

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM IN THE USSR IN THE 30S AND 40S

Ikhlov Boris Lazarevitch

Lead Research Engineer

Special construct bureau "Lighthouse" in Perm state university

Abstract. *Factual material about World War II is presented. The main points of modernization of the Soviet economy are analyzed. Some of the main theoretical works of the 30s - 40s of the XX century are considered. It was concluded that the level, with which the USSR approached in the mid-1950s, including in theory, was unsatisfactory.*

Keywords: *neoplatonism, metaphysics, accident, contradiction.*

Introduction

Throughout the existence of the USSR, its chronicle was subjected to the most varied, usually opposite in nature, aberrations. Accordingly, the distortions affected both authentic Marxism and attempts at generalizing historical research. Even the term "classical Marxism" appeared, although any science presupposes denial, denial of denial, the emergence of a new one. In recent times, the speed of the formation of mythology as a reaction to liberal reality is comparable to the speed of formation of the most liberal mythology.

World War II period

Historical mythology on the "right" and on the "left" also covers the period of the 1st World War.

Let's turn to the facts. Churchill described Stalin's actions in the first days of the war very negatively: "Stalin and his commissars showed themselves at that moment of the Second World War completely muddled." The beginning of the war, the rapid retreat on almost all fronts, the tragedy of July 9 near Minsk, the Kiev boiler, two Kharkov boilers, the failure near Rzhev, the failure of the winter offensive in 1942, the inhibition of the "Katyusha" commissioning, the destruction of the creators of the legendary MLRS, the destruction of military experts, the top of the army, the elimination of many prominent foreign intelligence officers, an attempt to replace the 45-mm guns with 107-mm guns, the removal of the gunner from the "IL" aircraft, the useless injection of funds to create double armor, etc. happened, obviously, not through the fault of the "scapegoats", the main fault lies with the top management.

Emelyanov writes: "When Pavlov was the head of the armored directorate of the General Staff, Emelyanov, as the head of the armored headquarters of the NK industrial shipbuilding, shot at the range double sheets of boiler iron, which Stalin, by mistake, recognized as protection for tanks instead of armor. Pavlov announced to Emelyanov that now they both died (for it turned out that Stalin was a fool). But they managed to cheat. It was reported that the double iron sheet is an excellent protection of tanks from bullets and shrapnel. But nothing stands still. Experience has shown that now it is necessary to protect the tank from shells. And therefore "you have to" to look for armor protection. They made it that one time" [1]

General of the Army A. V. Gorbatov: "It was believed that the enemy was advancing so quickly because of the surprise of his attack and because Germany put the industry of almost all of Europe at its service. Of course it was. But I was sweaty by my previous fears: how are we going to fight, having lost so many experienced commanders even before the war? This, undoubtedly, was at least one of the main reasons for our failures, although they did not talk about it or presented the matter as if the years 1937-1938, having cleared the army of "traitors", increased its power" [2].

Marshal of the Soviet Union A. I. Eremenko: "Comrade Stalin is significantly guilty of the extermination of military personnel before the war, which affected the combat capability of the army."

Marshal of the Soviet Union AM Vasilevsky: "Without the thirty-seventh year, perhaps there would have been no war at all in the forty-first year. In the fact that Hitler decided to start a war in 1941, an assessment of the degree of defeat of military personnel that took place in our country played an important role."

Marshal Konev, twice Hero of the Soviet Union: "There is no doubt that if the thirty-seventh-thirty-eighth years were not, and not only in the army, but also in the party, in the country, then by the forty-first year we would be incomparably stronger, what they were" [3].

The "main saboteur" of the Red Army Starinov, whom Hitler declared his personal enemy, asserts: "The repressions of 1937-38 dealt a crushing blow to the country, which affected the course of the war ... The

repressions led to the fact that in the Red Army many subdivisions, units and all the more the formations and formations were commanded by, to put it mildly, unprepared people" [4].

During the discussion of the planned attack on the USSR, some of the generals tried to convince the Fuhrer that it was premature to get involved in a war with the Russians. Hitler's answer was as follows: "80% of the commanding personnel of the Red Army have been destroyed. The Red Army is beheaded, weakened as never before, this is the main factor in my decision. We need to fight before the cadres grow up again."

According to Keitel, Hitler "constantly proceeded from the fact that ... Stalin destroyed in 1937 the entire first echelon of the highest military leaders, and there are still no capable minds among those who came to replace them."

Future Field Marshal F. von Bock: "The Russian army can be disregarded as a military force, because bloody repressions undermined its spirit, turned it into an inert machine."

The chief of the German General Staff, Halder, came to similar conclusions, who, after hearing the report of the military attaché in the USSR Krebs in May 1941, wrote in his diary: "The Russian officer corps is extremely bad. 20 years for the officer corps to reach the previous level."

