

PROLETARIANS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

M. MITIN

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM -
WORLDVIEW OF THE
Marxist-Leninist Party

*Lecture given at the Higher Party
School of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b)*

OGIZ * GOSPOLITIZDAT * 1941

" A short course in the history of the CPSU (b) " belongs to the outstanding works of Marxist-Leninist theory. This book was included in the *golden ideological fund of Bolshevism* . " A short course of the history of the CPSU (b) " gives a scientific generalization of the historical path traversed by the great and glorious Bolshevik Party. This way - according to the riches of his revolutionary experience of the intensity of the class struggle, typical of a new historical era, in a variety of forms of this struggle, the scale of historical movements, the head of which there was and there is a Bolshevik Party, according to its actual achievements - can not be with any than comparable.

In the "Introduction" to the "Short Course History of the CPSU (b)" states that the history of the CPSU (b) have a history of three revolutions: the bourgeois - democratic revolution of 1905 G. , the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917 G. , the socialist revolution in October 1917 Then there was pointed out that the history of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) has a history of overthrowing tsardom, the overthrow of the landlords and capitalists, the defeat of the foreign intervention and a host of enemies of the proletarian dictatorship, the history of the construction of the Soviet state and the socialist society in our country. Already one enumeration of these truly gigantic, world significance events shows how great the laboratory of the class struggle of the Bolshevik Party is. At all stages of this struggle, the Lenin - Stalin party was guided and is guided by the teachings of scientific communism, the theory of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin said that Marx's doctrine was omnipotent because it was true. This teaching is true, because it gives a correct understanding of the laws governing the development of objective reality. It equips with the knowledge of the laws of social development and is therefore an excellent weapon for changing this reality in a truly revolutionary spirit, in the spirit of communism. Guided by this doctrine, possessing knowledge of the laws of historical development, having powerful ideological weapons in their hands, being equipped with such a compass as the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the Bolshevik Party with honor went out and out of all historical trials, to which it fell out and fell to its share. Under the banner of this theory, it more and more unites the masses and confidently goes to its final goal.

The " Short Course in the History of the VKP (b) " differs in many respects from the previous textbooks on the history of the party, which we used to use. The fundamental difference of this course in the history of the Bolshevik Party is that it is saturated with a huge theoretical content. This book focuses exclusively on issues of dialectical and historical materialism. Otherwise, it can not be, because, as stated in the "Short Course History of the CPSU (b)" dialectical materialism is the world outlook of the Marxist-Leninist Party, dialectical and historical materialism constitute the theoretical foundation of communism, the theoretical foundations of the Marxist party.

The theme “ Dialectical materialism as the worldview of the Marxist-Leninist party ” is a very big one. In this brochure, we limit ourselves to the following three questions: 1) what is dialectical materialism and how did it come about, 2) how our party has fought for this worldview throughout its history, defended its purity, 3) what role does dialectical materialism play as the world view of the Bolshevik Party, as the only scientific method in solving the most important questions of the class struggle? It goes without saying that for each of these questions we will be able to illuminate only the central, key points here.

Table of contents

I

II

III

I

Worldview, as the very word says, is a view, a world view, an understanding of all the phenomena of nature and human society. In order to understand the diverse phenomena of the world surrounding a person, in order to encompass a complex and variegated chain of natural phenomena and human history with a single understanding, in order to understand the laws of their development, it is necessary to have a harmonious, integral world outlook.

Worldview is knowledge of the world as a *whole*, knowledge of the general laws of its existence and development. There are many various sciences. Basically they are divided into the science of nature and the science of public life of people. Each of the sciences is studying a certain range of phenomena. So, for example, physics takes into account the general properties of matter, its structure (atoms, molecules of solid, liquid, gaseous bodies) and the main forms of motion of matter. Chemistry studies the composition, the internal structure of substances, as well as the laws and mechanism of change of substances. Mathematics studies quantitative relationships and spatial forms of the real world. Social sciences study the totality of the phenomena of history, public life. Knowledge of one or another separate science or even knowledge of an entire group of sciences does not in itself give still solid worldview. In order to have a solid, scientific worldview, it is necessary to combine the concrete knowledge of individual sciences with the understanding and knowledge of the general picture of the world, the general laws of life of nature and history. In order to acquire a completely scientific worldview, it is necessary to study the science of the most common laws of nature, history and human thinking, i. e. *dialectical materialism*.

For a revolutionary leader, a clear, harmonious worldview is especially necessary because his practice, his activity in public life, must be correct, must go in the spirit of progressive historical development.

In the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, we find deep thoughts on the role and significance of the revolutionary world view for revolutionary activities. A certain understanding of this was of such great representatives of progressive human thought as the Russian revolutionary democrats - Chernyshevsky and Dob. Chernyshevsky in " Outlines from Political Economy " wrote: " ... who has not understood the principles in all logical completeness and consistency, not only in the head confusion, but also in the affairs of nonsense " [1]. With all its inherent depth and vividness, Chernyshevsky formulates the question of the relationship between clear theory and correct practice. In order that in practice, in activity, there would be no nonsense, for this to happen, it is necessary that the “ principles in their entire logical completeness ” be understood, in other words, one must have a harmonious, complete worldview.

Dobrolyubov wrote on the same issue: “ Having received the concept of the general, t. e. a permanent law for which there is a history of people, expand their worldview to the understanding of the common needs and the needs of humanity, educated person feels indispensable desire to transfer their theoretical attitudes and beliefs within the scope of practice ” [2] . Dobrolyubov, as we see, believes that a person who has a complete outlook, has an understanding of the laws of social development, inevitably seeks to transfer his views and ideas into the sphere of practical activity.

Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov were not Marxists. Speaking of worldview, they, of course, did not mean the Marxist worldview. But as revolutionary democrats, in the conditions of Tsarist Russia, they were striving for revolutionary practical activity and understood very well that this revolutionary activity should be inspired and spiritualized by ideological sense, a revolutionary worldview.

In Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, we find excellent lines devoted to the enormous role and significance that a consistent world view has, we find deep statements about the significance of revolutionary theory for revolutionary practice. Young Marx, when he developed his views, expressed the idea that philosophy finds its material weapon in the proletariat , just as the proletariat acquires its spiritual weapon in philosophy .

Lenin wrote:

“ Only the philosophical materialism of Marx indicated to the proletariat a way out of spiritual slavery, in which until now all the oppressed classes were stagnant. Only the economic theory of Marx explained the real position of the proletariat in the general structure of capitalism. ” [3] .

Comrade Stalin back in 1906 of "Anarchism and Socialism," he wrote in his article:

“ Marxism is not only a theory of socialism, it is a whole world outlook, a philosophical system from which Marx’s proletarian socialism logically follows. This philosophical system is called dialectical materialism. ” [4] .

Our worldview, the worldview of dialectical materialism, is above all a *monistic* worldview. What does it mean? Monism comes from the Greek word " monos " , which means " one " , " only " . *Monistic* - it means a worldview that the basis for understanding the world, all phenomena of nature, society, human history lays *single principle , single point of view* . Our worldview, as a monistic worldview, is radically different from any kind of eclectic or dualistic worldviews, of which there have been so many in the history of the development of philosophy and of which there is still so much today. These philosophies teach two or more mutually exclusive principles to the understanding of nature and history. They mix, confuse, combine different principles in the approach to the phenomena of the surrounding world.

Having established that our worldview is monistic, however, we say very little more. The fact is that there are many monistic philosophical systems, both idealistic and materialistic. Our worldview is not only monistic, but also *materialistic* . That principle, that single point of view, the single starting point from which we depart in understanding the phenomena of nature and history, in interpreting these phenomena, is the *principle of materialism* .

If we briefly describe the essence of this principle, then it consists of the following: matter, nature, the real objective world, life, being - this is the basis, the *primary* ; consciousness, thinking is *secondary* , derived from this basis. Nature, matter, exists outside and independently of any consciousness. Consciousness appears at a very high level of development of matter. A thought is a product of the activity of the human brain, which is a perfect organization of matter, created as a result of a very long path of historical development. The principle of materialism is fundamentally different and completely opposite to the principle of idealism.

The principle of idealism is that thought, consciousness - in one word, spiritual (for different idealists this spiritual, transformed into primordial, has different names: “ logos ” , “ absolute idea ” , “ world spirit ” , “ totality of my sensations ” and t. e.) is the primary, underlies everything, and the material world,

nature, real life, history is nothing but a secondary, derivative of this spiritual. From this very general characteristics can be seen that every idealism (difference of its forms is quite immaterial: blue devil, as pointed out more Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, is no different from white or green devil) smells of incense, essentially no different from religion, from a theological point of view. On the contrary, materialism, the materialistic theory of the interpretation of all the phenomena of the world, puts an end to religious mysticism, obscurantism, and all clericalism.

However, we have not yet said everything that is needed for the general characteristics of our worldview. In the history of the development of philosophy, there were various types of materialism, various materialistic schools: the mechanical materialism of the eighteenth century, the abstract, contemplative materialism of Feuerbach, the vulgar materialism of Büchner, Vogt, Moleschott, modern mechanistic materialism, etc. e. Our worldview is *dialectical* in its method, in its approach to the material world , and thus it is different from all the listed types of materialism.

Matter, which is put us in the foundation is not stagnant, stationary, and *develops* according to dialectical laws. The essence of these laws is that the world is in continuous movement, change, *development* . All natural phenomena are not isolated from each other, but are closely connected and interact with each other. The development takes place according to the law, according to which slow, insignificant, quantitative changes lead in the end by a leap to qualitative changes. The development of nature, history takes place according to the law of opposites. Here is in the most general form a characteristic of the laws of dialectical development, which are inherent in matter and thinking.

In the work of Comrade Stalin “ On Dialectical and Historical Materialism ”, dialectical materialism as a worldview is characterized as follows:

" It (this worldview. - *M.M.*) is called dialectical Materialism because its approach to natural phenomena, its method of studying natural phenomena, its method of knowing these phenomena is *dialectical* , and its interpretation of natural phenomena, its understanding of natural phenomena, its theory - *materialistic* " [5] .

The founders of scientific communism , Marx and Engels, were the creators of dialectical materialism . The great teachers of the proletariat created the theory of scientific communism, which armed the working class with victorious weapons to overthrow capitalism and build a communist society. The theory of scientific communism has clarified the historical role of the worker. class, showed that only the victory of the working class will save humanity from oppression and capitalist exploitation.

