, are akin to the theories of bourgeois atheism.

Nevertheless, the eighteenth-century French atheists Holbach, Helvetius, Diderot, and others gave a damning critique of the religious worldview and Christianity in particular. Engels and then Lenin, in their article "Socialism and Religion" and in a letter to the editorial board of the journal "Under the Banner of Marxism", point out the need to use the militant atheistic literature of the French materialists in the modern anti-religious struggle of the proletariat.

In contrast to bourgeois atheism, which is half — hearted and compromise-ridden and wormhole-eaten idealism, Marxism-Leninism is a completely consistent theory *of proletarian socialism.* atheism. Considering the existence of the capitalist system itself as the main reason for the existence of religion at the present time, Marxism-Leninism subordinates the struggle against religion *to the class struggle*of the proletariat against capital.

"The struggle against religion," Lenin formulates this point of view, " cannot be limited to abstract ideological preaching, it cannot be reduced to such preaching. This struggle must be linked to the concrete practice of the class movement aimed at *eliminating the social roots of religion*." This basic principle of Leninism in the struggle against religion is a further development and deepening, based on the practice of the working-class movement, of the propositions expressed by Marx in his Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law. "The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people," Marx wrote, " is the demand for their real happiness. The demand to give up illusions in one's position is a demand to give up *a position* that needs illusions. Criticism of religion is therefore in embryo a criticism of that vale of lamentation, of which religion is the sacred halo. Criticism plucked imaginary flowers from chains, not so that a person would wear sober, hopeless chains, but so that he would throw off the chains and pick fresh flowers. Criticism of religion disappoints a person so that he thinks, acts, develops his reality as a disillusioned, sensible person; so that he moves around himself and his real sun."

Marxism-Leninism are theories *of militant atheism* . The revolutionary proletariat fighting for the victory of socialism cannot but wage a struggle against religion, for, as Lenin wrote, the idea of God perpetuates class oppression, lulls the class struggle to sleep. That's why "*in relation to the party* for the socialist proletariat, *religion is not a private matter* . Our Party is an alliance of class-conscious, advanced fighters for the emancipation of the working class. Such a union cannot and should not be indifferent to unconsciousness, darkness, or obscurantism in the form of religious beliefs[410]."

But Marxism-Leninism, in contrast to bourgeois atheism, resolutely opposes purely administrative methods of combating religion by demanding the development of an anti-religious struggle.

Lenin wrote in his article "On the Attitude of the Workers 'Party to Religion": "In 1877, in Anti-Duhring, while mercilessly harassing the slightest concessions made by Duhring, the philosopher, to idealism and religion, Engels no less strongly condemned Duhring's allegedly revolutionary idea of banning religion in socialist society. To declare such a war on religion, says

410 В. Ленин, Социализм и религия.

Engels, is to "over-mark Bismarck himself," i.e., to repeat the folly of Bismarck's struggle against the clerics (the notorious "struggle for culture", Kulturkampf, i.e., Bismarck's struggle in the 1870s against the German Catholic party, the "center" party, by means of police persecution of Catholicism). Accusing Duhring, who aspired to be ultra-revolutionary, of wishing to repeat in a different form the same stupidity of Bismarck, Engels demanded that the Workers 'Party be able to work on the task of organizing and educating the proletariat, a task leading to the withering away of religion, and not rush into" adventures of political war with religion." This attitude of Marxism-Leninism to the question of the forms of struggle against religion was also expressed in the program of the CPSU(b), which, speaking of the need to organize the broadest scientific and educational, anti-religious propaganda, emphasizes' that "at the same time, it is necessary to carefully avoid any insult to the feelings of believers, leading only to the consolidation of religious fanaticism."

Unlike the proletarian parties of the Third International, the social-Democratic parties *renounced any struggle against religion* , declaring it a "private matter" in relation to the party. The new program of social fascism states: "Religion is a private matter, a matter of inner conviction, which has nothing to do with the party or the state."

The social-fascist leaders, concluding concordats with the Pope and the Lutheran princes of the Church, acting in coalition with the Catholic center party, are trying to justify "scientifically" their departure from Marxism on the question of their attitude to religion.

For example, Otto Bauer tries to prove that historical materialism, on the basis of which the Social-Democrats supposedly built their program, is not at all organically connected with the philosophy of Marxism, dialectical materialism, and therefore with atheism.

The views of historical materialism, according to Otto Bauer, can also be held by a deeply religious person. From this it is concluded that the struggle against religion is not at all obligatory or necessary for the party[411]. In his recent works, the "left" Max Adler takes the path of explicit reconciliation with religion, and the German social-fascist Zollmann, who became famous for his anti-Soviet speeches, declared in 1927, at a joint meeting of social Democrats and churchmen in Wittenberg, that "only then will socialism be invincible when the ice-cold, crystalline structure of the church is built in the form of a new state." the Marxist building will be rekindled by the sacred fire of Christian and religious power."

7.5. Building Socialism and fighting Religion

At the present moment, when there is a fierce class struggle between two worlds: the world of decaying capital and the world of socialism under construction, the counter-revolutionary role of all religions, all and all religious organizations, is particularly clearly visible. In the capitalist countries, which are gripped by an unprecedented and growing crisis, religion is being used by the imperialists to fight against the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, against the communist parties, and against the U.S.S.R. Churchmen take the closest and most direct part in preparing for the war against the USSR. From the heights of pulpits and pulpits during divine services, from the pages of religious periodicals and non-periodicals, streams of the vilest slander against the USSR are constantly pouring out.

Despite the failure of the last" crusade "of the Pope against the Land of Soviets, churchmen still organize rallies and meetings about the alleged persecution of religion in the USSR, they are directly involved in spreading slander about dumping, forced labor, etc. All this is done in order to intimidate the broad masses of believers with the" horrors of communism". to stifle the sympathy for the U.S.S.R. that exists in broad strata of the population, and to divert the working people, and especially the millions of unemployed, from the revolutionary movement.

At the same time, the Church, hand in hand with fascism and social fascism, is waging an offensive against the working class. The Church blesses the fascist terror and directly participates in

411 О. Бауэр, Социал-демократия, религия и церковь.

it. Cardinal Seipel, as head of the Austrian government, shot the working masses in Vienna in the July days of 1927 as well as Noske and Severing. How could it be otherwise, when the "pious father" openly declares that" every theory that seeks to transform the world by destroying the relations of labor and capital is inhumane","such doctrines are alien to a Christian, since a Christian must see the finger of God in everything"[412].

The Church is arming the backward masses of believers against the Communist parties, the Red Profintern, and the revolutionary mass organizations of the proletariat. Especially at the present time, when there are tens of millions of unemployed people, when the revolutionary upsurge of the working masses is growing more and more, the Church is taking all measures to support the rule of capital. The tale of the suffering Christ should quell the protest of hungry workers. The Pope urged the poor on the radio not to neglect "the acquisition of spiritual wealth, which is much easier than the wealth of the earth."

Religion plays the same *counter-revolutionary role*in the country of socialism under construction. The kulak class that is being liquidated, the remnants of the former exploitative classes, and various "former" people-all of them carry on counter-revolutionary work, most often hiding behind religion and using it as an instrument of counter-revolution. Religious organizations are often the headquarters of counter-revolutionary conspiracies, the threads of which, as the trials of the Mensheviks and the "industrial party" have shown, stretch abroad to the main headquarters of the world counter-revolution.

Religious organizations are agitprops of the enemies of socialism. By spreading rumors about the approaching demise of the world, spreading "God's" letters threatening collective farmers, fabricating miracles with the renewal of icons, with the healing of the sick — churchmen and sectarian preachers, who are agents of the kulaks, are trying to slow down collective construction, trying to disrupt sowing, harvesting, grain procurement and other campaigns.

Here, for example, is what Kulachye wrote in one such "God's letter" distributed in the Rovanetsky district, in the Donbass: "I am the Lord your God and I say to you: the moment has come when the devil is entangling the people in his net-collective farms. Those who are not tempted by the collective farms will be saved; I will destroy all the collective farmers in the next few days. I will also destroy those who do not wear crosses on their chests."

Religion also has a strong impact on labor productivity in enterprises. Where anti-religious work is poorly conducted, absenteeism usually increases during the so-called "Christmas" and "Easter" periods. There are enterprises where absenteeism during Easter 1931 reached 40% of all workers. On the contrary, where anti-religious work is well established, workers went to work one hundred percent completely. These examples and many other facts show that anti-religious work is of outstanding industrial significance and is one of the most striking areas of the struggle for socialist construction.

Religion, which sanctifies the old foundations of life, the old way of life, the servile position of women in the family, is the greatest obstacle in the struggle for the cultural revolution, for the dissemination of real scientific knowledge among millions of working people. That is why it is necessary to expand anti-religious work on the widest possible scale.

The successful implementation of the five — year plan, the introduction of the planned principle into the social economy, success in consciously regulating the social economy-all this educates a person to become a member of socialist society, all this leads to the breaking of the old, slavish worldview, and the departure from the religion of millions. Only in a country where power has been won by the working people and where they are building a new life can such a grand scale of the atheist movement be possible. This affects, of course, primarily the work *of the Union of Militant Atheists* .

But all this does not mean that religion is already over and that no anti-religious propaganda should be conducted. This attitude is not a Marxist-Leninist attitude; it is nothing more than a right-

412 См. доклад Зейпеля «Труд и капитал с точки зрения христианства».

wing opportunist underestimation of the importance of the struggle against religion. Religion will die out only under developed socialism, after its socio-economic foundations are finally destroyed. Religion in the reconstruction period is not yet dead, because there is still a fierce class struggle going on. In their struggle against the power of the Soviets, the enemies of socialism, using religion as an instrument of counter-revolution, are taking all measures to delay the fall of religion. The roots of religion in the reconstruction period are in the non-socialist elements of production, in the old, undefined way of life. Among the individual workers, religion is mostly held up as a relic. The lack of general education, the inability to give materialistic answers to questions about the origin of the world, the earth, life, etc. — all this can keep individual workers in captivity to clerical practices.

At the same time, it is necessary to keep in mind the differentiation of workers, to keep in mind the new layers of workers that flow in from the countryside, not only collectivized, but also from the individual sector, bringing with them petty-state sentiments and religious prejudices.

The XVI Party Congress emphasized in its decisions that the party and the proletariat must consolidate and expand the successes achieved on the front of the struggle against religious prejudice. By fighting mercilessly against the opportunist attitude towards the anti-religious struggle, and by preventing any leftward bends in it, the working people must develop the struggle against religion even more widely, because the struggle against religion is a struggle for building a socialist society, for Bolshevik pace in work, for quality, and for a new man.

Chapter 8. The Marxist-Leninist Doctrine of Revolution

8.1. The Doctrine of Revolution as the most important problem of dialectical and historical Materialism

"Leninism is *the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution* in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular."

In this definition, belonging to T. According to Stalin, Leninism is characterized from the side *of the main, basic and decisive factor.* in the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. The doctrine of the proletarian revolution (its character, prerequisites, driving forces, stages of the revolution) is a necessary part *of* the views of Marxism-Leninism. But this is the component part, the rejection of which means in the most direct way the rejection of *the whole*of Marxism.

Reformists and opportunists of all stripes are ready to accept anything in Marxism except the call for a revolutionary struggle. But while they strip Marxism of its revolutionary essence, they remain stuck with fragments of theory and contradictory theoretical propositions. Attempts to link these fragments into something unified and internally consistent lead, as the entire history of Revisionism proves, to a complete departure from Marxism in all its constituent parts. This is due to the fact that the doctrine of revolution is something in Marxism that binds all its constituent parts into a single, integral, coherent worldview. Moreover, the very development of Marxism, its ascent to a higher stage, can be understood only in connection with the development of the doctrine of revolution.

The doctrine of the proletarian revolution is the point that not only" guarantees us the unity and continuity of the idea of Marxism and Leninism "[413] (as everyone who reduces Leninism to a simple restoration of Marxism in the era of Marx and Engels thinks): Lenin's elaboration and further development of the theory of revolution raises Marxism to a new, *higher*level.

The Proletarian revolution received its scientific justification due to the fact that historical materialism proved its historical necessity and inevitability. The subjectivism that prevailed before Marx in understanding historical phenomena proceeded from the recognition of the sovereignty and

413 Б. Фридлянд, В. И. Ленин и учение Маркса о революции / Воинствующий материалист, кн. 2-я.

free will of the creative personality and thereby devalued the true historical revolutionary activity of people, since it deprived it of its support in the world of reality.

The historical materialism of Marx — Engels discovered the factors of revolution objectively operating in history, presenting the development of human society as *a necessary*natural-historical process and at the same time as a product of human activity, a product of the class struggle in class society. The old historical necessity is denied in the revolutionary struggle of the new classes. On the other hand, social relations that have necessarily emerged, but have already ceased to be hysterically necessary at a new stage, are forcibly fixed by the ruling class in order to perpetuate them.

In contrast to the objectivist, who only proves the necessity of a given set of facts, the materialist, in Lenin's words, goes further, raising the question "*which class* determines this necessity", which class ""manages" the given economic order, creating such and such forms *of counteraction*of other classes".

Historical necessity is not, therefore, a mechanically understood necessity. Determinism does not exclude a properly understood freedom of action. Bernstein's vulgar criticism of Marxism is based precisely on the fact that he "confounded freedom of will with freedom of action, identified historical necessity with the forced hopelessness of people without any justification[414]." Theoretically, the whole renegade practice of social-fascism, which calls on the masses to actively support capitalism on the grounds that imperialism is an objective historical necessity, rests on this mechanical conception of historical necessity[415].

It is true that imperialism necessarily grows out of industrial capitalism. The scientific proof of this is given precisely by Lenin. But what is this necessity? This is a necessity that speaks of the decay, decline, and imminent demise of capitalism. While actively working towards the overthrow of imperialism, the revolutionary forces here rely on objective historical necessity. Historical necessity *is internally contradictory* , and *the subjective* factors of history simultaneously oppose it and find *objective ones in it.* opportunities for their revolutionary activities. This is how Marxism justifies the active, effective, and creative role of the subjective factor in history, which transforms possibility into reality. An objective revolutionary situation cannot turn into a victory of the revolution if there is a lag of subjective factors. Only a dialectical understanding of historical necessity as internally contradictory, and only a concrete analysis of the driving forces of this historical necessity make it possible to correctly assess the role of both objective and subjective factors in history. The Marxist-Leninist understanding of revolution arms us both *against objectivism*, which condemns people to fatalistic contemplation of the so-called "irresistible tendencies" and "inexorable laws of history", and *against subjectivism* , which makes the historical revolutionary activity of people impossible by depriving it of an objective basis.

However, the significance of dialectical and historical materialism for the theory of revolution is not limited to the elucidation of this question.

Revolutionary changes occur *in leaps* and bounds . The origin of the revolutionary leap can be understood only from the law of the unity of opposites, from the dialectical law of the transition of quantity to quality, for only these laws give the key to self-movement, to the interruption of gradualness, to leaps and bounds, to the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new. Social opportunism conceived of the "leap into the realm of freedom" as a *single* , fleeting, painless act. This view has as its starting point a completely abstract opposition between capitalism and socialism. Up to a certain point there is an invariably ascending line of flourishing capitalism, and beyond this point there is already full-blooded socialism. This way *the transition period disappears* from capitalism to socialism, and with it the "leap"itself.

---

414 Ленинский сборник VII — с. 20.

415 В своей брошюре «Parteizusammenfahr» (1915) Г. Кунов поясняет, что лозунг свержения империализма равносилен лозунгу: нельзя терпеть никакой машины, разрушим их и предпишем, чтобы в дальнейшем производство шло только ремесленным путём.

Opportunists, says Lenin ironically, "were accustomed to oppose capitalism to socialism in the abstract, and thoughtfully *put the word*'leap' between[416]them." However, in their perversion of Marxism, the social-fascists are now even going so far as to directly deny revolutionary leaps. Thus Kautsky considers it meaningless to say of a given phenomenon that it is slow or abrupt, because "such concepts are relative, and when we consider two phenomena, we can say with full justice that one phenomenon developed more slowly and less noticeably in comparison with the other[417]." In this way Kautsky transfers the "leap" to consciousness, makes it dependent on the comparative evaluation of the subject; it amounts to the quantitative difference between faster and slower movement. Kunov says the same thing. He manages to attribute to Marx the idea that "political and social revolutions also belong to 'evolution' ... are evolutionary acts, but only accelerated, forced acts, a hasty movement forward at an accelerated pace[418]." A leap is understood here not as a break in continuity, but as *a faster pace*in moving along an unchanging line of development. Social-fascism here reaches its highest limit in its disfigurement of Marxism. It turns out, if we believe Kautsky and Co., that the transformation of capitalism into socialism is not a break in continuity, it turns out that socialism is essentially and does not differ from capitalism!

However, it is not enough to recognize the leap as a gradual break for a correct understanding of the Marxist-Leninist views on revolution.

The leap cannot be thought *of abstractly* ; dialectics also dictates a concrete historical approach. Leaps are made in nature and in society, but there is a significant difference between the two. And within the limits of society, we must distinguish between the leap made in the bourgeois revolution and the leap made in the proletarian revolution. All the revolutions that preceded the revolution of the proletariat led to a change in the forms of social relations, leaving unchanged the basis of these relations in the form of private ownership of the tools and means of production. Viewed from the point of view of world history, these revolutions gave new forms to the continuation of the identical basis built on class exploitation. The Proletarian revolution is not a continuation, but a turning point. A leap in the proletarian revolution is therefore a leap *of a special*kind.

The " leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom "cannot be regarded as a"one-time and universal one-time act"[419]. The latter follows from *the specific* patterns of development of capitalist contradictions at a certain stage, when there is an increase and aggravation *of the uneven* development of capitalism. Being, in Lenin's words, a turning point "from the point of view of the twists and turns of world history," this revolutionary leap cannot but be at the same time a period of the fiercest *and most intense struggle between the old and the new* . It cannot therefore be fleeting, instantaneous, immediately reaching its highest point. The ideological penetration of the bourgeoisie among the proletariat, on the one hand, and on the other, the colossal nature of the proletariat's own tasks, which gives rise to the phenomena of hesitation and indecision among its individual strata, lead to the fact that proletarian revolutions " constantly interrupt their course, go back and start anew what has already been accomplished... continuously *criticize* they ridicule themselves ... *with merciless severity*the half-heartedness, weakness, and shortcomings of their first attempts... until finally conditions are created that exclude the possibility of any retreat, until life itself declares imperiously: „hic Rhodus, hic saltus“»[420].

The "leap" in the proletarian revolution embraces a series of years, *a whole transitional*

---

416 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XXII — с. 466. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

417 К. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / т. II — с. 218.

418 Г. Кунов, Марксова теория исторического процесса общества и государства / т. II — с. 288.

419 Программа Коминтерна.

420 К. Маркс, 18-е Брюмера Луи Бонапарта.

epoch, characterized by the proletariat's conquest of its dictatorship, the merciless suppression of the exploiters ' resistance, the organization of socialist construction, the mass transformation of people in the spirit of socialism, and the destruction of classes.

This indissoluble connection between dialectical and historical materialism and the doctrine of revolution explains the fact that international opportunism, while revising Marxism in the field of strategy and tactics, inevitably extends this revision to the entire field of Marx's method and worldview.

We have already spoken of the type of social-fascist perversion of Marxism presented by the theorists of the Second International, which shows in the most undisguised form the connection between the philosophical views of these leaders and their rejection of the Marxist theory of revolution. But even in the more disguised forms of the philosophical revision of Marxism, we find a distortion and disregard of the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution. Bukharin's sociology, for example, reduces the revolution to such leaps and bounds as occur in the field of mechanics, draws the revolution (as we will show in detail below) in the form of an abstract scheme, eliminating from analysis classes, the party, the concrete struggle between classes, the dialectic of this struggle, and carrying its simplistic schematism to the complete elimination of all the cardinal problems of the revolution. Another kind of modern philosophical revision of Marxism-Leninism — Menshevik idealism-also abolishes the problems of revolution "more economically" and with much less effort. For Menshevik idealism, the problems of revolution do not exist at all. Having withdrawn into the realm of Hegelian abstractions, the Deborinists, under the guise of a supposedly "scientific" development of dialectics, carried out their complete disregard for the objective dialectics of our revolution and the revolutionary movement of the world proletariat.

Meanwhile, the doctrine of revolution united the method of Marx, Engels, and Lenin and their worldview into a single whole, " poured out of one steel, from which not a single basic premise, not a single essential part, can be extracted without departing from objective truth, without falling into the embrace of bourgeois lies."

8.2. The Law of Social Revolution

Marx, based on the study of actual human history, established the following *law* of social revolution in his Preface, which we have already quoted many times: "At a certain stage of its development, the material productive forces of society come into *conflict* with the existing relations of production, or, which is only a legal expression of this, with the property relations within which they have hitherto developed. These relations are transformed from forms of development of the productive forces into their fetters. Then comes *the era of social revolution* ."

As has already been pointed out, it would be wrong to interpret this thesis of Marx's in the sense that before the revolution there is a relation of complete harmony between the productive forces and the relations of production. From the very beginning of the concentration of the means of production in large workshops and manufactories, and their transformation in practice into social means of production, the basic contradiction of the capitalist mode of production arises, consisting in the contradiction between the social character of labor and the private character of appropriation ,which "*contained in itself the germ of all modern contradictions*" *(Engels).* . And as the new mode of production made its way into countries and branches of economy still untouched by capitalism, "the incompatibility of social production with capitalist appropriation became more and more pronounced[421]."

But it is also wrong to imagine that the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production must mean a permanent crisis, a situation in which an absolutely hopeless situation is created for the development of the productive forces.

Imperialism is the eve of a social revolution; imperialism is parasitic, decaying, dying

421 Ф. Энгельс, Анти-Дюринг — с. 255–256.

capitalism. But, Lenin points out, "it would be a mistake to think that this tendency to decay precludes the rapid growth of capitalism; no, individual branches of industry, individual strata of the bourgeoisie, individual countries exhibit one or the other of these tendencies with greater or lesser force in the era of imperialism. On the whole, capitalism is growing immeasurably *faster than before*, but this growth is not only becoming *more uneven* in general , but the unevenness is also manifested in particular in the decay of the most capital-rich countries (England)[422].

Lenin waged a decisive struggle against Rosa Luxemburg*'s theory of the automatic collapse*of capitalism. According to the theory of capital accumulation outlined above, capitalist reproduction becomes impossible due to the fact that as the non-capitalist environment (so-called third parties) narrows and becomes involved in the cycle of capitalist production, the part of surplus value that goes to expand production cannot be realized on the market.

The fundamental error of the theory of automatic collapse is that it does not see the basic internal contradiction of capitalism: between the social character of production and the individual form of appropriation. According to Rosa Luxemburg's concept, the external environment is crucial for the development of capitalism.*внешнее* contradiction: between the capitalist system and the non-capitalist environment. But if capitalism, as Luxemburg's theory suggests, is free from internal contradictions, how does the theory of automatic collapse differ from the social-fascist theory of organized capitalism? Of course, there is no essential difference here, and this makes it clear that the social-fascist apologists of capitalism and the enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat are now appearing under the banner of this theory of Rosa Luxemburg. A characteristic methodological feature of Luxemburg's theory, along with the sophistry and subjectivism inherent in its views, is the mechanistic *Struvist objectivism alien to Marxism* : Struvism, as is well known, drew conclusions from the progressiveness of capitalism, from its inevitability, "sometimes apologetic... sometimes apolitical (i.e., denying politics or denying the importance of politics, the probability of socio-political upheavals, etc. P.)"[423]. The Luxemburgian theory of the automatic collapse of capitalism inevitably leads to the same conclusions.

It is not surprising that the left-wing social fascists (Sternberg et al.) and the renegades of the Comintern (Thalheimer, Brandler et al.) support Luxemburg's theory, finding in it a theoretical weapon for their treacherous practice. This theory is also based on another methodological principle hostile to Marxism, which consists in *separating economics from politics*and, as we will see later, also forms the starting point of Kautskyism. R. Luxemburg, as we see, seeks the "purely" economic collapse of capitalism, distracting himself from all the concrete variety of political, national, etc. contradictions in which it is based. in which the main contradiction of the capitalist mode of production is revealed — the contradiction between the social character of production and the individual form of appropriation.

Abstract schematism, which is the common methodological weapon of both Kautsky and Luxemburg, leads them to the same result — to the disarmament of the proletariat, although in different ways: in one case (with Kautsky) through the theory of ultra — imperialism; in the other case (with Luxemburg) through the theory of automatic collapse. "Abstractly' conceivable, '"says Lenin," is a new phase of capitalism *after the revolution.* imperialism, namely: ultra-imperialism… There is no doubt that the development is going *in the direction of* to one single trust, a worldwide one, which absorbs all enterprises and all states without exception. But development is progressing to this end under such circumstances, at such a pace, with such contradictions, conflicts and upheavals — not only economic, but also political, national, etc., etc. — that imperialism is bound *раньше*to reach a single world trust, an "ultra-imperialist" world association of national finance capitals it will inevitably have to collapse, and capitalism will turn into its opposite[424]." The same should be said about the automatic crash theory.

---

422 В. Ленин, Империализм как новейший этап капитализма / Соч., изд. 2-е, т. XIX — с. 172.

423 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 3-е, т. XVIII — с. 355.

424 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 3-е, т. XVIII — с. 357.

The theory of automatic collapse, like the theory of ultra-imperialism, pushes the cause of socialism back centuries. The theory of automatic collapse, as can be easily seen, is opposed to the Leninist doctrine of the non-capitalist way of developing small-scale commodity production, of the possibility of involving the working masses of the peasantry in the construction of socialism. It is not surprising that the theory of automatic collapse finds its welcome in *the Trotskyist* arsenal of ideas. "World development, especially the development of the United States, has driven Europe into this impasse. This is now the main force of the capitalist world, and the nature of this force *automatically*determines the hopelessness of Europe within the capitalist regime[425]." Trotsky needs this "arch-revolutionary" pose as a cover for his social-fascist, counter-revolutionary denial of the general crisis of post — war capitalism, to cover up his theory of big cycles-this new apologetic weapon that Trotsky is delivering to the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

In the works of the theoretical pillars of international social-fascism (for example, Kautsky), we meet with criticism of Luxemburg's theory. Kautsky, however, criticizes Luxemburg not for the theory *of the automatic* collapse of capital, but for the theory of its *collapse* . At the same time, he falsifyingly identifies Luxemburg's theory with Marx's.

Commenting on Marx's thesis above about the transformation of the relations of production into fetters for the development of the productive forces, in the sense that the productive forces of capitalism are being created *in a complete state.* in the absence of any possibility of their movement, modern social-fascism catches Marx on the "mistakes" that he himself invented. By such a vulgarization of Marx's theory, the social-fascists are able to push the collapse of capitalism far back in their theory and reproach Marx and Engels for being "too hasty" in predicting the time of the collapse of capitalism in their Communist Manifesto.

Kautsky puts himself in a "left" position before Marx and declares that he expects the victory of socialism long before the productive forces of capitalism come into conflict with its relations of production. Moreover, according to Kautsky's scheme, this conflict may not occur, because it turns out that in the course of its development, capitalism eliminates its temporary contradictions, such as those between industry and agriculture, and gives its forces a full flowering, which is accompanied by the rise of the working class. Kautsky "eliminates" the conclusion which inevitably follows from this that socialism is impossible and unnecessary by the following sophism. It turns out that under capitalism the proletariat is steadily raising the material and cultural level of its existence, but this happens as a result of the proletariat's struggle to meet its growing needs. Rejecting the theory of the impoverishment of the working class, Kautsky sees the source of the struggle of labor against capital in the "growth *of needs*." In this way, the proletariat is directly interested in the development of capitalism, because " however sharply the interests of capital and labor may be opposed, they still have in common that both are most successful in the rapid turnover and growth of capital," because "the problem of production is more important than the question of the relations of production. We must therefore *promote the revival of capitalist economy* , its rationalization, *and combat interruptions in production* ."

