

F. KONSTANTINOV

BASIS  
AND  
SUPERSTRUCTURE



FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE

Moscow 1955

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN

Man produces material wealth to sustain life, exchanges and consumes this wealth, and engages in politics, science, the arts, literature, and philosophy. All this constitutes the complex and multiform process of social life, fosters the historical progress of society, its continual development from lower to higher forms.

The philosophers, sociologists and historians that preceded Marx and Engels, vainly tried to find the dividing line in the complexity and multiformity of social life for phenomena that were "important" and "unimportant," substantial and unsubstantial, necessary and casual. And since bourgeois sociologists and historians proceeded (and proceed) from some preconceived and pet idea, all their sociological speculations resulted (and result) in unexampled chaos and subjectivism alien to science.

The great merit of Marx and Engels, the founders of the genuine science of the laws of social development, was that they were the first to ascertain "the simple fact, hitherto concealed by an overgrowth of ideology, that mankind must first of all eat, drink, have shelter and clothing, before it can pursue politics, science, art, religion, etc.; that therefore the production of the immediate material means of subsistence and consequently the degree of economic development attained by a given people or during a given epoch form the foundation upon which the state institutions, the legal conceptions, art, and even the ideas on religion, of the people concerned have been

evolved, and in the light of which they must, therefore, be explained, instead of *vice versa*, as had hitherto been the case.”\*

Since the production of material wealth necessary for life is a primary, basic and permanent historical fact without which there is no society or social life, it follows that the relations arising between men in the process of production, i.e., the relations of production, are primary and constitute the real foundation, the basis determining political, legal, religious, aesthetic and philosophical views and their corresponding institutions.

In the famous Preface to his *Critique of Political Economy*, Marx gave the following classical definition of the major thesis of historical materialism on the basis and superstructure:

“In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness.”\*\*

Thus, Marx defines the basis as the sum total of production relations corresponding to a definite stage of development of the material productive forces. The political and juridical superstructure, as well as the forms of social consciousness, correspond to, and are determined by, the definite basis of a given historical period.

Lenin held it as Marx's historic merit that in creating the science of society, he drew a dividing line between

\* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow 1955, p. 167.

\*\* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow 1955, pp. 362-63.

material and ideological social relations. The latter are a reflection of the first.

Material relations are those production, i.e., economic, relations, which, when arising, do not first pass through the consciousness of people, while ideological relations, when arising, first pass through the consciousness of people.

When analyzing the structure of capitalist society and pre-capitalist social formations, Marx and Engels were always guided in all their works by this division of social relations into economic, which are the determinant, and ideological, which are a reflection of the former, and constitute their superstructure. They always considered the ideas of the ruling class to be the dominant ideas of a given society. The basic and chief element in the superstructure is the state, the law and the ideology of the ruling class, which reflect the economic structure of a given society, protect and consolidate it.

The division of social relations into production or economic relations, on the one hand, and ideological relations, on the other, is the keynote of all the works of Lenin. Historical materialism is unthinkable without this division, just as it is unthinkable without the basic thesis that social being determines social consciousness.

The proposition concerning the basis and superstructure makes it possible to explain not only the relationship between ideological phenomena and the economy of society, but also the relationship between the political, legal and other institutions, on the one hand, and the political, legal and other views of the given society, on the other, as well as the relation of these institutions to the economic system of the given society.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of the basis and superstructure has been further developed in the works of Stalin.

Stalin's *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* defines the basis and superstructure, reveals their inner connec-

tion and interaction, demonstrates the inevitable elimination of the old, moribund basis and superstructure, and indicates the inevitable emergence and development of a new basis and superstructure. The work exposes the vulgar, simplifying anti-Marxist views on the basis and superstructure and exhaustively discloses the role of the superstructure in the development of society.

What, then, is the basis of society?

The basis is the economic system of society at a given stage of its development. The economic system of society is the sum total of definite production relations at a given historical period, relations that arise between people in the process of the production of material wealth. These relations are determined by the state of the productive forces of society, whose change inevitably brings about a change in the economic basis.

The basis of capitalist society is characterized by capitalist private ownership of the means of production, by the exploitation and oppression of workers by capitalists, and by the capitalist form of distribution of products. The capitalist basis, like the slave and feudal bases, is intrinsically antagonistic, as it is founded on domination and subordination.

In his *Dialectical and Historical Materialism* Stalin gives the following description of the capitalist relations of production, i.e., the basis of capitalist society: "The basis of the relations of production under the capitalist system is that the capitalist owns the means of production, but not the workers in production—the wage labourers, whom the capitalist can neither kill nor sell because they are personally free, but who are deprived of means of production and, in order not to die of hunger, are obliged to sell their labour-power to the capitalist and to bear the yoke of exploitation."\*

---

\* J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1954, p. 738.

The three volumes of Marx's *Capital* and a number of other profound works of his are devoted to a comprehensive analysis of the capitalist economic system, i.e., the capitalist basis. The state of the capitalist economic system in its imperialist stage of development was scientifically analyzed in Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* and other works, as well as in the works of Stalin.

The capitalist basis has long since become reactionary. The glaring contradictions it has engendered lead to its inevitable doom. The revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat against capitalism proceeds from the nature of the capitalist economic system, and neither decree nor violence on the part of the reactionary ruling circles of bourgeois states can eliminate this struggle.

As a result of the socialist revolution, the capitalist basis in Russia was replaced by the socialist basis, characterized by common socialist ownership of the means of production, the absence of exploitation of man by man, relations of co-operation and mutual help among the free toilers of the socialist society, and by the socialist form of distributing products according to the quantity and quality of labour.

Article 4 of the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. says that:

"The economic foundation of the U.S.S.R. is the socialist system of economy and the socialist ownership of the instruments and means of production, firmly established as a result of the liquidation of the capitalist system of economy, the abolition of private ownership of the instruments and means of production and the elimination of the exploitation of man by man."\*

The socialist economic system works on the following

---

\* *Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow 1954, p. 12.

principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work."\*

In socialist society the relations of production fully correspond to the state of the productive forces, and the social character of production is bolstered by common ownership of the means of production.

The socialist basis is the most progressive basis. It has already demonstrated its vital force and superiority over the capitalist basis. In a brief historical period the Soviet Union has effected a stupendous leap from backwardness to progress. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Soviet people have built socialism and are successfully advancing along the road to communism.

The economic basis, i.e., the economic system of a given society, should be distinguished from production, from the process of production. The process of production is the process of interaction between society and nature, while the basis is the sum total of definite production relations between people at a given historical period. The distinctive feature of the basis is that it serves society economically.

What does it mean to serve society economically? It means that in the production of material wealth not only productive forces are required, but relations of production as well. Production and, consequently, the existence of society itself, is impossible outside these relations of production.

Every new basis supplanting an old, moribund basis, serves society better than the preceding one; the new basis offers greater opportunities and a vaster scope for the development of the productive forces.

The economic basis determines the social superstructure. Whatever the basis, such also, the superstructure.

---

\* *Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow 1954, p. 16.

What, then, is the social superstructure? What social phenomena does it comprise?

"The superstructure is the political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical views of society and the political, legal and other institutions corresponding to them."\*

While it is the specific feature of the basis that it serves society economically, it is the specific feature of the superstructure that it serves society with political, legal, aesthetic and other social ideas and corresponding political, legal and other institutions.

The superstructure, like the basis, bears a historical character. The definite superstructure of a given society, born of a definite economic basis of a given historical period, corresponds to that basis. The feudal basis has its feudal superstructure, its social, political and other views and institutions; the capitalist basis—its capitalist superstructure, and the socialist basis—its own, a socialist superstructure corresponding to, and conditioned by, this basis.

Consequently, it is a characteristic trait of the superstructure that it is the product of the one epoch during which a given economic basis exists and operates. The superstructure is, therefore, short-lived; it lasts but one epoch. The definite superstructure of a given historical period is eliminated and disappears with the extirpation of the given basis.

The historical necessity of providing full scope for the development of the productive forces of society brings about the elimination of the old, outmoded superstructure and its replacement by a new superstructure.