Above we quoted an excerpt from the articles of Comrade Stalin " Anarchism or Socialism " from 1906 d. , which says that proletarian socialism of Marx logically follows from dialectical materialism. Dialectical materialism and scientific communism are organically linked with each other — one without the other is not conceivable. Indeed , the one who is a completely dialectical materialist to the end, who, drawing all the logical conclusions from this philosophical world view, must inevitably come to the whole system of views of scientific communism and revolutionary practical activities in the spirit of Bolshevism. On the other hand, one who really wants to stand on the basis of scientific communism must be a dialectical materialist. Marxism, said Lenin, is a harmonious, complete system of views, which consists of three components: the philosophy of Marxism (dialectical materialism), the economic teachings of Marx and the doctrine of socialism, strategy and tactics of the class struggle. Among these three components, dialectical materialism, according to Lenin, is the fundamental theoretical foundation of Marxism. The characteristic of dialectical and historical materialism as a theoretical foundation of Marxism, which is given in Comrade Stalin ’s work “ On Dialectical and Historical Materialism ” , is a continuation and development of this Leninist characteristic.

Marx and Engels came to dialectical materialism as a result of a big, tense , passionate ideological struggle. The history of the philosophical world Marx and Engels represents a record, saturated mastermind rich content, in particular - for Overcoming idealistic character dialectic Hegel and disadvantages Feuerbach materialism. Marx

and Engels criticized the philosophical speculations of the Young Hegelians, representatives of the so-called German “ true socialism ”, the utopian systems of socialism, the petty-bourgeois teachings of Proudhon, and so on. Therefore, in order to understand the essence of the views of Marx and Engels, in the content of dialectical materialism, it is necessary, at least in the most concise form, to get acquainted with this rich ideological development.

The central links in the formation of philosophies, the views of Marx and Engels are their criticism of Hegel's idealistic dialectic and the limitations of Feuerbach's materialism. That is why in the work of Comrade Stalin “ On the dialectical and historical materialism ” after a general description of dialectical materialism as the worldview of the Marxist-Leninist party, speaks of the connection and at the same time the difference that exists between the views of Marx and Engels and the views of their predecessors - Hegel and Feuerbach:

“ Describing their dialectical method, Marx and Engels usually refer to Hegel, as a philosopher who formulated the main features of dialectics. This, however, does not mean that the dialectic of Marx and Engels is identical with the dialectic of Hegel. In fact, Marx and Engels came from Hegel's dialectic only “ Rational grain ”, rejecting the Hegelian idealistic husk and developing the dialectic further in order to give it a modern scientific appearance ” [6].

German idealist philosopher Hegel (1770–1831) is one of the largest representatives of human thought. Hegel had a great influence on the ideological development of Germany, as well as other countries. Hegel's influence was great in Russia too. In the 40-ies of the last century in Moscow, for example, there was even a saying that “ on the banks of the Moscow River there is no passage from Hegel's philosophy ”. It was the period when the advanced strata of the Russian intelligentsia were engaged in circles studying Hegel's philosophy, arguing about it, trying to attach the thoughts of this philosopher to the “ damned Russian reality ”.

Hegelian philosophy, like any other philosophy, is the product of its era. Hegel said that every philosophy is a mental expression of its time. The philosophy of Hegel grew up in a certain historical era - in the first thirty years of the XIX century. The thirties of the last century are the years when Hegel's influence in Germany reached its apogee. This was, according to Engels, the solemn procession of Hegelian philosophy. The philosophy of Hegel, being the product of certain historical and cultural conditions of Germany of this period, is, however, a broader phenomenon, a phenomenon of world order in the field of ideology.

The end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century was a period of extremely revolutionary in the development of Europe. A huge revolutionary movement was taking place in France - the French bourgeois revolution of 1789. The French bourgeoisie stormed the strongholds of feudalism, organized revolutionary terror against the nobility, and fought with the feudal reaction of the whole world. The broadest masses were drawn into the political struggle in France. Napoleon, who retained only those results of the French bourgeois revolution, which were beneficial to the big bourgeoisie, in this era made its victorious marches throughout Europe. Napoleon's invasion of Russia dates from this era. We know how the Russian people rose up against the hordes of Napoleon, against foreign invaders, and as in the Patriotic War of 1812. He destroyed these hordes. The biggest events that took place in Europe caused a shock to all the old foundations. These events could not help but worry the minds of the then Europe, could not fail to attract the wide attention of the largest representatives of philosophy.

Hegel created a magnificent theoretical structure. The turbulent events of this era have affected his worldview. When we study Hegel's dialectic, his teaching on revolutionary leaps, on the transition of quantity to quality, his teaching on the struggle of opposites, we undoubtedly see on this dialectic the press of the revolutionary, spasmodic events of that time. But Hegel, who reflected these processes in his philosophy, gave them such a broad philosophical generalization, could not, however, break away from his soil on which he grew up, lived and acted. Hegel was German, born and worked in Germany, he was the ideologue of the growing bourgeois order in a country in which the bourgeoisie was limited to a number of very significant remnants of the feudal system.

Germany was then a backward country compared with France and England. Bourgeois development made in it only their first successes. She was crushed into a large number of small feudal principalities, she was hacked into all sorts of customs barriers. The German bourgeoisie could only dream of what the British and French bourgeoisie actually did. The German bourgeoisie reprimanded before feudal monarchs and princes; it could not develop any kind of broad opposition activity in relation to the prevailing feudal reaction. But in the field of thought, in various areas of ideological activity, it ascended very high. She pushed into the arena of history the greatest representatives of literature and philosophy. Marx spoke of the philosophy of Kant, one of Hegel's predecessors, that it represents the German theory of the French Revolution. This characteristic of Marx can rightly be attributed to the entire development of German classical philosophy from Kant to Hegel.

In his work "Ludwig Feuerbach" Engels wrote:

“... Hegel was German and, like his contemporary Goethe, is not free from some element of philistinism. Goethe, like Hegel, was in his field a real Zeus — an Olympian, but neither could be completely separated from the German philistinism” [7].

Hegel, the creator of the revolutionary dialectic, at the same time came to the complete justification of the German order, to the justification of the feudal Prussian monarchy of Frederick William III.

Engels describes Goethe in the following remarkable words:

“... Goethe is tremendously great, then petty; then this is a recalcitrant, mocking, genius that despises the world, or a cautious, very happy, narrow philistine. And Goethe was unable to defeat German poverty; on the contrary, it conquers him.” [8].

Goethe, said Marx and Engels, is a mighty poet, an insignificant Weimar minister. This characteristic, which is given by Goethe, is undoubtedly applicable also to Hegel. Hegel is the greatest dialectician, the creator of a great philosophical frame of reference, which had a decisive influence on the development of a number of scientific fields, and at the same time Hegel, a man who crawls before Prussian feudalism, almost descends to servitude before him, a man who is completely infected by the miserable Prussian arrogance bureaucracy. In Hegel, the revolutionary dialectical method of thinking is combined with reactionary political conclusions. Hegel - the creator of the dialectic, this, in the fair expression of Herzen, “Algebra of revolution”, and at the same time the author of a complete idealistic system of “absolute” objective idealism.

The contradiction between the method and the system in Hegel's philosophy is a reflection of the contradictory nature of the development of Germany, the contradictory nature of the position of the German bourgeoisie of this era.

From the very beginning, it must be said, when we speak of the contradiction between the method and the system in Hegel, that this cannot be understood in a simplified way, as if Hegel had an idealistic system in one pocket, and his dialectic in another pocket. The dialectic and idealism of Hegel are spliced together. Hegel is the creator of idealistic dialectics.

What is the essence of the Hegelian philosophical system, if we try to characterize it very briefly? In "Ludwig Feuerbach" Engels in a few words throws out a masterful description of Hegel's philosophical system.

The basis of this philosophical system is the spiritual beginning - a kind of “absolute idea”. Hegel is an objective idealist. If Hegel had only this, then it would hardly be necessary to talk a lot about it. There were a lot of idealists in the history of science, in the history of philosophy. Hegel was distinguished from thousands of other petty and insignificant idealists by the fact that the spiritual principle that he laid at the basis of his whole worldview is distinguished by special properties. Hegel's “Absolute Idea” is distinguished by the fact that it has an intrinsic dialectic nature. It develops according to the dialectical laws. The dialectic, if I may say so, pulsation of the “absolute idea” is its main quality. In a word, dialectics, that is, development by transferring quantity into quality, development by means of a revolutionary leap, by fighting contradictions, continuous emergence

and destruction, perpetual change of forms , etc. , is, according to Hegel, an internal pulse, rhythm , the life of his " absolute idea " .

The “ absolute idea ” , having passed through itself all the stages of internal development, the entire cycle of its dialectical movement, is reincarnated into nature, into its own , as Hegel puts it, “ otherness ” . What is nature in terms of Hegel? This is another form of being of the same “ absolute idea ” , its negation. " Absolute Idea " denied samoo itself and passes into the " appearance " , Hegel said, and he said, as we see, is very vague. " Absolute Idea " as if pulls on an external, natural, material suit. The inner essence of nature, according to Hegel, is thus the " absolute idea . "

The doctrine of nature differs, among other things, in Hegel's greatest metaphysicality. In Hegel, nature does not develop in time, but only unfolds , diversifies in space.

This suggests that, in understanding the physical nature, Hegel was still largely in the position of mechanical natural science of the 18th century. Engels points out that Hegel, in his theory of nature, even took a step backwards compared to his predecessor Kant, who, in his theory of the origin of worlds, assumed that nature develops over time, that the solar system had a beginning and will have an end.

With all the metaphysical nature of Hegel's views on nature (views that were largely determined by Hegelian idealism, were caused by the needs of an idealistic system), Hegelian dialectics could not but serve as a powerful source of dialectical thoughts in natural science. Hegel, in his “ Philosophy of Nature ” , despite his generally metaphysical view of nature, expressed a number of brilliant thoughts about the dialectical nature of the development of nature. That is why the Hegelian dialectic was to influence and fruitfully influenced the development of natural science. In this sense, the Hegelian dialectic, although it was wrapped up in a mystical , idealistic attire, still continued the traditions, which Kant initiated in his work “ Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens " (1755).

We now turn to Hegelian understanding of human society. What is the history of mankind in terms of Hegel? The history of mankind, according to Hegel, is again nothing but the embodiment and development of the same " absolute idea . " But since human history for Hegel's idealist was entirely limited to the history of the human spirit, consciousness, knowledge, since, quite naturally, Hegel did not see and could not see the true, material basis of human history, here in the “ kingdom of the spirit ” , according to Hegel, dialectical development in time begins again. Human history as the embodiment of the " absolute idea " develops, according to Hegel, dialectically.