Kautsky, as we see, also recognizes the sharp contrast between the interests of labor and capital, and even the possibility of "sharpening the class struggle," but he does not recognize the fundamental contradiction of the capitalist mode of production — the contradiction in the very social relations of capitalism, between the social character of production and the individual character of appropriation. "The problem *of production* — for Kautsky — is more important than the question of *production relations*." Why exactly is this contradiction unacceptable to him? Yes, because this contradiction *is hopeless*, always inherent in capitalism, constantly reproducing itself with the course of the development of capitalism, giving rise to all other contradictions. It can, according to Marx's text quoted above, *find its solution only in the social revolution* .

The law of social revolution is the law of the development of antagonistic societies. Social

---

425 Л. Троцкий, Европа и Америка. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

fascism, however, tries to refute this character of the law of social revolution. Thus Kautsky *limits* the field of action of the social revolution *only to the transition from feudalism to capitalism* . He refuses to regard the fierce class struggles of the ancient East and Attica as social revolutions, defining them as "rebellions". According to Kautsky, the basis for this distinction is that the class struggles of these historical epochs, although they led to *political*upheavals, did not bring with them any "social" changes in the modes of production and in the development of the productive forces of society.

The meaning of this statement is quite clear. It is important for Kautsky to justify the sharp *distinction between a political revolution and a social* one . Kautsky needs this in order to prove that a revolution in the present mode of production can and must take place on the path of "economic democracy", *without*a political revolution, i.e., without the dictatorship of the proletariat. Taking a bourgeois-voluntaristic stance, he portrays our October Revolution as a product of "Bolshevik voluntarism" devoid of social content and social foundations.

Kautsky buys this limitation of the law of social revolution at the price of a direct distortion of historical facts and a distortion of historical perspective.

History fully confirms the correctness of the thesis that " in general terms, Asian, ancient, feudal, and bourgeois modes of production can be considered as *progressive*epochs of economic social formation[426]." Kautsky himself does not deny that capitalism has created a much higher productivity of labour than under feudalism. But the transition from slavery to feudalism also meant a higher stage in the development of labor productivity. Large Roman latifundia were so unproductive that they led to an extreme depreciation of the slave's labor force. After the Peloponnesian Wars, a slave was valued at 10 kopecks. A slave was a measure of cheapness: "Cheap as a Sicilian" (i.e., like a slave exported from Sicily) - such was the current saying of that era.

The kolonat that emerged at that time, which represented the rudimentary form of future feudalism, already provided greater productivity of labor than the slave economy. These transitions from ancient Eastern despotisms and ancient slavery to feudalism and from it to capitalism are all stages of progressive development of labor productivity, while at the same time being marked in history by bloody pages of slave uprisings, serf uprisings, and the most brutal class battles. All these transitions were made through revolutionary *revolutions in the existing mode of production* . Of course, this does not mean that history is a universal continuous line of progressive economic development, without the phenomena of regression, degeneration and death of individual cultures. But on the whole, it is precisely this line of development that is making its way, characterized by the overthrow of the political rule of some classes, the seizure of political power by other classes, which raised society to the highest historical level. It is also clear that each such social revolution has its *own special*physiognomy, and it would be absurd to deny, say, the fact of a bourgeois revolution on the grounds that it is profoundly different from the proletarian revolution.

So, the law of social revolution includes the following content:

1) that the fundamental driving contradiction *of every*class society is the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production;

2) that this contradiction is *a hopeless* one, which cannot be overcome within the framework of a given social form and whose resolution is possible only in a social revolution.

This basic contradiction cannot be conceived as standing alongside other social contradictions, outside and apart from them. Considering all the concrete variety of economic and political contradictions of a given socio-economic formation, we find that they are based on the contradiction between the relations of production and the productive forces, as a common principle for all of them. All economic and political contradictions are *forms of manifestation* of this basic contradiction, which is their *essence* .

This fundamental contradiction in capitalist society at the present stage of its development

---

426 К. Маркс, К критике политической экономии. Предисловие. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

finds expression in the following contradictions:

1) between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat;

2) between imperialism and the colonies;

3) between the winning countries;

4) between winners and losers;

5) between the capitalist world and the U.S.S.R.

In order for the capitalists to eliminate the root of all these contradictions, i.e., the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, they must cease to be capitalists. The hopelessness of this contradiction — within the limits of capitalism-makes the struggle between classes *an irreconcilable struggle* . This is the whole *essence*of Marx's doctrine of the class struggle.

The revolution is designed to eliminate the conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production, *to break* the relations of production that have become fetters for the development of the productive forces. These are the economic tasks of the revolution. But the existing system of production relations is protected by the political force of the ruling class — its *state* . Hence the task of gaining political power by the class representing the future mode of production. *A social revolution cannot but be simultaneously a political revolution.* Moreover, politics as a concentrated expression of economics "cannot fail to have primacy over economics" *(Lenin)* . *The political* tasks of the revolution are *crucial* in the whole process of the development of the social revolution, — are *the determining factors.* for the economic as well as ideological tasks of the revolution. The ruling class, which has the means of material production, "thereby also has the means of spiritual production, so that it thus dominates in general the thoughts of those who do not have the means of spiritual production." It follows "that *the overthrowing*class can only be cleansed of all the filth of the old society in a revolution and become capable of creating a new society[427]."

Revolution, as the highest manifestation of the class struggle, is the unity of all three forms of this struggle: economic, political, and ideological — *the unity of the economic, political, and ideological revolution* — a unity in which the decisive role belongs to the political struggle and the political tasks of the revolutionary class. At various stages of the revolution, one or the other side of it appears as the next task that stands in the foreground. "The first task of every party of the future," writes Lenin, " is to convince the majority of the people of the correctness of its program and tactics… Now this task, which of course is far from complete yet... is basically solved… The second task of our party was to gain political power and suppress the resistance of exploiters. And this task *is by no means completely exhausted, and it is impossible to ignore* it . The third task is now being put forward as the next one and is part of the peculiarity of the moment being experienced — to organize the management of Russia[428]." Such, according to Lenin, is the dialectic of the revolutionary process.

A complete perversion of this Leninist conception of the revolutionary process is the scheme of revolution given by Comrade Bukharin. According to the theory of Bukharin and Kritzman, the revolution *successively* passes through four final phases in its development. The first phase is *ideological* . "This ideological revolution consists in the collapse of the old psychology and ideology (it is being broken by the exploding facts of life) and in the creation of a new, truly revolutionary psychology and ideology." The second phase of the revolution is *a political* revolution , i.e. the seizure of power by a new class. "The third stage of the revolution is *the economic* revolution," and " finally, the fourth (and final) phase of the revolution is *the technical revolution*." Such is the simple mechanics of revolution in Bukharin's depiction: four stages follow one another, like four barriers that are placed slightly apart one after the other, and over which the revolution consistently jumps. True to his mechanistic scheme, Bukharin forcibly abstracts one side of the

---

427 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I — с. 207.

428 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XXII — с. 441. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

revolution from the other, placing them side by side, link by link, as if in a chain made by a blacksmith. Bukharin is ready to consider *завершённой*the political revolution completed as the moment of seizing power, and the ideological revolution completed and exhausted as the moment when discontent with the old regime was revealed. So it turns out that at the stage of the political revolution, no ideological tasks of the revolution are set: the first barrier has been removed, and the ideological process has already quietly moved towards the predominant revolutionary psychology and ideology; similarly, at the stage of the economic revolution, political tasks do not take place. In his pursuit of the "elegance" of architectonics, Bukharin completely ignores historical reality, which does not fit into this scheme.

According to Bukharin, it turns out that at the "stage" of the political revolution there are no longer any tasks of the ideological revolution, because the ideological revolution, as already "completed", is behind us. But this is decisively refuted by Lenin's following statement: "A proletarian revolution is impossible without *the sympathy and support* of the vast majority of the working people in relation to their vanguard — the proletariat. But this sympathy, this support, is not given immediately, is not decided by voting, but is won by a long, difficult, hard class struggle. The class struggle of the proletariat for the sympathy and support of the majority of the working *people does not end in the conquest of the political*power of the proletariat. After gaining power, this struggle continues only in other forms." The same is true of the very vanguard of the movement, the proletariat. The ideological and ideological emancipation of the proletariat does not take place in the form of a one-time act that ends before the proletariat seizes power. The ideological power of the ruling class, as we have already seen, is so great that even after its economic and political defeat, it still leaves a huge legacy of its former spiritual domination, which the proletariat, which is moving towards the destruction of classes, has to work long and hard to eliminate.

The dialectic of the revolution is such that if one of the conditions for the conquest of political power is that the "lower classes" no longer want *to live in the old* way, then the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat becomes a necessary condition for the "lower classes" to want *to live in a new* way . The political and economic conquests of the proletariat are becoming a powerful tool for revolutionizing the psychology and ideology of the masses. The same applies to the political and economic aspects of the revolution. For Bukharin, the political revolution is completely exhausted by the moment *of seizing power* , after which the "lowering of the state curve" begins. In his mechanistic scheme, there is no place for the problem of retaining power, *of consolidating it* . The same misunderstanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat as *a continuation* of the class struggle in new forms — a struggle *that becomes more acute* at certain stages of socialist construction-is reflected here. This is reflected in Comrade Bukharin's failure to understand that the proletariat can solve the problems of the economic "stage" of the revolution only by solving its political tasks, the tasks of consolidating and *consolidating* the proletarian dictatorship. "For the question is (and, in Marxist terms, *can it be* 2) *only* in this way: without a correct political approach to the matter, this class will not maintain its dominance, and *therefore* nor will he be able to solve *his own production problem* " *(Lenin).*

"In order to win," we recall Lenin's words, " the majority of the population to its side, the proletariat must, first, overthrow the bourgeoisie and seize state power; it must, secondly, introduce Soviet power... it must, thirdly, finish off the influence of the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois compromisers among *the bourgeoisie. the majority*of the non-proletarian working masses by the revolutionary realization of their economic needs at the expense of exploiters."

The same applies fully to *technical information* on the side of the revolution. The technical reconstruction of our national economy planned for the second five-year plan should, according to Comrade Bukharin's scheme, proceed less rapidly and more smoothly, since the political and economic stages of the revolution have already been "completed". Meanwhile, the directives for drawing up the second five-year plan do not *separate*the tasks of technical reconstruction from the tasks of destroying private property and classes, from the tasks of a fierce class struggle, from the tasks of the cultural revolution.

We see, therefore, that the political, ideological, and economic aspects of the revolution are linked in *a single continuous revolutionary process* . In the course of a revolution, one period is replaced by another, respectively putting forward one or another main task. But the solution of the main political problem is a knot in which the economic, ideological, etc., aspects of a single revolutionary process are linked. Thus the entry of our country into the period of socialism, the socialist industrialization of the country, and the collectivization of agriculture simultaneously pose and solve the tasks of the economic "stage", the tasks of technical reconstruction, the tasks of revolutionizing the psychology and ideology of the masses, and the tasks of strengthening the power of the proletarian dictatorship. In a revolutionary chain, each link is connected to other links, and this connection is "not so simple or so stupid" as in an ordinary chain made by a blacksmith" *(Lenin)*.

Bukharin's scheme of revolution does not differ in any way from Kautsky's separation of the social revolution from the political, his separation of economics from politics. It lays the foundation for the theory of the peaceful growth of the kulak into socialism by its gap between politics and economics. It repeats Menshevik arguments about the" cultural presuppositions " of the revolution, preferring the obligatory completion of the "ideological revolution" to its other phases.

We can summarize all of the above briefly in the following conclusion. In a society divided into classes, movement from one social form to another on the basis *of the internal*development of a given class formation is impossible except through revolution: revolution is the historical necessity for the development of every antagonistic social formation. The starting point of the revolution is the conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production; its task is to destroy the existing system of production relations and establish a new mode of production; its means are to seize political power on the part of the class that represents this future mode of production.

Such are the general definitions inherent in every revolution in the development of class society.

But the creators of the theory of revolution-Marx and Engels-were the founders of materialist dialectics. They were at the same time the greatest leaders of the developing revolutionary movement of the world proletariat. Their doctrine of revolution could not therefore be confined to *a general one* theories of revolution. They had to study further the general laws of social revolution that they had discovered, revealing *the special ones* regularities of the concrete forms of revolution that are being carried out by the struggling proletariat.

The general theory of revolution is developed by its founders into a concrete doctrine of *the proletarian revolution* . It is in the course of the following exposition that we will proceed to study the specific features and laws of the proletarian revolution developed by Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

8.3. Development of Marx and Engels ' views on Revolution

Even in his earliest writings, Marx speaks of the impending revolution, of its inevitability, and makes it his direct task to criticize bourgeois *politics* .

"The political question merely expresses in political language the difference between the rule of man and the rule of private property." Moreover, "*the political state* is a table of contents for the practical battles of humanity "(emphasis added). - *Author*), because it " expresses within its form, sub specie republicae (i.e., in the form of the state) all social struggles, needs, and truths." To criticize politics means " to connect and identify this criticism with *real struggle* ."

In his article "Towards a Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law", Marx further develops his views on politics as "accumulating in itself all the battles of humanity". "A radical revolution can only be a revolution *of radical needs*." Marx regards the idea of a purely political revolution as utopian. The driving force of the revolution is the liberating class, whose own claims and rights "are truly the rights and claims of society itself"; the class that represents the "social head and social heart". This special class is the proletariat. Partial victories over the Middle Ages cannot give Germany freedom. "*No* slavery can be abolished in Germany without *the abolition of all*slavery." "The head of this emancipation is philosophy; its heart is the proletariat."

In a detailed form, the views of Marx and Engels on the inevitability of revolution are already given in the German Ideology. Here, as a result of the materialist understanding of history that they have already found, they come to the conclusion that "all forms and products of consciousness can be destroyed not by spiritual criticism... but only *by a practical revolution in the real social relations* from which all these idealistic twists have come; *it is not criticism, but revolution , that is the driving force of history.*" This inevitability of revolution is deduced by Marx and Engels from the inevitably maturing material presuppositions ("various productive forces, the formation of a revolutionary mass that is revolutionized not only against certain aspects of the existing 'production of life', but against all the activities on which these aspects are based"). By the way, it should be noted that here, as in the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, Marx tirelessly emphasizes that the indicator of the maturity of a revolution is *the maturation of contradictions and the awareness of* of these contradictions by the revolutionary class. All attempts by the Mensheviks *to associate their*theory of the "maturing" of the revolution with the name of Marx are a clear falsification of Marx.

They understood the revolution that Marx and Engels relentlessly insisted was inevitable as *a violent revolution* , as a" physical clash " of people. In The Poverty of Philosophy, Marx sees in the struggle of the proletariat to rally and unite its forces "the necessary elements of the coming battles." With the transformation of the proletariat from a class "in itself" to a class "for itself", the interests defended by the mass of workers become class interests. But the struggle between classes is a political struggle, for " political power is precisely the official expression of class antagonism in civil society." Therefore, class antagonisms, when brought to the highest degree of tension, inevitably lead "to a gross contradiction, to *a physical clash of people* ." "Do not say," Marx concludes in his famous work, " that the social movement excludes the political. There has never been a political movement that is not at the same time social. Only in this order of things, when there will be no more classes and class antagonism' *social evolutions* they will cease to be *political revolutions* . Until then, at the end of every complete reconstruction of society, the last word of social science will be: "War or death; *bloody struggle or annihilation* . This is an irresistible statement of the question"".

Almost on the eve of the February Revolution of 1848, the famous lines of the Communist Manifesto were published, which are not only of general significance for the entire further development of the proletariat, but are also, to a certain extent, a reflection of the concrete revolutionary situation of that time.

"The Communist Manifesto,"says Lenin," owes its origin to Marx and Engels, who were not only thinkers, but also *effective revolutionaries* who were closely associated with the working — class movement of their epoch and led its vanguard[429]." The authors of the Manifesto sharply criticize all the varieties of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois socialism that existed at that time. The authors of the Manifesto harshly criticize German or " true socialism "and denounce the German socialist intellectuals for using their literature to weaken the revolutionary energy of the proletariat by preventing them from setting the masses in motion and"forcing the masses to think and act." And those lines of the Communist Manifesto that are directed against bourgeois socialism can still be fully applied to the theory of "economic democracy" of the modern social-democratic leaders. "The form of this socialism tries to turn the workers away from any revolutionary movement by asserting that it is not these or other political changes, but only the transformation of the material conditions of life and economic relations that can benefit the working class. But by the transformation of the material conditions of life, this socialism does not at all mean the abolition of bourgeois conditions of production, *which is possible only through revolution* , but administrative improvements that are carried out on the basis of this same organization of production, which consequently do *not change anything in the relations of capital*to wage labor, and at best only reduce for the bourgeoisie the costs of economy".

---

429 В. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. XII, ч. 2.

Finally, critical utopian socialism is reproached for "not seeing in the proletariat any *historical self*-activity , any political movement peculiar to it", for the fact that in utopian socialism "the place of the gradually advancing organization of the proletariat into a class" must be taken by "a social organization of their own invention", for the fact that they do not see in the proletariat any historical initiative, any political movement peculiar to it". they reject "all political and especially all revolutionary activity" and "strive to achieve their goal *by peaceful means and by means of small experiments that are naturally doomed to failure*."

Revisionists who, as we will see later, put forward the legend of the " two Marxists "refer the Communist Manifesto to the period when Marx was supposedly under the influence of the revolutionary Blanca. They declare the Communist Manifesto obsolete, and Marx and Engels as Blanquists or followers of Babeuf. One of the arguments is that in the Communist Manifesto, of all socialist literature — as Bernstein, for example, is indignant — Babeuf's writings alone remain without criticism (? - *Auth.*), it is said of them only that in the Great Revolution they expressed the demands of the proletariat — "a statement, in any case, contrary to the epoch (?! - *Author*). The revolutionary program of the Manifesto is thoroughly imbued with blankism[430]."

It is well known that Marx and Engels perfectly saw and pointed out the shortcomings of Babouvism, which consisted in its "crude communism" and crude equalization. It is also known that the authors of the Communist Manifesto had a negative attitude towards the conspiratorial methods *of the Blanquist and Babouvist secret societies* .

Marx and Engels appreciated in Babeuf, and especially in Blanquism, their *revolutionary violent methods of struggle* . But both Marx and Engels resolutely rejected what was specifically "Blanquist," the struggle of a revolutionary circle that did not rely on the working masses. "Marx in 1871 and Engels in 1891 showed that the experience of the Paris Commune excluded Blanquism, ensuring the direct, immediate, unconditional rule *of the majority* and the activity of the masses only to the extent *сознательного*that the majority itself consciously came out" *(Lenin)* .

In the Communist Manifesto we find the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat in its germ. The authors of the Manifesto formulate the following proposition: "In describing the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we have traced the more or less disguised civil war within existing society to the point where it turns into an open revolution, and the proletariat *establishes its rule by forcibly overthrowing the bourgeoisie*" (emphasis added). "The *Авт.*proletariat," we read further in the Manifesto, " will use its *political* supremacy to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie, *to centralize all the instruments of labor* in the hands of the state, i.e., *organized as the ruling class of the proletariat, and to increase the mass productive forces as soon as possible* . This means that this can only be accomplished *by despotic encroachment on property rights*and on bourgeois conditions of production; such measures are not sufficient and unreliable from an economic point of view, but in the course of the movement they will outgrow themselves and inevitably become means for transforming all modes of production."

Thus, even here, Marx and Engels present the following coherent program of action for the proletariat in the transition from capitalism to socialism: the conquest of political power, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the seizure of the means of production and their socialization, and the centralization of the available tools of labor in the hands of the "proletariat organized as the ruling class", i.e., *the proletarian state* . This proletarian State develops socialized production as soon as possible, and in the course of this transformation, a violent invasion of property rights is used. At the end of their Manifesto, the authors emphasize once again that the Communists have absolutely no intention of concealing the fact that they can achieve their goal only by *forcibly overthrowing*the entire modern social system.

The Communist Manifesto, as we know, was written in 1848. The idea of destroying the bourgeois state machine is already nipped in the bud here, and the Manifesto brings it very close to this idea, for if the proletariat needs a special organization of violence against the bourgeoisie, it

---

430 Э. Бернштейн, Социальные проблемы.

follows of course that the creation of such an organization is impossible without destroying the State machine that the bourgeoisie has created for its own interests and for its own purpose. And soon after the experience of the revolution of 1848, and especially after the experience of the June defeat of the proletariat, Marx, in his letter to Weidemeyer, concretizes the basic idea of the "Communist Manifesto" in the direct slogan *of the dictatorship of the proletariat* .

In his Critique of the Gotha Program, Marx, returning to the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, characterizes it as follows: "Between capitalist and communist society lies *a period of revolutionary transformation* from one to the other. The *political transition period also corresponds* to this period, and the state of this period cannot be anything other than *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*."

In the dictatorship of the proletariat, Marx and Engels saw a means of transition from capitalism to socialism, without waiting for small-scale production to complete its development on the road to capitalism. Engels writes bluntly:: "We will not wait for the final consequences of the development of capitalism, we will start creating a communist society *in the presence of small-scale production*."

This thesis is linked in Marx and Engels with their views on the historical mission of the proletariat as a class that liberates the working people and on the possibility of a non-capitalist path of development for the working peasantry. "We," said Engels, " are resolutely on the side of the small peasantry. We will do everything possible to make his life more tolerable, to facilitate his transition to camaraderie. We do this not only because *we believe it is possible for a small peasant working independently to come over to our side* , but also out of direct party interests. The greater the number of peasants whom we *will not allow to descend to the proletariat*and whom we will attract to our side as peasants, the quicker and easier the general transformation will be accomplished. It would be useless for us to wait with this transformation for the time when capitalist production everywhere will develop to its extreme consequences, when even the last small peasants will fall victim to large-scale capitalist production."

Marx and Engels ' views on the historical mission of the proletariat to play the role of hegemon in the struggle of the working people for their emancipation, and their recognition of the possibility of a small peasant working independently going over to the proletariat, are linked to their *theory of permanent revolution* . Comparing the theory of the" permanent revolution "of Parvus — Trotsky with Marx's theory, Comrade Stalin writes:" Our "permanentists", having taken it from Marx, modified it somewhat and, having modified it, "spoiled" it, making *it unsuitable for practical*use[431]." As is well known, this modification and corruption found expression in Trotskyism's denial of the significance of the idea of proletarian hegemony in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and in its assessment of the peasantry as a solid reactionary mass. Hence the direct contradiction between Marx — who did not at all propose "*to begin* the work of revolution in Germany in the 1950s directly with the proletarian revolution, but *only proposed to crown* the work of revolution with proletarian state power" *(Stalin)*-and Trotsky, who proposed to jump directly from the tsar to the workers ' government.

In the literature that comments on Marx's famous " document "("Appeal of the Central Committee to the Union of Communists"), it is sometimes suggested that, in contrast to Lenin's concept of permanent revolution, according to Marx,"the proletariat does not play the role of hegemon in the bourgeois-democratic revolution[432]." It is pointed out that in Marx we do not find the idea of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. This understanding of Marx is a concession to Trotskyism. It is based on a misunderstanding of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. From the fact that the" Appeal "does not contain the idea of the Workers' Party joining the government, it is still impossible

---

431 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 31.

432 К. Попов и Я. Резвушкин, О перерастании буржуазно-демократической революции в социалистическую — с. 11.

to draw the conclusion that Marx denied the significance of the hegemony of the proletariat in *the bourgeois-democratic revolution* . In addition, it is necessary to take into account the peculiarities of different types of bourgeois-democratic revolution at different stages of the development of capitalism.

Given the concrete historical situation in which the "Conversion" is concerned (the great organization of the German bourgeois democratic Party, the "defeat of the revolutionary people", etc.), there could be no question of the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution of Germany in the 1950s. But from this it is completely wrong to conclude that *the difference between* The difference between the Marxist and Leninist theories of the proletarian revolution lies, allegedly, in Marx's denial of the significance of the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Marx's idea of continuous revolution, which became the cornerstone of Lenin's theory of revolution, was concretized in Lenin (as will be shown in detail below) and further developed in accordance with the new conditions of the era of monopoly capitalism.

In the above-mentioned "Address", this idea of a permanent revolution is expressed as follows: "While the democratic petty bourgeoisie wants to complete the revolution as quickly as possible with the implementation of the above-mentioned demands, our interests and tasks are to make the revolution *continuous* as long as all the more or less propertied classes are not removed from power, as long as the proletariat does not win state power... Their (i.e., the workers') battle slogan must be *permanent revolution* »[433]." *The essence* of this theory, as we have seen, is to recognize the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, to recognize the revolutionary possibilities of the peasantry, to recognize the strength and ability of the proletariat to lead the peasantry, and to teach*that the*bourgeois-democratic revolution will develop into a socialist revolution. And we must recognize as distorting the meaning of Marx's theory of permanent revolution the explanation given by Zinoviev, who sees in it only the formula of " the ascending line of revolution as distinguished from the descending revolution[434]." The superficial empiricism that Zinoviev discovers here just bypasses the essence of the question. Its definition is quite acceptable to Trotskyism, for even Trotskyist "permanence" can be summed up in the formula of the" ascending " line of the revolution.

The further development of Marx's views on the revolution was connected with the solution of the following two cardinal questions:

1) *how*the bourgeois state should be replaced by the proletarian state,

2) *how to replace*the destroyed bourgeois state machine.

Based on the historical experience of the great years of the revolution of 1845-1851, Marx develops the following propositions in his 18th Brumaire of Louis-Bonaparte.

The executive branch, with its attributes of officialdom and a standing army, emerged in the era of absolute monarchy with the collapse of feudalism. The development of bourgeois society leads to an increase in the centralization of government power and to an extraordinary expansion of its powers, to an ever-increasing improvement of this machine. The executive power is brought "to the extreme perfection of a monstrous parasitic organism that opposes itself to the revolution" as a single reproach, "in order to concentrate all the forces of destruction against it." Inevitably, the course of the revolution sets the task *of destruction* the state machine. "All the coups improved this machine instead *of breaking it* her." This is how Marx and Engels answer the first question-how the bourgeois state should be replaced by a proletarian state.

The experience of the Paris Commune was the starting point for Marx and Engels to further refine their views on the tasks of the proletariat in the revolution. The first conclusion they draw is that "the Commune has proved that the working class cannot simply take possession of a ready-made state machine and use it for its own purposes." In Marx's French Civil War, we find the

433 К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс / Соч., т. VII — с. 483, 489.

434 Г. Зиновьев, Учение Маркса и Энгельса о войне.

following statement:"The Commune was the direct opposite of the Empire." "It was a definite *form of such a republic*, which was to eliminate not only the monarchical form of class rule, but also *class rule* itself." The nature of the new type of proletarian State has already been clarified in detail in the chapter "Dictatorship of the Proletariat"above. It is only important to emphasize here that Marx and Engels, having come to the conclusion that it is necessary to break down the bourgeois state machine, concentrate their energies on finding the form of political rule of the proletariat under which the economic emancipation of labor can take place. And it is precisely the Commune, in their opinion, that is "the first attempt of the proletarian revolution *to break*the bourgeois state machine" and "the political form finally discovered, which can and should replace the broken[435]one."