It is another characteristic trait of the superstructure that its connection with production, with the process of production, is not direct, but indirect, through its eco-

---

\* J. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, Moscow 1955, p. 7.

conomic basis. The changes in the process of production, in the productive forces and in the level of their development, do not directly and immediately influence changes in the superstructure; they act indirectly, through the basis and the changes in the basis.

Dependent on, and in conformity with, the changes in the state of the productive forces, there comes, in the final analysis, a radical change in men's relations of production, a revolutionary replacement of the economic basis. This radical change in the basis leads to a radical change in the social superstructure.

In analyzing the process of the revolutionary replacement of the moribund basis and its corresponding superstructure by a new basis and superstructure, Marx wrote: "... At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed."\*

Consequently, the change in the social superstructure lags somewhat behind the change in the productive forces. This sequence is subject, firstly, to the nature of consciousness, ideas, views and ideology, that are a reflection of social being, and, secondly, to the reactionary activities of society's obsolescent forces on guard over the old, moribund ideas, views and institutions.

In class society the superstructure is of a class nature. It is created by the ruling class and serves the needs of

\* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow 1955, p. 363.

the ruling class only, and not those of the whole of society. In this respect the superstructure differs, say, from language, which serves the various classes of a given society, which serves alike the bases of various societies and is created by the entire nation, by the given people, and not by one or another class. The language of the Russian people and the languages of the other peoples of the U.S.S.R. served both the capitalist basis and all the classes of bourgeois society, just as they now splendidly serve the socialist basis, socialist culture and all the aspects of life of socialist society.

It is the most important feature of the superstructure that being a product and reflection of the definite basis of a given historical period, it exerts a retroactive influence on the basis that created it.

Unlike the vulgar materialists, the Economists, Mensheviks, Kautskyites, Right-wing Socialists and other followers of the theory of spontaneity, of automatic development, of the peaceful growing of capitalism into socialism, Marxists have always recognized the active role of the superstructure, the great mobilizing, organizing and transforming role of advanced ideas and progressive social and political institutions in the life and development of society.

The superstructure is not passive or neutral to the fate of its basis, to the fate of the classes and the social system. Once begotten, the superstructure becomes a powerful active force that assists its basis to take shape and consolidate. The superstructure helps the new system, the progressive forces of society, to finish off the old basis, the old classes and reactionary forces. "... The superstructure is created by the basis precisely in order to serve it, to actively help it to take shape and consolidate itself, to actively fight for the elimination of the old, moribund basis together with its old superstructure. The superstructure has only to renounce this role of auxiliary,

it has only to pass from a position of active defence of its basis to one of indifference towards it, to adopt an equal attitude to all classes, and it loses its virtue and ceases to be a superstructure.”\*

\* \* \*

Thus, the superstructure plays an active part in serving the basis that created it.

The active nature of the superstructure can manifest itself in the defence and protection of an obsolescent basis, or social system, and its ruling class. This is precisely the function performed by the superstructure in present-day capitalist society, where it shields from ruin the utterly decayed, outmoded capitalist basis. It plays a reactionary role by retarding the development of the productive forces.

As an economic system, capitalism has completely outlived itself. The capitalist relations of production have long since become a major hindrance to the development of the mighty productive forces. Periodic economic crises and devastating imperialist wars are born of the very nature of the capitalist system and manifest the reactionary substance of the capitalist basis.

The reactionary, capitalist superstructure and, above all, the bourgeois state and bourgeois political and other views, ideas, and theories, are called upon to defend—and actually do defend—the capitalist basis; they protect it, and act as its apologists.

Along with the transition from pre-monopoly capitalism to monopoly capitalism, i.e., imperialism, there was the transition from bourgeois democracy to imperialist reaction. It is a distinctive feature of present-day cap-

---

\* J. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, Moscow 1955, pp. 9-10.

italism that it even renounces the curtailed, decayed, false and corrupt bourgeois democracy and goes over to fascism, to an overt terrorist dictatorship over the working people. By means of unconcealed terror, violence and predatory wars, the reactionary bourgeoisie seeks to preserve the foundations of capitalism, to safeguard against collapse the capitalist basis and the whole of bourgeois society. This precisely is the essence of the reactionary role of the bourgeois superstructure.

In his *Collapse of the Second International* Lenin wrote that all oppressing, exploiting classes need two social functions to safeguard their domination: the functions of hangman and priest. The hangman, i.e., the exploiter state, is to suppress and suppresses, by force, the protest and rebellion of the oppressed and exploited masses. The priest, i.e., all the ideologists of the bourgeoisie, including its Right-wing socialist lackeys, is to paint for the oppressed masses delusive prospects, to poison and deprave their spirit, to reconcile them to the existing bourgeois system, to undermine their determination in the struggle against capitalism and their revolutionary spirit; to destroy their confidence in their own strength and ability to overthrow the capitalist power, to effect a socialist revolution and build a society where there is no exploitation and oppression. Such is the social function of the bourgeois superstructure. Its active role consists in defending by all possible means the economic system of capitalism, the system of wage slavery and unrestrained exploitation of the working people.

The socialist superstructure that arose in the U.S.S.R. on the socialist basis, plays a fundamentally different role.

The socialist superstructure and, above all, the socialist state led by the Communist Party, has done everything to finish off the old basis and the exploiting classes,

and to ensure the triumph of the new, socialist basis and the new social system.

"In the course of the past thirty years," Stalin wrote, "the old, capitalist basis has been eliminated in Russia and a new, socialist basis has been built. Correspondingly, the superstructure on the capitalist basis has been eliminated and a new superstructure created corresponding to the socialist basis. The old political, legal and other institutions, consequently, have been supplanted by new, socialist institutions."\*

The socialist superstructure performs the functions of effectually defending, consolidating and further developing the socialist basis.

Hence, the general historical law manifested in the determining role of the basis with regard to the superstructure, and in the active role of the superstructure with regard to the basis, remains fully valid in socialist society. The socialist superstructure relies on its own, socialist basis and is determined by it.

The dictatorship of the proletariat and the Communist Party as the guiding force in its system, arose before the socialist basis and constituted a decisive factor in its victory. The dictatorship of the proletariat emerged before the establishment of the socialist economic system, in the process of breaking up the capitalist relations of production, the capitalist basis. This reveals a peculiar feature of the socialist revolution as distinct from the bourgeois revolution, a peculiar feature of the formation of the socialist basis as distinct from the formation of the capitalist basis, and, consequently, the special role played by the socialist state as the major political superstructure in the task of creating a socialist basis.

---

\* J. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, Moscow 1955, p. 8.

The capitalist economic basis matured spontaneously in the bosom of feudalism. This was possible since both capitalism and feudalism are based on private ownership of the means of production. The origination of the socialist economic basis is quite another matter. The socialist basis could not, and cannot, arise spontaneously in the bosom of capitalism, since it represents its absolute antithesis, its most radical and revolutionary negation.

It is only the material productive forces necessary for the creation of the socialist basis that arise spontaneously within capitalism. Socialism would have been impossible without the vast socialization of labour achieved in capitalist society on a national and world-wide scale. But this socialization of labour is effected in capitalist society on the basis of capitalist private property. It is but one of the material prerequisites of socialism, of the socialist basis. The emergence of this basis, however, presupposes socialist revolution, forcible expropriation of the expropriators, and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat as its decisive prerequisite. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the decisive political means of creating and shaping the socialist economy and ensuring its triumph.

The Soviet state was only able to perform its momentous role of eliminating the capitalist basis and founding the socialist economy, because it leaned upon the economic law that the relations of production must necessarily correspond to the state of the productive forces. The working class required the socialist state to bring the relations of production into correspondence with the level of the productive forces, to promote the formation of the socialist basis, and, eventually, after the triumph of this basis, to further its consolidation and development.