And so, Hegel advanced the thesis that human history develops, and moreover develops according to dialectical laws. Such an approach to history was a very important step forward in the development of social science.

However, in matters of history, Hegel combines the great with the petty, the insignificant. All the driving forces of human history, Hegel ultimately reduced to one — to the idea. Why did Greece fall according to Hegel? Because the idea of the beautiful, which de constituted the principle of Greek life, could only be a very short phase in the development of the universal spirit, after which a new idea should have appeared and changed the idea of the beautiful.

But, as correctly pointed out more Plekhanov, like " response " was the only pompous, stilted repetition of the question, because he did not give any response. Hegel's answer to the question inevitably gave rise to a new question: what was the reason for the emergence of a new idea and the idea of the beautiful that was outdated? In connection with this, Plekhanov writes:

" Hegel - which owns just The provided explanation for the fall of Greece, - as if he feels it is in a hurry to supplement his idealist explanation referring to the economic reality of ancient Greece: " *Lacedaemon fell mainly due to the inequality of assets* " , - he says. And he does this not only in the case of Greece. It can be said, his unflinching technique in the history of philosophy: the first, a few vague references to the properties of the absolute idea, and then - much more extensive and, of

course, much more convincing indications of the nature and development of property relations of the people in question” [9].

In order to somewhat more concretely imagine the essence of the Hegelian approach to historical phenomena, let us give the following example. Hegel, describing Napoleon, says in one place: " Napoleon is the world spirit on horseback . " The meaning of this statement of Hegel is clear. Historical figures, according to Hegel, fulfill only the purpose, predestination of the “ world spirit ” or the “ absolute idea ” , which is one and the same. Hegel rightly says that a great personality is nothing else than the " clerk of the world spirit . "

Plekhanov in his work " The Development of the Monist View of History " correctly points to the merit of Hegel that he first looked at the historical process as a natural, in which the " outstanding personality " , " heroes " do not act arbitrarily, a on basis of objective laws. It was a brilliant discovery of Hegel, showing how here, too, the great one makes its way through the ridiculous, through the idealistic shell.

What are different types of social consciousness, according to Hegel? Science, art, literature, philosophy , etc. , are, according to Hegel, only forms of ideological development, with the help of which the “ absolute idea ” comes to its self-knowledge. In the field of philosophy, the “ absolute idea ” through various phonosophical systems more and more comes to the knowledge of its own essence, until, finally, in Hegel’s philosophy, the “ absolute idea ” has not fully come to its self-knowledge. Thus, absolute truth was achieved, and the further development of philosophy, according to Hegel, becomes impossible and even unnecessary.

In the field of politics, Hegel believed that the political system that dominated Germany was the crown of the political system, the most ideal and perfect type of government. The “ absolute idea ” in this system found its best incarnation. It is clear that for such things the Prussian reactionaries praised Hegel to the skies and even elevated him to the rank of state philosopher Prussia. They were very grateful to him for putting the entire magnificent building of his philosophy at the feet of the Prussian feudal monarchy . This meant " strangling the revolutionary side under the weight of an excessively overgrown conservative side " (*Engels*).

So, what was the contradiction between the method and the system in Hegelian philosophy, between the revolutionary and conservative sides of his world view?

His dialectic said that the thinker could not and should not calm down on any positive and definitive conclusion that he should look for whether there is in this subject opposing forces and qualities of TV. The dialectic said that everything develops, grows , changes, eternally arises and is destroyed and there is no force that could stop or delay this eternal movement, there is no force that could resist this dialectical process. Goethe expresses the eternal dialectical movement in the following remarkable words:

In the storm of deeds, in the waves of being
I'm rising
I'm going down ...
Death and birth -
The eternal sea;
Life and movement
In the eternal expanse ...

Hegelian dialectics demanded to recognize that development was infinite, and the Hegelian system said: in the person of the Prussian feudal monarchy we have the final result of political development, further movement is impossible; in the face of Hegelian philosophy, “ absolute truth ” has been achieved , and further development of philosophy is not necessary. Gege Levian dialectic said: everything grows and develops according to the law of struggle against contradictions, every step reached in any area is eroded by internal contradictions and leads to a new, higher level. And the Hegelian system said: humanity, rising in the face of Hegelian

philosophy to the knowledge of the " absolute idea " , no longer knows any contradictions, and further movement is not necessary.

Such are the contradictions in Hegelian philosophy between the revolutionary and conservative sides of his doctrine, which should have found a way out for themselves. And this way was really found after the death of Hegel, when the social situation in Germany heated up when the revolutionary thunderstorm of 1848 approached .

Shortly after the death of Hegel, his school split mainly into two groups - into right and left Hegelians. The right-wing Hegelians most of all touched the conservative side of Hegelian philosophy, tried to draw the most reactionary conclusions from this philosophy. By the way, the Hegelian idealistic *system* for such a conservative system of thinking provided sufficient material. The left Hegelians, on the contrary, tried to draw progressive conclusions from Hegel's philosophy with regard to the reality of those days. The revolutionary side of Hegelian philosophy, his dialectic, gave in this respect: a lot of starting points.

Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific communism, at the beginning of their revolutionary activities, joined the left Hegelians. At first they stood on Hegelian, idealistic positions. But it must be immediately noted that among the Left Hegelians, Marx and Engels were the extreme wing, people most revolutionary-minded, seeking to draw the most extreme conclusions from Hegelian philosophy. In the vigorous social and literary activities of these young eagles, their revolutionary genius had already very early with great force. Adhering to the left Hegelians, still standing on the idealistic Hegelian positions, highly appreciating Hegel's philosophy, they at the same time already see the main flaw, the internal contradiction of this philosophy, and seek to find a way out of it.

Marx and Engels soon got rid of Hegelian idealism, radically reworked the Hegelian dialectical method, for in the form in which Hegel left it, namely in its abstract, idealistic form, it was unsuitable for use. It was necessary to free Hegel from the idealistic peel — his idea of development — and apply this idea to material reality. It was necessary to end the Hegelian idealist dialectic of the " spirit " and create a systematic theory of the dialectical development of life, matter, being. Marx later wrote:

“ Hegel has dialectics standing on his head. It is necessary to put it on its feet to open the rational grain under the mystical shell " [\[10\]](#).

It was necessary *from the* idealist eskoj Hegelian dialectic take its " rational kernel " , to use its reasonable sense - in a word, materialistic rework the Hegelian dialectic. It was a very serious theoretical problem. Much later, Marx, in his letters to Kugelmann, wrote:

“ He (Dühring. - *M.M.*) knows very well that my method of research is *not* that of Hegel, for I am a materialist, and Hegel is an idealist. The Hegelian dialectic is the main form of any dialectic, but only *after* cleansing it from its mystical form, and this is what distinguishes *my* method from it ” [\[11\]](#).

Lenin wrote on this issue:

“ Hegel's logic cannot *be applied* in its given form; can not be *taken* as given. From no, it is *necessary to choose* logical (epistemological) shades, having cleared the *mysticism of ideas* : this is still a great work. ” [\[12\]](#).

That is why, in the work of Comrade Stalin “ On Dialectical and Historical Materialism, ” it is clearly stated that

" Marx and Engels in zyali of Hegelian dialectics only th e " rational kernel " , rejecting the Hegelian idealistic shell, and developed dialectics further so as to lend it a modern scientific form " [\[13\]](#).

In order to understand how Marx and Engels solved this theoretical problem, how they dealt with Hegelian idealism, how they, at the same time, retained the valuable things that Hegel had, we need to understand the meaning that their closest predecessor had in the development of Marx and Engels , materialist Feuerbach.

In the work of Comrade Stalin “ On dialectical and historical materialism ” on this issue it is said:

“ When characterizing his materialism, Marx and Engels usually refer to Feuerbach as the philosopher who restored materialism to his rights. However, this does not mean that the materialism of Marx and Engels is identical with the materialism of Feuerbach. In fact, Marx and Engels took his " main grain " from Feuerbach's materialism , developing it further into the scientific and philosophical theory of materialism and throwing away its idealistic and religious-ethical layers . [14].

Feuerbach (1804–1872) appeared on the arena of social and philosophical activity in a period already significantly different from the period when Hegel spoke. On the one hand, a great influence on the whole of Europe, particularly in Germany, had the July Revolution of 1830 city of France. On the other hand, anti-government sentiment has grown strongly among the bourgeoisie and the democratic intelligentsia in Germany, especially since the accession to the throne of hypocrite and deceiver Frederick William IV. The German intelligentsia was no longer satisfied with the abstract-philosophical form of presentation of their interests, which was characteristic of the philosophy of Kant and Hegel. Approaching revolutionary storm of 1848 city of Imprinted on the philosophical and theoretical activities in then-Germany. In the philosophy of Feuerbach got his reflection advanced ideas of revolutionary democracy in Germany, radical aspirations and ideals of the revolutionary intelligentsia.

At the beginning of his philosophical activity, Feuerbach was a Hegelian idealist. He belonged to the Left Hegelians. However, he soon dealt with Hegel’s idealism, rejected Hegel’s “ absolute idea ” and heralded the triumph of materialism. Feuerbach declared that Hegelian idealism is only philosophically tinted theology. Hegel's theory that nature is the otherness of the spirit, pointed out by Feuerbach, is nothing more than the philosophical expression of the priests' point of view that God created the world. Hegel’s “ absolute spirit ” , said Feuerbach, is nothing more than the ordinary human consciousness, only alienated , cut off from man and elevated to the throne of objective " Absolute spirit " . In contrast, Feuerbach put an atheistic position that man creates God in his own image and likeness. According to Feuerbach, the material world - nature, man, should be the starting point for a consistent outlook .

The historical merit of Feuerbach is that he dealt a decisive blow to Hegelian idealism. The influence of Feuerbach's ideas in the pre-revolutionary situation in Germany was very strong. In the ideological preparation of the revolution of 1848 , the Feuerbach played a lesser role than the brilliant constellation of the French materialists and atheists of the XVIII century on the eve of the 1789 French bourgeois revolution of Engels in the ringing words characterizes the importance which appeared in 1841 , the works of Feuerbach's " Essence of Christianity " :

“It dispelled this contradiction with one blow, again and without any reservations proclaiming the triumph of materialism. Nature exists independently of any philosophy. It is the basis on which we, the people, grew up themselves the products of nature. There is nothing outside of nature and man, and the higher beings created by our religious fantasy are only fantastic reflections of our own essence. The spell was lifted; The “ system ” was blown up and thrown aside, the contradiction is resolved by simply discovering the fact that it exists only in imagination. We had to go through the liberating action of this book to get an idea about it. Inspiration was universal: we all immediately became Feuerbachians " [15].