The above-stated views of Marx and Engels on the revolution show us the complete failure of reformism and social-fascism, which try to cover their renegade practice with the name of Marx. They also reveal the degree of falsehood and falsification that the social fascists now resort to when they put forward the theory of the existence of supposedly "two Marxists": the Marx of the 40s and 50s, who strongly approached Blankism, and the Marx of the 70s, who "freed" himself from the utopian illusions of his youth.

To support their "theory", the social fascists refer to the following "documentary" data:

1) to Engels ' preface to the Class Struggle in France,

2) to Marx's speech in The Hague, where Marx expressed the idea of the possibility of non-revolutionary development of England and America in the 1970s.

Lenin subjected this passage of Marx's speech to a special analysis, proving that such a formulation of the question in Marx was quite legitimate and in no way contradicts Marx's general concept of violent revolution in the transition from capitalism to socialism. Lenin explained that Marx was referring to pre-monopoly Britain, when militarism and the military bureaucracy had not yet developed, and when the possibility of revolutionary development had not yet been ruled out. As for Engels ' preface to the Class Struggle in France, the social-fascists are dealing here with a document deliberately distorted by Bernstein. Engels writes about this falsification in a letter to Lafargue (1895) as follows.

"X played a pretty good trick on me. From my introduction to Marx's articles on France 1848-1850. he took everything that could serve him to defend *at all costs the peaceful and anti-violent tactics that he has been* pleased to preach for some time, especially at the moment when exceptional laws are being prepared in Berlin. I recommend this tactic only for *Germany at the present time* , and even then with significant reservations. In France, Belgium, Italy, Austria, this tactic cannot be followed in its entirety, and in Germany it may become unacceptable tomorrow[436]."

Summarizing the views of Marx and Engels on the specific features of the proletarian revolution, we can reduce them to the following most important propositions:

1. *The creative tasks* of the proletarian revolution are of a very special kind, which cannot be compared with all previous revolutions, in particular with the bourgeois revolution. While the bourgeois revolution finds ready-made forms of the capitalist system already in the bowels of feudal society, "the proletarian revolution begins in the absence or almost absence of ready-made forms of the socialist system" *(Stalin)* , requiring a whole *transition period*for the revolutionary transformation of capitalism into socialism.

2. The creative tasks of the proletarian revolution are immeasurably more complex, not only in the sphere of economic reconstruction of society, but also in the sphere *of political* relations — contrary to Kautskyite theory that the proletariat, unlike the bourgeoisie, begins with the democracy already won earlier. While for the bourgeois revolution the mastery of political power is reduced to a change of persons in the organs of political organization, the proletariat is faced with the task of breaking down the bourgeois state machine and *creating a new type of State* .

3. Contrary to the Kautskyite theory that the proletarian revolution is taking place in

435 B. Ленин / Соч., т. XXI — с. 408.

436 Архив Маркса и Энгельса, т. I.

conditions of the rise of bourgeois democracy, when "decisive political battles are fought not with firearms, but by means of electoral ballots,"[437] in conditions of "softened political morals and increased humanity," the proletarian revolution, on the contrary, meets with forms of resistance unprecedented in their cruelty. the parties of the overthrown bourgeoisie are being forced to *adopt resolute violent methods* of suppressing the resistance of the exploiters.

4. In contrast to the bourgeois revolution, which cannot rally the working masses around it in any lasting way, the proletarian revolution represents the long-term interests of the exploited majority of the population, having as its task *to link the masses exploited by capital into a lasting alliance with the proletariat — the hegemon and leader* in the struggle of these masses for emancipation from capitalist oppression.

These are the most important characteristics of the proletarian revolution.

8.4. Lenin's Theory of the Proletarian Revolution as the highest stage in the development of Marx's Theory

The laws of the proletarian revolution were established by Marx and Engels in the conditions of industrial capitalism. The new imperialist stage of the development of capitalism brought with it a number of completely new problems, the solution of which was given by Lenin in his theory of the proletarian revolution, which is a new and higher stage in the development of the theory of revolution of Marx and Engels.

The starting point of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution is the new laws that have emerged in the course of the development of capitalism and which express the transformation of pre-monopoly capitalism with its relatively smooth evolution and "peaceful" spread to the entire globe into monopoly capitalism with its spasmodic catastrophic development, the strengthening and aggravation of uneven development and contradictions of capitalism.

Under imperialism, the contradictions of the intra-capitalist order are reproduced in an ever-increasing number of new antagonisms; the internal contradictions inherent in capitalism from time immemorial *внутреннее* the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat becomes even more acute. The social-fascists accuse Leninism of putting forward the unevenness of capitalist development and the external contradictions of capitalism, while allegedly pushing the internal contradictions into the background[438]. On the other hand, the apologists of capitalism and their sub-voices, represented by the right-wing elements in the Comintern, deny the existence of the same internal contradictions, creating a utopia of organized capitalism. In reality, the external contradictions of capitalism stem from its basic, internal contradictions and aggravate and greatly aggravate the internal contradictions. The era of imperialism creates another contradiction — a contradiction between capitalism as a whole and the country of socialism under construction. And this is a contradiction that " opens up to the roots all the contradictions of capitalism, gathering them into one knot, turning them into a question of life and death of the capitalist order[439] itself."

The new laws inherent in the imperialist stage of the development of capitalism pose *in a new* way all the most important problems of the theory of the proletarian revolution. First of all, the question of maturing conditions for the victory of the proletarian revolution is raised in a new way. Marx's well-known thesis states: "No socio-economic formation perishes before it develops all the productive forces for which it provides sufficient scope." Among the theorists of social-imperialism, one, such as Kunov, pointing out those countries where capitalism is still poorly developed, refers to this thesis of Marx as proof that capitalism still has sufficient scope for its development and that, consequently, the conditions for the destruction of capitalism *are not yet ripe* . Other theorists, such

---

437 К. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории — с. 565.

438 Die Gesellschaft, январь 1929, см. «Критику программы коммунизма».

439 И. Сталин, Политотчёт ЦК ВКП(б) XVI партсъезду.

as Kautsky , in order to justify the proposition that capitalist relations are unshakeable, subject the above thesis of Marx *to limitations*, considering it true in relation to all hitherto existing forms of class society, "with the exception of industrial capitalism alone, and thereby excluding the period of the proletarian revolution[440]."

Kunov applies Marx's thesis about the maturity of the productive forces of capitalism to each *individual* country. Kautsky also proceeds from an isolated consideration of individual countries, and, as is well known, denies that imperialism has the significance of a special stage of capitalism. But the point is that imperialism binds all individual countries, all individual national economies, into *a single chain* called the world economy. This means that the question of whether there is still "scope" for the development of the productive forces must be solved from the perspective of the entire world economy. Then it will turn out that the capitalist framework has long been a barrier to the free development of the productive forces. The imperialist war, *the general* crisis of capitalism that arose during the period of the imperialist war, the first world economic crisis that is now unfolding on the basis of this general crisis*мировой*, the real threat of new imperialist wars, the growing aggressiveness against the U.S.S.R., which has already passed into direct preparation for military intervention, the further growth of fascization of the bourgeois state in the sphere of domestic politics-all these facts are proof of this position. They show that capitalism, for which of course there is not *yet an absolute solution, is not yet fully developed.* the capitalist mode of production no longer corresponds to the state of the productive forces, but seeks a way out in ways that lead to an ever-increasing narrowing of the circle of possibilities of escape. Moreover, when social-fascist theorists talk about the maturity of the productive forces , they "forget" about the maturity of the most important productive force, *the proletariat*, about its growing impoverishment and its rising level of consciousness!

But if the capitalist relations of the world economy have already become fetters for the development of the productive forces, this does not at all mean that their destruction must *begin* precisely in those countries where capitalist relations *are most important.* developed. Due to the fact that imperialism binds individual countries in a single chain, it is not necessary that the degree of maturity of capitalist relations in a given country should correspond exactly to the degree of maturation of contradictions in it and, consequently, the degree of weakness of imperialist forces.

The law of uneven, abrupt development of capitalism under imperialism leads to the weakening of imperialism as a single system of world economy. It leads to the fact that " the world front of imperialism becomes *easily vulnerable* on the part of the revolution, and a breakthrough of this front on the part of individual countries is likely. It is clear that the imperialist front is more easily susceptible to a breakthrough where it is weaker." It follows that the proletarian revolution does not necessarily begin where industry is most developed, where there are so many proletarians and so many peasants, but, as a rule, where *the imperialist front is most vulnerable*, where the links in the chain are weakest.

The presence of weak links in the chain of imperialism creates the conditions for a more rapid and easy breakthrough of the imperialist front. In the weak link of the chain, *it is possible* to break through it. But it does not break itself: *it must be broken* . And in order for a country that must break through the chain of imperialism to be able to do so, "a *certain minimum of industrial development is required." the existence of a certain minimum of the industrial proletariat* , the revolutionary character of the proletariat and the proletarian vanguard in this country, the presence in it of a serious ally of the proletariat (for example, the peasantry) capable of following the proletariat in the decisive struggle against imperialism in this country" *(Stalin)* . In other words, in order to break through the chain at its weakest link, this link must be *medium-weak*from the point of view of the level of industrial development, and a certain state of anti-imperialist forces must still exist in the given country. Of course, the characterization of this state of the anti-imperialist forces cannot be laid down in any scheme: this combination of forces may be different in different countries and at

---

440 К. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории, т. II — с. 621.

different times, and the nearest country, which will have to follow the U.S.S.R. in breaking through the imperialist front, will have such a powerful anti-imperialist force in addition to the conditions of its development, what is the Country of Soviets?

One sometimes meets with the opinion that defining the proletarian revolution as the result of breaking the chain at its weakest point can easily lead to fatalism, because "in this case, in order to determine the country from which the world revolution begins, it would only be necessary to establish this *weakest* country and *only from there*wait for the revolution[441]to begin." The author who expresses this fear therefore suggests the following obviously incorrect formulation:"The world Revolution begins *with the weak* but *imperialist*Powers[442]." It turns out that the author resolutely excludes the possibility of breaking through the chain, for example, in India, etc.As can be seen from the above phrase, the author here replaces the question of a weak link in the chain of imperialism with the question of the weakness of the country that must break through the front. This is the very confusion that Comrade Bukharin makes, and which was deliberately exposed by Comrade Bukharin. By Stalin[443].

Bukharin's thesis stated: "The imperialist chain breaks where the national economic system is weaker", i.e., Bukharin defines here the state of the anti-imperialist forces, whereas in the thesis: "The imperialist chain breaks where it is weaker", we are talking about the weakness of the imperialist forces themselves. The cardinal question of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution, which proceeds from an analysis *of the contradictions* inherent in the forces of imperialism , from the struggle of these contradictions, the crises, wars, etc .it generates, disappears from Bukharin's theory of revolution*исчезает*. In fact, Bukharin takes the same social-democratic position that he objects to, because the starting point in the social-democratic concept is that in analyzing the prerequisites for revolution, they distract from the contradictions of the imperialist system (or rather, they deny these contradictions), reducing the question to the question of the "maturity" of anti-imperialist forces.

The difference between Bukharin's and the social-democratic formulation of the question is only quantitative. If, according to the social-democratic conception, the revolution begins in *the most difficult part of the* According to Bukharin, it begins in the least developed countries.*наименее* industrial countries. If social-democracy establishes a relationship of direct proportion between the speed of the onset of the revolution and the degree of maturity of capitalist relations, then, according to Bukharin, "the speed of the onset of the revolution is inversely proportional to the maturity of capitalist relations[444]." Despite the fundamental "contradiction" of the social-democratic attitude, Bukharin's starting point is the same as that of the social-opportunists. Objecting to Bukharin's postulate, Lenin writes: "Wrong[445]: *medium-weak*." "*Without a certain height of capitalism*, we would not have succeeded." In other words, without a certain minimum of industrial development and the industrial proletariat, which is the hegemon in the revolution, the October Revolution would have been impossible. Bukharin, therefore, also applies to this question the characteristic rejection of the leading role of the proletariat.

Earlier, when we summed up the views of Marx and Engels on the proletarian revolution, we already spoke of the creative tasks that the proletarian revolution is facing in the field of building a

---

441 К. Попов и Я. Резвушкин, О перерастании буржуазно-демократической революции в социалистическую — с. 147.

442 К. Попов и Я. Резвушкин, О перерастании буржуазно-демократической революции в социалистическую — с. 147.

443 И. Сталин, Необходимая поправка.

444 Н. Бухарин, Экономика переходного периода — с. 156.

445 Т. е. неверно, что революция должна начаться в наиболее слабых в промышленном отношении странах. — *Авт* .

new socialist economy. The Mensheviks concealed this crucial point when they tried to convince the masses of the *bourgeois* character of the October Revolution. How did the Mensheviks justify their denial of the proletarian character of the October Revolution? Their main argument was that "Russia has not reached such a height of development of the productive forces at which socialism is possible", that in Russia there is no such *height of development of the productive forces* at which the proletariat could immediately after taking power introduce complete planning of production and distribution processes, complete destruction of market relations, complete destruction of private property for all tools and means of production.

For a Marxist, it is indisputable that "productivity of labor is ultimately the most important thing, the most important thing for the victory of the new social system" *(Lenin)*. . In fact, if the new system were not able to create a higher productivity of labor, it would mean the degradation of society, and no social forces would be able to pull society towards this new system. But if the new system has already created *a higher* productivity of labor, then this means that the old system was not able to create this new, higher productivity of labor. What is the meaning of the Menshevik argument that " Russia has not reached such a height of development of the productive forces that *socialism is possible* ?" (underlined by us. - *Author*).

Criticizing Sukhanov's notes, Lenin defines the argument given from the so-called height of the productive forces as having no decisive significance for the assessment of our revolution. For the Menshevik theorists completely fail to take into account the capabilities of the revolutionary proletariat and the role of its revolutionary consciousness, because nothing can prove that the proletariat, once in power, cannot overtake and overtake the advanced capitalist countries in terms of the height of their productive forces.

Lenin's law of the uneven development of capitalism in the imperialist period makes it necessary to distinguish between the ways and rates of the proletariat's rise to power in different types of countries. In accordance with this, the Comintern program divides all countries according to the nature of the upcoming revolutions into four groups:

1) the countries *of high capitalism* that are immediately facing a socialist revolution;

2) *middle-level countries* capitalism, in which either proletarian revolutions are coming, with a number of associated tasks of a bourgeois-democratic nature, or bourgeois-democratic revolutions that are more or less rapidly developing into socialist ones;

3) *colonial and semi-colonial countries and dependent* countries, in which the transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible only as a result of a whole period of development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one;

4) *even more backward* countries in which a victorious national insurrection opens the way to socialism, bypassing capitalism, provided that the countries of socialism actually support them.

Thus, a considerable number of countries are facing a bourgeois-democratic revolution, which must develop more or less rapidly into a socialist revolution.

This shows a huge *international impact* the significance of Lenin's idea *of the bourgeois-democratic revolution developing into a socialist* one . This idea, developed by Lenin as early as 1905, is one of the forms of implementation of Marx's theory of permanent revolution. Lenin's teaching on the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one is based on:

1) on the doctrine of the role of the hegemon inherent in the proletariat in every popular revolution;

2) on the doctrine of the revolutionary possibilities of the working peasantry.

But the ability of the proletariat to play the role of hegemon, the ability of the working peasantry to play the role of an ally and support of the proletariat in the struggle for the socialist reconstruction of society, are only objectively given *possibilities*for the bourgeois-democratic revolution to develop into a socialist one. As Leninism teaches, a party that organizes the forces of the proletariat and correctly exercises the leadership of the revolutionary movement of the masses is crucial for turning this possibility into reality: "From the democratic revolution," Lenin wrote in 1905, " we will immediately begin to move, and precisely to the extent of our strength, the strength of the class-conscious and organized proletariat, let's start moving on to the socialist revolution."

Lenin's theory of the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one was forged in *a struggle on two fronts* : against the Mensheviks, who denied the possibility of such a development, and against the permanent theory of Trotsky, who covered up his Menshevik essence with a "left" phrase. Through Plekhanov, the Mensheviks declared Lenin's idea of outgrowth to be an "ideological relic" inherited from the era when they adhered to the "subjective method in sociology." The Menshevik theory of the maturity of the conditions for the victory of socialism, the Menshevik ideas about the prerequisites of socialism, which exclude the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Mensheviks ' denial of the transition period, and the belief in the growth of capitalism into socialism — all this pushes the cause of the proletarian revolution back to the unattainable distance of centuries. The logical conclusion from this is the impassable gulf by which the Mensheviks separate the bourgeois revolution from the proletarian revolution and their attitude to the proletarian revolution. For example, the Mensheviks defined the October Revolution as a bourgeois revolution that could not set itself the tasks of socialist reconstruction.

On the other hand, *Trotskyism* , which was also fundamentally hostile to Lenin's theory of outgrowth, covered its counter-revolutionary interior by advertising its "permanentism", which, as already stated above, has nothing in common with Marx's theory of permanent revolution. By denying the hegemony of the proletariat and the revolutionary possibilities of the working peasantry, Trotskyism thereby *denied*the continuity of the revolution. History has already proved that the denial of the hegemony of the proletariat and the revolutionary possibilities of the peasantry, which is the essence of the Trotskyist permanent revolution, has made a major contribution to the arsenal of ideas that Trotskyism is now presenting to the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, leading its struggle against the Soviet state. History has proved that Lenin's theory of outgrowth, translated into reality, has already given the proletariat victory.

This serves as irrefutable proof of the entire falsity of the Trotskyist legend about the alleged "rearmament" of Leninism that took place in October. This is a decisive blow to the fabrications of the Trotskyist smugglers (the Slutskys, Voloseviches, and others), who are fueling the long-exposed propaganda. Stalin's Trotskyist theory of dissecting Leninism into "pre-war Leninism,' old 'Leninism,' bad 'Leninism... and new, post-war, October Leninism, which they expect to adapt to the demands of Trotskyism" *(Stalin)* . The characteristic form of expression of this Trotskyist theory of dissecting Leninism is the statement that has penetrated our literature[446], thanks to the rotten liberalism towards Trotskyism on the part of some members of our party, that Lenin in the period before the war did not understand the necessity of developing the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one.

Marx and Lenin's doctrine of permanent revolution is based on a dialectical understanding of the unity of continuity and discontinuity, and on the study of the process *of development* revolutions through a number of qualitatively different objective-historical stages. Trotsky's theory, on the other hand, is not a theory of continuous revolution, but a subjectivist theory of "jumping over" incomplete stages of movement, a theory that excludes continuity. It consists "in *a logical* (not material) *leap* in a *few* specific stages" *(Lenin)*. This is also reflected in his infamous slogan: "Without a tsar, but a working government!"

Exceptional attention to transitions and overflows forms the most characteristic feature of Lenin's revolutionary strategy. The transition is the moment in development when the old qualitative stage is exhausted, developing into a new one, where continuity passes into its opposite, into *a break in continuity* . Kamenev also discovered a misunderstanding of this dialectic when, in 1917, he reproached Lenin for jumping over the line, claiming that the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia was not yet finished.

Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution includes the doctrine of *the hegemony of the proletariat* and the doctrine of the working peasantry as an ally of the proletariat in its struggle for socialism. "Marx and Engels gave the basic outline of the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat.

---

446 См. «Историю ВКП(б)» под ред. Е. Ярославского, работы К. А. Попова и др.

What is new in Lenin's work here is that *he*further developed and expanded these sketches into a coherent system of leadership of the proletariat by the working masses of the city and countryside, not only in the overthrow of tsarism and capitalism, but also in the construction of socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat[447]."

Imperialism has divided the world into two camps: the "advanced" countries that are a minority and possess financial capital that serves as an instrument of oppression and exploitation of the majority of the world's population, and the colonial and dependent countries that form the overwhelming majority and are the object of oppression and exploitation by the imperialist Powers. In Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution, this fact serves as a starting point for justifying *the role of the national-colonial liberation movement* as the most important reserve of the proletarian revolution. "The socialist revolution," Lenin teaches, "will not be *solely and* mainly a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their own bourgeoisie; no, it will be a struggle *of all* the colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism against *international imperialism*."

At the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin developed the following basic ideas:

1) the proposition that the peoples of the world are divided into oppressive and oppressed, which is hushed up or directly denied by the theorists of the Second International;

2) that the central axis of the whole system of imperialist contradictions is antagonism and the struggle between a small group of imperialist States for domination over the colonial peoples.

Already Marx and Engels "gave the basic starting points on the national-colonial question", describing the economic and social crisis in the colonies as a manifestation of the general crisis of the entire capitalist system. Lenin further develops these basic starting points of Marx and Engels on the national-colonial question into a coherent system of Bolshevik views on national-colonial revolutions in the era of imperialism. In his speech at the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin said that "in the present world situation, after the imperialist war... the entire world system of states is determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia", that "every nationalist movement can only be bourgeois-democratic", and that "it would be utopian to think that proletarian parties, if they can arise at all in such countries, will be able to carry out communist tactics and policies in these countries without being in definite relations with the peasant movement, without actually supporting it." Communists must and will continue to support bourgeois liberation movements, insofar as these movements are truly revolutionary and "when their representatives do not prevent us from educating and organizing the peasantry and the broad masses of the exploited in a revolutionary spirit."

Drawing on the experience of the October Revolution, Lenin establishes those organizational forms that can ensure the leading role of the proletariat in the national revolutionary movement and the conquest of the oppressed masses of the colonies under the banner of the world revolution. The *formation of soviets in backward countries is also such an organizational form*: "It is the absolute duty of the communist parties and those elements that are affiliated with them to propagate the idea of peasant soviets, workers' soviets, everywhere and everywhere — both in backward countries and in the colonies. And there they should try, as far as conditions allow, to create councils of the working people[448]." Finally, starting from the fact that capitalism was decaying in the imperialist era, from the development of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, and from the possibility of direct assistance to the socialist movement of the colonies from the proletariat that has won in the capitalist countries, Lenin puts forward his well-known thesis: "The Communist International must establish and theoretically justify the position that with the help of the proletariat of the most advanced countries backward countries can pass to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of development, to communism, *bypassing the capitalist stage of development* »[449]."

---

447 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 331.

448 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVII — с. 277.

449 В. Ленин, Речь на II конгрессе Коминтерна. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

Another crucial issue in which Marx's theory of the proletarian revolution is further developed is the ingenious *doctrine of the Proletarian revolution.* Lenin *on the Party of the proletariat and its role* at various stages of its struggle. Even at the very beginning of Bolshevism, the question of the party as the highest form of class organization of the proletariat and of the organizational conditions of its combat effectiveness becomes a problem that draws a sharp dividing line between Bolshevism and Menshevism. Lenin's statement at that time of the question of the party as the decisive factor in the revolution proved, as is proved by the whole subsequent history of the revolutionary struggle, to be a most brilliant foresight. The question "on the role of the Communist Party in the proletarian revolution" was therefore the central question of the Second Congress of the Comintern. Lenin's doctrine of the party was further refined here by recognizing that "the working class needs the Communist Party not only before and during the conquest of power, *but also after power has passed into the hands of the working class*" (emphasis added). - *Author*), that the need for a political party of the proletariat disappears only with the complete abolition of classes and that "*in every country there must exist only one unified communist party* »[450]."

In the course of the Comintern's subsequent struggle for a world proletarian revolution, the general principles of Lenin's doctrine of the party are concretized mainly in two directions: in the development of Lenin's principle *of self-criticism* , in the question of concrete forms *of struggle on two fronts* at various stages, and in *the struggle for the masses* . This two-sided process of struggle to forge truly Bolshevik parties forms the main content of the entire history of the Comintern.

The Sixth Congress of the Comintern, whose decisions are directed with sharp edge against social-democracy, as imperialist agents in the working class are particularly dangerous in the present international situation, emphasized the special relevance of the slogan "struggle for the masses" and summed up the struggle that has passed in the following statement, expressed in the Comintern program: *tactics of the united front* as a means of the most successful struggle against capital the class mobilization of the masses, the exposure and isolation of the reformist leaders — this is an essential part of the tactics of the Communist *Parties for the entire pre-revolutionary period* .

8.5. Lenin's Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution

Leninism is further responsible for the elaboration of the question of *how* the party should lead the proletariat and its allies in the revolution, the elaboration of problems *of strategic and tactical leadership,* and the creation of a science of strategy and tactics for the revolution.

The strategy of the proletarian revolution aims at overthrowing the enemy. To this latter, therefore, corresponds the highest form of struggle against the enemy — the form *of armed insurrection* . This is the decisive and most crucial moment in the course of the revolutionary struggle. Lenin therefore elaborates the problem of insurrection in the most thorough and detailed manner, down to the smallest details of the technique of armed insurrection. In spite of the opportunist theories that the preparation of an insurrection is "blankism," Lenin remains faithful to Marx's dictum that "insurrection is an art," that insurrection must be treated as an art by preparing and organizing an insurrection, learning the art of war, and learning the technique of insurrection. Lenin directly suggests putting reports on military topics in circles:

"1) reading and discussing articles about the barricade struggle;

2) study of the city and district plan;

3) obtain prison plans;

4) find out the addresses of malicious people and superiors;

5) perform enemy tracking maneuvers;

6) prepare bombs;

---

450 Резолюция о роли коммунистической партии в пролетарской революции, т. IX.

7) draw up tactical plans for individual operations[451]."

Starting in the capital and in major urban centers, the insurrection spreads more or less rapidly to other urban areas and to the countryside, developing into a more or less prolonged *civil war,* the successful outcome of which is determined by the extent to which the party manages to gain the support of the main force of the revolution — the proletariat and correctly use its reserves among the broad working masses. Here lies the fundamental difference between Marxism and Blanquism on the question of insurrection. An insurrection "must be based not on a conspiracy, not on a party, but on the advanced class" - this is the most important law of Lenin's strategy.

The success of a revolution is determined *by the totality of objective and subjective factors* :

1) the degree of aggravation of the contradictions of capitalism in a given place and at a given time;

2) the degree to which the revolutionary class is aware of these contradictions;

3) the degree to which the broadest masses of the working people are aware of these contradictions;

4) the degree of organization of the revolutionary class and its connection with the masses of the working people;

5) the level of combat capability of the proletarian vanguard;

6) the state of the ruling class — its ability to temporarily mitigate contradictions, the degree of its ideological influence on the exploited classes, the degree of its disorganization.

The current *revolutionary crisis*in a number of countries is characterized by the discrepancy between the objective and subjective factors, the lag of the subjective factor from the objective. This does not mean that this lag of the subjective factor can be regarded as a certain necessary stage of the revolutionary process.

Revolution, according to Lenin's teaching, is impossible without *a revolutionary situation* . According to Lenin, the revolutionary situation is determined by the following characteristics:

1. "This or that crisis of the 'upper classes', the crisis of the politics of the ruling class."

2. " The need and distress of the oppressed classes are becoming more acute than usual."

3. "A significant increase in the activity of the masses, due to the reasons indicated, who in a" peaceful " era allow themselves to be robbed calmly, but in a turbulent time are attracted both by the whole situation of the crisis and by the "upper classes" themselves to independent historical action[452]."

It is quite clear that the revolutionary situation here is not considered by Lenin in the sense of a *stage* preceding the revolution. The revolutionary situation is "the totality of those objective changes""which, combined with the subjective factor, give a revolution. Lenin considers it possible to characterize the existence of a *certain state of economic and political* crisis as a revolutionary situation. The attempt to contrast *a political* crisis *with a revolutionary*crisis expresses schematism alien to Leninist dialectics, a desire hostile to Leninism to avoid a concrete analysis of the given situation.