The socialist state, the socialist superstructure as a whole, performs this specific mission because the socialist system is based on common, socialist ownership and

planned national economy. The socialist economic system is incompatible with elemental and spontaneous processes. In the capitalist system, based on private ownership of the means of production, economic laws operate spontaneously, while the socialist system proceeds from the conscious application of objective economic laws in the planned and centralized management of the whole of the national economy. It is the socialist state that performs the guiding and organizing function.

But, in spite of this specific function of the superstructure under socialism, in the final analysis the determining role of the basis in relation to the superstructure is also preserved. The socialist state developed and changed its form and functions in conformance to the changes taking place in the economic basis of Soviet society. The strengthening of the socialist basis, of socialist production relations, served as groundwork for the consolidation of the socialist consciousness and the new, socialist outlook of tens of millions of people.

When Marxists speak of the superstructure they mean the sum total of its component elements—the political, legal, aesthetic and philosophical views, and their corresponding institutions.

The formation and consolidation of the complex and vast socialist superstructure was by no means accomplished with the establishment of Soviet power. It continued throughout the past three decades. Even now, during the period of transition from socialism to communism, the Communist Party, the Soviet state and all the progressive people of socialist society, have to combat the survivals of capitalism in the minds of Soviet people, the non-socialist attitude towards labour, the remiss attitude towards socialist property, and the remnants of old customs and bourgeois morals still alive among the backward sections of the public.

This testifies to the fact that consciousness lags some-

what behind social being and the progress of material life, including the socialist basis.

When defining the superstructure, Marxism holds political, legal and other views to be primary. Political, legal and other institutions arise from, and depend on, these political, legal and other views. This conforms to the historical course of events.

In the process of social development there first arise new, advanced political, legal and other social views that reflect the requirements of the material life of society, and then appear their corresponding institutions. The contradictions of the capitalist mode of production and the attendant class struggle, as well as the development of scientific thought, nurtured the Marxist idea, the Marxist teaching of the dictatorship of the proletariat; upon gripping the masses, this idea eventually became a material force, and then, as a result of the socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and its institutions were established.

The superstructure is always framed by the conscious effort of people, as distinct from the basis, which (before socialism) originated and took shape spontaneously.

As is known, the old, obsolescent superstructure taken as a whole, is torn down in periods of revolution, when the conscious effort of revolutionary masses takes the place of spontaneous social development.

The revolutionary class consciously destroys and replaces the old superstructure by a new superstructure, founded on the new, rising basis. The individual components of the new superstructure (the new political, legal and philosophical views, the advanced ideas) take shape even before the revolution. But the new superstructure—the sum total of the political, legal and other ideas and their corresponding political, legal and other institutions—comes into being precisely at the time of revolution. Lenin's article *Against the Boycott* says:

"A high appreciation of revolutionary periods in the development of humanity is something that follows logically from the sum total of Marx's views on history. It is in such periods that the numerous contradictions that slowly accumulate in periods of so-called peaceful development become resolved. It is in such periods that the direct role of the various classes in the determination of the forms of social life manifests itself with the greatest force, and that the foundations are laid for the political "superstructure," which then for a long time continues to persist on the basis of the new relations of production."\*

Whilst breaking up the old, bourgeois relations of production in the course of the socialist revolution in Russia, the working class, led by the Communist Party, laid the foundations of the new political superstructure, and set up and consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat. The new political superstructure, the Soviet state, was the decisive lever in refashioning the old economy and creating a new, socialist economy.

Socialist production relations are a real and sound basis for the socialist superstructure—the political, legal, philosophical and aesthetic views and their corresponding political, legal and other institutions of socialist society.

Some lecturers and authors of popular Marxist pamphlets usually unreservedly treated all forms of social consciousness, including all spheres of science, as a part of the superstructure. The superstructure was often enough conceived too broadly and was erroneously thought to include the language. This was a gross mistake which had its sad consequences in linguistics.

Firstly, all sciences, both natural and social, have it in common that they are intended to provide us, and do

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow 1953, pp. 262-63.

provide us, with the objective truth existing independently of man and mankind. Both natural and social sciences are called upon to discover the laws governing processes that take place independently of man's will. Secondly, science progresses from ignorance to knowledge, from less complete truths to truths more complete, and from relative to absolute truths. Hence, there is continuity and interconnection in the development of all sciences, and every new generation of scientists carries on the work of their predecessors. This law-governed process is inherent in equal degree in all spheres of knowledge. By virtue of this, the specific relations of all natural and social sciences to the basis and superstructure, differ from those of other forms of social consciousness. When defining this common trait we must, however, bear in mind the difference between natural and social sciences.

The difference in the objects of study determines the difference between social and natural sciences, their different relation to production, the basis, the superstructure, and the classes. Should geometrical laws have affected class interests, Lenin wrote, they would have been contended. *If*. But they, these axioms, along with many mechanical, physical and chemical laws of nature do not generally affect class interests directly, and can, therefore, serve various modes of production and opposing aims. This is not the case with social sciences. Here the object of study—property relations, problems of labour and wages, problems of state and law, etc.—directly affects class interests.

Social sciences are the theoretical enunciation of the interests of one or another class, the exposition and substantiation of its political ideology. Thus, bourgeois political economy, bourgeois sociology and theories of the state and law, express the political ideology of the bourgeois class. They originate on the capitalist basis and are, therefore, a component of the bourgeois superstruc-

ture. It is not for any scientific knowledge of objective economic or other social laws, however, that they form part of the superstructure; bourgeois political economy, sociology and theories of the state are ignorant of these objective laws. They form part of the superstructure, or are treated as its part, because they express the political, legal and philosophical views of the bourgeoisie.

Marx and Engels, the ideologists of the working class, subjected to devastating criticism bourgeois political economy, bourgeois idealist sociology, and bourgeois political and legal theories. In their place, and opposing them, Marx and Engels created proletarian political economy, and dialectical and historical materialism.

Like any other social science, political economy is partisan from beginning to end, since it involves the cardinal and vital interests of the contending classes. In his preface to *Capital*, Marx wrote: "In the domain of Political Economy, free scientific inquiry meets not merely the same enemies as in all other domains. The peculiar nature of the material it deals with, summons as foes into the field of battle the most violent, mean and malignant passions of the human breast, the Furies of private interest. The English Established Church, e.g., will more readily pardon an attack on 38 of its 39 articles than on 1/30 of its income. Now-a-days atheism itself is *culpa levis*, as compared with criticism of existing property relations."\*

Bourgeois political economy, Marx wrote, could in a number of questions remain scientific only so long as the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie was still latent and manifested itself in isolated cases. But when the practical and theoretical class struggle waged by the proletariat began to assume increasingly pronounced forms and threatened the bourgeois

---

\* K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow 1954, p. 10.

economy, "it sounded the knell of scientific bourgeois economy. It was thenceforth no longer a question whether this theorem or that was true, but whether it was useful to capital or harmful, expedient or inexpedient, politically dangerous or not. In place of disinterested inquirers, there were hired prize-fighters; in place of genuine scientific research, the bad conscience and the evil intent of apologetic."\*

Lenin wrote that even a single word of the bourgeois professors of political economy cannot be trusted "when it comes to the general theory of political economy. For in modern society the latter is as much a *partisan* science as is *epistemology*. Taken as a whole, the professors of economics are nothing but learned salesmen of the capitalist class, while the professors of philosophy are learned salesmen of the theologians."\*\*

What Marx and Lenin said about bourgeois political economy fully applies to all of bourgeois sociology, historiography, and jurisprudence, which are nothing but pseudo-science. Bourgeois social science arises on the capitalist basis. It was called into being by it, and serves and protects its procreator.

Referring to bourgeois social science, Lenin wrote: "there can be no 'impartial' social science in a society based on class struggle. In one way or another, *all* official and liberal science *defends* wage slavery, whereas Marxism has declared relentless war on wage slavery. To expect science to be impartial in a wage-slave society is as silly and naive as to expect impartiality from manufacturers on the question whether workers' wages should be increased by decreasing the profits of capital."\*\*\*

---

\* K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow 1954, p. 15.

\*\* V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow 1952, p. 358.

\*\*\* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part I, Moscow 1952, p. 75.