" Essence of Christianity " Feuerbach gave, in the words of Marx and Engels, " retired, " the world spirit of Hegel " . She dealt a serious blow to idealism and religion. In the " Holy Family " Marx and Engels evaluate the historical merits of Feuerbach as follows:

“ Who destroyed, ” they wrote, “the dialectic of concepts , the war of the gods, familiar only to philosophers?” *Feuerbach* . Who replaced the old junk, to the place of " infinite consciousness " not " value *person* " (like a man does more for some other value, if not the fact that he is a man!), And the most " *human* " ? *Feuerbach* , and only *Feuerbach* " [16].

Marx and Engels wrote that they had to go through a fiery stream (Feuer - Bach), through fiery purgatory, like Feuerbach's views, in order to free themselves from idealism and become firmly on the position of materialism.

At the same time, Marx and Engels from the very beginning felt the limitations of Feuerbach's materialism, its shortcomings. Feuerbach threw Hegel's mysticism and Hegelian idealism aside, but with the water he also threw out the child from the bath . Feuerbach never claim onimal value of the Hegelian dialectic, the more he could not be any question of its application to the actu Mr. spine. Feuerbach bade farewell to Hegel's idealism, but the valuable and healthy that Hegel had wrapped in idealistic clothes, Feuerbach was not able to rework and use it critically. This task was solved only by the founders of dialectical materialism , Marx and Engels. Feuerbach was an abstract, contemplative materialist. Being a materialist In matters of a general philosophical worldview, Feuerbach could not apply his materialism when he approached questions of history. Here he became completely helpless.

In " German Ideology " (1846 city of), Marx and Engels, finally overcoming the limitations of Feuerbach's materialism, wrote:

“ Since Feuerbach is a materialist, he is not engaged in history, because he considers history - he is not a materialist at all. Materialism and history are completely unrelated to him, which, incidentally, is already clear from what was said. ” [\[17\]](#).

This happened because Feuerbach did not understand the idea of development which Hegel unfolded in a mystified form. Not understanding the idea of development, that is , the dialectic, Feuerbach, when explaining the phenomena of social life, slipped into the position of idealism. Idealism in the approach to the phenomena of social life, on which Feuerbach drew himself, was combined here with vulgar-materialistic elements.

In order to imagine this somewhat more specifically, we present one of the Feuerbach aphorisms. He says: " Man is what he eats " [\[18\]](#) . This, of course, is a materialistic position, but it is a vulgar materialism. He who puts an end to this will not go on , will limit himself so much that he will not be able to understand anything in the patterns of social life. Feuerbach approaches a person only physiologically or biologically. He does not see that man is a social being, developing in history; he does not see that man is an active being, producing. If we try to express the point of view of Marx and Engels in the same brief formulation, then one could say: man is what he produces, what tools of labor he produces. Such an approach as the sky from the earth is different from the above aphorism of Feuerbach.

The real, real, living in history, in certain historical periods of a person Feuerbach does not know. This is why Feuerbach, Marx and Engels say,

" ... forced to see, for example, instead of healthy people a crowd of scrofulous, nicked, work and consumptive poor to resort to " a higher contemplation " and the ideal " alignment in kind " , ie. E. Once again fall into idealism just where the communist materialist sees the need and at the same time the condition for the transformation of both industry and the social system ” [\[19\]](#).

These remarkable words of Marx and Engels clearly reveal the lack of Feuerbach materialism. It is clear that this kind of worldview, this viewpoint could not be the effective weapon with which one could enter into the struggle to change reality. It is very well understood Marx more in 1843 city of He wrote:

“ Feuerbach 's aphorisms suffer, in my opinion, in the sense that he presses too much on nature and too little on politics. Meanwhile, this is the only union thanks to which the present philosophy can become the truth. ” [\[20\]](#).

From these beautiful words of young Marx, we can see how high he was already at that time, although he was not yet a formed dialectical materialist and only approached the formulation of the views of scientific communism.

In connection with these shortcomings Feuerbach in the approach to the phenomena of social life are those religious and ethical layers, which is imbued with his philosophy. Having dealt with God as the highest power over the world, over man, Feuerbach began to deify man himself. He even began to defend the very word "religion" on the grounds that it means "connection." These philological tricks were, according to Engels, the last loophole of idealistic philosophy. In the dignity of religion was built the relationship of two people - sexual love, sex. Defending the word "religion", deifying "cordial relations between people", Feuerbach was already directly preaching reactionary ideas, because general reconciliation flowed from them, which, of course, only darkened the awakening of the class consciousness of the proletariat.

Marx and Engels, evaluating all the positive significance of Feuerbach in the ideological struggle of Germany of this period, at the same time subjected to criticizing criticism the shortcomings of Feuerbach materialism. The "Short Course of the History of the CPSU (B)" indicates that Marx and Engels took his "main grain" from Feuerbach's materialism and developed it further into a modern, harmonious scientific and philosophical theory, into a complete, consistent to the end world view of dialectical materialism.

Marx and Engels for several years - roughly from 1839 to 1847 city of driving the passionate, an intense ideological struggle, criticized various unscientific, utopian forms of socialism, studied and summarized the historical experience of the struggle of the working class and came to scientific communism. They put Hegel's dialectic from an idealistic head onto materialistic legs, they applied development theory to the material world, to history. They found *that* is the basis of historical development, social life of people. In the development of productive forces and production relations, they saw this material basis of society.

In 1847, Marx and Engels create the magnificent work of Marxism, The Manifesto of the Communist Party, a book that will live for centuries. Comrade Stalin lovingly and figuratively called this greatest work of human thought "a song, a song of Marxism." In the Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels, applying the method of dialectical materialism to history, paint an exceptional in their strength and depth picture of the development of human history. History, they say, is a history of class struggle. They show with great force the historical role of the bourgeois class in the struggle against feudalism and in the development of new productive forces.

It can be said, although it will sound like a paradox, that not one of the ideologists of the bourgeoisie, not one of the scholars of the bourgeois class has painted such a picture of the progressive significance of capitalism compared with feudalism given by the ideologists of the proletariat, Marx and Engels, in the "Manifesto of the Communist Party". Marx and Engels show how the bourgeoisie destroyed customs borders, eliminated feudal fetters that hindered the development of productive forces, created the world market, and drove forward the development of productive forces.

At the same time, Marx and Engels provide an amazingly powerful picture of the contradictions inherent in the bourgeois system. The bourgeoisie, they wrote, is like "a wizard who is unable to cope with the subterranean forces caused by his spells." Marx and Engels give an amazing picture of the contradictions in which bourgeois society develops, the contradictions inherent in the very nature of capitalism. Next to the bourgeoisie, its antagonist is growing and developing, its grave-digger is the working class. Marx and Engels show how this powerful force grows as if from individual, private, unconscious and spontaneous speeches, the working class moves to militant and conscious revolutionary actions, as it is from the class "a" is transformed into a class "for itself", until there comes a time when it is most acutely raises the question of the destruction of the capitalist system.

Only the one who was armed with the method of dialectical materialism — this most advanced and most consistent world view, based on all the achievements of science and philosophy — could only so deeply substantiate the historical role of the working class and provide such a wonderful picture of the general controversial course of world history.

" The Communist Manifesto " and then a monumental work of Marx - " Capital " is the greatest treasure house of Marxism. In these grand works, everything is given the most important that was created by Marxism before the era of Lenin and Stalin.

||

From the foregoing it is clear what great importance is the application of the provisions of the dialectical method to the study of social life, the history of society, what significance the method of dialectical materialism has for the practical activities of the party of the proletariat. In the work of Comrade Stalin " On Dialectical and Historical Materialism ", the idea of the connection of dialectical materialism with the tasks of the practical struggle of the Communist Party was carried out with exceptional clarity . In this work, with the greatest consistency, the thread is stretched from the general provisions of dialectical materialism to questions of the practice of class struggle. Developed with special force in the " Short Course of the History of the CPSU (b) " the internal connection that exists between the philosophy of Marxism and practical revolutionary activity has revealed that the correct understanding and application of dialectical and historical materialism to the phenomena of social life is one of the decisive conditions for the unmistakable solution of practical questions of the class struggle. Dialectical materialism is set forth in Comrade Stalin 's work " On Dialectical and Historical Materialism " not in the form of complete and frozen formulas, but in the form of a living revolutionary teaching, in the form of militant leadership for action.

" If the world, " says this work, " is in continuous movement and development, if the death of the old and the growth of the new is a law of development, then it is clear that there is no more " immutable " social order, " eternal principles " of private property and exploitation, " eternal ideas " subordination of peasants to the landlords, capitalists, workers.

This means that the capitalist system can be replaced by the socialist system, just as the capitalist system was replaced in his time the feudal system.

So, we should focus not on those sectors of society that are not developing anymore, although they currently represent the prevailing force, but on those sectors that are developing, have a future, although they do not represent the prevailing strength at the moment " [\[21\]](#).

From these provisions it can be seen that the revolutionary party, relying on the Marxist, dialectical method, correctly outlines the basis of its activities aimed at overthrowing capitalism and building a communist society. These provisions show with remarkable clarity, why dialectical and historical materialism is the theoretical foundation of communism.

In the work of Comrade Stalin the initial theoretical points of the revolutionary activities of the Bolshevik Party were clearly formulated:

" If the transition of slow quantitative changes into rapid and sudden qualitative changes constitutes the law of development, then it is clear that the revolutionary coups committed by the oppressed classes represent a completely natural and inevitable phenomenon.

Hence, the transition from capitalism to socialism and the liberation of the working class from capitalist oppression can be accomplished not by slow changes, not by reforms, but only by a qualitative change in the capitalist system, by revolution.

So, in order not to err in politics, one must be a revolutionary, not a reformist.

Farther. If development occurs in the order of disclosing internal contradictions, in the order of collisions of opposing forces on the basis of these contradictions in order to overcome these contradictions, then it is clear that the class struggle of the proletariat is a completely natural and inevitable phenomenon.

This means that it is necessary not to gloss over the contradictions of the capitalist order, but to open them and unwind, not to extinguish the class struggle, but to bring it to the end.

So, in order not to err in politics, it is necessary to pursue an implacable proletarian class policy, not a reformist policy of harmony of the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and not a compromising policy of “growing” of capitalism into socialism.” [22].