While warning against any schemes, Lenin's strategy requires taking into account a specific balance of forces, while relying on the following most important strategic principles:

1) "never play with an insurrection, but when starting it, know firmly that it is necessary to go to the end"[453];

2) "the concentration of the main forces of the revolution at a decisive moment on the point most vulnerable to the enemy, when the revolution is already ripe, when the offensive is going at full speed, when the insurrection is knocking at the door, and when drawing up reserves to the

---

451 Ленинский сборник — с. 456.

452 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVIII — с. 214.

453 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIV, ч. 2.

vanguard is a decisive condition for success"[454];

3) carefully monitor the brewing of a revolutionary crisis, timing the moment of opening the insurrection to the highest point of the crisis, "violation of this condition leads to a dangerous mistake called "loss of pace""[455];

4) "once an insurrection has been started, we must act with the greatest determination" *(Lenin)* .Violation of this condition leads to a huge mistake... "loss of course" *(Stalin)*.

These are the most important principles of Lenin's strategy of revolution.

Let us briefly consider the most important propositions of Lenin*'s tactics* revolutions.

Tactics should help to draw the masses to revolutionary positions. If there is a revolutionary upsurge, the tactical line is determined by the task of leading the masses into a direct attack on the bourgeois state. This task corresponds to a number *of escalating transitional slogans* and the organization *of mass demonstrations* . In the absence of a revolutionary upsurge, the tactics *of partial demands*and slogans are applied, moreover, subordinated to the fundamental tasks of the Communist International and linked to them.

Of course, this does not mean that partial and transitional slogans represent sharply delineated areas. The metaphysical juxtaposition of these two types of slogans would lead to major errors in practice. In the conditions of a revolutionary upsurge that has not yet reached a sufficient scale, a complete rejection of partial demands could make it difficult to bring millions of people to the front of the revolution, and, on the contrary, it could help to preserve partial slogans and prevent timely detection of the transition to a new band — the band of revolutionary upsurge with new tactics corresponding to it. "The fundamental rejection of partial demands and transitional slogans is incompatible with the tactical principles of communism, for it actually condemns the party to passivity and separates it from the masses[456]." But the more complete the scope of the revolutionary upsurge, the less ground remains for partial slogans, and the more imperiously do the increasingly acute transitional slogans come to replace them, even to the point of disarming the bourgeoisie and arming the proletariat, etc. Thus, tactics change depending on whether there is a rise in movement or not.

But in the course of a revolution, there are also moments when the movement ebbs and flows, when the revolutionary upsurge gives way to a decline, which necessarily corresponds to other slogans and other forms of organization that differ from the organizational forms of the upsurge period. For example, the tactics of the period 1903-1905 were offensive tactics, and in the period 1907-1912 the party was forced *to adopt retreat* tactics, although the strategic plan remained unchanged during both periods. *Within the limits of a given strategic plan, tactics can change depending on a given situation, on a given balance of forces, being subordinated to the main strategic goal of a given stage of the revolution.* Tactics thus refer to strategy as part of the whole. The most important condition for proper tactical leadership is the ability to find the main decisive *link* .

To find the main link of a given stage of the revolution means to find the main decisive element, that which all the problems put forward by this stage rest on, and to which all these problems are reduced as their basis. The link acts as *a general one* conditions for solving all other problems, it concentrates all *the originality* the stage.

The principle underlying Lenin's tactics of finding *a link*as the most important prerequisite for correct slogans of the revolutionary struggle easily reveals the deeply principled basis of the tactics of short flights or flights characteristic of opportunism. Based on a correct understanding of this Leninist tactic, the Comintern has waged and is now waging a struggle on two fronts — with the right and with the "left" opportunists.

---

454 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 70.

455 И. Сталин, Вопросы ленинизма — с. 71.

456 Программа Коминтерна.

Opportunists on the" left", when they borrow a particular revolutionary slogan from the party, always show excessive haste, so that if this slogan is successful, they will appear to "the inexperienced and inexperienced as the most far-sighted, who said it" first", as having mastered"long-range tactics"." Opportunism on the right, while also borrowing one or another revolutionary slogan from the party, always seeks to preserve it, and resists the transition from an old slogan that has already become obsolete to a new one, so that if this slogan fails, it will also appear to the inexperienced and inexperienced working masses as the most far-sighted prophets.

The usual *backwardness for opportunism* or *running away, a short-flying tactic* or *flights* it consists precisely in a lack of understanding of the link, i.e., in a lack of understanding of the essential, main, and decisive element. The effectiveness of the slogans put forward by the revolution is determined, firstly, by their correctness, and secondly, by their timely proclamation.

We have seen that the correctness of slogans is determined by finding the main link. As for the timeliness of putting forward a slogan, Lenin's tactics oblige us to take into account the truth that "propaganda and agitation alone are not sufficient for the political education of the vast masses, and that this requires *the masses' own political experience* »[457]." Ignoring this most important tactical principle leads to a dangerous confusion of the formula as *a prospect* for the near future with the same formula as *the slogan of the day* . Leninism's tactical instruction on the strict distinction between a formula as a perspective and a formula as a slogan of the day is now becoming particularly important in the tactical line of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries. Here, the fate of tactical leadership is decided precisely by a timely transition from the formula of perspective to the slogan of the day.

Chapter 9. Marxism, Revisionism, and Social Fascism

9.1. Socio-economic roots and historical evolution of opportunism towards Social fascism

The main obstacle on the path of the proletariat to the conquest of power and victory over capital is now social-fascism and the existence of large social-democratic parties — "bourgeois workers 'parties" - which still have a great influence on the working masses. International social-democracy, the Second International and its sections are *the main social pillar*of bourgeois rule; international social-democracy has become an agent of the international bourgeoisie to prepare for intervention against the world's first proletarian state.

The Second International has never been a single whole. From the very beginning of its formation, two tendencies, two trends, fought in it: *the revolutionary and the opportunist* . "In fact, however, *the main* work of the Second International was carried out along the line of opportunism" *(Stalin)* .

Almost from the very beginning of its existence (in the 1940s), opportunism in the working-class movement received its theoretical expression in the revision (revision) of all the most important components of Marx's teaching by a number of social-democratic theorists — *revisionism* . At the end of the nineteenth century, "a whole period of undivided domination of the opportunism of the Second International" was revealed *(Stalin)* .

Lenin gave the most in-depth analysis of the historical causes of the development of revisionism and its social basis. "It is not surprising," Lenin wrote in 1908, " that Marx's teaching, which directly serves to enlighten and organize the advanced class of modern society, points out the tasks of this class and proves the inevitable replacement of the modern system by new orders due to economic development; it is not surprising that this teaching had to take every step of its life from the battlefield paths… But even among the doctrines connected with the struggle of the working

457 И. Сталин, Заметки на современные темы.

class, which were spread mainly among the proletariat, Marxism did not immediately consolidate its position. For the first half-century of its existence (since the 1940s), Marxism struggled with theories that were *fundamentally hostile to it* … But when Marxism *has supplanted* all the doctrines that are in any way integral and hostile to it (from the ideology of the working-class movement. - *Auth.*), then the tendencies that were expressed in these teachings began to look for other ways. The form and occasion of the fight changed, but the fight continued. And the second half-century of Marxism's existence began (in the 90s of the last century) *with the struggle of a current hostile to Marxism within Marxism* ." "Pre-Marxist socialism is broken," Lenin concludes. - It continues the struggle no longer on its own independent ground, but *on the general ground of Marxism* as *revisionism* »[458]." The dialectic of history is such, as Lenin notes elsewhere, that " the theoretical *victory* of Marxism forces its enemies to *disguise themselves as Marxists* . Internally rotten liberalism is trying to revive itself in the form of socialist opportunism[459]."

Revisionism thus represented *the alien and hostile* Marxism is a trend that sought *to undermine Marxism from within* , and for this purpose acted "on the common ground of Marxism", i.e., in the form of external Marxist phraseology. The more *побеждал*Marxism defeated all other ideological trends in the working-class movement and became more firmly established in the minds of the working class, the more necessary it became for groups hostile to Marxism, but wishing to influence the proletariat, this fake, mimicry "under Marxism", whose task was, however, to carry through views hostile to the revolutionary proletarian movement under the banner of Marxism.

It is quite obvious that Revisionism's hostility to truly revolutionary Marxism was due to its *class* basis, which was alien to the proletariat. It was not for nothing that Lenin saw in opportunism the same "internally rotten liberalism"; it was not for nothing that he noted that all the revisionists ' objections to Marxism were reduced to a system of "long-known *liberal-bourgeois* views." "The inevitability of revisionism,"he pointed out," is determined by its *class roots*in modern society[460]." Lenin saw these class roots of revisionism in the inevitable penetration *of the petty bourgeoisie into the working-class movement* , which took place at all stages of the development of capitalism and in all countries and transformed Revisionism into an international phenomenon.

"What," Lenin asked, " is its *inevitability* in capitalist society? Why is it deeper than the differences in national characteristics and degrees of development of capitalism? Because in every capitalist country there are always broad strata *of the petty bourgeoisie* , the small proprietors, standing side by side with the proletariat. Capitalism was born and is constantly being born out of small-scale production. A whole number of "middle strata" are inevitably created again by capitalism (an appendage of the factory, work at home, small workshops scattered throughout the country, due to the requirements of large-scale industries, such as bicycle and automobile manufacturing, etc.). These new small producers are also inevitably *thrown back into the ranks of the proletariat* . It is quite natural that *the petty-bourgeois worldview* again and again it breaks through in the ranks of the broad workers ' parties[461]."

The petty-bourgeois essence of opportunism found its expression in its defense of class cooperation, in its renunciation of the idea of a socialist revolution and of revolutionary methods of struggle. Lenin considered the main characteristic of opportunism to be " adaptation to bourgeois *nationalism* , forgetting the historical transitory borders of nationalities or the fatherland, turning into a fetish of bourgeois *legality* , *renouncing the class point of view and the class struggle*for fear of alienating the broad masses of the population (read: petty — bourgeois) — these, Lenin noted,

---

458 В. Ленин, Марксизм и ревизионизм. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

459 В. Ленин, Исторические судьбы учения К. Маркса. Подчёркнуто нами. — *Авт* .

460 В. Ленин, Марксизм и ревизионизм.

461 В. Ленин, Марксизм и ревизионизм.

are the ideological foundations of opportunism[462]."

The same petty-bourgeois characteristic of opportunism was its vagueness, vagueness, and elusiveness of its positions. "The opportunist," Lenin said, " by his very nature always evades a definite, irrevocable formulation of the question, seeks out resultants, and winds his way between points of view that exclude one another. He tries to "agree" with both sides, reducing his differences to corrections and doubts, to good innocent wishes, etc[463]."

Lenin saw another historical reason for the development of opportunism and revisionism in the process *of bourgeoisization of certain strata of the proletariat*, a process especially characteristic of the imperialist era, when the bourgeoisie has the opportunity to use its *super-profits* bribe the labor aristocracy and trade union bureaucracy. This bourgeoisization of a part of the proletariat led to the direct penetration of bourgeois ideology into its ranks *буржуазной идеологии*, although the latter often took external "Marxist" forms. The closer the connection between the opportunist elite of social-democracy and bourgeois society and the state became since the imperialist war and throughout the entire post-war period, the more and more openly bourgeois was expressed in the theoretical views of social-democracy.*откровенно-буржуазное* worldview: revisionism has turned into social fascism.

The historical cradle of opportunism is England. In England, earlier than in other countries, capitalism had at its disposal, thanks to its monopoly position, super-profits for bribing and corrupting the workers. That is why in England, earlier than in other countries, a privileged stratum of the working-class aristocracy was created, a privileged stratum of working-class leaders bribed by the bourgeoisie. Back in 1858. Engels wrote to Marx on the subject of English opportunism: "The English proletariat is actually *becoming bourgeois* , so that the most bourgeois of all nations seems to want in the end to have a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat side by side with the bourgeoisie."

This bourgeoisization of the English working-class aristocracy found its expression in *trade unionism* , in the desire to separate the trade union movement and the economic struggle of the proletariat from the political struggle, from the struggle for socialism. English socialism found its theoretical expression only in the so-called Fabianism — a reformist intellectual group that professed Spencer's evolutionary positivism and Christian " socialism." Today, the process of gradual merging of the working-class aristocracy and the trade union bureaucracy in England with the bourgeois state has been completed, expressed in the openly bourgeois policy of the English "workers '" party, in the preaching of "constructive" socialism by the MacDonalds, Hendersons and Thomases.

In Germany, already in the second half of the 60s and the first half of the 70s, there was a fierce struggle between Lassallians and Eisenachians. Lassalle's supporters and followers defended compromise with the ruling classes for the sake of individual political handouts, and the Eisenachites were in the position of an irreconcilable class struggle. Only after the victory of Marxism over Lassallianism and other ideological trends within the German working-class movement (over Mulberger's Proudhonism and Duhring's positivism) do these trends, which are class-alien to the proletariat, begin to appear in "Marxist" garb. Former Marxist Ed. Bernstein led this movement in the 90s and gave it its name, calling *for an audit* theoretical foundations of Marx's teaching.

In philosophy, revisionism came out against materialism, calling for a return to Kant, and against dialectics, replacing it with eclecticism and philistine sophistry. "Dialectic," Bernstein declared, " is a traitor, an ambush on the way to a correct judgment of things." Bernstein and his followers denied the possibility of providing a scientific basis for socialism, denied the superiority of large-scale production over small-scale production, especially in agriculture, and proved that small producers could survive even under capitalism. They also denied the inevitability of the

462 B. Ленин / Соч., изд. 2-е, т. XVIII — с. 67.

463 B. Ленин / Соч., изд. 2-е, т. VI — с. 304.

collapse of capitalism and the role of economic crises, and denied the growing impoverishment of the working class. Revisionism was particularly strongly opposed to the theory of class struggle, which is unthinkable and unnecessary in a democratic society. In 1898, in his Problems of Socialism, Bernstein wrote: "It is necessary that social-democracy should have enough courage to get rid of the outdated phraseology and appear to be what it really is, i.e., *a democratic-socialist reform party* . What is social democracy today but a party that strives to transform society in the spirit of our teaching through democratic and economic reforms[464]?"

Throughout the entire pre-war period, "Bernsteinism" was most widely developed in German social-democracy in the form of an outspoken reformist right wing led by Vollmar, David, and others.

9.2. Kautskyite Centrism and Luxemburgianism

Along with the openly revisionist trend, intermediate groups are also emerging in German and international social-democracy, such as Kautskyite centrism and Luxemburgianism (the"left" wing of social-democracy).

Karl Kautsky — the most prominent theoretician of modern German and international social-democracy, has never held strictly consistent positions of orthodox revolutionary Marxism. Even Marx in one of his letters scoffed at Kautsky's philosophical narrowness, and Lenin already in 1901 noted the "rubber" nature of his formulations. When Lenin examines Kautsky's perversion and suppression of the Marxist doctrine of the State in The State and Revolution, and for this purpose traces Kautsky's early and even best works, he vividly shows how Kautsky's entire unprincipled opportunism grew out of all this sum of errors, omissions and omissions. Similarly, very early on we find Kautsky attempting to reconcile Marxism with Kantianism and Machism, to introduce into Marxism the bourgeois theory of equilibrium and the adaptation of society to nature, Kautsky's biological understanding of social instincts, and many other major perversions of dialectical and historical materialism. The polemic that Kautsky, as a representative of the Social-Democratic "orthodoxy", was forced to start with Bernstein after much hesitation was of an essentially helpless and conciliatory nature, and Kautsky himself was slipping into Bernstein's position on a number of fundamental issues (in assessing dialectics, in denying the impoverishment of the proletariat, etc.). Kautsky and in his assessment of the discussion between the Russian Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in 1903-1904. During the 1905 revolution, Kautsky, under pressure from the "left" Social Democrats, came somewhat closer to the Bolshevik assessment of the driving forces and prospects of the Russian revolution, taking a more correct position than Plekhanov. However, during the period of reaction that followed, Kautsky once again adopted a wavering semi-Menshevik line, ostensibly striving to rise above both the right and left social-Democrats and reconcile both, while in practice supporting the opportunists in Germany and the Menshevik liquidators in Russia. By this time, *the centrist* current in German social-democracy (Kautsky, Ledebur, Haase, and others) was finally taking shape, characterized by its theoretical and political eclecticism, fluctuating between right and left social-democrats, and in essence being a special kind of Menshevism, a current even more dangerous than outright opportunism because of its" Marxist " phraseology. It should be noted here that centrism was a phenomenon characteristic not only of Germany, but also acquired *an international*character: in particular, Trotskyism was nothing more than one of the Russian varieties of centrism.

The so-called left held a special place in pre-war German social democracy and in the international labor movement*левые* social Democrats (R. Luxemburg, F. Mehring, etc.). The left social Democrats were distinguished by a greater understanding of the revolutionary prospects of the working-class movement: the position of the left social Democrats during the German revolution, when they joined the German communist movement, was of a revolutionary nature.

464 Э. Бернштейн, Социальные проблемы — с. 272.

However, considering Rosa Luxemburg an "eagle" among the social-democratic "chickens", Lenin severely criticized numerous *opportunist mistakes* Roses and other German "leftists". In his Accumulation of Capital, R. Luxemburg openly reviews the very foundations of the Marxist doctrine of capitalist reproduction and gives a completely incorrect characterization of imperialism. R. Luxemburg took a distinctly Menshevik position in her assessment of the organizational dispute between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, failing to understand the dialectical relationship between spontaneity and consciousness in the working-class movement and defending the Menshevik theory of spontaneity. During the revolution of 1905 Rosa did not understand its bourgeois-democratic character under the hegemony of the proletariat, and in her assessment of the role of the peasantry and the attitude of the proletariat towards it, she took a line close to Trotskyism. Rosa Luxemburg's views on the national question were fundamentally opposed to Lenin's principle of the "right of nations to self-determination" and led to actual support for the positions of the worst liquidators and bourgeois national liberals. Rosa's criticism of the Bolshevik policy after the October Revolution was also clearly opportunistic. While paying tribute to the revolutionary merits of R. Luxemburg, it would therefore be completely wrong *to identify "Luxemburgianism" with Bolshevism* to see in "Luxemburgianism" the germs of future German Bolshevism, and to gloss over all these opportunist perversions of the Rose.

As T. has so convincingly shown. Stalin, such attempts, as well as the claims that Lenin did not fight Kautskyite centrism and Luxemburgianism before the war, constitute Trotskyist contraband, Trotskyist slander of Lenin and Leninism[465]. The left social-Democrats were very close to Trotskyism in the theoretical foundations of their views and in a number of important political questions *троцкизму.*

The methodological foundations of Luxemburgianism were *mechanismismand idealism* . Although Rosa Luxemburg paid lip service to revolutionary dialectics, she gave it a mechanistic and subjectivist interpretation and application. 3, 13), that in revising Marx's theory of expanded capitalist production, Rosa considered it necessary to proceed from an explanation of capital accumulation that was not based *on internal factors.* laws of capitalist production, and from *external factors* relations between capitalism and the non-capitalist environment. "Accumulation," wrote Rosa Luxemburg, "is not only an internal relationship between the branches of capitalist economy; it is primarily a relationship between capital and the non — capitalist *environment*." ... In capital accumulation, Rosa Luxemburg saw "the process of exchange of substances between capitalist and pre-capitalist modes of production", believing that without the realization of capitalist surplus value through the medium of "third parties". the very existence of capitalism is unthinkable. Capitalism, according to Rosa, lives on the ruin of these pre-capitalist formations: it "cannot exist without other economic forms as *a medium and a nutritious soil."* "By destroying small-scale commodity production in backward countries, colonies, etc., capitalism automatically prepares its own destruction! From this *mechanistic* attitude of Rosa Luxemburg came, first of all, her idea of *the automatic collapse of capitalism, which separates economic development from the political struggle*, and which becomes possible as soon as it destroys its "breeding ground". This further led to Rosa's Menshevik underestimation of the revolutionary possibilities of the peasantry and the possibilities of its non-capitalist development. The same theory of capital accumulation was also associated with its erroneous understanding of imperialism as a political expression of the competitive struggle of capitalists for the remnants of the still undivided "non-capitalist world environment".

Rosa seeks to replace the basic contradiction of capitalism - between social production and private appropriation-with "a profound *basic contradiction between the productive and consumptive capacity*of capitalist society[466]." Rosa forgets here that consumption is entirely determined *by production* . By promoting the consumption of non-capitalist strata as the main lever for the

---

465 См. И. Сталин, О некоторых вопросах истории большевизма.

466 Р. Люксембург, Накопление капитала / 1921 — с. 242, 259, 297, 336.

development of capitalist production, it slips into the position of historical *idealism* . This idealism, as a characteristic feature of R. Luxemburg's methodology, was also noted by Lenin in his polemic with her on the national question. Lenin emphasized *the subjectivist, sophistical* character of Rosa's dialectic and her arguments about the inevitability of turning a national war into an imperialist war. "Only a sophist," wrote Lenin, " could have discovered the difference between an imperialist war and a national war on the ground that one *might* turn into the other. Dialectic has more than once served as a bridge to *sophistry* ." And in another place he pointed out to Rose: "We must proceed from *the objective* , we must take the relationship of classes on this point. By not doing this, Rosa Luxemburg falls into the very sin *of metaphysics, abstractness, generality* , bluntness, etc., of which she vainly tries to accuse her opponents[467]."

Thus it is obvious that the most mechanistic, abstract, subjectivist methodology of Luxemburgianism was fundamentally opposed to the materialist dialectic of Leninism and was severely criticized by Lenin.

The situation is no better with the statement that Lenin allegedly did not fight Kautsky's pre-war centrism. Lenin also gives us positive references to Kautsky, which relate mainly to the period of the 1905 Revolution. But this positive assessment of Kautsky by Lenin took place only when and to the extent that Kautsky himself, in certain periods, approached the *Bolshevik*understanding of the Russian revolution. At the same time, in a whole series of pre-war speeches, Lenin sharply criticized Kautsky as soon as the latter showed his characteristic vacillations and his Menshevism. Thus, as early as 1905, Lenin, in a letter to Bebel, criticized Kautsky's Menshevik position in his assessment of the differences on the organizational question between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, pointing out that Kautsky was trying to "weaken the pace of formal organization, i.e., organization in general." Lenin criticizes Kautsky's Menshevik position on the slogan of a " provisional revolutionary government." In another instance, Lenin notes the "confusion" of Kautsky, who "came to terms with monstrous things" by admitting, together with the Russian liquidators, that "the party is dead," etc[468]. Therefore, the position of those Menshevik idealists who tried to draw a sharp line between the "two Kautskys" — the pre-war and post-war-is profoundly erroneous. Such statements only add water to the Trotskyist mill (Korsh et al.). The latter also try to identify pre-war Bolshevism with centrism and thereby support the version of Lenin's "rearmament"!

The only consistent exponent of the Marx — Engels revolutionary traditions and their successor was Russian *Bolshevism* in the person of Lenin. Lenin took the lead in the struggle against international revisionism, and even in the depths of the Second International he waged a relentless struggle with *all* its shades and varieties (Bernsteinism, Kautskyism, Luxemburgianism, Trotskyism, Russian Menshevism, etc.), and constantly pursued the line *of splitting* with opportunism and centrism, of breaking away from it the best elements of the working-class movement. This is the most important *international significance of Bolshevism* as a direct continuation of the revolutionary communism of Marx and Engels.

9.3. Opportunism in Russian social-democracy. Trotskyism in the pre-revolutionary period

In his well-known letter to the editorial board of the journal Proletarian Revolution, Comrade Stalin emphasized the enormous *international significance of Bolshevism* and the struggle that Lenin waged in the Second International against *all* varieties of opportunism and its theoretical expression in the revision of Marxism. In this sense, the struggle that Bolshevism was forced to wage against opportunism within the pre-war Russian social-democracy also played an extremely

467 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 439; В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIX — с. 115.

468 Ленинский сборник V — с. 179; В. Ленин / Соч., т. XII, ч. 2 — с. 288.

important role in the development of the entire international working-class movement and its theoretical foundations*российской*. Because the questions *of the Russian* revolution were at the same time questions of the *world Revolution* revolutions *(Stalin)* .

"In Russian social-democracy," Lenin notes, " revisionism *is from the very beginning* the mass workers ' and mass social-democratic movement of 1895-1896 *had an influence* ... "Economism" of 1895-1902, Menshevism of 1903-1908, Liquidationism of 1908-1914 are nothing but a Russian form or variety of opportunism and revisionism[469]." Elsewhere, Lenin describes in the following words the most important stages of this struggle between Bolshevism and opportunism in Russia.

"Economism" was an opportunist trend in Russian social-democracy, its political essence being reduced to a program: "economic struggle for the workers, political struggle for the liberals." Its main theoretical support was the so-called "legal Marxism" or "Struvism", which "recognized" a "Marxism" completely cleansed of frenzied revolutionism and adapted to *the needs of the liberal bourgeoisie* … The old Iskra (1900-1903) carried out a victorious struggle against "economism" in the name of the principles of revolutionary social-democracy....

The epoch of the bourgeois-democratic revolution gave rise *to a new* struggle of social-democratic trends, which was *a direct continuation of the previous* one . "Economism" was transformed into " Menshevism." In the turbulent years 1905-1907, Menshevism was an opportunist movement supported by the liberal bourgeoisie and which carried *out liberal-bourgeois tendencies in the working-class movement* . Adapting the struggle of the working class to *the liberals*-that was its essence. On the contrary, Bolshevism set "the task of the social-democratic *workers* to rouse the democratic peasantry to the revolutionary struggle."*крестьянство* despite the vacillations and betrayals of liberalism."

The epoch of reaction, in an entirely *new* form, has again placed on the agenda the question of the opportunist and revolutionary tactics of social-democracy. The main channel of Menshevism, despite the protests of many of its best representatives, gave rise to a current *of liquidators*, renouncing the struggle for a new revolution in Russia, renouncing illegal organization and work, and scornful ridicule of the "underground", the slogan of the republic, etc. " Defending loyalty to the revolutionary precepts of the party, supporting the beginning of the rise of the working-class movement (after the events of 1912). especially), by creating legal and illegal organizations, the press and agitation, the Pravdists rallied the overwhelming majority of the class-conscious working class around them, while the liquidators, acting as a political force exclusively in the person of the Nasha Zarya group, relied on the comprehensive assistance *of liberal-bourgeois elements* »[470]."

But apart from the struggle of Bolshevism against outright opportunism, "Lenin points out,"Bolshevism has grown, developed and hardened in the long struggle against *petty — bourgeois revolutionism* , which looks like anarchism or borrows something from it." Here Lenin notes the struggle of Bolshevism against the socialist-revolutionaries, and then within the Bolshevik Party against Otzovism and ultimatumism[471].

This struggle of Bolshevism against the various domestic manifestations of opportunism and revisionism on the right and "left" had definite methodological foundations and was moving on *to methodological* ground. Lenin very early revealed *the Kantian* foundations of" legal Marxism "("Struvism") and raised the question of exposing them. Lenin tirelessly exposed in Menshevism the perversions of philosophical materialism and the bias towards *Kantianism* (in Plekhanov, L. Axelrod, Semkovsky, and Deborin), *machism* (in Valentinov, Yushkevich, and others), the perversion *of dialectics* and its substitution for sophistry and eclecticism (in Plekhanov, Martov, Dan, Trotsky, and others), and the revision of the foundations *of economic thinking.* the teachings

469 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XII, ч. 2 — с. 441.