Marxism, the genuine social science, was established by Marx and Engels and further developed by Lenin and Stalin. It is a scientific enunciation of the vital interests of the working class and constitutes its scientific political ideology. This partisan science came into being as a negation of the capitalist basis and its superstructure. Under socialism, Marxist political, legal, aesthetic and philosophical views constitute the superstructure on the socialist basis, which they reflect and for whose further consolidation and development they work. Marxism came into existence as a result of the progress of science, including philosophy, in the preceding period. It took the rational kernel (elements of the labour theory of value) of the classical English bourgeois political economy, the rational kernel of dialectics (the theory of development and change) from Hegel's philosophical system, etc. Meanwhile bourgeois social science, i.e., the various bourgeois social and political theories intended to protect and serve the capitalist basis, is eliminated along with the elimination of the latter.

As for special bourgeois economic and historical investigations, Marxism makes use only of their rich store of factual material, discarding the bourgeois pseudo-scientific theories intrinsically opposed to Marxism.

The discovery and utilization of the economic and sociological laws affecting the interests of classes meet with the frenzied opposition of the reactionary forces, while the progressive classes promote the discovery and utilization of the objective laws of social development.

Social sciences are an instrument of class struggle. They cannot be neutral to classes and the class struggle, and being the embodiment and substantiation of political and legal views, of the ideology of classes, they perform functions of the superstructure.

It is different with natural science. A reflection of nature, a science treating of its forces and law-governed

processes, it was born of the needs of producing material wealth, of developing technology and subjugating to society the elemental forces of nature.

Defining the connection between natural science and production, Engels wrote:

*"The successive development of the separate branches of natural science should be studied.—First of all, astronomy, which, if only on account of the seasons, was absolutely indispensable for pastoral and agricultural peoples. Astronomy can only develop with the aid of mathematics. Hence this also had to be tackled.—Further, at a certain stage of agriculture and in certain regions (raising of water for irrigation in Egypt), and especially with the origin of towns, big building structures and the development of handicrafts, mechanics also arose. This was soon needed also for navigation and war.—Moreover, it requires the aid of mathematics and so promotes the latter's development. Thus, from the very beginning the origin and development of the sciences has been determined by production."\**

Such was the case in the ancient world. The decline and fall of slave society was attended by a decline of culture and science. The early centuries of feudalism saw the persecution of scientific thought and the complete sway of religious obscurantism, theology and scholasticism. But, Engels wrote, after the darkness of the Middle Ages science is reborn with renewed vigour, and again it is to production that we owe this miracle.

Toricelli's hydrostatics arose out of the practical need to regulate mountain streams in Italy (Lombardy), from the need for hydrotechnical projects.

Genuine progress in electricity began after it had been already utilized in practice for the needs of production. It is the demand for technical progress that stimulates

---

\* F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, Moscow 1954, p. 247.

the development of natural sciences and engineering directly connected with production.

Hence, it is one of the features of natural science—the sum total of knowledge of the laws of nature, of physical, chemical and other properties of things—that, distinct from the superstructure, it is connected with production and its processes not only through the basis, but also directly.

Unlike medieval handicrafts, modern big industry both in capitalist and socialist society, is based on the conscious application of natural science, of the fruits of science. It could not live a single day without employing science. This is particularly true of such industries as machine-building, electrical engineering, the chemical, war, coal-mining, oil and other industries.

Social sciences and the apprehension of the laws of social development enable the working class, as society's advanced class, to exert a conscious influence on the course of social development with the aim of achieving a socialist revolution and, subsequently, of building socialism and communism. Reflecting the laws of nature, natural science enables society to subjugate nature's elemental forces—the wind, heat, steam and electricity; to utilize atomic energy and the mechanical, physical and chemical properties of matter.

Natural science, including mechanics, physics, chemistry and agrobiolgy, has summed up the wealth of practical production experience accumulated by mankind. Marx called science the universal spiritual product of social development, or the product of general historical development as expressed in its abstract result. Whereas the practical labour experience of the artisan, or peasant, is very limited, primitive and routine, embodied in labour practices, habits and customs that are passed on from generation to generation, from father to son, science

concentrates and scientifically generalizes the best achievements of the whole of mankind.

It is one of the features of advanced science based on theoretical thought, that it not only sums up mankind's past experience, but blazes new trails on the strength of this experience both in science itself, and in technology, and the productive forces as a whole. The discovery of steam-power, electricity, and atomic energy, of new chemical elements, new deposits of ores and minerals, and their useful physical and chemical properties—all this demonstrates the potency of advanced science and its part in the development of the productive forces.

Describing the development of capitalist production, Marx wrote: "Hand in hand with this centralization, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever-extending scale, the co-operative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science."\*

Under monopoly capitalism, the monopolies place impediments in the way of scientific progress and obstruct the utilization of inventions that do not lead to the enrichment of capitalists. But large-scale production in the epoch of imperialism as well cannot exist without applying scientific data in industry and agriculture. The increase in the production of surplus-value also depends on the progress of science and technology. And the productivity of labour, Marx wrote, attends the progress of science and technology.

Especially great is the role and application of science under socialism and in the period of transition to communism. All of society—from material production and the economic basis to the superstructure—is built and developed with the conscious application of all the achieve-

---

\* K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow 1954, p. 763.

ments of science, the laws of development of nature and society.

It is one of the features of the superstructure that it furnishes society with definite ideas and sets up corresponding institutions. Natural science also elaborates ideas and theories, studies and defines the laws and principles that reflect the actual relations and connections between things and phenomena. But natural science, applied technical sciences—mechanics, mechanical engineering, physics, chemistry, pedology and agrobiolgy—and all other sciences applied in production, give rise not only to ideas and theoretical principles, but help to design novel machines, new types of products, new varieties of plants and animals. Geologists survey and discover new mineral wealth, deposits of ore, minerals and precious metals, and place them at the service of man. According to Marx, every advance in the field of chemistry multiplies the number of useful substances and useful applications of substances already known.

With the aid of modern progressive science, constantly promoting its progress, Soviet scientists and engineers constructed hundreds of new types of machines, machine-tools and turbines; Soviet chemists discovered new types of raw materials (certain kinds of plastics), and substitutes not found in a natural state.

Modern chemistry succeeded in converting solid fuel (coal) into liquid fuel; hundreds of useful products are produced from petroleum. Mankind owes all this to progressive science.

In the field of agrobiolgy the great Michurin, his pupils and followers, have evolved new varieties of plants, striving to increase the yields of agricultural crops. Promoting progressive science, Soviet soil experts seek to raise the fertility of soil.

The transition from capitalism to socialism signifies maximum co-operation between science and production.

The foremost Soviet scientists combat any isolation of science from production and practical experience, and strive for the closest possible all-round ties between science and production.

Any gulf between science and production is anomalous. Capitalism applies the laws of natural science in large-scale industry and partly in agriculture to intensify exploitation of the working class, but in virtue of its antagonistic nature and the ever-increasing antithesis between mental and physical labour, it constantly widens the gulf between the working people—society's principal productive force—and science.

It is only socialism and communism that bridge this gulf by effecting a close alliance of science and labour and raising the cultural and professional level of the working people.

The development of production and the productive forces of socialist society, and the progress of natural science, have much in common: both aim at the subjugation of nature's elemental forces to the interests of social progress, and their utilization by society. In the capitalist antagonistic social formation, production emerges as the production of surplus-value, and natural science serves the capitalist and the cause of producing more surplus-value.

Under socialism, however, where the antagonism and the antithesis between mental and physical labour are eliminated, the unity of science and production manifests itself to the full.

This direct bond of the natural sciences and engineering and production, reveals the distinction between these branches of science and the ideological superstructure, which serves the basis and is only indirectly connected with production through the basis.

Natural science and its laws can equally well serve both capitalist and socialist production; both the purposes

of capitalist exploitation and pursuit of capitalist profits, and the object of raising the material well-being of the working people and satisfying their constantly rising material and cultural requirements; both the destructive designs of the imperialist aggressors and the creative, socialist work of the Soviet people.