The work of Comrade Stalin emphasized with no less force all the significance that the provisions of the philosophy of Marxism extend to the study of social life, that is, the materialist understanding of history. The materialistic understanding of history makes it possible to disclose the *laws* of social development, and this in turn leads to the correct practical conclusions. It is from the materialist understanding of history that “the practical activity of the party of the proletariat should be based not on the good wishes of “eminent persons”, not on the demands of “reason”, “universal morality” and so on. N. , But on the laws of social development, on the study of these laws” [23].

It is the materialistic understanding of history that makes the science of society as exact a science as biology. It is from the philosophy of Marxism that “socialism is transformed from a dream of a better future for mankind into a science” (*Stalin*).

Comrade Stalin emphasizes in his work “On Dialectical and Historical Materialism” that the connection between science and practical activity, the connection between theory and practice, their unity should become the guiding star of the party of the proletariat.

From all this it is clear why Lenin and Stalin repeatedly said that dialectics represent the revolutionary soul of Marxist doctrine. It is also natural that those who opposed the fundamental foundations of revolutionary Marxism, against dialectical materialism, also betrayed Marxism as a whole.

The struggle for the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory as a whole, for the purity of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, runs as a red thread through the history of the Bolshevik Party.

The Bolshevik Party, as a party of a new type, differs from the old, opportunist, social democratic parties in Western Europe in many ways.

From the very beginning of its emergence, the Bolshevik Party acted as a genuinely Marxist party, as the party of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the party of the Second International, mired in opportunism, were essentially parties for preserving capitalism and protecting it from revolutionary upheavals. By the way, one of the fundamental, fundamental differences of the Bolshevik party, as a party of a new type, is that throughout its of the historical path, the leaders of the party, Lenin and Stalin, uphold and develop the ideology of dialectical materialism as a party philosophy. They enrich and develop this worldview on the basis of new data accumulated by the development of social and natural sciences, on the basis of new data of the class struggle in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

The Social Democratic Parties of the Second International, and first of all the leading party of the Second International - German Social Democracy - deeply rooted in political opportunism, eating away from revisionism and conciliationism to it, completely changed dialectical materialism.

Already the first open attacks of revisionists and reformists against revolutionary Marxism were accompanied by the declaration of war to dialectical materialism. In 1898 the city of Bernstein, the father of revisionism, has published its infamous book “Problems of Socialism”, which subjected the revision Marx's teaching on the

nature of the class struggle, of crises of impoverishment of the working class, he opposed the Marxist theory of revolution. In the same book, Bernstein attacks the Marxist dialectic with rabies. He makes the "discovery" that "the dialectic is a trap on the path to true knowledge", calls for as soon as possible to abandon the dialectic and proclaims the famous slogan of the need to combine Marxism with Kantianism. Under the direct protection of Kautsky-type centrists in German and Austrian Social Democracy, a whole group of "philosophizing" writers who systematically defamed dialectical materialism was nurtured and nurtured. They spat out dialectical materialism in every possible way, wrote dozens of books, articles and brochures in which they "proved" that Marx and Engels did not create their own philosophical system. They advocated the combination of Marx with Kant, with Mach, with Avenarius and other typically bourgeois philosophers and philosophical trends, if only to eradicate his revolutionary soul from Marxism, in order to damage the dialectical materialism.

Lenin in his correspondence with A. M. Gorky in the following words describes the essence of this philosophical revisionism:

Materialism, like philosophy, is *everywhere in their pen*. « The Neue Zeit », the most seasoned and knowledgeable authority, indifferent to philosophy, has never been an ardent supporter of philosophical materialism, and recently typed, without any reservations, empirio. So that from *the* materialism that Marx and Engels taught, it was possible to deduce the dead philistinism, it is wrong, wrong! All the philistine movements in social democracy are fighting most of all with philosophical materialism, they are drawn to Kant, to neo-Kantianism, to critical philosophy. No, the philosophy that has proved Engels' 'Anti-Duhring', middle class does not allow on the threshold " [24].

More more complete characterization of the philosophical revisionism Lenin gives in his famous article "Marxism and Revisionism", written in the same 1908 city of :

"In the field of philosophy, revisionism went at the tail of the bourgeois professorial "science." The professors went "back to Kant", - and revisionism dragged along for the neo-Kantians, the professor repeated a thousand times said priests vulgarity against philosophical materialism - and the revisionists, smiling indulgently, mumbled (word for word the last handbuhu) that materialism had long been "refuted"; professors blamed Hegel like a "dead dog", and preaching idealism themselves, only a thousand times smaller and more vulgar than Hegel's, shrugged contemptuously about dialectics - and revisionists followed them into the swamp of the philosophical debacle of science, replacing the "cunning" (and revolutionary) dialectics with "simple" (and calm) "evolution" ...

What kind of real class meaning such "amendments" to Marx did not have to say about this - the matter is clear of itself" [25].

Only our Bolshevik party, as it has been revealed with great force in the course of the history of the party, since its inception has tirelessly upheld and moves forward the Marxist doctrine as a whole, including the fundamental theoretical basis of Marxism - dialectical materialism.

Lenin and Stalin raised the banner of the philosophy of Marxism high, carried this banner through three revolutions, through the entire history of the party, developing and enriching dialectical materialism with new experience of the class struggle of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the era of the victory of socialism on one sixth of the earth.

Already the ideological defeat of Populism, Implemented by Lenin, demanded opposing the so-called subjective sociology of Populism - with its cult of the "heroes", "critically thinking individuals", with its disdainful and aristocratic attitude towards the masses of the people - a coherent and solid philosophical, scientific and historical theories of Marxism. Lenin's work "What are the "friends of the people" and how are they fighting against the Social Democrats?" and it was a classic exposition, concretization and development of dialectical and historical materialism in the struggle against populist subjectivism and idealism.

The struggle against the " Economists " and the Mensheviks as saturated as it is brilliantly shown in the " Short Course History of the CPSU (b) " , great philosophical content. The question of the relationship between spontaneity and consciousness in the labor movement, the need to unite socialism with the labor movement was only possible on the basis of the consistent application of dialectical materialism.

Lenin and Stalin contrasted the dialectical analysis of the great events of the first Russian revolution with the vulgarization hostile to Marxism and the metaphysics of the " economists " and the Mensheviks.

The questions of the struggle for the philosophy of Marxism, against its liquidators , against the substitution of dialectical materialism for bourgeois philosophical junk acquired exclusive party-political significance in the period after the defeat of the 1905 revolution .

The revolution of 1905 city of defeated. It was a temporary defeat. However, all sorts of fellow travelers of the revolution, who joined the revolutionary movement when it was on the rise , interpreted the defeat of the revolution not at all as temporary, but as a complete defeat of the revolutionary movement in Russia and began to move away from it. In the midst of the intelligentsia, decay and decadence were observed. There was an offensive reaction. This offensive also took place on the ideological front. 1907–1909 was a time when the fashion for all sorts of idealistic trends, mysticism and clericalism, spread. The whole of Russian writers engaged in the development of Marxism. There was a chanting of debauchery under the guise of a " personality cult " . One stick, Lenin said, - the stick of political and economic, to suppress the masses now turned out to be a bourgeois-landlord reaction is not enough. The revolution of 1905 , although it was defeated, still broke this stick. To keep the masses in submission, it took, according to Lenin, also a spiritual stick. Hence the striving of the ruling classes to implant idealistic and priestly teachings.

This ideological decay and decomposition, fashion clericalism and idealism got its reflection in the environment of a section of the Social-Democratic intelligentsia in the ranks of both the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. A whole group of social democrats (Bogdanov, Bazarov, Rozhkov, Suvorov, Valentinov, Yushkevich, Lunacharsky, and others) began to preach idealism, trying to replace the philosophy of Marxism with the philosophy of Machism. It was about the philosophical movement presented by the philosophers Mach and Avenarius, who presented idealism in a subtle and smoothed form.

Machism is a typical philosophy of subjective idealism. The main philosophical content of this trend can be expressed very briefly: the world is the totality or complex of sensations of the subject. Machism, or empirio-criticism, comes to this conclusion as a result of " purification " , " critics of experience . " Mach and Avenarius argued that the material world, existing independently of our consciousness, is nothing but the complex of my - human - sensations.

Subjective idealism, as is known, has in the history of philosophy of many of its representatives. Lenin in his book " Materialism and Empiric " pointed out that even in 1710 city of Bishop Berkeley with much more consistency to develop similar subjective-idealist philosophy, is now played by Mach and Avenarius and their followers - Bogdanov, Bazarov Valentinov, Yushkevich and others.

Along with liquidationism in relation to the political party of the working class has received its spread also liquidationism in regard to the philosophical foundations of Marxism. True, the liquidators of the philosophical foundations of Marxism were quite cowardly. This was, in the words of Lenin, "a riot on his knees . " They presented all their Machist trash under the banner of the philosophy of Marxism. From this, however, liquidationism with regard to the philosophy of Marxism did not become less dangerous. It became so widespread that Lenin considered it necessary to study it thoroughly and to oppose to this reactionary movement a large work, which was " Materialism and empirio-criticism " . In order to imagine the state in which Vladimir Ilyich was at that time, with what passion and intensity he began his philosophical work, here are some of his correspondence with A. M. Gorky here:

" Now came the Essays on the Philosophy of Marxism . " I read all the articles except Suvorovskaya (I read it), and with every article I simply raged with outrage. No, this is not Marxism! And our empirio-critics, empirio-mononists and empirio-symbolists climb into the swamp. To assure the reader that " faith " in the reality of the external world is " mystic " (Bazarov), to confuse materialism and Kantianism (Bazarov and Bogdanov) in the most ugly manner, to preach a variety of agnosticism (empirio-criticism) and idealism (empirio-monism) - to teach workers " religious atheism " And " Adoration " higher human potentialities (Lunacharsky), - declare the mystique of Engels' doctrine of dialectics (Berman), - draw from the stinking source of some French " positivists " - agnostics or metaphysicians, the devil their poberot , with " symbolic theory of knowledge " (Yushkevich) ! No, that's too much. Of course, we, ordinary Marxists, people in philosophy are not well-read, - but why offend us so much, that we should present such a thing as the philosophy of Marxism! I will allow myself to be quartered rather than agree to participate in the body or in the college, such things are preaching " [\[26\]](#) .

After some time, Lenin again wrote to Gorky:

" The newspaper I am neglecting because of his philosophical binge: today read one empirio areal and swear words, tomorrow - another and mate ernymi. And Innokentiy [Dubrovinsky] scolds, and for the cause, for neglect of the " Proletarian " [\[27\]](#) .