470 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 123.

471 В. Ленин, Детская болезнь «левизны» в коммунизме.

of Marx (in Maslov and Plekhanov), the lack of understanding of the dialectic of the historical process, the liberal understanding of the class struggle, etc. While waging a struggle against the "Otzovists" and "Vperyodists," Lenin fought simultaneously with their machism (Bogdanov, Bazarov, etc.), "God-building" (Lunacharsky), and so on.

In this sense, Lenin's struggle against Plekhanov's theoretical errors and political opportunism was extremely important not only for the Russian but also for the world working-class movement. Considering Plekhanov as a Menshevik and severely criticizing his opportunist positions (on the question of class consciousness and spontaneity, on the character of the Russian revolution, on the agrarian question, etc.), Lenin at the same time saw in Plekhanov the best representative of the "Menshevik party members", "Menshevik workers", and noted all cases of Plekhanov's special position, At a certain stage, he considered it expedient to "unite" with Plekhanov for a common struggle against the Liquidators. Philosophically, this was expressed in the fact that Lenin placed Plekhanov, as a dialectical materialist, many heads above the other Mensheviks, and at the same time constantly and tirelessly waged a struggle against Plekhanov's philosophical errors, with his contemplation, hieroglyphism, etc. for Russia, but also *for the entire European labor movement* . Lenin also noted the historical peculiarities of revolutionary Russia in its struggle against opportunism and *its special significance опыт*"For about half a century, from about the 40s to the 90s of the last century, advanced thought in Russia, under the yoke of an unprecedented savage and reactionary tsarism, eagerly sought a correct revolutionary theory, following with amazing zeal and thoroughness each and every 'last word' Europe and America in this area. Marxism, as the only correct revolutionary theory, has truly *suffered in Russia* a half-century-long history of unheard-of torments and sacrifices, unprecedented revolutionary heroism, incredible energy and selfless search, training, testing in practice, disappointments, testing, comparing the experience of Europe. Thanks *to the emigration forced by tsarism* In the second half of the nineteenth century , revolutionary Russia possessed such a wealth *of international connections*, such an excellent knowledge of *the world* forms and theories of the revolutionary movement, as no other country in the world possessed. On the other hand, Bolshevism, which grew up on this granite theoretical basis, *has gone through a practical history of fifteen years (1902-1917)*, which in *its richness of experience* has *no equal in the world* »[472].

Lenin notes here at the same time the fact that Russian Bolshevism has absorbed all the experience of the theoretical and practical struggle of the entire *world* working-class movement and the rich experience that the practical and theoretical struggle of Russian Bolshevism has brought to the world working-class movement*русского*. In the Second International, Russian Bolshevism not only directly defended revolutionary positions on questions *of the international* labour movement (for example, Lenin's statements in defence of the German" left " social-democrats, against Kautsky on the question of the British labour Party, against R. Luxemburg on the national question, etc.), but also questions of the struggle between Bolshevism and Russian Menshevism They *международное значение*acquired international significance , caused disagreements in the leading organs of the Second International, the German and Polish social-democratic parties, and contributed to the organization and struggle of revolutionary elements against opportunist ones (the organizational question, the question of the driving forces of the Russian revolution, the problem of uniting Russian social-democracy). The opportunist elements of Russian social-democracy (Plekhanov, Martov, Trotsky) and their false coverage of the situation in Russia in the most influential theoretical organs of the social-democrats (Neue Zeit, Vorwärts) also demanded close attention from the Bolsheviks to the international movement: as is well known, the fugitive Russian Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks were not able to find a solution to this problem. now they maintain a close connection with international social fascism, being the source of its information about Soviet Russia!

In this respect, the struggle that Bolshevism waged against Trotskyism during the entire pre-

472 В. Ленин, Детская болезнь «левизны» в коммунизме.

war period is also important *троцкизмом*. Trotsky's theoretical and political path during all these years *was that of a centrist*, a path of incessant vacillation and political "flights" from liberals to Marxists and back *again (Lenin)* . In a few moments, only approaching revolutionary positions, Trotsky in the vast majority of cases defends Menshevism and Liquidationism, hiding behind "revolutionary" phrases and striving to "reconcile" and" unite "all the trends of Russian social-democracy on the basis of their peaceful"competition".

This eclectic line of Trotskyism was already expressed in his early work "Our Political Tasks". Trotsky here attacks the" politicians "and" Jacobins " — the Bolsheviks-who, in Trotsky's words, turn away from the distance that lies between the objective and subjective interests of the working class, who "do not lead the proletariat, because they themselves fulfill its duties", who "try to put pressure on another social organization *with an abstract form."* by the strength of class interests, not by the real strength of the proletariat.": in short, the Bolsheviks "think and decide" for the proletariat. In contrast to the Jacobin Bolsheviks, Trotsky suggested that the Social-Democrats "should only be the exponents *of objective* tendencies" and should have "unshakable confidence in the historical "will" of the proletariat." Accusing the Bolsheviks of" organizational fetishism, "of" political metaphysics, "and of" political rationalism, "Trotsky argued that" it is impossible to prescribe paths of development not only for social development as a whole, but also for an individual party *нельзя предписать пути развития*. They can only be removed from the conditions given by history and cleared by relentless critical work." Instead of an "organizational *plan*," Trotsky proposed to count on "a slow but steady growth of class consciousness." Trotsky pointed out that the proletariat "is still incapable of giving lessons to its intelligentsia", that the Bolsheviks "theoretically terrorize" the intelligentsia: "Orthodoxy *provides for everything* … Trotsky therefore proposed "a competition of different methods of economic and political construction," through long "disputes," through "the systematic struggle of various trends within socialism."*кто сомневается* , тот близок к отрицанию…» Троцкий предлагал поэтому «соревнование разных методов экономического и политического строительства», путём долгих «споров», путём «систематической *борьбы различных течений внутри социализма* »[473].

All the characteristic features of Trotskyist methodology have already been revealed here. On the one hand, *idealistic* subjectivism and voluntarism, expressed in Trotsky's intellectual anarchism in relation to the party and its decisions, in the desire to ensure freedom of factions and trends within the party, in opposing the "will" of the proletariat to the plan and rational foresight of party tactics. On the other hand, Trotsky's Menshevik *mechanistic* fatalism, his lack of understanding of the relationship between the proletariat and the party, his defense of Menshevik "tactics-process" instead of "tactics-plan", and his narrow *empiricism hostile to broad generalizations were also clearly manifested here*.

The revolution of 1905 aroused on the part of the centrist Trotsky the same vacillations in the direction of revolutionary views that it aroused on the part of the centrist Kautsky: Trotsky expressed his solidarity with Kautsky's views on our revolution in his book In Defense of the Party. Having noted this verbal "approach" of Trotsky to revolutionary positions at the London Congress of 1907, Lenin considered it necessary to specify his disagreement with the Trotskyist theory of "continuity of revolution" developed by Trotsky and Parvus. At the same time, Lenin noted all Trotsky's unscrupulousness, pointing out in particular that Trotsky's "fear of admitting mistakes" on the question of the Duma faction was "*non-partisan* something in our party[474]."

Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution as applied to 1905, as Lenin pointed out, represented "a disregard for the bourgeois character of the revolution, a lack of clear thought on the question of *transition* from this revolution to the socialist revolution." This "original" theory "took from the Bolsheviks the call for a decisive revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and for its conquest of

473 Л. Троцкий, Наши политические задачи.

474 В. Ленин / Соч., т. VIII — с. 287, 400, 410.

political power, and from the Mensheviks *the denial of the role of the peasantry*." As Lenin pointed out, this theory actually helped the "liberal workers' politicians of Russia" (i.e., the Menshevik Liquidators), who understood the denial of the role of the peasantry as "*unwillingness to rouse the peasantry to revolution*."

Indeed, Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, which aspired to be "the most revolutionary of all", was a characteristic combination *of idealistic ideas.* adventurism and a clearly *mechanistic* underestimation *of internal factors.* the forces and possibilities of our revolution, trusting in the world revolution, and at the same time not understanding the contradictory ways of the general development of the world revolution and the special role of each individual revolutionary country in this general development. "Left to its own forces," wrote Trotsky, " the working class of Russia will inevitably be crushed by the counter — revolution when *the peasantry turns its back on it* . He will have no choice but to link the fate of his political rule, and consequently the fate of the entire Russian revolution, with *the fate of the socialist revolution in Europe* … With State power in his hands, with the counter-revolution at his back, with European reaction in front of him, he will throw out to his fellow workers all over the world the old rallying cry: "proletarians of all countries, unite[475]." Here, behind Trotsky's revolutionary phrase, the whole of social-democratic Menshevik pessimism is still visible, and here its rush from fatalistic passivity to adventure is revealed. All the methodological foundations of the future Trotskyist *disbelief in the possibility of building socialism in one country were already laid here* . These views were further developed in Trotskyist's rejection of the law of uneven development of capitalism under imperialism and in his theory of the inevitable "clashes" between the proletariat and the peasantry.

During the struggle of Bolshevism against the liquidators, Trotsky acted as a" unifier "and" conciliator", always trailing behind the Mensheviks, but hiding behind a ringing phrase. Together with Martov, Trotsky, from the standpoint of Menshevism, "informed" the European social-democrats about this struggle in the foreign press, presenting Marxist-tinted *liberal articles.* views. Trotsky's philosophy of history boiled down to the fact that in the struggle of Bolshevism against Liquidationism he saw "the adaptation of the Marxist intelligentsia to the class movement of the proletariat"; he found in this struggle of Bolshevism "a sectarian spirit, intellectual individualism, *ideological fetishism* ", "a struggle for *influence* the politically immature proletariat." Thus, ignoring *the class* meaning of the ongoing struggle, Trotsky idealistically reduced it to the struggle of individuals, leaders, and intellectual groups. Here, too, Trotsky's historical idealism manifested itself, which later found its expression in Trotsky's idealistic assessment of the October Revolution and issues of internal party struggle in the Russian Communist Party. While noting Trotsky's non-class, non-materialist approach, Lenin also notes the connection of these views with the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution, *with his underestimation of the forces of the proletariat* . "Trotsky is perverting Bolshevism," Lenin wrote, " because Trotsky has never been able to assimilate any definite views *on the role of the proletariat in the Russian revolution* »[476]."

Trotsky's centrism also found expression in the period of the imperialist war, when Trotsky defended the discussion of "unity" with the Social-Defencists, when he did everything possible to conceal Kautsky's opportunism, when, while acknowledging in words the slogan of self-determination of nations, he did not put forward demands for self-determination of nations oppressed by the ruling nation. Lenin then emphasized the" Kautskyite " character of Trotskyism. In defending the slogan of a "United States of Europe", which was in perfect harmony with his lack of understanding of the uneven development of capitalism and with his theory of continuous revolution as a one-time act, Trotsky, as Lenin had already pointed out, thereby justified "*the impossibility of the victory of socialism in one country* »[477]."

---

475 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XI; В. Ленин / т. XIII — с. 213, 214.

476 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XI, ч. 2 — с. 292, 298, 371.

477 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XIII — с. 133, 214.

Pre-revolutionary Trotskyism thus represented the preparation of the same system of Trotskyist views that received their full expression during the temporary stay of the Trotskyists in the Communist Party and in the world communist movement[478]. Lenin considered Trotskyism particularly harmful: Trotskyists and compromisers "*are more harmful than any liquidator,* because convinced liquidators directly state their views, while the Trotskys *deceive* the workers *and cover*up evil[479]." The transformation of Trotskyism into a counter-revolutionary trend confirmed this brilliant forecast of Lenin, who tirelessly waged a struggle against Trotskyism throughout the entire pre-revolutionary period of Bolshevism's development.

From all this we can judge how true Trotsky's fables about Lenin's ideological "rearmament" in October and Trotskyist fabrications about the identity of pre-war Trotskyism and Leninism are.

9.4. Post-war evolution of social democracy and socio-economic roots of modern social fascism

The result of the World War was the shaking and shattering of the rule of capitalism not only in the countries of the vanquished, but also in the countries of the victorious. The flames of the revolution swept across Europe and spread to far - flung corners of Asia and America. The oppressed masses of many millions themselves undertook to implement the historic decision of the Basel Manifesto of the Second International on "turning the world war into a civil war." The victory of the October Revolution was the first decisive blow to world capitalism.

The bourgeoisie faced two tasks:

1) restore its shattered economic base,

2) defeat the revolutionary action of the proletariat and consolidate its political supremacy.

The social-Democratic parties that openly sided with the bourgeoisie during the war, each of which has merged with the bourgeois government and the military command of its national bourgeoisie, undertake to carry out these tasks.

In 1918, the theorists of the Second International, Kautsky, Vandervelde, and Renner, put forward two main theses that should theoretically justify the salvation of capitalism from the proletarian revolution. The first thesis is that social revolution *is impossible on the basis of economic ruin* . Therefore, the proletariat must restore and strengthen capitalist economy. The second thesis of the Social-Democrats says: between capitalism and communist society lies not the period of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, as Marx and Engels taught, but the period *of the democratic republic* . Therefore, the proletariat must exert all its forces to strengthen the bourgeois-democratic republic, because only within its framework and through democratic means-parliament, electoral rights, etc. - can it carry out a "social revolution" and thus peacefully and democratically gain power.

In their arguments and theoretical constructions, Kautsky, Vandervelde, Renner, O. Bauer, and other social-democratic theorists completely break with Marxist philosophy and dialectical materialism, contrasting it with idealism and philistine sophistry. They openly adopt the position of Kant when they talk about " pure democracy," a "free state," a "people's state," and so on, completely separating the democratic form from its bourgeois content. They completely reject Marx's economic teaching and his theory of class struggle, and advocate the reconciliation of class interests, the theory of "organized capitalism" and "economic democracy."

The fact is that *the socio-economic basis of modern social democracy has changed* . The correlation of class forces has changed, and the class struggle itself is on a completely different level. These circumstances led to the development of social chauvinism and its development into social fascism. These circumstances determine a new stage in the development of modern social-

---

478 См. подробности в главе, посвящённой критике методологии троцкизма, правого и «левого» оппортунизма (часть 1).

479 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XI, ч. 2 — с. 359.

fascism, in comparison with the old revisionism of 1892-1914. The old revisionism, pre-war, was the ideology of the petty bourgeoisie and the working-class aristocracy, willing to accept the rule of capital. The old revisionism simply denied the historical concentration of capital and enthusiastically insisted on the superiority of small-scale farming over large-scale: its political ideal was "a republic headed by a duke." Modern social-fascism tries to portray modern capitalist concentration and the entire development of imperialism as "socialism in the making", and it itself pursues with persistence and maximum consistency the policy of imperialism.

After the World War, the party social-democratic organizations, and especially the trade-union social-democratic organizations, grew to unprecedented proportions, and under the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party they began to transform themselves into additional organs of capitalist domination. The economic organizations of the parties of the Second International have also grown to unprecedented proportions, with multibillion-dollar turnover and a crowded army of well-paid officials and employees. Such, for example, is the German Social Democratic Party with its three-hundred-thousand-strong army of officials and employees of state, municipal and other mass organizations. Among this army we find several dozen ministers, several hundred directors and members of the boards of capitalist enterprises. German social-democracy still has a number of large-scale economic enterprises of various types, starting with construction enterprises and ending with commercial and banking ones, with annual turnover amounting to tens of billions. A number of these enterprises, for their part, are shareholders in the largest capitalist trusts.

This is the same situation in other social-democratic parties. This is the general picture in all sections of the Second International. The situation is similar with the Executive committee of the Second International, which, on the one hand, is closely connected with the League of Nations, and on the other — through the International Labour Office — with international financial organizations.

If the picture of the social roots of social fascism is to be complete, it is also necessary to take into account the formation *of a new type*of "workers ' aristocracy"after the war. Thanks to new methods of labor, capitalist rationalization, and the use of female and child labor, the base of the "labor aristocracy" has narrowed much more compared to the pre-war level. On the other hand, the qualitative character of this "working aristocracy" has changed: instead of the former highly paid skilled worker who makes up the "working aristocracy", now the more highly paid observation staff of "drivers" who stand at the conveyor belt, in the shop, in the workshop and are so distributed in production that they follow every movement of the worker. These "pushers" are much closer to capitalism than the former high-paid worker.

These circumstances determine *the social structure* of the modern parties of the Second International. The social-democratic parties were flooded with petty-bourgeois masses. In some countries, especially in Germany and France, we can also observe the entry *of bourgeois elements into social-democracy.* This process is being further deepened and intensified in parallel with the growth and strengthening of the communist labor movement. The revolutionary workers are gradually withdrawing to the communist camp, and their place in the ranks of the social-democrats is taken by the petty-bourgeois masses. The process of degeneration of the social-democratic asset is particularly rapid, and as it becomes officials of the state apparatus of the bourgeois State, it is rapidly becoming bourgeois. This process of changing the social base is expressed in the fact that the Social-Democratic Party is joined not by new young workers, but by officials, craftsmen, employees, etc. If we take, for example, the German social-Democratic Party, then for 800,000 members there are more than 40% of the petty bourgeoisie, 100% of the professional workers, especially the workers of the Social-Democratic Party. highly paid workers, including craftsmen.

Social-Democracy thus became a *left-wing bourgeois party,* which, along with certain strata of backward and better-paid workers, also embraces the broad masses of the petty and partly middle bourgeoisie. With the fascization of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois state, Social democracy, as a left-wing bourgeois party, is also *being fascized* . It is more capable than all the other parties of capital of carrying out the imperialist policy of the bourgeoisie, because thanks to its past traditions, thanks to the extensive connections it still maintains and maintains among the working masses

through its trade unions and mass organizations, it is best suited to deceive the broad masses.

In the conditions of the growth and strengthening of the communist parties, the growth and strengthening of socialism in the U.S.S.R., in conditions when capitalism is no longer able to ensure the physical existence of society, social-democracy is forced to act actively and cruelly, to mercilessly suppress every revolutionary movement of the workers. And it does this with great zeal — it stifles strikes, shoots workers, kills communists, throws revolutionary workers into prisons, and, together with fascist gangs, prepares for a campaign of extermination against the proletarian revolution in its own country and the world revolution.

Social fascism is not only a complete rejection of Marxism and a transition to the position of the imperialist bourgeoisie in practice and theory, it is *militant anti-Marxism*, still partially masked by "socialist" and "Marxist" phraseology.

Social fascism assimilates the most reactionary aspects of bourgeois idealist philosophy. In the field of philosophy, social fascism approaches closely and often passes over to the position *of national fascists*, making an alliance with all obscurantism, with all metaphysics in the struggle against revolutionary dialectics.

Social-fascism is social-democracy, which has long passed the stage of revising Marxism and has become the " objectively moderate wing of fascism "*(Stalin)* , *the main social support of the bourgeoisie* . It is a product of the contradictory nature of social-democracy: the desire to work for the salvation and strengthening of capitalism, and the need to pay lip service to it before the masses.

9.5. General characteristics of the philosophy of modern social fascism

Modern social-democracy, as the main support of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, is a vehicle of bourgeois influence in the field of philosophy. The bourgeoisie, which once fought under the banner of materialism itself, is now fighting against materialism with all the force of its class hatred *против материализма*, when the proletariat, which is destroying the foundations of capitalism, has become its defender and propagandist. Modern social-democracy, to please the bourgeoisie and in its interests, is striving to shake off all traces of materialism. It slanders materialism, stigmatizes it as metaphysics, mysticism, and even Fideism. For example, M. Adler, in his last philosophical book published at the end of 1930, explicitly says that it is materialism that is supposedly connected with all mysticism and theology, that materialism can be a bulwark of fideism, since materialism is based, they say, on the recognition of a metaphysical objective reality, which can be both an idealistic absolute and a divine one an entity!!

The key to this philosophical position of social democracy lies in the socio-political role it plays in modern capitalist society. The bourgeoisie hates materialism so fiercely and fights against it on a broad front, because it understands perfectly well that the spread of the materialist worldview among the masses contributes to the masses ' awareness of the full historical validity of their struggle, to their awareness of the real ways of emancipating them from capitalism. A bourgeois would not be a bourgeois if he did not fight materialism with all his might during the decline of his class. A social-fascist would not be a real defender of the bourgeoisie, a reliable support of the collapsing capitalism, if he did not seek to distract the worker from materialism, if he did not try to poison his consciousness by means of an idealistic worldview.

The most important starting point of the philosophy of social democracy is the question *of the relation of Marxism to Kant* . Kant has been a favorite philosopher of the bourgeoisie since the mid-nineteenth century. Its ambivalence, its appeal to experience, its demand to investigate empirically given material, its support and defense of mathematical and natural sciences, on the one hand, and Kant's open justification of the separation of society from nature and faith in God, on the other, perfectly corresponded to the aspirations of the bourgeoisie, which was interested in increasing profits in the development of productive forces and science, and in at the same time, in the cultivation of a reactionary worldview, in the dissemination of idealistic and mystical views, especially in the field of social knowledge.

The turn to Kant in the second half of the nineteenth century among bourgeois philosophers

was also reflected among the Social Democrats. The first among them to throw out the slogan "back to Kant" was the revisionist Bernstein, who in 1898, in his book Problems of Socialism, systematically revised Marx's teaching on the class struggle, on the crises and impoverishment of the working class, and on revolution. In the same book, Bernstein criticized the philosophical foundations of Marxism from a Kantian perspective. At the same time, the slogan "back to Kant" was adopted by Russian critics of Marxism — Struve, Bulgakov, and others. Since then, attempts to unite Marx with Kant, to supplement the former with the latter, and to link them "organically" have not left the pages of the revisionist and social-fascist press.

With great philosophical "erudition", Forlander, who recently died, but until recently was considered a sworn and official philosopher of social democracy, developed and "justified" the idea of supplementing Marx with Kant. Throughout his book Kant and Marx, he develops the idea that Marxism *lacks an ethical foundation* socialism, that this very justification is given and developed by Kant. The socio-political meaning of this ethicism of a prominent social democrat is quite clear. It consists in replacing the scientific theory of socialism, which is based on the study of the laws of the development of capitalism and its tendencies, and which has scientifically determined in the person of the proletariat the real force for building socialism, with the bourgeois theory *of ethical socialism* .

The meaning of this concept is to distract the working masses from the real struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the construction of a socialist society, to weaken the revolutionary energy of the proletariat, to disorient it with vague, petty-bourgeois dreams of eternal supra-class "socialist" justice, morality, etc. and oppression-this is the real meaning of the revisionist theory of the ethical justification of Marxism.

Among the modern philosophizing social-fascists, M. Adler is one of the most consistent Kantians. Confining Marxism to the theory of society, Adler believes that Marx uses *Kant's theory of forms of consciousness in his theory* . This Kantian theory of pure and immobile forms of thought is regarded by the "learned" social-democrat as an eternal, unshakable, and unique scientific philosophy. The "left" social — fascist considers it possible to combine the theory of pure reason and its a priori forms, about which its creator, Kant, said that in it he limited reason in order to give place to faith, with the materialist understanding of history. This position of Adler reveals all the hopeless confusion, all the theoretical venality of the most prominent theorists of modern social-democracy.

Here you can clearly see:

1) the desire to transform the revolutionary materialist understanding of history into an idealistic theory that does not reflect the actual course of history, but characterizes only *the state of our consciousness* ;

2) the desire to transform the materialist theory of society, which provides the proletariat with a scientific orientation in its struggle for a new system, into a doctrine of *frozen forms*of historical consciousness, as meaningless as Kant's forms of pure reason, which can only disorient the proletariat and push it on the path of mystical religious quest.

Thus, for Adler, the economic organization of society is only a historical expression of the social properties of consciousness, and the class struggle in society is only "an expression of the formal regularity of 'will'", which tends to a consistent unity! To show that Adler himself draws the most reactionary conclusions from his philosophy, we quote his following words:: "God and immortality are nothing but practical knowledge, that is, the necessary guiding lines of our volitional nature, without which we must find life unbearable."

Thus Adler, in his idealistic philosophy, not only loses the objective ground of the struggle against religion, not only objectively pours water on the mill of fideism and obscurantism, but also consciously is a defender of religion. Idealism "is a weakened, refined fideism," Lenin taught. The idealism of modern social-democracy is directly *connected with religion* , with this most vile and reactionary phenomenon of social life, one of the most powerful means of domination by the exploiting classes. The attitude of social-democracy towards religion underlines even more sharply the depth of the decline of the social-democratic leaders, the depth of their ideological

disintegration.

M. Adler is a Kantian. But he does not entirely agree with Kant. He criticizes it for recognizing the existence of a thing-in-itself outside of us. In his last book, Adler especially focuses on this inconsistency of Kant, cleanses him of all materialistic elements, bypasses all the moments of hesitation in Kant between materialism and idealism, and defends Kant as an idealist , metaphysician and theologian, *criticizes him from the right*, from the standpoint of subjective idealism, *Machism* . To recognize a thing in itself as existing outside of us is, according to Adler, metaphysics. If things are considered "constructs of our thinking", "contents of our consciousness", then we get the theory of "cognitive-critical idealism", which Adler defends, contrasting this old idealistic nonsense with the theory of dialectical materialism. We thus see that the reactionary tendencies of Kantian "Marxism" correspond to the same tendencies among openly bourgeois neo-Kantians. *Neo-Kantianism*, which emerged as a trend in the epoch of reaction, after the revolution of 1848, has always differed from Kant's own philosophy in that it inherited from him *the most reactionary features* and developed the most negative aspects of his philosophy.

Neo-Kantianism in the era of decaying capitalism is a particularly reactionary trend and fully reflects the process of final decomposition and putrefaction of bourgeois ideology. Causal explanation is completely banished from the social sciences and replaced *by teleological* explanation , i.e. all phenomena are considered from the point of view of the goal, and all sorts of "ethical assessments", "moral values" and even religious, divine dogmas are brought under the concept of the goal. For example, one of the most revered contemporary philosophers of the bourgeoisie, Max Weber, who came out of the neo-Kantian school, wrote three volumes on the Sociology of Religion, which, on the basis of extensive historical "research", proves that it is religion that underlies economic life.

Kautsky's philosophical views also show a significant bias towards Kantianism. Kautsky has shown a certain weakness for Kant for a very long time. Kautsky had already stated in his argument with Bernstein that he was very little concerned with the neo-Kantian revision of the philosophy of Marxism, and that, strictly speaking, he considered it quite possible to combine Marx's socio-economic teaching with Kant's philosophy, or with some other philosophy. That this statement of Kautsky's was not accidental, that it concealed a substantial dose of Kantianism in Kautsky's own philosophical views, became clear later and was particularly pronounced in his "Materialist Understanding of History."

If M. Adler's attitude to Kant is characterized by an idealistic critique of Kant, Kautsky's position in relation to Kant is characterized by its uncriticism, complete acceptance of the basic propositions of Kantian dualism, although Kautsky tries to present himself as a materialist criticizing Kant. Kautsky found himself captivated by Kant on the question of the thing-in-itself and its unknowability, but he wants to appear to be a materialist. He believes that he dissociated himself from Kant by recognizing in things-in-themselves something cognizable, namely their differences among themselves. However, according to Kautsky, the knowledge of the differences and connections of things does not give us a real knowledge of these things themselves. He says: "All our knowledge *is not the knowledge of things in themselves* , but only the reflection of their differences and identities."