In the Soviet country Pasteur's great discovery serves to combat diseases and epidemics, and in the hands of the American imperialists preparing a bacteriological war, it is a means of exterminating thousands and millions of people.

Euclid's geometry, evolved in slave society, equally serves both capitalist and socialist production. In this respect natural science to some extent resembles engineering and machinery. Under capitalism natural science, like machinery, confronts the workers as a hostile force, a force wielded by capitalists. Marx said that the division of labour under capitalism turns mental and physical labour into deadly foes: "... As in the natural body head and hand wait upon each other, so the labour-process unites the labour of the hand with that of the head. Later on they part company and even become deadly foes."\*

Large-scale industry isolates science from labour as an independent potential of production, and makes it serve capital. Accordingly, Marx describes science as one of the forces of production, one of its potentials set apart, in virtue of the antagonistic nature of the capitalist mode of production, as an independent force hostile to the workers.

Capital employs machines, engineering, scientific inventions and science as means of subjugating the working class, as instruments of exploitation and domination.

\* K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow 1954, p. 508.

Science is intended to lighten the labour and living conditions of millions of people, to extend their sway over nature and its elemental forces, and broaden their intellectual scope. Under capitalism, however, science in the hands of the bourgeoisie has become a force of subjugation, exploitation and destruction.

Marx wrote "... At the same pace that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy. Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance. . . This antagonism between modern industry and science on the one hand, modern misery and dissolution on the other hand; this antagonism between the productive powers, and the social relations of our epoch is a fact, palpable, overwhelming, and not to be controverted."\*

The momentous discoveries in the domains of natural science should serve for creating and developing the productive forces, to augment to the maximum the wealth of mankind.

Today bellicose imperialism is attempting to utilize great scientific discoveries, made by the genius of man, as a means for destroying the achievements of world culture. The reactionary, imperialist camp, headed by the United States, threatens the nations with the atom bomb. It is the duty of the peace-loving peoples of the world to curb the warmongers and fashion such social relations that would place the supreme achievements of human genius, the great scientific discoveries, at the service of the people for the production of material wealth for peaceful purposes.

It is only under socialism that science serves the entire people. Only in socialist society is the antithesis between

\* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow 1955, pp. 359-60.

mental and physical labour abolished and science lights the way to a cultural and professional upsurge of tens of millions of people.

On the strength of the socialist relations of production the forces of nature are subject to the will of free men. The profound prophecy of the founders of Marxism is coming true that people would become the real masters of nature only after they became masters of their own social relations.

In the U.S.S.R. the latest achievements of science and engineering are utilized in the construction of further giant hydroelectric stations supplying cheap electric power to industry and agriculture.

Science—the captive and slave of capitalism—is relieved of its fetters in socialist society and for the first time in history it is a free and vigorous force reunited with physical labour. Consequently, the role of science has increased enormously and is to grow still greater. In the U.S.S.R. science is introduced on an ever-increasing scale into all spheres of production and into all fields of social life.

The future of socialist industry lies in the conversion of factories and plants into huge scientific laboratories where millions of workers of communist society, having risen to the level of engineers and technicians, will apply the best achievements of human knowledge to operate vast systems of highly-productive machines; they will produce an abundance of material wealth and simultaneously blaze new paths in science and engineering. Even at present we can observe numerous infant shoots of communism, and they multiply from day to day.

But not only the socialist plants and factories, collective farms and state farms, will assume new proportions. Physical, chemical, biological and other laboratories will likewise turn into large-scale enterprises

equipped with complex machinery operated by an army of scientists who will wrest from nature ever new secrets and discover more and more of its laws.

In bourgeois society, where production facilities are used only in part, where factories and plants close down, the acreage under cultivation shrinks and crops are destroyed, the capitalists are interested in developing science and constructing new machines and machine-tools of greater productivity only to the extent that augurs profit; if, reversely, new machinery does not give promise of increased profits, capitalism opposes innovations and resorts to hand labour. In bourgeois countries it is primarily the pursuit of capitalist profit that engenders and stimulates the progress of science.

Today the development of science in capitalist countries is determined by the basic economic law of modern capitalism. The major features and requirements of this law are the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the country in question, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits.

Socialism has created limitless opportunities for the all-round development of science and the productive forces. In socialist society science serves the people. It is inseparably connected with the people, and all the people are interested in its progress. For this reason in the U.S.S.R. not only professional scientists but millions of workers and collective farmers take part in developing science.

Under socialism, the progress of science, like all social development, is subordinated to the basic economic law of socialism whose essential features and

requirements are the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques.

Insomuch as natural science supplies the knowledge of the objective laws of nature, which are independent of man's will, it does not contain any class or partisan elements. There is nothing suggestive of such elements in, say, the terms of Euclidian geometry, or in the laws discovered by Lomonosov or Mendelejev.

However, besides objective laws and objective truths verified and proved in practice, science also contains their theoretical interpretation and general philosophical deductions drawn from these laws—in short, there are also the philosophical and ideological principles of science. These general theoretical and philosophical deductions, as well as the interpretation of laws, express directly the world outlook of the classes, and may be either materialist and scientific, i.e., true, or idealist and metaphysical, i.e., non-scientific.

Progressive, true science has always been materialist and radically opposed to idealism and religion. Due to the decay of capitalism, the dominant trend in the science of present-day bourgeois society is reactionary and proceeds from reactionary principles of idealist philosophy. The bourgeoisie and its learned lackeys infuse science with mysticism and idealism.

It is commonly known that such an outstanding discovery in physics as the electron stands as one of the countless substantiations of the infinity of human knowledge. This discovery furnishes additional proof of the trueness and authenticity of dialectical materialism. Bourgeois reactionary physicists, however, sought to curry favour with the clergy by drawing on Machism—an idealist philosophical system—for unscientific, ideal-

ist conclusions from this great scientific discovery. They made out that it testified, as it were, to the subjectivity of knowledge, the non-existence of objective laws, the "disappearance of matter," and the like. Equally idealistic in their interpretation of Einstein's theory of relativity, bourgeois reactionary physicists crown their folly with assertions about the finitude of the universe and the electron's freedom of will, etc.

Analyzing the crisis of physics in bourgeois society, Lenin wrote:

"In a word, the 'physical' idealism of today, just as the 'physiological' idealism of yesterday, merely means that one school of natural scientists in one branch of natural science has slid into a reactionary philosophy, being unable to rise directly and at once from metaphysical materialism to dialectical materialism. This step is being made, and will be made, by modern physics; but it is making for the only true method and the only true philosophy of natural science not directly, but by zig-zags, not consciously but instinctively, not clearly perceiving its 'final goal,' but drawing closer to it gropingly, hesitatingly, and sometimes even with its back turned to it. Modern physics is in travail; it is giving birth to dialectical materialism. The process of childbirth is painful. And in addition to a living healthy being, there are bound to be produced certain dead products, refuse fit only for the garbage-heap. And the entire school of physical idealism, the entire empirio-critical philosophy, together with empirio-symbolism, empirio-monism, and so on, and so forth, must be regarded as such refuse!"\*

At the same time Lenin stressed that the crisis in physics was not only a consequence of the advance of science and the breaking up of old concepts; but that it

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow 1952, pp. 325-26.

was also a crisis brought about by the decay of capitalism and the pernicious influence of the reactionary, idealist philosophy dominant in capitalist society.

Where the working class and socialist society nonetheless utilize discoveries made by bourgeois scientists in the spheres of physics and chemistry, they cast away every alien, reactionary and metaphysical element introduced into science by the bourgeois scientists. Lenin wrote: "*Not a single one* of these professors, who are capable of making very valuable contributions in the special fields of chemistry, history, or physics, *can be trusted one iota* when it comes to philosophy."\*

As we see, Marxism teaches us to distinguish in bourgeois science, and particularly in bourgeois natural science, the specific data, verified and proved in practice, the objective knowledge of the actual law-governed natural phenomena, from idealistic philosophical principles pervading that science.