Lenin comes to the conclusion that it is necessary to put an end to the statements of the Machists against Marxist philosophy. In 1908 the city of he sits down to work on his book " Materialism and Empiric " . In 1909 city of this remarkable book is published.

The leader of the Bolsheviks, a man who leads a tense political struggle in the midst of the defeat of the revolutionary movement, when it is necessary to keep the ranks from panic, to fight back every kind of liquidators and fellow travelers, finds time to work out whole mountains of volumes on questions of philosophy and science. As a result, he creates a classic work of Marxism, which constitutes a *new stage in the development of Marxist philosophy* .

The value of Lenin's book went far beyond that immediate task he set himself, - to defeat the Machians, the liquidators of Marxist philosophy. This book was a martial work in which the Bolshevik leader gave a philosophical generalization of the latest discoveries in the field of natural science, especially in the field of physics. He provided invaluable material on how dialectical materialists should approach new discoveries in science. This book is still the guiding light for materialist dialecticians, for representatives of natural science who want to firmly hold on to consistently materialist positions.

In the " Short Course History of the CPSU (b) " is given the following estimate brilliant work of Lenin's " Materialism and Empiric " , which is the greatest contribution to the treasury of Marxist science:

" ... The book is not only Lenin's criticism of Bogdanov, Yushkevich, Bazarov and Valentinov and their philosophical teachers - Avenarius and Mach, who tried in their works to present sophisticated and sleek idealism - as opposed to Marxist materialism. The book of Lenin is at the same time a defense of the theoretical foundations of Marxism - dialectical and historical materialism - and a materialistic generalization of everything important and essential from what was acquired by science and, above all, natural science for a whole historical period, from the death of Engels to the appearance of the book Lenin's " Materialism and Empirio-Criticism " [\[28\]](#) .

The new era, which began at the beginning of the 20th century, posed a whole series of new questions for the Marxists in the field of philosophy in connection with the revolution in natural science that was taking place at that time. Just after the death of Engels (1895), an extremely turbulent period begins in the development of physics. One discovery follows another. The electron theory of matter opens. New ideas about the structure of matter are created, which break the old ones that existed before that idea. In the era of imperialism, when the

reaction is rampant along the whole line, a number of idealistic philosophers grab at these new discoveries and begin to assert that matter has disappeared, that the mass has disappeared, only energy remains, etc. They are further, they claim that the latest discoveries of science allegedly prove the correctness of idealism, that materialism itself is allegedly refuted by science. The Pope himself could be delighted with all these fabrications.

Marxists were faced with the question of how to give an answer to these new discoveries, how to "cope" with dialectical materialism with these latest discoveries. And Lenin in his work "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" showed that the latest discoveries in the field of natural science only confirm the correctness of dialectical materialism. He showed that the old theory of the structure of matter had failed, that it had outlived its life and was being replaced by a new one. He showed that all this testifies to the inexhaustibility of matter, that our knowledge goes deeper and deeper, and not at all that the alleged matter disappears. Creatively applying Marxism to these new discoveries, Lenin moved far ahead development of Marxist philosophy.

It is extremely remarkable that in the same period Comrade Stalin, working in the Transcaucasus, pays great attention to philosophical questions. In 1906-1907's. Comrade Stalin, in a number of theoretical articles, united under the common name "Anarchism or Socialism", develops questions of dialectical and historical materialism with exceptional depth. Stalin conducts an intense ideological struggle for the basics of Marxist philosophy, against the anarchist groups in the Caucasus, which published the newspaper "Nobati" and vociferously opposed the dialectical materialism. In a number of profound articles, Comrade Stalin in the struggle against philosophizing anarchists from "Nobati" clarifies *that* such a dialectical method, *which* is the materialist theory, *that* is, historical materialism. In these articles, Comrade Stalin gave a detailed exposition of questions about the attitude of Marxist philosophy to the contemplative materialism of Feuerbach, to Hegel's philosophy in general, and especially to its revolutionary dialectics.

The articles of Comrade Stalin are remarkable in that they show why and how logical proletarian socialism of Marx follows from the philosophy of Marxism, from dialectical materialism. These articles by Comrade Stalin belong to the *most outstanding works of Marxist philosophy*. More long before the preparation and publication of Lenin's book "Materialism and Empiric" Comrade Stalin gave in his articles "Anarchism or Socialism," the only one in its kind profoundly scientific and at the same time extremely popular exposition the foundations of dialectical materialism and scientific socialism in general. The articles of Comrade Stalin in their significance went far beyond the immediate task of criticizing anarchists. This work is a classic work on philosophy, in which the connection of Marxist theory and the revolutionary practice of the proletariat is shown with great force.

Some of the Menshevik writers who wrote on questions of philosophy (Deborin, Axelrod), in their anger against Bolshevism, then tried slanderously to assert that Machism is nothing but the philosophy of Bolshevism. Meanwhile, the immutable historical fact is that it was the Bolsheviks, it was their leaders Lenin and Stalin who, in an atmosphere of ideological corruption, the intelligentsia's flight from the party, in an environment of unbridled struggle of the liquidators against the party, raised the banner of dialectical materialism, developed the philosophy of Marxism in the new historical conditions.

In Chapter IV "Short Course History of the CPSU (b)", which refers to how the Bolsheviks occurred registration as an independent Marxist party, stressed that "Lenin's book "Materialism and Empiric" was *the theoretical* preparation for such a party" [29].

And in the subsequent period, Lenin and Stalin tirelessly lead the struggle for the philosophy of Marxism, they are engaged in the further development of dialectical materialism. During the years of the first world imperialist war, the party of the working class faced new historical tasks. At this time, Lenin, preparing a special study on the materialist dialectic, is his famous "Philosophical Notebooks."

The slogan of the Bolshevik Party about turning the imperialist war into a civil war is a brilliant example of Leninist revolutionary dialectics.

Great Lenin's discovery of the victory of socialism in a single country, which he made in 1915 city of , meant a new step in the development of Marxism. The masterful use of materialistic dialectics allowed Lenin to enrich Marxism with new content and provide the party of the proletariat with unbeatable weapons for the upcoming struggle.

And during the years of Soviet power, during the years of the socialist revolution, Lenin and Stalin continue to attach the highest importance to the questions of the philosophy of Marxism.

During the trade union discussion 1921 city of , in the struggle against the treacherous line of the Trotskyites and Bukharinites trying to derail the proletarian dictatorship, Lenin smashing through them hostile to Marxism " methodology " . Exposing eclectic and vulgar sophistry of Bukharin and Trotsky, Lenin emphasizes the basic requirements of dialectical logic: study the subject comprehensively, take the subject in its development, approach every question from the point of view of practice as a criterion of truth and, finally, understand that there is no abstract truth that is true always specific. By applying these requirements of dialectics to the question of trade unions, Lenin gives the famous definition of trade unions as the school of communism.

In 1922 , Lenin wrote his famous article “ On the Meaning of Militant Materialism, ” which became the program of the struggle for the philosophy of Marxism and for the further development of dialectical materialism.

In defending and developing the Leninist theory of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country in the struggle against the Trotsky-Bukharin reptiles, Comrade Stalin brilliantly applies the method of dialectical materialism to the whole sum of questions of class struggle and socialist construction. Classic examples of dialectics are: the Stalinist development issues of the law of uneven development of capitalism, about the controversial, the dual nature of NEP, the nature of the collective and . T . D Stalin subjected annihilating defeat, left no stone unturned in the bourgeois mechanistic theory of equilibrium, which is a traitor and an enemy Leninism Bukharin tried to oppose dialectical materialism.

Of great importance for the whole of the Marxist-Leninist theory, for the further development of dialectical and historical materialism were the instructions given by Comrade Stalin in the late 1930 city of on combating Menshevik idealists and mechanists - two kinds of covert, veiled treason dialectical materialism.

And finally, the work of Comrade Stalin " On Dialectical and Historical Materialism " , written by him for the " Short Course of the History of the CPSU (B) " . It summarizes all the ideological material on Marxist philosophy, given in the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, philosophically interpreted the entire rich political experience of the Bolshevik Party.

The work of Comrade Stalin “ On dialectical and historical materialism ” raises the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism to a new height, is a new stage in the development of dialectical and historical materialism.

|||

Dialectical materialism, as the revolutionary soul of Marxism, is a military weapon for the unmistakable solution of the most important questions of the class struggle. Here are some examples from the history of our party, where you can see firsthand what the weapons were and have. Let us take the question of how the struggle of the Marxists against the populists at the end of the last century. As we know, populism was the main ideological obstacle to the spread of Marxism in our country. in Russia and on the path of development of the social democratic movement. In order to clear the path of ideological development of social democracy, it was

necessary to subject the complete ideological defeat of populist views. For this, one had to give one's own, Marxist answer to the questions about the nature of the development experienced by Russia, to the new questions that arose before the working-class movement during this period.

We know all the political significance of this struggle of the Marxists against the populists. When comparing the populist and Marxist methods of approach to these issues clearly acts entirely the difference between the typical anti-dialectical, metaphysical approach to reality populists - and dialectical approach, Marxist.

In the articles of comrade Stalin already mentioned above on the topic " Anarchism or Socialism " , an analysis of these questions is exceptional in its content and depth.

Describing the dialectical method in these articles, Comrade Stalin pointed out that one of the most important requirements of materialist dialectics is not to consider life as something unchanging, stuck. Life, both in nature and in society, must be regarded as being in perpetual motion, in its origin and development. In life there always exists that which grows , and that which dies; surely something dies in it and at the same time something surely is born. In life there is always a new and old. Therefore, if we want to look dialectically at the world, we must look, as Comrade Stalin put it, " where life goes , what dies and what is born in life, what is destroyed and what is being created . "

Another requirement of the dialectical method is to clearly see how what in Life loses its ground, goes back, dies, must be finally defeated, even if it is at the moment and still seemed strong. And all that in life is born and every day is growing , developing, is a new, as if it is at the moment any more poorly, win in the end. Starting from these basic characteristics of the Marxist dialectical method, Comrade Stalin wrote:

" In the 80 - ies of the XIX century, a remarkable dispute arose among the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia. Populists said that the main force that can take over the " liberation of Russia " , - this poor peasantry. Why? - Marxists asked them. Because - they said - that the peasantry was the fewest of all and at the same time all the poorer in Russian society. The Marxists answered: it is correct that the peasantry today constitutes the majority and is very poor, but is that really the case? The peasantry has long been a majority, but so far it has not shown any initiative in the struggle for " without the help of the proletariat. " freedom " . And why? Because the peasantry, as an estate, collapses day by day, breaks into the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, while the proletariat, as a class, is growing and gaining strength *day by day* . And poverty is not decisive here: the " tramps " are poorer than the peasants, but no one can say that they will take over the " liberation of Russia " .