This half-hearted criticism of Kant only proves how deep Kautsky himself is in the idealistic swamp of Kantianism. For if the knowledge of the differences and connections of things does not give us knowledge of things themselves, then all our knowledge is subjective, having its source only in sensibility and understanding. If things - in-themselves are inaccessible to either our perception or our imagination, then the very existence of the external world is already being questioned. Then the thing-in-itself, the actual material world, becomes an abstract thought about this external world, a meaningless concept, a dummy that plays no role either in theory or in practice.

For Kant, the recognition of the thing-in-itself was an expression of his inconsistency; for Kautsky, all his flirtations with materialism have a purely disguised meaning. Kautsky's social-fascist gut does not tolerate materialism, although at the same time he wants to appear to be a

materialist. Hence the exceptional eclecticism, endless throwing in different directions, appeal to the most diverse philosophical systems. It is difficult to imagine anything more eclectic, spineless, and unsystematic than the philosophical views of the greatest theorist of modern social democracy. But this eclecticism has a definite basis — the idealism and mechanismism of modern bourgeois philosophy.

In Kautsky's philosophical views, in addition to, or rather in organic combination with, the Kantian elements, there are very strong streams *of positivism* and vulgar *mechanismism* . This, again, is not accidental, for since the last century and to this day the bourgeoisie has also held the philosophy of positivism in high esteem. Kautsky's positivism is most vividly expressed when he declares that we are not in a position to explain the phenomena of the world around us in substance, but can only describe them. Kautsky's mechanismism is particularly evident in his teaching on the adaptation of society to nature, of the organism to the external environment.

Modern bourgeois philosophy is not only characterized by positivism or neo-Kantianism. Neo-Hegelianism and voluntarism now occupy a prominent place in it. The capitalist class, which in the field of politics, in the face of the immediate growth and development of the world proletarian revolution, is turning to more active, open and violent methods of struggle against this revolution — to fascism-is also striving for more effective, more reactionary and consistent views in the field of ideology and philosophy. *It is neo-Hegelianism and voluntarism that most correspond to these requirements* . Both of these tendencies in modern bourgeois philosophy are reflected in the philosophical views of social fascism. They also found a place in Kautsky's philosophical views.

The founder of modern voluntarism, as is known, is the German philosopher Schopenhauer (1788-1860). His philosophy, which Engels described as "flat reflections adapted to the spiritual development of a philistine," attracted the attention of the bourgeoisie in the era of reaction after the revolution of 1848. "The World as Will and Representation" is the title of the main work of this philosopher. Since a certain trend in bourgeois philosophy, voluntarism has not left the scene. In the conditions of decaying capitalism and the developing world revolution, voluntarism reflects and theoretically reinforces *fascism* , the desire of the modern bourgeoisie to mobilize all its will, all its material and spiritual forces for a concentrated, determined, frenzied struggle against the proletariat.

Social-democratic theorists were not slow in helping the bourgeoisie to spread the ideas of voluntarism. In Kautsky's work, this voluntaristic tendency is very clearly expressed in the following words: "There is no doubt that in the last analysis our *volition* It is not determined by our knowledge, but *is given before all knowledge* , that it affects it in a determining way."

The meaning of Kautskyite voluntarism is to undermine the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of determinism, to undermine the materialist justification of the inevitability and necessity of the proletarian revolution, the justification of the revolutionary efficacy of the proletariat, the mobilization of all its will and energy for revolution, for a decisive struggle against capitalism. Finally, its purpose is to explain theoretically and justify the frenzied activity of fascism. Thus, in Kautsky's work, the struggle against the philosophy of Marxism is accompanied by an open defense and support of the most reactionary tendencies of bourgeois ideology and politics.

Neo-Hegelianism is one of the most influential trends in modern bourgeois philosophy. In 1930, even the "international Hegelian Union" was organized, and the German bourgeois professor Richard Kroner was elected chairman. The forgotten Hegel is once again triumphant in the German universities.

What attracts the old Hegel to the modern bourgeoisie? The historical connection that exists between the dialectic of Marx and the dialectic of Hegel alienated the bourgeoisie from Hegel for a long time. In the second half of the nineteenth century, bourgeois theorists wrote a number of critical works directed against Hegel. And yet, beginning at the end of the last century (the turn to Hegel in England and Scandinavia was already marked by Engels), Hegel began to attract the attention of bourgeois philosophers again. This interest runs along the lines *of Hegel's idealism* , along the lines of his metaphysics, along the *most reactionary features*of his philosophy. It is from this side that the bourgeois and reactionary character of Hegelianism emerges, and it is precisely this side that attracts the modern fascist bourgeoisie.

Social-democratic theorists are also fulfilling the social order of the bourgeoisie in this matter. The neo-Hegelian tendencies of bourgeois philosophy find their echo in the philosophical writings of the Social Democrats. Kautsky's eclectic bouquet of philosophy, made up of numerous varieties of idealism, is complemented by another reactionary flower-neo-Hegelianism. Thus, comparing the development of technology and industrial relations in society, Kautsky says: "We find here a dialectical process, in many *respects similar to the Hegelian* one . Both the one and the other of these processes ultimately have a spirit that develops society further, which sets its own antithesis for itself and then seeks a synthesis between the thesis and the antithesis, and after finding it from the synthesis forms a new thesis, etc." Thus Kautsky's Hegelian absolute spirit once again proved to be the engine of world history! Even the Kantian M. Adler considers it his duty to bow before Hegel's idealism.

Along with this pronounced neo-Hegelian tendency in Kautsky and partly in Adler, we have a group of revisionists who conduct the entire philosophical revision of Marxism mainly from neo-Hegelian positions. These are, first of all, Mark Siegfried — a "left" social democrat, Lukacs and Korsch (Korsch is a former member of the German Communist Party, now a renegade Trotskyist fold, Lukacs is a member of the Communist Party, now partially admits his mistakes). Both Lukacs and Korsch, keeping pace with all the critics of Marxism, limit the latter to social theory. Both stand on the point of view *of identifying the social object and the subject* , i.e., social production and social consciousness. Instead of an objective-revolutionary dialectic, these theorists preach a metaphysics of concepts and substitute the concrete revolutionary struggle of the proletariat for a new economic system with the intellectual struggle for new forms of consciousness.

Thalheimer, a former member of the German Communist Party and now a member of the *Brandlerian*group, which was expelled from the Comintern and openly entered into a bloc with the social fascists, also joins the host of philosophical revisionists of the Korsch and Lukacs type.

Thalheimer's philosophical views are characterized by eclecticism, seasoned with a large dose of idealism. So, for example, along with a number of materialistic propositions, Thalheimer departs from Marxism in such an essential point as the question of practice as a criterion of truth. Instead of the Marxist-Leninist understanding of practice as the only correct criterion of truth, Thalheimer resorts to self-consciousness, which in itself seems to provide proof of the existence of a world other than my consciousness. Thalheimer writes: "The material of dialectics is categories of thinking that "presuppose" separate sciences as known and given " ("On the subject of dialectics"). This last point proves that Thalheimer *was completely captivated by the Hegelian dialectic* . It completely throws overboard the colossal critical work done by Marx and Engels on the materialistic reworking of the Hegelian dialectic. Leninism as a new stage in the development of dialectical materialism is completely ignored, and all Lenin's instructions about the actual tasks of Marxism in the field of philosophy, which should consist "in the dialectical treatment of the history of human thought, science and technology"[480], are ignored. Instead, Thalheimer's entire theoretical work is wrapped up in a scholasticism of concepts clothed in dialectical phraseology, under the guise of which it is easier to drag bourgeois ideology into the ranks of the working class, and it is much more convenient to pursue a policy of saving capitalism together with the social fascists.

The most clear demonstration *of the official role of neo-Hegelianism*in the theories of modern social-democracy and the bourgeoisie is made by such a venerable social-fascist theorist as Kunov. Kunov uses Hegel's help to justify his theories about the general foundations of the state, the general principles of nationality, law, and so on. The whole point of returning to Hegel is precisely to perpetuate theoretically the relations of the bourgeois system by means of his absolute idealism, to elevate these relations to a universal principle, to sanctify them, and thereby to contribute to their practical perpetuation. With the help of the absolute spirit of Hegel, it is possible to portray the concrete bourgeois fascist state as eternal, the capitalist League of Nations as an instrument of eternal peace, and capitalism as an eternal means of progress and culture.

---

480 Ленинский сборник IX.

Along with this suitability of Hegel's philosophy for the purpose of defending capitalism, Hegel is also attractive to social-democrats as a disguise. The teachers of Marxism have spoken quite clearly and extensively about the positive influence of the Hegelian dialectic on them, and it would be strange if modern revisionists did not try to make up for Marxism with the help of Hegel. That is why Kautsky flirts with the Hegelian dialectic. At one point in his last work, he explicitly says that in some points his understanding of dialectics *is more in touch with Hegel's than with Engels*'. But it is also quite clear to every revolutionary Marxist that a return from the Marxist-Leninist dialectic to the Hegelian one is a reactionary step backwards. Even in his initial works, Marx noted the conservative side of Hegel's dialectic, since it does not complete the struggle of opposites, but synthetically *reconciles opposites*in absolute knowledge. It is precisely this "synthetic" result of the Hegelian dialectic that helps the social-fascist theorists, masquerading as Hegelian dialectics, to continue and deepen their further revision of Marxism and its opportunist perversion. Materialist dialectics, consistently applied, leads to revolution; idealist dialectics inevitably leads to the blurring of contradictions, to their blunting, and thereby to their preservation in real life.

In this fascination with Hegel's idealistic dialectic, social fascism also received an unexpected response within the Soviet Union. As is already known, the revision of dialectical materialism, mainly from the Hegelian standpoint, was particularly pronounced in the form of the Menshevik idealism of the Deborin group in the U.S.S.R. For the social roots and theoretical views of Menshevik idealism, see the chapter on the two-front struggle in philosophy (part 1).

We must also mention the Machist wing of the philosophizing revisionists. It is headed again by the" left " Social Democrat, member of the Austrian Party, General Secretary of the Second International-Friedrich Adler. In his philosophical books and articles, he advocates the addition of Machism to Marxism. F. Adler puts Mach — an open subjective idealist, a most reactionary philosopher, about whose views Lenin said that this "current not only huddles under the wing of Fideism, but also reaches Fideism" - puts him next to Marx. According to F. Adler, Mach was supposed to have done the same work in relation to the natural sciences that Marx did for the social sciences.

Otto Bauer, the most prominent contemporary theoretician of social-democracy and its pride, a theoretician who has pushed Kautsky, Kunov and others into the background, stands on the same point of view. His attention is more drawn to theoretical questions that are more directly connected with the real policy of the struggle against the proletarian revolution, the struggle for capitalism. Nevertheless, he could not refuse to help the bourgeoisie defend its ideology.

In the collection dedicated to Kautsky's 70th birthday, Bauer published an extensive philosophical article. In it, he wants to be independent and original. He is against any addition to Marxism. Nevertheless, Bauer's Machist sympathies are clearly visible in this article. In this article, he *identifies Marxism with Machism* . He argues that the common essence of Marxism and Machism is the doctrine of the process of adapting one's thoughts to others and to facts. Just as Machism considers the history of natural science as a process of progressive adaptation of thought to each other and to natural facts, so, according to O. Bauer, Marxism requires studying the process *of adaptation of thoughts*to the social state and, through it, to certain spiritual needs. All these statements clearly show the struggle of the most prominent social-fascist theorist against the philosophy of Marxism, and reveal his defense of idealism of the most reactionary type. These statements also reveal once again the entire tendency of the social-fascist theorists towards the theory of adaptation to facts. This theory perfectly corresponds to the intentions and practice of social-fascism, its desire to adapt the proletariat to the conditions of capitalism, to heal capitalism, and to be a reliable support for it. Marxism is a theory of revolutionary action, which requires the most detailed consideration of facts, the most concrete study of them, but not in order to adapt to them, but in order to revolutionize them, to revolutionize the destruction of capitalism and build socialism.

Summing up the general assessment of the philosophical foundations of modern social-democracy, it is necessary to say the following.

Eclecticism , a hodgepodge of old and new bourgeois philosophical systems-this is what primarily characterizes the philosophical position of the leaders of social-democracy. And this is not accidental. The bourgeoisie is incapable of a consistent philosophy in the era of decaying capitalism. Modern social-democracy is all the more incapable of doing this because of the social and political role it plays.

It would be wrong, however, to limit ourselves to describing philosophical revisionism as eclecticism and to ignore the *idealistic and mechanistic* basis on which all this eclectic construction is built and the reactionary tendencies that are very clearly manifested in the philosophical evolution of social-fascism. Fragments of "Marxist" phraseology, fragments of "materialist" and "dialectical" phrases, and a complete and irrevocable defense of the fashionable, idealistic, and mechanistic views of the modern bourgeoisie with a definite orientation towards fascist philosophy — voluntarism, neo — Hegelianism, and Machism-are characteristic of the philosophical views of social fascism. What is most common to all these tendencies and currents is *idealism* in its most reactionary forms, which is directly connected with the defense and justification of religion and all mysticism. "Idealism is only a refined, refined form of fideism" *(Lenin)* . The philosophical position of social-democracy is a direct servitude to the reactionary elements of modern society, a defense, reinforcement and justification of the theoretical views of the fascist bourgeoisie, a complete rejection of the philosophy of Marxism and a resolute struggle against it.

The philosophical views of the social-fascist theorists show once again how deep is the gulf that separates them from Marxism, how firmly they stand on the other side of the barricades, and how irrevocable is their departure from Marxism — the theory and practice of the proletariat.

9.6. Revision of the materialist foundations of Marxism

Max Adler is the author of a number of books on philosophy, monographs, articles and pamphlets. Its struggle against materialism is particularly open and clear, and therefore it is best to begin with it.

Adler begins by declaring that Marxism is only a doctrine of *social* life. He categorically asserts that Marxism as a social theory does not need any philosophy and cannot be organically connected with any of them. This categorical statement of M. Adler certainly does not prevent him from trying to combine Marxism with the favorite philosopher of the modern bourgeoisie and modern social democracy-Kant. Marxism does not need philosophy. But it needs a logical superstructure, and this superstructure is provided by Kant's eternal and unshakable *theory of knowledge* .

This appeal to Kant makes quite clear the meaning of limiting Marxism to social theory. The point is that M. Adler does not agree with dialectical materialism-the philosophy of Marxism, the consistent application of which to the study of the laws of social history and the economy of capitalism provided the creation of the theory of scientific communism.

Marxism has no philosophy of its own — this is the old position of long-standing critics of Marxism. *Socio-economic gap* The study of Marxism from its *philosophical*foundations is also the first step in the struggle against dialectical materialism for modern social-democratic theorists.

This passage is also characteristic of Kautsky, a theoretician who has preserved the most defensive coloration of Marxist phraseology in questions of philosophy. Kautsky believes that Marxism has its own philosophy, and that this philosophy is materialism. But there is no point in the theory of Marxism which at the present time is not subjected by Kautsky to the most notorious revisionist attacks. The philosophy of Marxism - according to Kautsky-is materialism; Marx and Engels are materialists. But" the materialist understanding of history is compatible with any worldview that uses the method of dialectical materialism, or at least does not stand in irreconcilable contradiction with it, " says Kautsky in his last work, The Materialist Understanding of History, published in 1927[481]. "It makes no difference whether we fight for a materialist

481 К. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / нем. изд., т. I — с. 28.

understanding of history by calling ourselves a materialist or prefer the name of a realist or a monist, a positivist or a sensualist, an empiricist or an empirio-critic, " says Kautsky in the same place.

Thus, it turns out that the connection between the socio-economic teaching of Marxism and its philosophical basis is completely accidental, not organic, not necessary. So Marxism is not a *single worldview* It covers all aspects of the life of nature, society and thought, built on the development of all the achievements of science and tested by its further development and the experience of the world labor movement. Kautsky, the social-fascist, must tear Marxism to pieces in order to break it more easily and imperceptibly. It is to Kautsky's advantage to undermine the universal significance of Marxism, in order to more easily undermine its historical and scientific validity, in order to reduce Marxism to the level of *one point of view, along with others*, which can be criticized, supplemented, and interpreted in various ways, in order to transform the complete scientific, only correct, and revolutionary theory of Marxism into" fragments "of theory, into "fragments" ofdilapidated dogmas "*(Stalin)*.

Thus Kautsky admits that although the Marxist doctrine of society is compatible with *various* philosophical systems, yet in Marx and Engels it is connected with philosophical materialism, and therefore he, Kautsky, "prefers" materialism. But immediately he begins to twist and twist, straining all his efforts to recognize the word materialism and reject it in practice, to empty it of all its content. First of all, this is reflected in the limitation of Marx and Engels ' materialism to its mere meaning *as a method* .

To characterize materialism, as Kautsky does, only as a method means to understand it only as a method of thinking, unfounded in no way, subjectively chosen. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of materialism is such a fruitful and only correct method because it is at the same time a doctrine of the laws and properties of the objective external world. The materialist method of Marxism is directly connected with the recognition of the objective existence of a world apart from human consciousness, a world reflected in this consciousness and defining it. This is the basic starting point of philosophical materialism. Kautsky, on the other hand, wants to exhaust materialism by a method, only by an approach to this or that phenomenon, and completely ignores all the scientific justification of this method given by Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

Thus the limitation of the philosophy of Marxism to the method is the form behind which Kautsky conceals a frank struggle against the philosophy of Marxism and a desire to distort, distort, and bourgeoisize Marxism.

How do social fascists understand materialism? Again, M. Adler shows his hostility to materialism more directly and openly. "What is materialism?" he asks. "This is the answer to the question of *the essence of the world* , of its meaning in itself — in short, an ontological and therefore fully metaphysical representation." Everything in this phrase from beginning to end is false and wrong. It was not materialism, but scholasticism, that raised the question of the essence of the world; it was not materialism, but idealistic metaphysics, that sought the meaning of the world in itself. All this is bourgeois slander of materialism, which M. Adler so readily repeats.

Materialist philosophy really solves the problem of the laws and properties of the world external to our consciousness, and in solving this problem materialism relies on the achievements of modern natural science. That is why Engels and Lenin said that materialism *changes its forms with every new discovery of science* . Philosophical materialism is the doctrine that there is an objective world outside of our consciousness, that this objective material world determines our consciousness, is displayed and copied by this latter. This is the essence of materialism. This is not metaphysics, as M. Adler wants to portray it, but the only solid foundation with which one can fight against any metaphysics, whether it is dressed up in the verbal husk of positivism or empirio-criticism, intuitionism or directly religious mysticism. This is the only ground from which it is possible to fight for the development of science, for the conquest of nature, for the overthrow of capitalism and the liberation of the proletariat from the rule of the bourgeoisie. It is precisely because Adler stands

in politics for the defence of the bourgeoisie, which in the present conditions is entirely a reactionary class, no longer able to fight for the development of technology and science, and which is resisting with all its might the revolutionary transformation of society — that is why the social-fascist Adler *is opposed to the bourgeoisie.* materialism.

In his textbook on philosophy, M. Adler devotes an entire chapter to a critique of Lenin's materialism. M. Adler concentrated all his hatred of materialism, and especially of the consistent and revolutionary materialism of which Lenin is the representative, precisely in this chapter. If Plekhanov's works on philosophy were described by M. Adler in his earlier book "Marxist Problems" as brilliant, then it was Lenin's work (we are talking about Lenin's book "Materialism and Empirio-criticism"). Adler lashes out, foaming at the mouth. He calls Lenin's theory of reflection "old rubbish, long buried by critical philosophy," an unfounded and meaningless, naive and philistine theory. Let's take a closer look at the arguments against this theory that Adler utters.

Adler writes: "If Lenin says that a person who feels red is at the same time given an objective reality, then one can say that no doubt it is given to him, but *only* in his consciousness, or better to say — as an integral part *of consciousness* »[482]." Thus, according to Adler, nothing exists outside of our consciousness, the whole world around us, all of nature, society with its class struggle-all this is only a part of our consciousness and exists only in consciousness. Against this theory, which is really justified by the entire development of science, social life and production, and which is daily tested by the practice of people, against this theory, Adler pulls out the old junk of subjective idealism, which supposedly says that without a subject there is no object, without consciousness there is no matter.

All the senselessness and unscientific position of the struggle against materialism by M. Adler, who claims to be exceptionally scientific, is revealed in all its unsightliness when he tries to repel the Leninist attack against the subjective idealism of Mach, Bogdanov and others. Lenin, in his book "Materialism and Empirio-criticism", suggested that all the defenders of the position "without a subject there is no object" answer-what to do with the conclusions of science about the existence of the earth before man, before every living being on earth.

Even then, a number of modern philosophers tried to get out of this contradiction with natural science with all sorts of theories about the consciousness of the embryo(embryo), about the "potential central member" , etc. Adler is a" learned " theorist. He is, of course, on science, he admits that the earth existed before man, but you see, he only supports the fact that *the earth does not exist before consciousness*, since only through the concept of time can we state the existence of the earth before man!!

Empirio-critics have objected to the materialistic view that consciousness is a product of the brain. Lenin revealed all the absurdity and unscientific nature of their position. M. Adler expresses his "enlightened opinion" on this issue as well. Human thought, as a psychological process, is of course impossible without the brain, but you see, "consciousness as a basic spiritual law of its own" is not only possible without the brain, but cannot be understood otherwise, since the *brain itself is only the content of consciousness* , its mental definition. So figure out who can! Nature existed before man, but nature is only a part of consciousness, thought cannot exist without a brain, but the brain itself is the content of consciousness… The rejection of materialism, of the theory that the world exists outside of human consciousness and is only reflected in human feelings and ideas, the rejection of this position, despite all reservations, inevitably leads to idealism, to a contradiction with science, to the defense of reactionary views both in theory and in politics.

From this brief analysis, the hostile attitude of these theorists towards the materialist basis of Marxism, their non-recognition and perversion of it, and their open and veiled, but quite explicit and decisive struggle against materialism clearly follow. The whole history of philosophy is the history of the struggle between idealism and materialism. The struggle of social-democratic theorists against materialism reveals the full extent of their departure from Marxism along all lines

---

482 М. Адлер, Учебник по материалистическому пониманию истории / нем. изд., т. I — с. 138.

and their decisive transition to the position of the bourgeoisie in matters of world outlook.

9.7. Revisionist and social-fascist perversion of the materialist dialectic

Numerous bourgeois lackeys in the philosophical field are exerting every effort to present materialist *dialectics*in the most unsightly form, to slander it, to distort it, to uproot it and reject it as worthless.

The philosophical group of social fascists, as in other questions of theory and practice, fully echoes the ideologues of the bourgeoisie. Marx and Engels loudly declared their commitment to dialectics and defended it. Therefore, revisionist theorists can never directly renounce this" soul " of Marxism. They can carry out the social order of the bourgeoisie — to corrupt the proletariat ideologically, to weaken it — only by especially skilfully *perverting the materialist dialectic* , especially subtly, imperceptibly, piecemeal disintegrating this revolutionary essence of Marxism, trivializing and mortifying it.

There is not a single philosophical social-fascist who does not accept dialectics in one way or another and flirt with it. But on the other hand, there is not a single one of them who does not raise a whole series of objections, "doubts", and his own beliefs that differ from Marx's and Engels ' in relation to this dialectic. You can't just reject it, but accepting it for what it is is even worse. And so a real mouse fuss begins around dialectics.

Kautsky-for dialectics. He accepts it. But Kautsky "doubts" the applicability of dialectics to *all*spheres of life. M. Adler is more frank. He does not even doubt that he says in the affirmative that dialectics is inherent only in thinking, and that it is precisely in this limitation of dialectics to a subjective thought process that the essence of Marx's "rearrangement" of Hegel's dialectics from head to foot supposedly consists.

The empirio-critic Bogdanov, who also considered himself a Marxist, similarly *objected to universality* dialectical laws: "Dialectics is not something universal, it cannot become a universal method of cognition. It is a special case of organizational processes that can also proceed in other ways, " Bogdanov said in the Philosophy of Living Experience.

As is already known, Plekhanov also violates the principle of universality of dialectics, since he also failed to extend dialectics to the theory of knowledge. Finally, Lenin also noted the tendency to limit dialectics in Bukharin, since the latter called dialectics only *a point of view* , contrasting it with the historical point of view. This is how the philosophical ideas of social fascism find their echo in mechanismismand right-wing opportunism within the Soviet Union.

Attempt *to restrict* dialectics is nothing but a veiled struggle against it, a desire to turn the whole theory of Marxism into fragments, fragments of theory, a desire to neutralize dialectics. If we can prove that dialectics is only a special case of the various regularities of phenomena, then it will be all the easier to dismiss it in the most burning questions of politics, and the easier it will be to justify and justify our refusal to revolutionize, to defend the interests of the proletariat.

The question of the universality of dialectics is not a secondary but *a fundamental*question of Marxism. To reject the universality of materialist dialectics means to undermine its scientific foundations, its objectivity, and inevitably slide down to a subjective, idealistic interpretation of it.

If the dialectical movement of consciousness is not a reflection of the dialectic of movement in the objective material world, if it does not have its source in the objective world, then dialectics acquires only an idealistic meaning as the movement of spirit in itself. Thus, by limiting the universality of materialist dialectics , social-democratic theorists *are dragging in idealism*, from the standpoint of which it is much easier to blunt the revolutionary edge of materialist dialectics and neutralize it in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

The central point of materialist dialectics is the doctrine of the law of unity of opposites and their struggle. This is why the revisionists focus all their criticism of the philosophy of Marxism on *refuting the contradictory nature of development* .

Let us first focus on the more open and clear position of M. Adler on this issue. By limiting the significance of dialectics in Marxism to a method, M. Adler completely discards the question of

whether dialectical laws belong to material reality itself. Adler considers the study of the material properties of reality itself, as well as the consideration of objective contradictions and other laws of the development of this reality, to be metaphysics, naive, philistine, and not a scientific statement of the question. He declares, as a generally accepted truth, that the ideas of modern science about molecular and etheric motion are *only a means of thought* theoretically master the phenomena of nature, but they do not reflect anything objective.

But perhaps Adler recognizes dialectics at least as a doctrine of the laws of our thinking? But even this is not the case with the" left " social Democrat. This is how he examines the well — known dialectical proposition that even the simplest form of motion of matter — mechanical motion-is already a contradiction. He doesn't agree with that. Not to mention the fact that in this case, again, he considers only *the concept of* It is not a reflection in this concept of a real contradictory movement, but in the concept itself Adler sees only *an apparent*contradiction, which can easily be eliminated. According to Adler, it is necessary to divide both the concept of time and the concept of space into infinitesimal quantities, and then we can say that a moving body is located each time at each given infinitesimal point in space. Dialectics seems to him so easily put to shame, both as the law of the contradictory development of the objective world and as the logic of contradictions!

Adler's intellect does not tolerate contradictions. In the actual world itself, for Adler, these contradictions do not exist at all. There are only apparent contradictions in thinking, and at the slightest effort of human thought to analyze its concepts, these contradictions are dispelled like smoke. So easily does the "left" social-democrat Max Adler, who is fond of revolutionary phrases in politics, even to the extent of the slogan of social revolution, deal with the fundamental question of the Marxist worldview! In politics, too, he proceeds from the fact that the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are only apparent, which have arisen only because of a wrong point of view, a wrong way of thinking, and therefore he hopes to solve the problem of social revolution through "democracy."

Kautsky is much more skilful in his struggle against dialectics. Kautsky knows that Marx and Engels speak of dialectical laws of nature, society, and thought, and that is why he also speaks of the dialectic of organic, inorganic, and social life, although Kautsky's principle of the objectivity of dialectics in Marxism was already tarnished by his struggle against materialism.