Stalin's military abilities are well known, his failures during the Civil War were so great that Lenin removed him from participation in military affairs, along with Voroshilov.

Modernization of the economy

Let us consider one of the main theoretical sources of the 1940s, to the "Short Biography" of Stalin, which he himself ruled. "I. Based on Lenin's instructions, Stalin worked out the provisions on the socialist industrialization of our country. He showed that: 1) the essence of industrialization lies not in the simple growth of industry, but in the development of heavy industry and, above all, its core - mechanical engineering ... 2) socialist industrialization is fundamentally different from capitalist - the latter is built by colonial conquests and plunder, military defeats, enslaving loans and merciless exploitation of the masses of workers and colonial peoples, and socialist industrialization is based on public ownership of the means of production ... 3) therefore, the fundamental tasks in the struggle for industrialization are to increase labor productivity ... 4) the conditions for building socialism in the USSR, the labor enthusiasm of the working class - make it possible to implement the necessary high rates of industrialization ... Armed with this precise and clear program, the working people of the Soviet Union began the socialist industrialization of the country." [5, p.107-109].

However, as you know, Lenin did not give any "instructions". Lenin explained that Russia is an agrarian backward country, therefore the Bolsheviks cannot have any special socialist program, the only program is to transfer everything advanced from developed countries to Russia. Secondly, the development of heavy industry, mechanical engineering was exactly the same priority in all developed countries of the world. Thirdly, there was no public property in the USSR and could not be.

Even the slogan "factories for workers, land for peasants", which clearly denotes private property, was not implemented. The property was state owned. State property, however, is a form of private property, Engels explained in the works "Antiduring" and "The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science." Fourth. Indeed, industrialization in the USSR differed in form from industrialization in developed countries, and this seriously slowed it down. If in the USA or Europe industrialization was carried out at the expense of workers of third countries, i.e. at the expense of strangers, then in the USSR - at the expense of the peasants. The reaction of the peasants was predictable: they responded with a reduction in crops, mass slaughter of livestock, and thousands of uprisings every year.

As for the "merciless exploitation of the masses of the workers." In the 1980s, workers in developed countries received 40% - 70% of the cost per unit of output. In the same years in Perm the workers of the plant named after Sverdlov received 12% of the unit value of the manufactured product, the workers of the plant named after Lenin - 9%, the plant named after Dzerzhinsky - 7%. Plus 3% of the factory social and cultural life.

Free medicine existed both in Great Britain and France, and in Japan there was a life-long employment institution, i.e. there was no unemployment until 2000.

Finally, about labor productivity, the rate of industrialization, and enthusiasm. There is no need to speak of enthusiasm by the mid-30s after the uprising of the Vichugian weavers, after dozens of strikes. Moreover, it is impossible to speak about the enthusiasm of the prisoners who were massively used at great construction sites.

The rate of industrialization in the USSR was indeed higher than in Western countries, especially under Khrushchev. But only because labor productivity was initially low. Even by the 1980s, it was no more than 70% of labor productivity in the United States or 60% of labor productivity in Germany and Japan.

The autobiography deals with the period of collectivization.

"II. "Stalin, comprehensively concretizing the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism, showed that the transition to collectivization is possible not as a simple and peaceful entry of peasants into collective farms, but as a mass struggle of peasants against the kulaks. It was necessary to defeat the kulaks in open battle in front of the entire peasantry so that the masses of the peasants were convinced of the weakness of the capitalist elements, therefore the transition to complete collectivization was inextricably linked with the task of eliminating the kulaks as a class" [ibid, p.129)].

"III. Relying on Lenin's instructions about the need to move from small peasant farms to large, cooperative, collective farming in agriculture, relying on Lenin's cooperative plan, Stalin developed and practically implemented the theory of agricultural collectivization. Stalin's new in this area is that he: 1) comprehen55

sively worked out the question of the collective farm form of socialist economy in the countryside ... 3) substantiated the transition from the policy of restricting and ousting the kulaks to the policy of eliminating the kulaks as a class on the basis of complete collectivization..." [ibid, p.133-134].

However, there was no struggle of the peasants against the kulaks; the kulaks were exterminated already in the early 1920s. They deprived the middle peasants. And the struggle was fought not by the peasants, but by the authorities, the JSPD and then the NKVD. Sholokhov writes in detail to Stalin how cruelly the peasants were treated. The struggle in the form of peasant uprisings was also not against the kulaks, but accelerated collectivization according to Trotsky, as you know, after the expulsion of Trotsky, his agrarian policy was adopted, thus, Stalin did not play a role in theory at this point. Again, the uprisings were suppressed not by the peasants, but by the police, security agencies, and the army.