The only thing is who grows and who ages in life. And since the proletariat is the only class that is constantly growing and striving to live, therefore our duty is to stand next to it and recognize it as the main force of the Russian revolution - this is how the Marxists responded. As you can see, from the dialectical point of view, Marxists looked at the question, while the Narodniks reasoned metaphysically, because they looked at life as " frozen at one point " [\[30\]](#) .

In this example, Comrade Stalin perfectly showed the full power of the Marxist theory, the power of the method of the dialectical approach to reality. Imagine Russia in the eighties of the XIX century. The working class, although it already makes itself felt as strikes , etc. , still represents a small minority compared with the sole peasantry. The vast majority of the population is the peasantry. Populists, as typical metaphysics, not understanding the laws of social development, do not see what is growing in life , what is decomposing, and oriented towards the peasantry. They proceed from the fact that the peasantry was, is and will be the bulk of the population of Russia. They do not want to see the actual processes that occur in life. On the contrary, the Marxists, applying the method of dialectical materialism to the analysis of Russian reality, said: at the moment the working class, at first glance, is still a small noticeable amount, a small minority of the entire population. However, due to the fact that Russia has firmly embarked on the path of capitalist development, in connection with the development of capitalism in our country, the working class represents the force that is

continuously growing and growing as a class. This force must be guided, for it represents the link that will lead Russia through the revolutionary struggle to the socialist system.

Any theory of something is worth it if it gets its confirmation in life. Practice is the best test of any theory. Conversely, any theory, like any science, as she looks great either looked as if she looks not played all the rays of the rainbow, if it does not receive an acknowledgment in life, in practice - it is worthless, worthless.

Life shattered the "theory" of the populists. Who can seriously speak at all about the theoretical views of populism on the development of Russia, as well as on all other issues? On the contrary, life showed how the Marxists were right in all these questions. Marxist-Leninist theory celebrates its complete triumph.

This example shows the great importance of revolutionary theory, scientific foresight, based on knowledge of the laws of social development. This example shows the full power of the method of dialectical materialism. He says that the Marxist dialectical method is in the hands of the revolutionary party a powerful ideological weapon, which makes it possible, as Comrade Stalin said, to take the most impregnable fortresses.

Let us now examine another example, which again, with all its force, reveals the significance of the method of dialectical materialism in analyzing the most acute questions of the class struggle.

Fundamentals of the revolutionary tactics of Bolshevism, as shown in the "Short Course History of the CPSU (b)", "have been developed by Lenin in his book "Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution" in 1905 city of this book, as well as Sun g resolution tactical problems line of Bolshevism, full of revolutionary revolution, Marxist dialectics. One could say this: one cannot deeply and thoroughly understand the basic questions of the Bolshevik tactics without understanding how these questions were resolved on the basis of a dialectical approach.

One of the main questions determining the tactical line of the Bolsheviks was the question of the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. And the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks proceeded from the fact that the forthcoming revolution, by its nature, would be, at least initially, a bourgeois revolution.

Further serious disagreements began. The Mensheviks reasoned like the most typical metaphysics, like people who were completely and completely mired in a formal logical approach to business. Since the bourgeois revolution is ahead of us, they said, the bourgeoisie must be the main driving force in this revolution. So it was, they said, in those revolutions of a bourgeois character that had taken place before that time, so it should be with us. In 1789, city of , during the French bourgeois revolution, the main leading force that led the entire so-called third estate was the bourgeoisie. It is clear that our business should also proceed in the same way. Once a major role in the coming revolution must play the bourgeoisie, the working class, argued the Mensheviks, removed the tail part of the bourgeoisie, the role of the opposition pusher and so on. D. There is no self, the more leading role in the revolution of the working class, according to the views of the Mensheviks sages have not maybe it should not. This line was fully and fully supported and justified also by Plekhanov, despite the fact that he spoke in a lot and detail in a general theoretical perspective on dialectical materialism.

How did the Bolsheviks look at it? Lenin said that the dialectical method requires that we proceed not from empty analogy that does not say anything. The dialectical method requires a specific analysis of a kind of historical situation. Yes, Lenin pointed out, our revolution will be bourgeois, but it is not at all a simple repetition of the bourgeois French revolution. Our revolution has its own specific features. Lenin put forward a position: in the upcoming bourgeois revolution the working class will be the hegemon. Is this contradictory? Of course, contradictory, but this is a real dialectical contradiction, which correctly reflects the real contradictions of life.

When the bourgeois revolution took place in France (1789), the working class was still a very unorganized and unconscious force. He was not yet completely differentiated from the bourgeoisie, speaking with her within the so-called third estate. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie was not yet of such a

sharp character as it is now. The bourgeoisie could still act as a leading force in the revolutionary movement against feudalism.

Quite different conditions were created by the beginning of the 20th century. First, the working class has already ceased to be a “ in itself ” class, it has become a “ for itself ” class . He already had his scientifically developed ideology, the ideology of scientific communism, created by the great leaders of the working class, Marx and Engels. In our country, the working class by this time had already grown into a significant force, had its own social democratic party. Class antagonisms between the working class and the bourgeoisie have already managed to unfold with full force. In our country, the liberal bourgeoisie was afraid of the actions of the working class more than of tsarism. Lenin gives an exceptional analysis of why the liberal bourgeoisie was not interested in the completion of the bourgeois revolution. As the greatest master of revolutionary dialectics, he shows that the working class is interested in bringing the bourgeois revolution to the end.

“ ... It is profitable for the bourgeoisie to rely, ” wrote Lenin, “ on some remnants of antiquity against the proletariat, for example, on the monarchy, on the standing army , etc. of the bourgeoisie . of them, t. e. so that this revolution is not fully consistent, has not reached the end, it has not been determined and ruthless ... advantage of the bourgeoisie to the necessary changes in the bourgeois-democratic direction occurred slowly, gradually, cautiously, hesitantly, by reform, not by revolutions ... so that these transformations develop as little as possible revolutionary initiative, initiative and energy of the common people, i.e. , the peasantry and especially the workers, for otherwise the workers will be easier, as the French say, “to shift the gun from one shoulder to the other ” , t. e. to turn against the bourgeoisie the guns which supply them with the bourgeois revolution, the freedom that it gives, the democratic institutions that will arise on the soil cleared of serfdom.

On the contrary, the working class is more favorable to the necessary changes in the bourgeois-democratic direction passed was not reformist, but a revolutionary way , for the reformist path is the path of puffs, procrastination, the painfully slow decomposition of the putrid parts of the national organism. First of all, the proletariat and the peasantry suffer from their rotting. The revolutionary path is the path of quick, least painful to the proletariat operation, the path of direct removal of rotting parts, the path of least pliability and caution with respect to the monarchy and the rotten and vile, rotten and infecting the air corresponding to it ” .

“ Therefore, ” continued Lenin, “the proletariat and fights for the republic in the front ranks, discarding with contempt the stupid and unworthy advice to reckon with whether the bourgeoisie will recoil ” [\[31\]](#).

Such are the deepest thoughts of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, which provide an example of the application of the method of dialectical materialism to the analysis of concrete historical reality.

Let us take another question related to the views of the Bolsheviks on questions of tactics in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the question of whether the Social Democrats should participate in the provisional revolutionary government. As is known, the Mensheviks, being completely captive of their most harmful political conception, captive of the metaphysical approach to business, rejected such participation. The main argument of the Mensheviks was this: the government would be bourgeois, therefore, social democracy should not participate in such a government. If she participates, she will make the same mistake that the French socialist Millerand made by joining the bourgeois government.

The Bolsheviks, refuting these Menshevik " arguments " , said that this is a typical metaphysical statement of the question. The Bolsheviks said that it was necessary first of all to analyze specifically what kind of temporary revolutionary government this would be. Such a government, the Bolsheviks said, can arise only as a result of an armed uprising, armed the struggle of the masses in order to overthrow the tsarist regime. Consequently, by its class nature such a government can only be a revolutionary-democratic government representing the interests of the workers and peasants. In France, the Bolsheviks spoke, it was about the participation of

Millerand in the bourgeois government at a time when there was no revolutionary situation in the country and when the government was a typical reactionary government of the bourgeois class. It is clear that Millerand, joining such a government, committed a betrayal of the interests of the working class, a betrayal of the interests of socialism.

We have completely different conditions. A provisional revolutionary government can be created only in a situation where a revolutionary situation occurs in a country, only as a result of the armed struggle of the workers and peasants. Dialectics, as is known, requires a specific historical approach. Dialectics says that each time the question must be taken in a certain setting, time and place, and not based on empty analogies, not proceed from the metaphysical formula " it was so and it should be further . "

It is unmistakable to solve this kind of questions only by relying on the dialectical approach to all the events of today, relying on knowledge of the laws of historical development. Those models of revolutionary dialectics in solving this kind of questions that Lenin and Stalin give , the Bolshevik Party gives , are the guiding thread for the Communists of all countries in their practical revolutionary work.

In these examples, we can see the whole force and significance of dialectical materialism, which is the worlds seen by our party, which is the revolutionary soul of the whole Bolshevik theory.

It is known that the national question plays a huge role in society, in the life of nations, in the class struggle and belongs to the most difficult issues of social science. It is known that only the Bolsheviks, Lenin and Stalin, proceeding from the basic principles established by Marx and Engels, theoretically developed and practically resolved this issue, over which ideologists and politicians of bourgeois society were fighting unsuccessfully and hopelessly . And this question could be resolved correctly, and a majestic prospect could be planned ahead for the whole epoch only thanks to the dialectical-materialistic method. Here are the statements on this issue of Comrade Stalin at the XVI Congress of the CPSU (b):

“ It may seem strange that we, supporters *of* the future *merging of* national cultures into one common (both in form and content) culture, with one common language, are at the same time supporters of the *flourishing of* national cultures at the moment, during the dictatorship of the proletariat. But there is nothing strange about it. It is necessary to let national cultures develop and unfold, revealing all their potencies in order to create conditions *for* their merging into one common culture with one common language. The flowering of national in form and socialist in content cultures under the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country to merge them into one common socialist (both in form and content) culture with one common language, when the proletariat wins all m world and socialism will enter into life, - in e fact, it is the dialectics of Lenin's formulation of the question of national culture.