How, then, does Kautsky understand the central point of materialist dialectics? He sees the essence of dialectics in the solution of the question *of the relation of the environment and the organism* , and from the point of view of Marxism , the change in this relation seems to fit into the scheme *of the triad*, the starting point of which is the adaptation of the organism to the environment. Kautsky directly objects to Engels ' idea, which is supposedly different from Marx's, of the struggle *of internal* contradictions in every phenomenon as the main source of all movement, development, and transitions. Kautsky completely rejects the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of *self*-movement, which in his opinion was inspired by the scholasticism of Hegel, who always explained movement from only one factor, namely, the spirit positing its own negation. Kautsky replaces all this supposedly scholastic and idealistic teaching about internal contradictions with the supposedly materialistic and real process of adapting the organism, the ego, to the external environment.

On closer examination, these revelations of Kautsky's turn out to be an old one, already worn out by bourgeois positivists (Spencer and others), repeated in thousands of ways by all sorts of empirio-critics and empiriomonists, popularized in the USSR by Comrade Bukharin, the well-known *theory of equilibrium* . The fitness of the organism in the environment as the starting point of movement is the state of equilibrium between them. Contradictions between the environment and the organism are violations of this equilibrium. Finally, a new higher adaptation of the same organism to its environment is the restoration of disturbed equilibrium on a higher basis.

And it is this old theory of equilibrium, clothed in a dialectical phraseology of thesis and antithesis and synthesis, or the negation of negation, that Kautsky calls dialectics.

The anti-dialectic and mechanistic nature of this theory of equilibrium is already clear from the previous chapters of our textbook. Here we consider it necessary to dwell a little on the reasons

why this theory is attractive to the bourgeoisie and its ardent defenders — the leaders of modern social-democracy.

Kautsky himself quite clearly discovers the class meaning of this theory when he calls the process of the relationship between the organism and the environment the process *of adaptation* the organism's attitude to the environment. Thus, it is not a struggle for a revolutionary transformation of the environment, both natural and social, but *a passive adaptation.* to it, the obsequious change by the organism, both animal and social, of its own properties, organs, and institutions is a logical and practical conclusion from this theory. Not a revolutionary overcoming of all the obstacles that stand in the way of a given development of the social organism, not a struggle for mastery of this environment and its subjugation, but, on the contrary, a complete surrender of oneself to the power of this environment, a complete slavish submission to it — these are the consequences of the practical implementation of this theory.

A party guided by the theory of adaptation cannot be a party of the revolutionary proletariat, a party of social revolution. Such a party is incapable of organizing the proletariat to storm capitalism, but it is quite suitable to play the role of a doctor of this capitalism, to distract the workers from the struggle against the bourgeoisie, to organize the complete enslavement of the proletariat by this capitalism.

All the political theories of modern social-fascism, such as the theory of organized capitalism, the theory of the growth of capitalism into socialism through democracy, and finally one of the newest theories — the theory of "lesser evil" - all of them have their methodological roots in the philosophical theory of adjustment, which is essentially a theoretical generalization of the renegade, the treacherous policy of modern social-democracy. Kautsky's philosophy most consistently formalizes theoretically, elevates into a principle, and introduces into the worldview the adaptable essence of this party. Its whole point is to adapt proletarian interests in politics *приспособить*to bourgeois ones; in theory, to carve up revolutionary Marxism in such a way, to cut it off in such a way, and to falsify it in such a perverted way as to place it in the service of the bourgeoisie.

The theory of adaptation removes the question of *internal* contradictions. Applied to society, this means renouncing the class struggle and the revolutionary tasks of the proletariat. The negation of internal contradictions inevitably leads to the blunting of all contradictions, to the complete abolition of them, since the internal incentive to struggle, all its iron necessity, is lost. In relation to external contradictions, you can maneuver, you can adapt to them, you can get rid of them. Here *are the methodological foundations of the theory* of organized capitalism, according to which internal contradictions are transferred to the arena of international relations, i.e., the capitalism of each country becomes internally organized and the struggle manifests itself only in external relations between individual countries and states, and which is crowned by social-fascist theorists with the theory of ultra-imperialism, the theory of a single world This conclusion, which Bukharin and all the right-wing defenders of the theory of organized capitalism in the Comintern did not reach, is methodologically completely linked to the mechanistic theory, which denies internal contradictions in each phenomenon and sees the source of the movement of this phenomenon, the law of its development in its relations with the environment.

*Mechanismsmthe*theory of the blunting of all contradictions, the theory of their gradual elimination and complete abolition, the theory of adaptation and not of revolutionary struggle — this is the key to understanding why it is so attractive to the bourgeoisie, why the social-fascist defenders of the bourgeoisie are so interested in it and propagate it so diligently, and why this theory finds its adherents in the bourgeoisie. among the right and" left " opportunists.

An assessment of the revisionist attitude to materialist dialectics is characterized by these theorists ' understanding of the dialectical *law of negation of negation* . Kautsky, Adler, Bogdanov, and other critics of Marxism interpret this law as *a triad* . From their point of view, the triad is the essence of dialectics. Kautsky rejects Engels ' conception of negation, since Engels regards it as the self-negation of a given phenomenon, as the process of its transition into its own opposite by virtue of the struggle of internal forces, tendencies, and contradictions. Kautsky stands for the negation of negation, but for one that would result from the interaction of two factors-the individual and the

environment.

M. Adler is also more or less friendly to the law of negation of negation and even considers it his duty to "help" Marxism to scientifically substantiate this law, resorting for this purpose to the help of such pillars of" modern science " as the bourgeois sociologist Spencer and the bourgeois philosopher Wundt.

How can we explain the favor shown by revisionists of all stripes to this law of dialectics? Of course, this law itself — understood in a Marxist way-does not give any grounds for revisionist distortion of the materialist dialectic.

But if we take a closer look at the revisionist interpretation of this law, we will clearly see the whole anti-Marxist meaning of this interpretation. This is expressed, first, in the fact that by reducing the essence of materialist dialectics to a triad, social-democratic theorists make it easier for themselves to *fight*against Marx's dialectic, which is supposedly a scholastic, far-fetched, dogmatic, schematic theory.

None of the classical Marxists ever defended the Hegelian triad as a law of materialist dialectics. But by distorting the Marxist understanding of the law of negation of negation, the opportunists are pulling out one side. This aspect consists in the fact that the final moment of the triad is a synthesis, which they transform into a non-contradictory unity, into absolute equilibrium. *A synthesis that excludes contradictions* is what attracts all revisionists to such a "triad", since this position serves as an excellent means of theoretically justifying the policy of blunting class interests, the policy of fighting against revolution. If such a triad with its final chord-synthesis-is the universal dialectical law of all life, then it is possible to synthetically unite the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in a democratic state, it is possible through this latter to overcome class contradictions, to balance class interests.

Thus, the materialist dialectic is violently attacked by the philosophizing revisionists, especially by a monstrous perversion. The whole fire of attack on dialectics is directed in one direction — to expel from Marxism the theory of the struggle of contradictions in all phenomena of nature, society, and thought, and to replace it with a lifeless, unscientific, opportunist theory of adaptation; to reject the theory of irreconcilability of contradictions, their development and sharpening to antagonism, to the extreme, to irreconcilability, and to replace it with the theory of conciliatory synthesis to eliminate from Marxism the revolutionary theory of internal contradictions, which, if carried out consistently in politics, requires a struggle for revolution, to disfigure, trim, and trim this theory on the model of its reformist-fascist treacherous policy. This is the fundamental meaning of all revisionist writings on dialectics.

9.8. Revisionism, social fascism and historical materialism

On the attitude of revisionists and social-fascists to questions *of historical development* The whole anti-Marxist and anti-Proletarian character of social-democratic theories is even more easily revealed by materialism, since these questions are directly connected with politics, the class struggle, and the daily activities of parties.

In recent years we have had three social-democratic theorists — Kautsky, Kunov, and Max Adler-present voluminous books in which the historical views of modern revisionism are more or less systematically expounded. These books, like all the "theoretical" writings of social-Democrats in general, are saturated from the first page to the last with a certain "partisanship"; they defend in theory the anti-Marxist, bourgeois, reactionary line. It is precisely of modern social-democratic theorists that we can say, to paraphrase Dietzgen's words about German professors of philosophy, that for them historical theory, like philosophy, is not a science, but a means of fighting against Marxism, against the proletariat and its revolution. On the theoretical side, the historical, as well as philosophical, views of modern revisionism are a mixture of bourgeois ideas of the mechanistic and positivist, neo-Hegelian and neo-Kantian persuasions.

One of the main tendencies that characterize Kautsky's historical views is *naturalism*in general, and especially biologism. Here is what Kautsky himself says about the paths of his

theoretical development: "They (Marx and Engels) proceeded from Hegel, and I from Darwin. The latter preoccupied me earlier than Marx, the development of organisms earlier than the development of economics, the struggle of species and races for existence earlier than the class struggle[483]." Now, in his old age, Kautsky decided to return to his starting point. He replaces the Marxist theory of historical materialism, which scientifically reveals the actual laws of social history, with an empty *game of biological concepts* on the adaptation of the organism to its environment, on the natural innate properties and instincts of man, such as caring for offspring, the need for adornments, sexual feeling, etc., Kautsky considered the central task of his research "on the materialist understanding of history" to be to find a general law to which the development of men, animals, and plants is subject. Kautsky believes that he has developed further the ideological legacy of Marx and Engels by finding this general law. Kautsky formulates his "valuable contribution" to Marxist science as follows: "The general law... is that every change in societies, as well as in species, can be reduced *to a change in the environment* . Where this environment remains constant, the organisms and organizations that live in it do not change. New forms of organisms and social organizations are reduced to adapting to a changed environment[484]."

In the first place, Kautsky vainly ascribes to himself the honor of this " discovery." Elements *of naturalism*, attempts to explain social phenomena by analogy with natural ones, were already present in the French materialists, since they appealed to the natural nature of man. Since the mid-nineteenth century, the teachings that liken the social life of man to the natural life of organisms have been diligently propagated by bourgeois sociologists (Comte, Spencer) and their numerous followers. Finally, even in modern bourgeois sociology, Kautsky is not the only representative of the social-Darwinian trend. A number of professors develop the idea of the law of natural selection in society in order to justify and perpetuate the bourgeois system with its competition, with its struggle for the existence and survival of economically stronger social organisms and institutions. The fascist wing of bourgeois theorists also resorts to various naturalistic theories of social development in order to theoretically justify the necessity of active violent reactionary actions of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. Fascist theorists carry out the idea of innate racial and national characteristics. According to their theory, some peoples are destined by nature to play the role of oppressors and enslavers, while others are destined to play the role of colonial slaves. These are the reactionary theories that talk about the innate qualities and instincts of man leads to.

Secondly, the entire unscientific and theoretical futility and fruitlessness of the results of such attempts to explain social life by means of biology was long ago proved and exposed by Marx and later by Lenin in his "Materialism and Empirio-criticism". "We must agree that this is a very convincing method... for the pompous, pretentious scientific, pompous ignorance and indolence of thought, "Marx wrote in a letter to Kugelmann about a certain G. Lange, who also" discovered " the universal law of history — the law of the struggle for existence. "Can one imagine anything more barren, dead, and scholastic than such a string of biological and energetic phrases, which give absolutely nothing and cannot give anything in the field of social sciences, "Lenin wrote in Materialism and Empirio[485]-criticism about Bogdanov's arguments about" positive and negative social selection." "To bring social laws under the natural-scientific concepts of biology and energetics is a dead and scholastic occupation, it does not move the actual laws of social life one iota along the path of scientific knowledge, but on the contrary closes this path, replacing science with empty energetic and biological literature" *(Lenin)* .

Thus the defence of the old bourgeois, reactionary, unscientific views, which have already been worn out because of their long-standing use — this is what Kautsky's historical "theory" is already characterized at the starting point.

---

483 K. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / нем. изд., т. I — с. 17.

484 K. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / нем. изд., т. II — с. 630–631.

485 B. Ленин / Соч., изд. 1-е, т. X — с. 276.

The tendency to naturalism is not unique to Kautsky among social-democratic theorists. Heinrich Kunov, who in recent years has written a voluminous book entitled: "Marx's theory of the historical process of society and the State" also takes the point of view of these reactionary, bourgeois theories. This tendency is clearly reflected in his interpretation of the Marxist definition *of productive forces* . He naturalizes the productive forces: from his point of view, all natural conditions belong entirely to the productive forces; the forms of economy depend on the geographical situation and are determined by it.

Bukharin's theory of equilibrium as applied to society also operates with the natural-scientific concepts of "energy", "equilibrium", "labor costs" , etc.We have already noted Lenin's critique of Bogdanov's "social energy". And if we finally recall that Plekhanov also has a certain overestimation of the role of the geographical environment in social development, then it becomes quite clear that there is a definite connection between political opportunism and the naturalistic-mechanistic perversion of historical materialism.

The goal of all these biological, geographical, and energetic phrases is the same: to banish from Marx's historical theory the doctrine of *the historically determined* character of social production, on which the whole theory of class struggle and revolution rests; the goal is to ignore the socio-economic characterization of such social phenomena as classes, parties, states, and nations. The aim is to divert the proletariat from the struggle for a socialist system of social production, to divert it from the struggle for the revolutionary removal of all political obstacles that stand in the way of the realization of the most basic, most fundamental and profound tasks of the proletariat — to replace the capitalist organization of social production with a socialist one. To pervert the historical theory of Marxism, to bourgeoisize it, to make it suitable for justifying and propagating the bourgeois policy of social fascism — such is the meaning of obscuring *the doctrine of economic formations*in historical materialism by using naturalistic concepts.

For these purposes, revisionists of all stripes use not only the methodology of mechanismism. *Idealism*, a means tested by all reactionary classes in their struggle against materialism — is widely used by social-democratic theorists in their sociological constructions. The most consistent defender of idealism in the historical theory of social fascism is the already well-known M. Adler.

We have already found out earlier that, according to Adler, Marxism is *only a doctrine of society* . A closer examination of this Adlerian "Marxism" reveals that Adler defends Kantian idealistic metaphysics, which is not covered by anything. In order not to dwell on this question, we will quote a few quotations: "The dependence of the ideal on the material is no longer difficult, since it is a question of *the dependence of one kind of psychic on another kind* »[486]." "This material thing is no longer a thing, but something human, and as such something spiritual is already necessary[487]." The material and the spiritual are identical. One and the other, "economics and ideology... two stages of the same spiritual connection" and thus Marx's greatest discovery that "the mode of production of material life determines the process of social, political and spiritual life in general" — in Adler is interpreted in such a way that *one kind of consciousness determines its other kind* .

Kautsky and Kunov attempt to erase the materialist content from the Marxist doctrine of the basis of social life. Both idealize both the productive forces and the relations of production. Kautsky identifies the process of development of productive forces with *the spiritual process*of cognition of nature. "If the material productive forces are already largely of a spiritual nature, this is all the more true of the relations of production..." says Kautsky in his last book[488]. The idealistic nature of this distortion of the materialist understanding of history is quite clear and indubitable.

When studying the theoretical views of international social-fascism, it becomes quite clear

---

486 М. Адлер, Учебник по материалистическому пониманию истории.

487 М. Адлер, Учебник по материалистическому пониманию истории — с. 1.

488 К. Каутский, Материалистическое понимание истории / т. I — с. 814.

that idealism did not accidentally become a similar form of revision of Marxism even under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Idealism, both in philosophy and in sociology, is widely used by international social democracy in order to pervert Marxist theory. Menshevik idealism, along with mechanismism, continues this revisionist work in the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The bourgeois meaning of both the mechanistic and idealistic perversions of historical materialism is fully revealed when social-fascist theorists first touch on such purely political problems as *classes, the state, and revolution* .

Kautsky, who stands on the side of the bourgeoisie in the practice of the class struggle and strives to turn the working-class movement towards bourgeois politics, defends the point of view of reconciling class interests at the expense of the ever-increasing enslavement of the proletariat. Kautsky, as a theorist, revises the Marxist doctrine of the origin of classes from *the internal laws* of the economic development of primitive society and replaces it with the theory of the emergence of classes through *the conquest* of one people by another. Kautsky revises the Marxist definition of classes, which clearly states the dependence of the existence of classes and their role on the economic system of social production, and replaces it *with a distributive one* class theory. Both theoretical propositions serve the same political purpose — to blur and obscure all the irreconcilable opposition between the class interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, to distract the proletariat from the tasks of fighting for a new mode of production, and to limit its class struggle to the area of distribution, i.e., to make it reformist, acceptable, and harmless to the bourgeoisie. If classes did not arise with iron necessity from the development of the economic basis of primitive society, but from purely incidental circumstances, then the classes of modern society can also be eliminated, gradually eliminated by various economic and political reforms and secondary measures. This is how a hardened bourgeois politician mobilizes his entire scientific apparatus, all the accumulated knowledge, and forces it to serve his treacherous policy: to save capitalism from the proletarian revolution.

Kautsky, as a politician, defends the bourgeois state, fights against the country of the proletarian dictatorship and against the communists of all countries. Kautsky, as a theoretician, openly revises the Marxist doctrine of *the state* . Like the classes, the state, according to Kautsky, did not arise out of the economic development of society, but as a result of naked military violence. Kautsky, in defining the state, seeks *to separate politics from economics* , to make it independent of the economic basis, and to contrast it with the latter. The following words can serve as a vivid example of the anti-Marxist theory of the state: "The modern democratic state differs from previous types of state in that this use of the state apparatus for the purposes of exploiting classes does not relate to its essence, *is not inextricably linked with it* . If it becomes the organ of an exploiting minority, this *is not due to the characteristics of the State* , but to the characteristics of the working classes, their fragmentation, ignorance, lack of independence or inability to fight, which in turn are the result of the conditions in which they live[489]." And there are infinitely many such places. This means that the modern state in capitalist countries *is not essentially bourgeois* , exploitative. Its reactionary role and outright violence against the proletariat cannot be explained by the economic domination of the capitalists, which can only be overthrown by a proletarian revolution — the proletariat itself is to blame for the bourgeois character of the modern state, which has not yet learned to use all the benefits of democracy! Thus the "Marxist" Kautsky throws overboard all the remnants of Marxist baggage and irrevocably takes the position of fetishism of the bourgeois state. This is how the theorist Kautsky serves Kautsky, the politician.

Kunov, like Kautsky, obscures the opposition between the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, ignoring in defining class such a basic feature of class as the relation to the means of production. All this is done in order, with the help of such bourgeois fetishes as the "national" and "state" "feeling", to erase from Marxism the concept of the class struggle, the class character of the bourgeois state, the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Kunov admits that class

489 К. Каутский / Соч., т. II — с. 598.

antagonisms can go so far that a class can turn against its own nation, but "this *can only* be, but by no *means should*be." To prove that the bourgeois state is above class, Kunov resorts to Hegel's objective idealism, to Hegel's teaching about the state as a "higher organism", as an absolute idea, eternal and indestructible.

Max Adler, as we have seen, revises the doctrine of historical materialism on the economic basis and the class struggle in a frankly idealistic manner. "Just as economic socialization is only, in his opinion, a historical expression of the transcendental-social *capacity of consciousness* , so the class struggle is also an expression of the formal *regularity of the will* »[490]." The economic basis of society is only *a form of consciousness* ; similarly, the development of the class struggle is determined by the formal laws of the will, and the whole content of the class struggle is exhausted by the struggle of wills. From this, of course, it is very easy to pass to the call of the proletariat to change the economic basis by means of parliamentary chatter, to moderate the class struggle by means of democratic chatter.

Both in politics and in theory, the social-fascist theorists, especially Kautsky, are fighting against the dictatorship of the proletariat. Their " theoretical investigations "are aimed at proving that Marx dropped the word" dictatorship of the proletariat " by accident, that the dictatorship in Soviet Russia shows the immaturity of the proletariat to fight for its liberation, and that only a modern bourgeois democratic state is an all-saving remedy for all the evils of capitalism and all the horrors of the proletarian dictatorship.

Kautsky, Kunov, Otto Bauer, Max Adler, Karl Renner, and other theorists of modern social fascism all agree in their assessment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and bourgeois democracy. There are no theoretical differences here. Only the methods of theoretical justification of the bourgeois policy of social-democracy vary.

The metaphysics and scholasticism of the social-historical views of social fascism are particularly prominent in their solution of the problem *of revolution* . In the previous chapters of our textbook, the Marxist-Leninist content of the doctrine of revolution has already been clarified. According to this theory, the economic basis of revolution is the conflict of productive forces and production relations. This proposition is directly connected with the teaching of dialectical materialism about the universality of the dialectical law of unity and the struggle of opposites. The social-fascists diligently distort the Marxist doctrine of revolution. Kautsky also pays the greatest attention to this question in his theoretical works.

In his book The Materialist Understanding of History, Kautsky devotes an entire section to his own commentary on Marx's preface to the Critique of Political Economy. Having stipulated the necessity of a "periodic revision of Marxism," Kautsky makes several "corrections" to this Marxian preface, which relate precisely to the question of the social revolution. First of all, it *denies the universality of the law of social revolution*and restricts its operation in society to the period from the beginning of the development of industrial capitalism. All the preceding social forms developed not because of a social revolution, but as a result of a push received from outside, as a result of arming the barbarians.

The second "amendment" restricts the operation of another of Marx's propositions, according to which "no social formation will perish before it has developed all the productive forces for which it offers sufficient scope." Kautsky considers it necessary to "correct" Marx on this point, since, from his point of view, capitalism is capable *of infinitely developing the productive forces* : capitalist relations of production never become fetters to the development of the productive forces; on the contrary, "industrial capitalism leads to an increasingly rapid development of the productive forces." This last proposition of Kautsky's is, as we know, supported by all the theorists of modern social-democracy. Otto Bauer, in his last book, published in 1931, also predicts long years of magnificent development for capitalism, and also praises its ability to achieve endless technological progress. The whole political attitude of modern social-democracy to cure capitalism, to help it, is

490 М. Адлер, Кант и марксизм / нем. изд. — с. 187.

based entirely on this theoretical proposition, according to which, under capitalism, there is no conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production.

Thus, the content of both Kautsky's first and second "amendments" to Marx amounts to a rejection of the doctrine of social revolution as the law of development *of all class* society, and to a blatant rejection of the Marxist doctrine of social revolutions, their necessity and inevitability precisely because of the internal economic laws of the development of class societies and the laws of mass struggle. According to Kautsky, before the advent of industrial capitalism, all class formations, being antagonistic and creating fetters for the development of the productive forces, did not lead to social revolutions and did not receive an impetus for further development through them. History knows only bourgeois and proletarian social revolutions. But after all — according to Kautsky's second "amendment" to Marx-capitalism does not retard the development of the productive forces, nor does it create any obstacles to it. This means that the proletarian revolution is not determined by any internal necessity for the development of capitalism, by its contradictions, by its decay. Capitalism is capable of developing the productive forces indefinitely, and there is no tendency to impoverish the workers: on the contrary, capitalism "reduces working hours, improves housing conditions" *(O. Bauer)* , and raises the material and cultural level of the workers. The question is: why and to whom is the proletarian revolution necessary, and what is its economic and political necessity?

But, as is well known, even from the standpoint of Lenin's criticism of the revisionism of the Second International, the whole point is that Kautsky and all the other leaders of social-democracy *throw out all the socio-political content of the proletarian revolution*, and are waging a practical and theoretical struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat. Political democracy achieved by gradual, peaceful, parliamentary means, while the economic foundations of capitalism are completely inviolable — this must amount to the proletarian revolution, as it is portrayed by all the "theoretical luminaries" of modern social-democracy. With this bourgeois-lackey theory they substitute the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the Proletarian revolution as the most profound revolutionary revolution in the sphere of the economic basis, a revolution necessarily connected with the revolutionary seizure of political power, with violence against the bourgeoisie, with its expropriation, and with the revolutionary suppression of all counter-revolution, unlimited by any laws. It is clear that Kautsky also appears in the theory of revolution as a class enemy of the proletariat: having donned the toga of a learned theorist, he continues to carry on with theoretical weapons the same resolute struggle against the proletarian revolution that he, together with his party colleagues, is waging in practice.

According to the Kautskyite theory of revolution, only for *the bourgeoisie* Marx's law is true to the revolution. Only the bourgeois revolution was the result of a conflict between productive forces and feudal property relations. Capitalism has opened a new era in history. But this aspect of the question only once again clearly confirms the entire bourgeois apologeticism of Kautsky's theory. After all, this is how the bourgeois historians of the restoration period explained and justified their revolution, and this is how, in theory, they fought against the class struggle of the proletariat and its revolution. According to these openly bourgeois historians, the bourgeoisie fought feudalism in the interests of the whole society, and the bourgeois revolution brought freedom, equality, and fraternity to the whole people. According to Kautsky, capitalism has brought society out of its impasse and opened up an era of endless development of production, and already within *the framework of capitalism*, the proletariat and the entire people, through the democratic state, receive all the opportunities and use them to become free and equal. It is clear that Kautsky completely repeats bourgeois ideas aimed at praising the bourgeoisie, at consolidating and preserving capitalism, and at fighting against the proletariat.

Thus, the views of revisionism in historical theory can be characterized as follows:

Not historical materialism, but *an idealistic understanding of history* social-democratic theorists defend and promote it. The materialism of the historical views of Marx, Engels, and Lenin consists in recognizing the existence, apart from and independent of social consciousness, of a socially and historically determined material production, which determines all other aspects of

social life. All social-fascist theories, without exception, while expounding the Marxist doctrine of the economic basis and treating a whole series of questions of social development as classes, the state, revolution, and nation, emasculate all materialist content from historical materialism and replace it with idealism.

It is not a dialectical understanding of the historical process, but *metaphysics and scholasticism*in historical science, that is preached by the "learned" leaders of social-democracy. The doctrine of contradictions in the development of the economic basis and class contradictions, which throughout history (with the exception of the era of primitive communism) developed to irreconcilable antagonism and led to social revolution — this doctrine is the essence of the dialectic of social development in a class, exploitative society. Social-fascism rejects this teaching of Marxism, distorts it mechanically and scholastically.

And finally, not a proletarian and revolutionary understanding of social development, but *a bourgeois and reactionary one* these leaders preach. The recognition that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that this dictatorship itself is a transition period to a classless society, is what distinguishes the proletarian revolutionary and real Marxist from the opportunist and renegade under capitalist conditions. Both in theory and in practice, the Social-Democrats completely reject Marx's teaching. Their theoretical struggle against these ideas of Marxism-Leninism and their practical struggle against the first proletarian state clearly outline their role as practical and theoretical defenders of capitalism and traitors to the working class.

9.9. Economic and political views of modern social fascism

All the above-mentioned perversions of the philosophical foundations of Marxism and its historical theory by modern social fascism are inextricably linked to their views on bourgeois democracy and the nature of the capitalist economy.

The essence of social-fascism's views on *the bourgeois state* was most clearly expressed by Kautsky, Vandervelde, and others, who defended bourgeois democracy against the proletarian dictatorship. Kautsky argued in every possible way that modern bourgeois democracy has already ceased to be *классовым*а bourgeois class state in proportion as the proletariat wins a majority in parliament. According to Kautsky, by the dictatorship of the proletariat Marx meant a "*democratic republic*."