There is no inner connection between true science and its discoveries, on the one hand, and idealism, on the other. They are antipodal. Only bourgeois reactionaries and obscurantists try to establish an inner bond between scientific discoveries in, say, physics and idealistic nonsense. True science has been, and always will be, internally connected with materialism only: intrinsically it can be nothing but materialist.

By virtue of its philosophical and ideological principles, natural science, and not only social sciences, is of a class and partisan nature in a class society. Modern physics, chemistry, physiology, biology and even such an exact science as mathematics, have, therefore, become the field of embittered battle between progressive and reactionary science and their respective representatives, a

battle of materialism against idealism, of dialectics against metaphysics. In the final analysis this struggle reflects the struggle of classes.

The struggle of Soviet Michurinist biologists headed by T. Lysenko against the Mendelist-Morganists, of the followers of I. Pavlov against reactionary, idealistic schools of physiology, of Soviet physicists against the idealistic vacillations of some of their colleagues, and the struggle against the idealistic theory of resonance in chemistry—all this is a fight against the influence of the reactionary bourgeois ideology, a fight to uphold the socialist ideology, and progressive science.

Dialectical materialism is the only reliable, stable and authentic philosophical foundation of modern natural science. Only this scientific philosophy shows the right way of scientific progress. This is proved by the outstanding discoveries of Soviet physicists, biologists, microbiologists and physiologists. They conclusively confirm the profound truth of the infinity of human knowledge.

The Communist Party, which inspires Soviet scientists to daring revolutionary exploits in science, teaches that progressive, Soviet science should serve the people, and not shut itself off from the people.

Soviet progressive science, aware of the significance of time-honoured traditions, skilfully utilizes them in the interests of developing science. At the same time, following the example of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, those great men of science, Soviet scientists are not slaves of these established traditions. They boldly break up obsolete traditions, injunctions, formulas and postulates, and blaze new trails in science. This is also testified by the discoveries made by Soviet scientists in physics, biology and agrobiolgy.

What conclusion can be drawn then about science as a form of social consciousness?

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow 1952, p. 357.

Natural science emerges from the requirements of production, practice and technology. It develops along with production, it is connected with production and directly influences its progress. This science can equally serve both capitalist and socialist production. It is not destroyed with the disappearance of the old basis and the emergence of a new basis. It is necessary, therefore, to combat all simplifiers and vulgarizers alleging that both Euclid's geometry, and mechanics and engineering, bear a class character, and that a proletarian geometry should replace slave and feudal geometry, and proletarian physics replace bourgeois physics. This was propagated by the Machian Bogdanov and his followers, who denied the objective truth and believed truth to be nothing more than organized and harmonized social experience; and that since the experience of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat differed, their truth and science also differed.

The Machians are enemies of socialism. The Communist Party waged a relentless and irreconcilable fight against them. At present there are no Machians in the Soviet Union, but vulgarizers and Talmudists, dogmatists and simplifiers are not yet extinct. It is against them that the Communist Party carries on an ideological struggle.

The problem just discussed, of science and its relation to production, the basis and the superstructure, and its role in social life, is of cardinal theoretical and practical significance. The attitude to the scientific heritage of the past depends on a correct theoretical appraisal of the connection between science on the one hand, and production, the basis and superstructure, on the other. This attitude can be either anarchist, nihilistic, Machian-Bogdanovite, or Marxist-Leninist.

Socialist society inherits, assimilates and preserves the great achievements of mankind in the realm of science and effects their further development. Every science,

however, including natural science, has its philosophical and ideological foundation, its theoretical interpretations of existing laws, and conclusions drawn from them. This theoretical, philosophical foundation can be either materialist and progressive, or idealist and reactionary. This aspect of science is of a superstructural and class character.

Soviet science accepts Newton's law of gravity, but discards his assertion about the divine primary impulse. Soviet science defends Darwin's theory from attacks by obscurantists, American and British reactionaries and the clergy, but it rejects those elements of it that are infused with bourgeois ideology (elements of Malthusianism, etc.).

The present-day Morganist-Mendelist biological theories are far from being a science; they are nothing but idealistic and metaphysical conjectures of bourgeois obscurantists. These conjectures and self-styled theories are rejected by Soviet science as pseudo-scientific.

The force of Michurin's discoveries lies in their benefit to practice, production and the development of the productive forces. The Weismannist-Morganist-Mendelist theory, meanwhile, is absolutely sterile.

It is the vital duty of Soviet scientists to combat uncompromisingly all bourgeois reactionary idealistic and metaphysical theories and influences.

\* \* \*

Let us now consider the problem of aesthetic or artistic views, of art and literature. Firstly: are the concepts "artistic views" and "art" identical? As a matter of fact, they are not quite identical, nor coincident. Artistic views are primarily embodied and expressed in art, but they also exist in the minds of millions of people. Artistic views are at the same time a definite attitude towards

art itself, towards works of art, and a definite attitude towards the beautiful, towards the relation of art to reality, and its role in social life. Brought into being by a definite economic system, artistic views are a superstructure on this system. They are cultivated in the people by works of art and literature, book reviews and aesthetic theories.

Aesthetic views are in varying degrees inherent in everyone, although not all people, by far, create works of art. Naturally enough, however, the aesthetic views, ideas and principles dominant in a given society are most fully expressed and embodied in works of art and literature. In this sense, art and literature, the embodiment and expression of the aesthetic views reigning in a given society, constitute a superstructure.

The aesthetic views, ideas, theories and principles fostered by a definite economic basis, exercise a guiding influence upon the development of art and literature in a given society. Aesthetic, or artistic, views can be either progressive or reactionary, realistic or formalistic. They can be either optimistic and sanguine, like those of socialist realism prevailing in the U.S.S.R., or decadent and pernicious, like those in the U.S.A. and other capitalist countries.

The aesthetic ideas dominant in modern bourgeois society are reactionary, decadent and anti-realistic, viewing art as a means of spiritually subjugating the working people and nurturing obedient slaves. These "aesthetic" bourgeois views are anti-democratic and misanthropic in character.

Modern bourgeois art is pseudo-art. In an effort aimed at destroying the will of the working people to fight capitalism, demoralizing them, and diverting their attention from the urgent tasks of the revolutionary struggle for socialism, peace and genuine democracy, it plays the part of a vehicle of imperialist reaction.

Decadent modern bourgeois art, including literature, propagates reactionary, anti-democratic, anti-scientific ideas and superstitions; it preaches predatory war, cosmopolitanism and individualism; it sows seeds of contempt for man and life, inculcates beastly instincts, and proclaims being to be accidental.

A great many progressive men of culture in the capitalist countries oppose the forces of reaction which are ready to engage the nations in an atomic war. To them Soviet literature and art are sources of inspiration in the struggle for a progressive development of their national cultures. On the other hand, Soviet men of culture develop the best traditions of world literature and art.

The classical 19th-century art of critical realism brought home the truths of life and cultivated the spirit of humanism and lofty moral principles. But the banner of modern bourgeois art is amorality. The classical, realistic art championed reason, science and enlightenment. But modern bourgeois art is an apology of irrationalism, of the "sub-conscious" and the instinctive. According to surrealism—the current vogue in bourgeois art—the more meaningless the work, the higher its "merits."

This bourgeois art is an expression and reflection of the capitalist basis and its superstructure. The meaningless, misshapen decadent art and literature are a counterpart of the senselessness and ugliness of capitalism.

Actively opposed to the degrading art of the ruling classes in capitalist countries are such progressive workers at art and literature as Howard Fast, Jack Lindsay, Louis Aragon, James Aldridge, Pablo Neruda and many others, who are ideologically bound with the liberation movement of the working people and the struggle for peace and democracy, and uphold realistic, national, people's art.

Decadent, reactionary aesthetic views were widespread in tsarist Russia, finding expression in the reactionary,

decadent and anti-realistic "art" of formalists, cubists and symbolists.

With the abolition in the U.S.S.R. of the capitalist basis and its replacement by the socialist basis, aesthetic, or artistic, views also underwent a radical change.