It may be said that such a formulation of the question is “ contradictory . ” But isn't it the same " inconsistency " we have with the question of the state? We are for the death of the state. And at the same time, we stand for the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which represents the most powerful and most powerful government of all the state authorities that still exist. The highest development of state power in order to prepare the conditions *for the* withering away of state power — this is the Marxist formula. Is it " contradictory " ? Yes, " contradictory . " But this is a contradiction of life, and it fully reflects Marx's dialectic.

Or, for example, Lenin's statement of the question of the right of nations to self-determination, right up to secession. Lenin sometimes portrayed the thesis of national self-determination in the form of a simple formula: “ disengagement for unification ” . Just think - disconnect for unification. It gives even a paradox. Meanwhile, this " controversial " formula reflects the vital truth of Marx's dialectics, which gives the Bolsheviks the opportunity to take the most impregnable fortresses in the field of the national question.

The same must be said about the formula for national culture: the flourishing of national cultures (and languages) during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country in order to prepare the conditions for the extinction and merge them into one common socialist culture (and one common language) during the period of the victory of socialism all over the world.

Whoever did not understand this uniqueness and " inconsistency " of our transitional time, who did not understand this dialectic of historical processes, died for Marxism " [32].

Comrade Stalin with all his strength emphasizes here that only on the path of a truly dialectical analysis of reality can one arrive at the correct theoretical and practical conclusions in the field of the national question, as in the question of the state, as in all other questions of the class struggle. The most important requirement of the dialectical method is the requirement to reveal the real life contradictions and ways to overcome them.

On the basis of the dialectical analysis of concrete reality, Comrade Stalin, in his report at the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B.), Developed further the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Theoretically, summarizing the gigantic experience that our party accumulates, Comrade Stalin gave a *new* answer to *new* questions posed by life. He established that the dying off of the state will occur only when communism wins in the whole world, or at least in the decisive countries of the world. Under the conditions of the victory of communism in one country, located in a capitalist environment, the state of the dictatorship of the working class does not die off, but, on the contrary, must be strengthened and strengthened in every way.

Let us further give an example, which is yet another testimony of the classical model of the dialectical solution by Comrade Stalin of the most important questions of the class struggle. We have more time see the full force of the Marxist-Leninist foresight, the value of the Marxist-Leninist theory.

In the " Short Course of the History of the CPSU (B) " , the significance of the liquidation of the kulaks as a class on the basis of complete collectivization is characterized as follows:

“ It was a profound revolutionary coup, a leap from the old qualitative state of society to a new qualitative state, equivalent in its consequences to the revolutionary coup in October 1917.

The peculiarity of this revolution was that it was produced *from above* , on the initiative of state power, with direct support *from below* by the millions of peasants who fought against kulak bondage for a free collective-farm life.

She, this revolution, with one blow resolved three fundamental questions of socialist construction:

- a) It eliminated the most numerous exploiting class in our country, the kulak class, the stronghold of the restoration of capitalism;
- b) It transferred from the path of a single-person economy giving birth to capitalism to the path of a social, collective-farm, socialist economy the most numerous, toiling class in our country, the peasant class;
- c) It gave the Soviet government a socialist base in the most extensive and vital, but also in the most backward area of the national economy — in agriculture.

Thus, the last sources of the restoration of capitalism were destroyed inside the country, and at the same time new, decisive conditions were created for building a socialist national economy. ” [33].

That is compressed, but the rich content of the deepest characteristic of the meaning and significance of the policy of eliminating the kulaks as a class, to which our party has moved to the end of 1929 city of in connection with the growth of the collective farms and state farms. On the value of these events are equal to the value of the coup that took place in our country in October 1917 city of In fact, because the fate of the whole of our

Great October Socialist Revolution, the fate of all the conquests of October, in the final account rested on the question of whether the working class of our country will be able to transfer, under its leadership, the working masses of the peasantry from the rails of an individual economy to the rails of a collective-farm, socialist economy. The fate of all the gains of October rested on the question of whether the working class, together with the broadest peasant working masses, would be able to destroy the most numerous exploitative class in our country — the kulaks.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, our party brilliantly coped with this great historical task. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the correct resolution of the question of the transfer of multimillion-dollar peasant masses to the rails of socialism. It matters not only within our country - it has international significance, setting an example to the working class of all other countries, hundreds of millions of peasantry, moaning under the yoke of capitalism and remnants of feudalism, telling them that the only way to a happy and prosperous life is under leadership of the working class is the way of socialism.

The “ Short Course of the History of the CPSU (B) ” states that the elimination of the kulaks as a class on the basis of complete collectivization was the deepest revolutionary upheaval, a jump from one qualitative state of society to another qualitative state. Then all the uniqueness of this leap is characterized , which consists in the fact that this revolution was carried out from above, on the initiative of state power, and supported by millions of people *from below* . We know in history a number of “ revolutions from above ” , which were initiated by the dominant state power. These " revolutions from above " were " revolutions " , produced by the ruling classes of landowners and capitalists, directed *against the* interests of millions of people. In our country, the revolution from above was carried out by the state power of the dictatorship of the working class and is aimed at protecting the interests of the masses. That is why this revolution has received such remarkable support from below. In order to make a jump, the transition from one qualitative state to another, it was necessary to prepare all the relevant conditions for this jump, it was necessary to prepare all the necessary changes.

Thanks to the wise policy of our party, which she pursued for a number of years in preparing this jump, thanks to the implementation of the Stalinist plan of industrialization and collectivization of our country, thanks to the fact that the party managed to move new equipment, new people to the village, to prove to millions of masses of the peasantry the profitability of collective farming, thanks to the skilful preparation of the material conditions for replacing kulak production of bread production collective and state - this jump could be so brilliantly held Asha state power with such strong support from the bottom.

In order to successfully carry out such a profound revolutionary upheaval as the elimination of the kulaks as a class on the basis of complete collectivization, it was necessary to be able to choose the right time and prepare all the conditions necessary for this leap. We know that the Trotsky-Zinoviev treacherous gang tried to raise the question of dispossession even when the time had not ripened, when the conditions for a successful offensive had not yet been prepared. Now it is quite clear: we were dealing here with the provocative, treacherous behavior of the despicable restorers of capitalism. The party repulsed these enemies of Leninism.

The greatness of Comrade Stalin's genius lies in the fact that he, as a mighty master of dialectics, who possesses this revolutionary weapon in the world, enriching it with new class struggle experience, unmistakably determined the beginning of this jump, the time when the party had to move from the old policy of restriction and ousting the kulaks to the policy of eliminating the kulaks as a class.

Here it will be permissible to draw the following analogy. Recall, the accuracy with which the genius of the proletarian revolution, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin defined time overdue jump in October 1917 city of Just before 25 October 1917 city of Lenin wrote that we must take power on 25 October. History, Lenin said, will never forgive revolutionaries if they, having all the conditions for seizing power, do not take advantage of it. The delay of death is similar, Lenin said in his fiery speeches on the very eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Precisely because our party was guided by such leaders as Lenin and Stalin, it won a world-historic victory in the fighting days of October 1917 .

With the same precision, Comrade Stalin establishes the moment when it was necessary to go on an unfolding offensive against the kulaks and to give a decisive battle to the most numerous capitalist class in our country. This once again testifies to the mighty power of Marxist-Leninist theory, the power of dialectical materialism - this greatest acquisition of human thought, which the Bolshevik Party owns and which it enriches on the basis of the new experience of the class struggle.

The whole history of the Bolshevik party is saturated with such examples of the application of the Marxist, dialectical approach to the solution of questions of class struggle. That is why the " Short Course of the History of the CPSU (B) " says that the assimilation of dialectical and historical materialism " is the duty of every active leader of our party " .

[1] N. G. Chernyshevsky, Selected Works, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 435, 1937.

[2] N. A. Dobrolyubov , Complete Works, Vol. III, p. 227, GIKHL, M., 1936.

[3] Lenin, Vol. XVI, p. 353.

[four] Stalin, Anarchism or Socialism. Quoted in the book by L. Beria " On the History of the Bolshevik Organizations in Transcaucasia " , p. 120, 1939.

[five] Stalin, Dialectical and Historical Materialism, " Problems of Leninism " , p. 535, ed. 1 1 - e .

[6] Stalin, Dialectical and Historical Materialism, " Problems of Leninism " , p. 535, ed. 1 1 - e .

[7] F. Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of classical German philosophy, p. 13, Politizdat at the Central Committee of the CPSU (b), 1940.

[8] K. Marx and F. Engels, Cit., Vol. V, p. 142.

[9] G. AT. Plekhanov, On the Question of Developing a Monistic View of History, p. 66, Gospolitizdat, 1938.

[10] K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. XXIII, 1935.

[11] K. Marx and F. Engels, Letters, p. 230, Sotsekgiz, 1931.

[12] Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, p. 274.

[13] Stalin, On Dialectical and Historical Materialism, Questions of Leninism, p. 535, ed. 1 1 - e .

[14] Stalin, On Dialectical and Historical Materialism, Questions of Leninism, pp. 535–536.

[15] F. Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy, p. 16.

[16] K. Marx and F. Engels, Cit., Vol. III, p. 117.

[17] K. Marx and F. Engels, Cit., Vol. IV, p. 35.

[18] L. Feuerbach, Sämtliche Werke , hrsg. von Bolin und Jodl . Band X. Stuttgart, 1911, S. 22, 41, 64.

[nineteen] By . Marx and F. Engels , Soch ., T . IV, p . 35

[20] K. Marx and F. Engels, Cit., Vol. I, p. 510.

[21] Stalin, On Dialectical and Historical Materialism, Questions of Leninism, p. 540, ed. 1 1 - e .

[22] Stalin, On Dialectical and Historical Materialism, Questions of Leninism, p. 541, ed. 1 1 - e .

[23] Stalin, On Dialectical and Historical Materialism , "Questions of Leninism", p. 544 , ed. 1 1 - e .

[24] Lenin, Letters to Gorky, pp. 11–12, 1939.

[25] Lenin, vol. XII, pp. 184–185.

[26] Lenin, Letters to Gorky, p. 14.

[27] Lenin, Letters to Gorky, p. 17 .

[28] "A short course of the history of the CPSU (b)", p. 98.

[29] "A short course of the history of the CPSU (b)", p. 136.

[30] Stalin, Anarchism or Socialism. Cited from L. Beria's book, On the Question of the History of Bolshevik Organizations in the Transcaucasus, pp. 121-122.

[31] Lenin, Vol. VIII, pp. 57–58 and 94.

[32] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, pp. 426–427, ed. 1 0 - e .

[33] “A Short Course on the History of the CPSU (B)”, pp. 291–2.