"If the proletariat is *the majority*in a bourgeois democracy, then we no longer have a bourgeois state, but a dictatorship of the proletariat," Kautsky teaches. - There is absolutely no need for the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie; the conquest of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" takes place very simply, democratically and calmly. It is only necessary to obtain a "majority" in parliament — and the dictatorship of the proletariat is ready without the barbaric Bolshevik methods. But in this case, Kautsky continues to teach — there must be full equality of rights between the" majority "and the"minority." The rights of every minority are protected." In exposing Kautsky and others, Lenin showed that in essence this theory, the theory of the equality of the "majority" and the "minority," conceals not only the theory of the equality of exploiters and exploiters, but also a theoretical justification of capitalist exploitation in general, which is similarly based on the formal "equality" of the capitalist and the worker who sells his labor.

These theories later became the main elements for the justification of all further policies and tactics of post-war social democracy. On this theoretical basis, theories of "political and *economic democracy*" or, as Otto Bauer calls it, theories of "functional democracy" as the main path to socialism are constructed and derived. These theses were the theoretical basis for social fascism's organization of the defeat and suppression of the revolutionary working-class movement. Under the guise of defending democracy and with the slogan "democracy," international social-democracy has drowned the German, Hungarian, and Austrian proletarian revolutions in blood, is fighting the Communists, and is organizing intervention against the U.S.S.R.

Kautsky's position is also *shared by the" lefts " in the Second International* . Max Adler proves very scientifically that " political democracy "is identical with the dictatorship of the

bourgeoisie," social democracy " corresponds to socialism. Following Kautsky, he says that "a democratic republic in which the bourgeoisie has a majority in parliament is a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie." A democratic republic in which the proletariat has democratically won a majority is the dictatorship of the proletariat! Otto Bauer, the most prominent theorist of the "left" Social-Democrats at the Linz Congress in 1926, stated in his program report: "We are not drawing up a program today with the intention of finding out for ourselves what Marx thought in 1875 — We must look at the world as it is now… Suppose that the proletariat gains power *by means of democracy* , then what should we do, whether to destroy democracy — this is out of the question."

Thus, in their revision of Marx on the question of bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the "left" also relies entirely on Kautsky, developing and concretizing his anti-Marxist teaching. Bauer, as well as Kautsky, Hilferding, and others, argues that the "situation has changed", that we live in a completely different epoch from that in which Marx lived. Capitalism is now "fundamentally" different, they say, from the capitalism of Marx's time. Therefore, there is now a different path leading to socialism "than in Marx's time." Otto Bauer, like all "leftists", in contrast to the right-wing Social Democrats, insists that they are "leftist" Marxists, that they stand by Marx, but for Marx who has been reduced to the level of an Austrian or German philistine. "We need a Marx," exclaims Otto Bauer, "who overcomes Marx"!!

The theorists of social fascism associate their defense of bourgeois democracy with their *rejection of the class struggle* as a means of achieving socialist society. These views were especially vividly expressed in *Austro-Marxism*, by the same O. Bauer, in his theory of"guild socialism".

The mainstay of Austro-Marxism has always been a peculiar form of cooperation with the bourgeoisie, which the Austro-Marxists covered up with "left-wing" revolutionary phrases. In fact, even before the war, the Austrian Social-Democracy was only a party of "bourgeois progress", which fought for "better management of the capitalist state", against the" national treason " of other bourgeois parties. And a special feature of Austro-Marxism is its ability to adapt to any conditions. It is no accident that the most prominent theorists of Austro-Marxism worship the philosophy of "adaptation" — Machism. Until 1927, the Austro-Marxists managed to lead part of the mass of the industrial proletariat and the urban petty bourgeoisie at the same time. Along with the shootings and murders of workers on July 15 and 17, 1927, the traitorous Austro-Marxism was also shot on the streets of Vienna.

The Austro-Marxists still talk a lot about "socialism" and "collectivism," they talk about the class struggle and even about the dictatorship of the proletariat! But at the same time, the Austro-Marxists are more outspoken in practice than all the other sections of the Second International in favour of a purely "*spiritual struggle*."

As early as 1920, in his work Bolshevism or Social-Democracy, Otto Bauer argued that, unlike Bolshevism, which is the socialism of only *the ideologists* of the working-class movement, "guild socialism" is socialism *itself*. the labor movement.

Guild socialism, promoted by a few former English Fabians, denies all class struggle; it fetishizes the principles of" individual freedom " and bourgeois democracy. The "Guildsmen" believe that in a bourgeois democracy the "individual" gets the greatest freedom. The "Guildsmen" preach "cultural", "spiritual", and "political" equality. Only against the material equality of the proletariat with the capitalists do the "guild members" wage a fierce struggle. They regard any struggle for material equality as opportunism and reformism.

The Austro-Marxists, especially the "left" ones, are very adept at using this philosophy of "guild socialism". Bauer sets out several *stages in the development of the working class* , starting from the "working cattle" or "working slave" as the lowest stage in the development of the working class to the highest stage, when the working class rises to the "working person". At the lowest stage or stage, Professor Bauer teaches, " the driving force of socialism is the revolt against economic inequality." "Working cattle" seek to seize power in order to loot the loot. And this requires "a*despotic dictatorship of the proletariat*, which mercilessly suppresses all resistance that prevents the equalization of the use of property and income." Otto Bauer is referring here to the USSR. In the U.S.S.R. there is a dictatorship of the proletariat, and this, in his opinion, corresponds to the lowest

stage of development of the working class. But, Otto Bauer continues — where the proletariat has passed through a long period of political democracy, i.e., where it lives in a bourgeois-democratic republic, as in Austria, England, Germany, etc., where socialism grows out of a different root in "political democracy", the workers have the right to live in a bourgeois — democratic republic. all opportunities to "grow into free conscious individuals".

The "working person" strives for "freedom," and this striving for" freedom "is not a striving for" material "equality, but for "*spiritual*" equality. This desire for" spiritual " equality is the strongest driving force in her thinking and behavior. It is not the dictatorship of the proletariat that is its goal — or, as Bauer puts it, despotic socialism — but a social system that provides "every individual with a broad sphere of free activity." Bauer considers the democratic republic, i.e., *bourgeois democracy, to be such a social system* .

The Second International has always substituted the interests of the proletariat for the interests of the top of the "workers ' aristocracy" and tens of thousands of officials and employees of the party, trade union, cooperative and other economic enterprises of social-democratic organizations. Otto Bauer's theory of "personalities" and "working cattle" is essentially a bourgeois theory that idealizes the opposition of the "working aristocracy" to the rest of the working class.

In its views on the economics of modern capitalism, social fascism also speculates on the changed "conditions". In essence, Otto Bauer puts forward the same arguments here. Right-wing open social fascists-Tarnov et al. — in the assessment of the capitalist economy against Marx until recently put forward... the theory of the American billionaire Ford. They said that Marx's political economy corresponded to the English period of capitalism, with its crises, exploitation, and impoverishment of the proletariat. The present stage of capitalism knows neither crises nor impoverishment of the proletariat. Today's stage of capitalism corresponds to the American "prosperity", in which, along with the flourishing of capitalism, there is a constant increase in the material level of workers. The theorist of this period, in their opinion, is not even Marx, but Ford!

The textbooks for the party and trade union schools of German and Austrian social-democracy completely *deny the existence of exploitation* under the capitalist mode of production. "Only those who participate in the production process, whether as workers, owners of the means of production, or owners of land, receive primary income," the textbooks say. Under the "primary income" is summed up and salary and profit and rent. This provision is generally recognized in the Second International. Forverts of January 1931 gives the following statement:: "The income achieved belongs to those who created it, since *both suppliers of labor and suppliers of means of production have created economic income* , they are obliged *to share*it among themselves."

This very proposition is put forward by the social-fascists in order to justify their theory of "economic democracy." From here they derive the position' that the relations between capitalists and workers must be considered exclusively *in the sphere of distribution, and not in the sphere of production* . In other words, the capitalist mode of production is recognized as quite good, only the mode of distribution is bad, but through "political and economic democracy" these bad aspects of capitalism can be eliminated.

By putting forward the theory of" economic democracy "or the theory of" class harmony, " modern social-democratic theorists seek to prove that in modern capitalist society Marx's thesis about the transformation of the wage worker into a wage slave does not stand up to any criticism. The textbooks of party and trade union schools explicitly state that " anyone who adheres to Marx's position on the transformation of the wage worker into a wage slave in our era has not understood anything from Marx."

During the relative stabilization of capitalism, Hilferding proclaimed *the theory of organized capitalism* . Developing Kautsky's idea of ultra-imperialism as a new possible stage in the development of capitalism, Hilferding believed that we are already at a stage of its development at which capitalist anarchy disappears and when the transition to socialism takes place by *increasing the participation of the proletariat in the control of capitalist enterprise* . In the textbooks of social-democracy on political economy, the question of methods of eliminating the crisis phenomena of capitalist economy was seriously raised. Hilferding contrasted Marxism-scientific socialism — with

MacDonald's " constructive socialism "and the" guild socialism " of the Fabians. Kautsky at the same time proclaimed the eternity of the capitalist mode of production. In the main and final work of his life, The Materialist Understanding of History, Kautsky openly apologizes for capitalism; he proves that " economic theory has no arguments that would call into question the vital forces of capitalism." The capitalist mode of production, Kautsky declares, is "the best, most rational, and *only possible method of developing the productive forces*."

The old reformist slogans about "growing into socialism" and "implementing socialism piecemeal" are being resurrected again, and at this time they receive their general formulation, which is expressed in the fact that" economic democracy "and" political democracy "are the main ways of translating or" transforming " capitalism into socialism. The economic laws of modern capitalist economy are the laws of a revolutionizing society that is being transformed from capitalism to socialism, as the theorists of the Second International proudly declared when the world crisis was already in full swing.

At the same time, the theoretical views of social-democracy revealed an ever-increasing *fusion of social fascism with outright fascism* .

In fact, what else is a fascist "*cooperative state*" headed by the "national spirit" that prevails in it but the same somewhat modified social-fascist "organized capitalism" with its pure democracy? Of course, fascists and social fascists *from different ends* they come to this "ideal" of society and the state, but find themselves in the most immediate neighborhood. Or, on the other hand, what else is the so-called "economic democracy" or "*functional democracy"?* democracy", as opposed to the same theory of fascism about the same *state functions of capitalist and worker*, about the "equality of capitalist and worker", about their identical "functional roles". National fascism concludes that the capitalists, in the name of the "idea of the state," are given the right to exploit, while the worker, in the name of the "idea of the state" and the "national spirit," must submit, must leave himself to perpetual exploitation. The social-fascists essentially say the same thing as the fascists, putting it only in a more "attractive" form of " democratic phraseology."

Let us note another aspect of the connection between social fascism and fascism. As you know, one of the characteristic features of fascism is the *nationalization of trade unions* . They become organs of the bourgeois state, whose tasks are "regulating labor relations" and "eliminating minor conflicts between workers and entrepreneurs." In other words, their task is to create conditions that would be most conducive to capitalist exploitation. But this is the same task that social-democratic theorists set for the trade unions. Hilferding, for example, gives the following description of trade unions:

"The organization of Producers feels itself to be the true bearer of the state, especially of its bureaucracy, feels itself *to be an inseparable organ of the state*, equivalent to the state bureaucracy, even more important than the latter, because without its help the problems of production are insoluble."

Thus, with the development and growth of the revolutionary upsurge and activity of the revolutionary masses, with the intensification of the class struggle, the lines between social-fascism and national-fascism are increasingly blurred, for they have the same goal — to protect and save capitalism from the proletarian revolution and to perpetuate capitalist exploitation. They perform these tasks in different ways, according to the requirements and needs that are determined by the specific state of affairs.

In conclusion, it is interesting to note that the renegades from communism-the right — wing opportunist *Brandlerites* and the "left" Trotskyists — this vanguard of the counter — revolutionary bourgeoisie-are also taking the same social-fascist path of defending bourgeois democracy and capitalist economy*троцкисты*.

In their international platform, published in 1931, the Brandlerians write:: "As long as the Communists do not renounce the theory of social-fascism, it will not be possible to really overcome the reactionary bourgeois-democratic policy of the social-democratic leaders and to really fight against real fascism." Thus, the Brandlerites deny that social-democracy is being fascized, that the social-democratic leaders and the trade union bureaucracy are openly and covertly actively

contributing to the implementation of the predatory policy of the bourgeoisie, contributing to the implementation of the fascist dictatorship. The Brandlerites propose to form an alliance with social-democracy, with its bureaucratic *leadership* , and not with the social-democratic *workers*, in order to fight fascism together. The Brandlerites ' slogans "on the control of the workers over production" without violent revolution, without the dictatorship of the proletariat, and their slogans that "a workers' and peasants 'government" under the conditions of capitalism will lead to the dictatorship of the proletariat-essentially conceal the same social — fascist theory of the state and the same social-fascist attitude towards the Proletarian revolution. Both of these Brandlerite slogans mean nothing more than the substitution of a "violent revolution" for "peaceful growth into socialism," the substitution of a coalition government for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"A workers' and peasants 'government," Thalheimer and others declare, " is not synonymous with the dictatorship of the proletariat, but with the preparation of this dictatorship *within the framework of the capitalist state*."

The alliance of the Brandlerites with the social-fascists, i.e., the party and trade union social-democratic bureaucracy, is particularly evident in the persecution of communists, in slandering and denigrating the revolutionary action of the proletariat, in slandering the U.S.S.R. and socialist construction.

The world economic crisis and the rise of the revolutionary activity of the working masses led to the complete bankruptcy of not only Trotskyism, but also Brandlerism. The Trotskyists had long ago completely gone over to the side of the open enemies of communism, the open enemies of the U.S.S.R. Trotsky has long been an employee and servant of the imperialist bourgeoisie. There is not a single country where the Trotskyists have a significant number of supporters among the workers. Their press offices are being closed down one by one. Recently, the same fate has befallen the German variety of Trotskyists (Urbans).

The Brandlerites, who were more needed by the social fascists as auxiliary help in their struggle against communism, the Comintern and the USSR, also suffered a complete collapse. Having entered into a full and open alliance with the" left " social-fascists, they, like the latter, capitulated to the official social-fascist leadership.

9.10. The world economic crisis and social fascism. Social fascism and the USSR

The current economic crisis that has arisen on the basis *of a common* the crisis of capitalism in the post-war period greatly accelerated and revealed the whole development of the contradictions of capitalism. The complete failure of the capitalist system and the capitalist mode of production was clearly revealed. The crisis led both to a reduction in production and to unprecedented unemployment in the history of capitalism, which captured many tens of millions of workers.

All this is happening at a time when the USSR is rapidly completing the construction of the economic foundation of socialism, when one by one the giants of industry and agriculture are growing on the territory of the USSR. Naturally, the working class in the capitalist countries and all the exploited and oppressed turn their eyes more and more to the U.S.S.R. as the only possible way out of poverty, hunger, and oppression. Naturally, the revolutionary working-class movement is growing in activity and momentum. The political and organizational influence of the Communist parties is growing, mobilising and preparing the industrial proletariat of the cities and working villages for the violent overthrow of the rule of capital and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In this state of affairs, all the social-fascists ' theoretical constructions are collapsing before their eyes. It is no longer possible to tell the working masses about the new crisis-free stage of capitalism that has arrived. Not only did the theory of "economic democracy" and the theory of "class harmony" collapse, but the entire theory of "political democracy" and the conquest of power by "democratic means"also collapsed. The world economic crisis could bring nothing but shameful exposure to the social-fascist theories. Together with the beginning of a new crisis of capitalism, a

new *crisis of social-democracy* began-a crisis that expressed itself in the following terms:

1) the complete bankruptcy of Hilferding's theory of "organized capitalism" together with his theory of "imperialism — the formation of socialism";

2) in the same complete bankruptcy of the theory of the "American stage of capitalism", which supposedly knows no crises, in which the working class constantly improves and raises its standard of living.

The theory of "gradual conquest of power" and "gradual growth into socialism" has failed. On the other hand, the crisis fully justified the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of imperialism as the last phase of capitalism, and confirmed that imperialism brings hunger, poverty, and new wars to the working masses of the city and countryside. The crisis also confirmed the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the irreconcilability of classes and the class character of bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois state. The economic crisis finally confirmed the Marxist-Leninist position that the only way out of poverty, hunger, and ruin is the violent overthrow of capital and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The social-fascists, while exposing themselves and being exposed by the Communist Party, nevertheless quickly found new forms and methods of deceiving the working masses. As early as November 1930, social-fascist theorists tried to prove that "the phenomena that we are now experiencing are typical phenomena of a crisis in *the conjunctural cycle* of the capitalist economic system" *(Naftali)* . The social-fascists set themselves the task of presenting the world crisis as a temporary phenomenon in such a way that it distracts the working masses from raising questions about the general crisis of capitalism. In Germany, Austria, and England, they are equally demanding of the workers: "Every effort must be made to *mitigate and overcome* the present economic crisis." In the name of "future socialism," the social-fascists propose that the workers accept for the time being a reduction in wages, an increase in indirect and direct taxes, and the abolition of social insurance; they put forward, along with the above-mentioned theory, another and more sophisticated one: this *is the "lesser evil" theory* . After all, the road to socialism, the social — fascists assure us, leads through "economic and political democracy." We have followed this path and must continue to do so, the theorists of social fascism teach the workers. But now this democracy is in danger, so the crisis is not a problem, the crisis is a temporary, transitional phenomenon. With the help of "democracy", they say, we will not only be able to overcome the economic crisis, but also very soon move forward on the path to socialism. Kautsky and all the theorists of the Second International prove that the main task is to preserve democracy, and that *bourgeois democracy is a lesser evil*in comparison with open fascism and the "Bolshevik dictatorship."

At the same time, the social-fascists also used the crisis to ideologically train the broad masses of workers and peasants against the U.S.S.R. "Every new factory, every new smoking chimney on the territory of the U.S.S.R. increases unemployment," the social-fascists wrote and said.

"The entire counter-revolutionary, anti-labor policy of international social-democracy finds its culmination in *the preparation of a blockade and military intervention against the world's first proletarian state* »[491]." The trial of the "union bureau" of the Russian Mensheviks (Social-Democrats) revealed the whole vile double-dealing counter-revolutionary role of social-democracy. The trial revealed that, along with the turn of the world bourgeoisie towards a military interventionist policy against the U.S.S.R., the parties of the Second International also turned towards intervention, realizing that the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. would finally undermine their influence among the working masses of the capitalist countries. In this case, not only open social fascists such as Severing and Grzezinski exposed themselves, but also Kautsky and the so-called "lefts" led by Otto Bauer. Zevering, Grzezinski, Renaudel, Vandervelde and Kautsky openly demand *military intervention* against the Soviet Union, demand the overthrow of the dictatorship of

---

491 Из тезисов по докладу Д. Мануильского на XI пленуме ИККИ.

the proletariat and the restoration of capitalism. Severing and Kautsky also believe that the world crisis is caused *by the existence of Bolshevism*, i.e., by the existence of the USSR, and they see the only way out of the crisis in overthrowing the dictatorship of the proletariat. "Unfortunately," writes Kautsky, " as long as Bolshevism prevails, the capacity of the Russian market will have to remain absolutely negligible. The victory of democracy (i.e., capitalism. - *Ed.*) in Russia will not only open up the Russian market to global industry, but it will also contribute to the rapid expansion of this market to an extraordinary extent." Kautsky immediately appeals to the workers, proving to them the advantage of overthrowing the dictatorship of the proletariat and restoring capital in the U.S.S.R. "The consequences of such a coup will reduce poverty and unemployment in Europe and America." In order to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat, Kautsky is ready not only to cooperate with the German fascists and White Guards, but also to call on the kulaks and wreckers to take action against the Soviet government: "Every uprising against the Soviet government and against the dictatorship of the proletariat is *a progressive step* Kautsky exclaims.

It is interesting to trace the attitude of the Austro-Marxists and the" left " Social Democrats towards the USSR. At first they did not believe in the victory of the proletariat and tried to dissuade themselves from it. "All the same," Bauer declared in 1917,"even if the Russian revolution overcomes all dangers, its result cannot be anything other than bourgeois democracy."

In the future, the Austro-Marxists also took a course of intervention. They, along with the right-wing social fascists, conducted ideological training among the working masses against the USSR. In 1925. Otto Bauer puts forward the following formula for the struggle against the USSR:"We must fight against Bolshevism," he concludes, " since its foreign policy is ultimately directed towards war."

Now the "lefts" are forced to pay lip service to a certain turn in their speeches against the U.S.S.R. in order to fool the workers. They began to recognize the success of the five-year plan, and they began to talk about socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., and this all the more frequently, the more widely and profoundly the broad masses were revolutionized, and the more widely and profoundly the process of fermentation within social-democracy itself began. But while they acknowledge the success of socialist construction in the press and at meetings, they speak of the" impoverished and hungry condition " of the Russian proletariat, of the enormous sacrifices that the Russian proletariat is making. Western Europe, they argued, needed a different path of development, a strengthening of capitalism.

Thus, both in theory and in practice, the "left" Austro-Marxists, as well as the right in the Second International, did not for a moment suspend their anti-Soviet preparations and their persecution of the USSR. The statement in the resolution of the last XI plenum of the ECCI that international social-democracy, including the "lefts", *has become a shock brigade of world capitalism, preparing a war against the Soviet Union, is more correct and correct than ever* .

9.11. Revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in the struggle against Revisionism and Social fascism

The struggle of revolutionary Marxism against Revisionism was consistently waged even in the depths of the Second International in the pre-war period.

In the field of philosophy, this struggle was directed primarily *against neo-Kantianism, for dialectical materialism* . Neither Kautsky nor Plekhanov, who played a prominent role in the theoretical discussion during this period, were able *to fully expose* Kantianism as *классовую*a bourgeois class ideology. In addition, they themselves considered a certain compromise with Kantianism possible, and did not draw the appropriate conclusions for the revolutionary policy of the proletariat from their philosophical positions. As Lenin later pointed out, Plekhanov fought Kantian revisionism more "Feuerbachian" and "Buchnerian" than "Hegelian," i.e., he criticized the Kantians from the standpoint *of contemplative*materialism. Only Lenin, who recognized the necessity of criticizing Kantianism earlier than anyone else, adopted a strictly consistent revolutionary-Marxist position in his theoretical works and speeches directed against all kinds of

revisionism. When the Second International shamefully collapsed, suffered a shameful collapse, only the Bolsheviks and Lenin raised the banner of revolutionary Marxism high. Even before the war, the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, waged a relentless struggle against all forms of revisionism.

Therefore, when the World War began, it was clear to the Bolshevik-Leninists that a new epoch in the history of mankind had arrived, the epoch of the proletarian revolution, of the proletarian dictatorship. That is why the Bolshevik-Leninists believed that the struggle against the Social-Defencists should be a struggle for the organization of the proletarian revolution. "It is necessary," Lenin said, " to carry on the struggle directly in the spirit of the coming social revolution[492]." In another passage, Lenin explains that to reject "defense of the fatherland" means to deny all the foundations of modern bourgeois society, not only in theory, not only in general, but in practice, directly. "Is it not clear," Lenin continues,"that this can only be done if we have not simply passed on to the most firm theoretical conviction that capitalism is already fully ripe for its transformation into socialism?" This is not enough. "It is still necessary," Lenin goes on to argue, " to recognize this socialist revolution as practicable immediately and immediately[493]." Only those who fight in this spirit against the "defense of the fatherland" fulfill the duties of a revolutionary Marxist.

As early as 1916, Lenin, addressing the social-chauvinists, said: "The victory of revolutionary social-democracy on a world scale is absolutely inevitable, but it goes on and on, it happens and will happen only against you, it will *be a victory over you* ." This statement of Lenin's was a brilliant foresight of which only Marx, Engels, and Lenin were capable. 1917 and 1918 brought revolutionary Marxism victories over Russian and international opportunism.

Since the formation of the Third Communist International, the struggle of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism against international social-chauvinism and social-fascism has been steadily advancing. This struggle is being waged both by the Comintern as a whole and by its individual sections. In this respect, the program of the Comintern is the most important theoretical document describing a new historical stage in the development of world communism. The struggle against social-democracy and anarcho-syndicalism for the purity and revolutionary orientation of the professional working-class movement (Profintern), the struggle for the working masses of the peasantry (Krestintern), the struggle for cadres of youth (KIM), the exposure of the social-democratic theories of "economic democracy" and "organized capitalism", the exposure and defeat of Trotskyism and " Maslovism"etc., the struggle against right opportunism, the Brandlerites, the tactics of the united front, the exposure of social-democracy as the" moderate wing of fascism "*(Stalin)* , the exposure of the Kautskys ' social-interventionist plans, etc. — all these stages and moments of the struggle of the Comintern and its sections are of extremely important *methodological significance* for further development of Marxist-Leninist theory.

In addition to fighting trends outside the ranks of the Third International, its sections had to fight to purge their own ranks of the remnants of social-democratic and anarcho-syndicalist opportunism that had penetrated them in the first years of the revolution's rapid rise. This post-war struggle against revisionism and social fascism also went through a number of stages. By the tenth Plenum of the ECCI, the remnants of opportunism within the Communist International and its sections had been crushed. The Communist parties and their central committees were purged of Trotskyists and Brandlerites, who by this time had become not only open liquidators, but also accomplices of the enemies of the communist movement and the USSR. The parties were mostly purged of right-wing and" left-wing " deviators. Here and there there are still some hidden Brandlerites and Trotskyists, right-wing and "left" opportunists, hiding behind the formal recognition of the general line of the Comintern and waiting for an opportunity to speak out against the Communist Party. Therefore, as before, *the struggle against right-wing and" left " opportunists*, the struggle on two fronts, will not stop at the next stage. The XI Plenum of the ECCI also points

492 Ленинский сборник XVII.

493 В. Ленин / Соч., т. XVII.

out that the struggle against the main and main danger in the ranks of the Communist Party, the struggle against right-wing opportunism, remains as before *the main*task of the Communist parties. At the same time, an equally vigorous struggle is necessary against "left" opportunism, which, like right-wing opportunism, is only one of the varieties of revisionism in the working-class movement, "revisionism from the left," as Lenin put it. As shown recently by T. Stalin, in his letter to the editorial board of the Proletarian Revolution magazine, declared that Trotskyism, defeated, was making new attacks against Leninism. The Trotskyist smugglers, taking advantage of the rotten liberalism shown to them by certain leading party workers, drag Trotskyist ideas about the "rearmament" of Leninism, about the identity of Bolshevism with Luxemburgianism, etc., into their works on the history of Bolshevism, on philosophy, etc. one of the most important tasks facing international communism.

Вместе с этой борьбой против социал-фашизма и ревизионизма вне и внутри рядов Коммунистического интернационала крепнет и растёт коммунистическое движение. Авторитет и влияние революционного марксизма-ленинизма выросли не только среди городского пролетариата, но и среди трудящихся деревни всего мира.

В колониях, во всех уголках земного шара выросли отряды коммунизма, которые ведут беспощадную борьбу с угнетателями за победу пролетарской революции, за установление диктатуры пролетариата, за построение социализма в СССР. Коммунисты всюду ведут борьбу за окончательный разгром социал-демократии, как главной социальной опоры буржуазии. Шаг за шагом закрепляется победа революционного марксизма-ленинизма над социал-фашизмом — победа III Интернационала над II Интернационалом. Коммунистический интернационал — Интернационал революционного марксизма, созданный Лениным и руководимый сейчас т. Сталиным, работает с успешностью над выполнением заветов Маркса, Энгельса и Ленина.

Спасибо, что скачали книгу в бесплатной электронной библиотеке Royallib.com
Оставить отзыв о книге
Все книги автора