Gone forever are the decadent bourgeois ideas and degenerate, sterile music and painting (outside of some survivals in this sphere that still have to be combated). They have been replaced by the aesthetic views of socialist realism which, firmly rooted and widespread, find expression and embodiment in works of Soviet art and literature.

Soviet socialist art and literature express the most advanced ideas of our time, the ideas of socialism and communism. Born of the socialist basis, Soviet art and literature reflect it and serve its consolidation and development. They constitute an integral part of the socialist superstructure.

Soviet socialist art and literature are the exact opposite of the whole of modern bourgeois literature and art.

Hence, we can see that art belongs to the superstructure, being the utterance and embodiment of the artistic views of the ruling class at a definite historical period, of views originated by a given basis.

With the abolition and disappearance of the basis of a definite historical period, its superstructure is likewise abolished, and disappears. The reactionary, decadent aesthetic views widespread in bourgeois society and expressed in reactionary bourgeois art, views born of the rotten capitalist basis, will disappear together with this basis, much like the aesthetic views of the Russian feudal-serf society pervading the works of Bulgarin, Kukolnik, Grech and other advocates of tsarist autocracy. But far from disappearing with the feudal-serf society which gave it birth, the remarkable classical, realistic art of the past epoch, is imbued with new life under socialism, and

comes within reach of the masses for the first time in history.

The art of Renaissance and the works of Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Tolstoy, Repin, Surikov, Glinka and Chaikovsky not only survived the abolition of the old basis that gave them life, but after the socialist revolution these masterpieces have for the first time in history become the possession of millions and live to be the source of unending aesthetic delight. In some ways the momentous works of Russian 19th-century classical art remain artistically unsurpassed even to this day, particularly in music, painting, and partly in literature.

In his article *L. N. Tolstoy*, Lenin wrote that in tsarist Russia Leo Tolstoy was known only to an insignificant minority of the population. "To make his great works really accessible to *all*, it is necessary to fight and fight against the social system which has condemned millions and tens of millions to ignorance, oppression, slavish toil and poverty; a socialist revolution is needed."<sup>\*</sup>

Lenin's prophecy saw fulfilment in the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

What Lenin said about Tolstoy's works is true of the whole of the magnificent Russian fine literature, of the entire Russian classical art, as well as the works of the art of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., of the treasures of world classical art, the art of Shakespeare and Balzac, Beethoven and Bizet, Chopin and Liszt, Goethe and Heine. Only the socialist revolution and the socialist system has made the great, immortal treasures of classical art accessible to hundreds of millions of working people, placing art at the service of the people.

How can it be explained that the great works of Russian and world art survived the abolition in the U.S.S.R.

<sup>\*</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Articles on Tolstoy*, Moscow 1953, p. 17.

of the old basis and its corresponding superstructure, the abolition of the old, obsolete bourgeois and pre-bourgeois aesthetic views and their replacement by new, socialist aesthetic views, and that these works, far from disappearing, are imbued with new vital force, become accessible to the masses, and play a tremendous role in Soviet social life?

This is chiefly explained by the fact that, say, the Russian classical literature and art of the first half and middle of the 19th century did not serve the feudal-serf economic system or basis, though they arose on it. On the contrary, the great Russian classical literature and art were permeated with an anti-feudal and critical revolutionary spirit. They did not serve the cause of consolidating the feudal basis; they enlisted fighters against that basis.

The creative effort of Pushkin and Lermontov, Glinka and Surikov was an enunciation of the same social forces as the Decembrist movement. In the realm of philosophy these views were represented by Radishchev and Herzen.

Both Russian classical literature and art, and the materialist philosophy of Radishchev, Herzen and, later, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, developing on the feudal basis, or, more exactly, out of the conflict between the new, growing productive forces and the moribund feudal relations of production, by no means represented the superstructure serving the feudal basis, though they were a phenomenon of a superstructural nature which blazed the path to the new society that was on its way to replace the feudal society.

The works of Grech, Bulgarin, Kukolnik and similar apologists of the serf system represented the superstructure on the feudal basis.

How can one and the same basis give birth to such greatly differing phenomena in the realm of ideology,

literature and art? This occurs because both the feudal-serf and the capitalist basis are sustained by the antagonism of opposing classes. In the sphere of ideology, for this reason, there arise opposing trends, some defending the given basis, others directed against it, and undermining it. This occurs when the new productive forces come into contradiction with the obsolete relations of production; an advanced art and literature appear on the scene to represent and give expression to the new, progressive social forces.

"Out of the conflict between the new productive forces and the old relations of production, out of the new economic demands of society, there arise new social ideas; the new ideas organize and mobilize the masses; the masses become welded into a new political army, create a new revolutionary power, and make use of it to abolish by force the old system of relations of production, and to firmly establish the new system."\*

What has been said here concerning the appearance of advanced social ideas, is equally true of aesthetic views and ideas expressed in art and literature.

It is precisely out of the conflict between the new productive forces and the obsolescent feudal-serf relations that there arose the advanced Russian classical literature and art of the 19th century, imbued with the lofty spirit of serving the country and the people.

The secret of the efflorescence of Russian classical literature and art in the 19th century lay in the profound contradictions of feudal-serf society, in the contradiction between the productive forces and the obsolescent feudal-serf relations, and in the profound social-economic and political contradictions of tsarist Russia. The Russian literature and art of the 19th century were called into being by the needs of developing the country's ma-

---

\* J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1954, p. 743.

terial life and to help in solving urgent political issues, and economic, social and political contradictions. This underlay the creative effort of Pushkin and Lermontov, Gogol and Turgenev, Nekrasov and Saltykov-Shchedrin, Surikov and Repin, Glinka and Chaikovsky.

It is one of the most important features of realistic art that it represents a specific form of an objective, true apprehension of reality—apprehension through artistic images. This makes art kindred to genuine science, and constitutes the everlasting significance of great, progressive, realistic art.

It was Engels who wrote that from Balzac's *Human Comedy* he had learned more about the history of France than from the writings on the same period by all the historians taken together. And this, in spite of Balzac's reactionary political views, in spite of his legitimism. Such was the strength of realism. What Engels said about Balzac equally applies to the works of Shakespeare, and the great Russian art and literature.

Russian realistic art and literature were a faithful mirror of the old life, a reflection of its contradictions, an artistic expression of the historical tasks and aspirations of the progressive anti-feudal forces and also of the hopes and ideals of the broad popular masses.

One of the major features of the progressive art and literature that come into existence at the turning points in world history and the history of nations, is their national character and their close ties with folk art.

The great Gorky said that real art is always linked with folk art, that it draws inspiration from the people and makes use of its images, airs, melodies, fables, etc. Prometheus, Don Quixote, Faust and others, had lived in the popular imagination long before the time of Aeschylus, Servantes and Goethe. "... No individual genius has produced any generalization that was not based on the crea-

tive effort of the people, or any world type that had not existed before in popular fairy-tales or legends."\*

These ties with the popular creative effort account for the vital strength of classical art and literature. That is the reason why they have outlived their own epoch and will live on as long as the peoples live, whose ideas, emotions, aspirations and thoughts they express in their different ways. Obliterating and destroying all that is superficial, insignificant, moribund and reactionary, ruthless time is impotent against the great works of the human spirit, intellect and artistic imagination.

Glinka's operas *Ruslan and Lyudmila* and *Ivan Susanin* originated on the feudal-serf basis, and yet today they are as beautiful as at the time when they were composed. The magnificent overture to *Ruslan and Lyudmila* continues to be an inspiring summons to feats of daring, heroism and courage, rousing lofty emotions and noble ardour. *Ivan Susanin* kindles a deep, powerful sense of love for the homeland and the Russian people, a sense of patriotism.

It goes without saying that the Soviet audience appreciates *Ivan Susanin*, *Ruslan and Lyudmila* and the other classical works of music quite differently than the audience of the time when they were composed. The same should be said about the works of Pushkin, Lermontov, Surikov, Repin, and Tolstoy. This different appreciation of the masterpieces of the art and literature of the past is shaped by the new social conditions of material life, by the new ideology dominant in Soviet society, by the new aesthetic views firmly established in the U.S.S.R.

---

\* M. Gorky, *Critical Articles on Literature*, State Publishing House of Fine Literature, Moscow 1937, p. 27.

Thanks to the genius of Lenin who disclosed the essence of Tolstoy's creative effort, Soviet people understand the works of the great writer more profoundly than Tolstoy did himself. And this is true of all the classical art.

We speak of the Russian nation as the nation of Lenin and Plekhanov, Glinka and Chaikovsky, Surikov and Repin. The giants of Russian science, art and literature embody the genius of the Russian nation. Their creative effort gave expression to the progressive national traits of the Russian people. The same applies to the classical art of other nations.

Lenin said that within every nation there are two cultures—progressive, and reactionary. "There are two nations in every modern nation. . .", Lenin wrote in 1913, "There are two national cultures in every national culture. There is the Great-Russian culture of the Purishkeviches, Guchkovs and Struves—but there is also the Great-Russian culture that is characterized by the names of Chernyshevsky and Plekhanov. There are the *same two* cultures among the Ukrainians, as well as in Germany, France, England. . . ."

Imbued with a love for the people, with democratic ideas and a hatred for serfdom and tsarism, classical art belongs above all to the democratic culture of the past.

The works of Pushkin and Glinka, Gogol and Tolstoy, Mussorgsky and Chaikovsky, Surikov and Repin, are the priceless cultural legacy which we rightfully inherited and preserved from oblivion, a legacy that for the first time in history has become accessible to the people. It is only socialism and the forces of socialism that really protect and preserve the treasures of world art.

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Critical Remarks on the National Question*, Moscow 1955, p. 29.

When creating the socialist culture, ~~socialist~~ teaches, it is essential to preserve all that is best of the progressive culture of the past, to learn from its choice masters in the spheres of music, art, literature, drama-turgy, etc., in order to be able to surpass their artistic mastership as well.

Since it expresses and embodies aesthetic views, art, therefore, belongs to phenomena of a superstructural nature. The art of the ruling class is part and parcel of the superstructure of a given basis. Artistic views are abolished and disappear along with the moribund basis that gave rise to them. By no means, however, does this contradict the fact that the great classical, realistic art offering an appreciation of the artistic values of a definite epoch, not only survives, but becomes the treasured possession of the broad popular masses. In new conditions this art of the past is differently appreciated, however, and its social mission is quite different to what it was in the preceding social formations.

This explains why the great art and literature bear an undeniably superstructural character, and yet, unlike reactionary art and literature, not only survive, but flourish long after the conditions that engendered them cease to exist.

Russian classical literature and realistic art, sculpture and music, reflect in artistic images the history of the Russian people, their heroic past, the history of the struggle for national independence, and against feudal and capitalist oppression. That is why classical progressive realistic art survives the abolition of the obsolescent basis and its superstructure, and thrives in the new, victorious socialist society.

The course of the development of Soviet society offers eloquent confirmation to the Marxist precept that the collapse of capitalism signifies an end to mankind's pre-history and the prime of its real history, of conscious,

planned social development based on perceived objective laws consciously applied. The development of Soviet society is not attended by economic catastrophes, class conflicts, anarchy of production and the destruction of the already existing social wealth, including the social productive forces.

The abolition of the antagonistic capitalist basis built upon the exploitation of man by man, the effectuation of a full conformity of the modern productive forces and the socialist production relations, as well as the rise of the socialist superstructure, have paved the way to a gradual planned socialist development, effected without explosion, on the initiative and under the leadership of the socialist state and the Communist Party.

This new mode of development, this new law-governed historical process revealed itself in collectivization—the great socialist revolution in Soviet agriculture—although the antagonistic contradictions were still being resolved at the time between the working class and the working peasantry, on the one hand, and the kulaks, on the other.

The revolution in agriculture was carried out in the struggle against the kulaks, the most numerous capitalist class. After the elimination of this last remaining class opposing socialism, after the victory of the socialist mode of production, no hostile class forces remained to oppose the onward march of society. The victory of socialism brought the U.S.S.R. to a new phase of historical development, the phase of completing the construction of socialism and gradual transition from socialism to communism.

The remaining hostile elements and inert forces are incapable of seriously impeding the gradual transition of society to communism.

The transition from socialism to communism is a development within one and the same social-economic formation, the communist formation; it is a development from

its first, or lower, phase to its higher phase. This transition occurs on one and the same economic basis—the socialist relations of production—and through the overcoming of non-antagonistic contradictions between the growing productive forces and the relations of production that lag somewhat behind these forces. The transition occurs in the process of struggle with hostile elements, remnants of routed classes and groupings, and in the process of further consolidating the moral and political unity of Soviet society, of fostering fraternal co-operation and friendship among the peoples of the Soviet Union, and cultivating the vivifying Soviet patriotism. An extraordinarily active role in this process falls to the socialist superstructure. The transition does not involve abolition of the existing power. To the contrary, on the strength of further consolidating Soviet power, the socialist state organizes, promotes and directs this transition. It is bound up with the development of the dominant socialist ideology—socialist political, legal, aesthetic and philosophical views—and to struggle to stamp out the survivals of capitalism in the minds of Soviet people.

In the past, in antagonistic formations, social progress signified a growth of antagonisms in all fields—economic, social, political and spiritual. The development of capitalism deepens the abyss between the rich and poor, the exploiters and exploited, town and country, mental and physical labour.

The progress of socialist society also involves a struggle to surmount contradictions and difficulties, a struggle of new, developing elements against old, obsolescent elements, and the victory of the new over the old. But this emergence of contradictions and their solution, as well as the struggle of new elements against old, is of an essentially different character.

The development of the capitalist mode of production means an aggravation of the conflict between contempo-

rary productive forces and capitalist relations of production, and all the attendant antagonisms and antitheses, leading ultimately to a revolution that destroys the capitalist basis and its superstructure. The further development of the socialist mode of production, on the other hand, means the solution of incipient contradictions between the productive forces and the socialist production relations. By virtue of the correct policy of the socialist state these contradictions cannot grow into a conflict between ascendant productive forces and developing socialist relations of production. The development of the socialist mode of production leads to the elimination of the still existing essential distinctions between town and country and between mental and physical labour, and to the further promotion of fraternal co-operation and friendship among the peoples. This new mode of development springs from the non-antagonistic character of the socialist basis and the specific role of the socialist superstructure. Since the contradictions arising in the socialist mode of production are not antagonistic, the socialist superstructure and, above all, the socialist state and the Communist Party, are capable of resolving, and do resolve, them in good time.

Hence, the progress of socialist society and the transition from socialism to communism signify greater unity of society in all fields. Private ownership, which underlies the slave, feudal and capitalist bases, disunited people and placed them under capitalism into relations of competition with one another, into relations of struggle of "all against all." In socialist society, progressing towards communism, the common ownership that underlies the socialist basis, unites and brings together tens of millions of people.

In antagonistic formations irreconcilable contradictions and the class struggle were the principal and decisive driving force in the development of society. Under

socialism and during the period of gradual transition from socialism to communism, it is unity of productive forces with relations of production, as well as the moral and political unity, fraternal friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance of the peoples, and the ardent Soviet patriotism engendered by it, that emerge as the new, unprecedented driving forces of development. These driving forces of socialist society are immeasurably stronger than the driving forces active under capitalism, and ensure accelerated progress towards communism.

The transition of socialist society to the next, higher stage of the development of communism, a transition now taking place in the Soviet Union, marks a powerful economic, social and cultural advance of the new formation and fully brings out its potentialities.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the great inspirer, organizer and leader of this irresistible progress of millions of people towards communism. Its wise leadership stimulates the energy of millions, impelling them to a creative effort, to heroism and unexampled exploits. It discloses new laws governing the developing socialist society and demonstrates how to utilize the laws of social development in the interests of communism, including the law of the determining role of the basis in relation to the superstructure, and how to employ the active role of the superstructure in the struggle for communism.

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*