Historical materialism

The Biography notes:

"I. V. Stalin further developed Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution. He concretized the theory of the possibility of building socialism in one country and came to the conclusion that it is possible to build communism in our country, even if the capitalist encirclement persists. This conclusion of Comrade Stalin enriches Leninism, equips the working class with a new ideological weapon, gives the party a great perspective of the struggle for the victory of communism, moves forward the Marxist-Leninist theory" [ibid., p. 170]. But this moment was not a "further development", but a complete departure from the teachings of Marx - Lenin. Lenin regarded the idea of the victory of socialism in one country as a petty-bourgeois ideal. For a detailed justification see [6].

The question of the nature of the state is inextricably linked with the question of revolution. The Biography reads:

"V. Comrade Stalin, relying on the gigantic experience of more than 20 years of existence of the Soviet socialist state in a capitalist encirclement, created an integral and complete doctrine of the socialist state. Stalin gave a detailed analysis of the stages of development of the socialist state, changes in its functions, in connection with the change in the situation, summarized the entire experience of building the Soviet state, came to the conclusion that it is necessary to preserve the state under communism if the capitalist encirclement continues to exist" [5, p. 171- 172]. Meanwhile, Stalin did not create a doctrine of the state. The state, explain Marx, Engels, Lenin, is a tool in the hands of the ruling class to suppress other classes. Engels writes about another of its functions: the state "protects warring classes from mutual devouring" [7]. No one has ever argued with these moments, except that the preservation of the state was justified by the capitalist encirclement.

Of course, there is no such absurdity as the state under communism, neither in Marx, nor in Engels, nor in Lenin, nor in Plekhanov. Practice differed even more strikingly from theory: withering away was replaced by strengthening.

Biography also covers international practice. "VII. Comrade Stalin gave examples of the scientific solution of questions of international relations and foreign policy of the USSR in the conditions of war and post-war times. Comrade Stalin developed a concrete practical program of action and policy in organizing and re-creating the state, economic and cultural life of European peoples after the victory over Nazi Germany" [ibid., p. 232-233].

However, can we call examples of such solutions to international issues as avarice with the help of Spain (1936-1939), belief in a treaty with Hitler, the separation of the Comintern, the annexation of Silesia to Poland, the territory of Pomerania, vacillation between Israel and the Arabs, etc.

Theory

In "Biography" one of the main theoretical works in the USSR of the 40s is indicated:

"VI. JV Stalin's work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism", written by an incomparable master of the Marxist dialectical method, generalizing the gigantic practical and theoretical experience of Bolshevism, raises dialectical materialism to a new, higher level, is the true pinnacle of Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought" [ibid. , p. 164-165].

The work was written in 1938, republished in 1945. "Dialectical materialism", asserts Stalin in this work, "is the worldview of the Marxist-Leninist party" [8].

From this it follows that only party members are capable of dialectical and materialistic thinking. The party has a monopoly on the correct worldview. None of the world's scientists, if they are not in the Communist Party, can have a correct worldview. How, then, do they make scientific discoveries?

Ilyenkov notes that scientists who make discoveries are dialecticians [9]. Indeed, it is impossible to make discoveries without dialectics, because a discovery is the emergence of new. But, unlike the Marxist-Leninists, they are not stable scientific dialectics, but spontaneous ones. To become scientific dialecticians, they also had to become materialists.

On the other hand, in Soviet universities it was a must to ask how bourgeois idealist scientists successfully investigate nature. It was argued that in their research bourgeois scientists are spontaneous materialists. In order to become scientific materialists, they also had to become dialecticians. But if bourgeois scientists are both spontaneous materialists and spontaneous dialecticians, therefore, they are dialectical materialists, it follows from the principles of Soviet ideology. Which, of course, is not true.

"Historical materialism", Stalin continues, "is the extension of the principles of dialectical materialism to the study of social life, the application of the principles of dialectical materialism to the phenomena of social life, to the study of society, to the study of the history of society. In characterizing their dialectical method, Marx and Engels usually refer to Hegel as the 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 took from Hegel's dialectics only its "rational kernel", discarding the Hegelian idealistic husk and developing dialectics further in order to give it a modern scientific look."

Stalin does not tell how exactly Marx developed Hegel's dialectics, what exactly he added to the three laws of dialectics, how exactly he developed it. Meanwhile, there were no attempts to develop Hegel's dialectics in the USSR until the end of the 60s, by the Vyakkerevs, Batischevs, Mamardashvili and other Soviet philosophers. True, Stalin further quotes the words of Marx himself, who speaks not of dialectics, but of the dialectical method: "My dialectical method, says Marx, is fundamentally not only different from Hegel's, but is its direct opposite. For Hegel, the process of thinking, which under the name of an idea he even turns into an independent subject, is a demiurge (creator) of reality, which is only its external manifestation. For me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material transplanted into the human head and transformed in it"[10]. Note: "transformed."

We read further: "In characterizing their materialism, Marx and Engels usually refer to Feuerbach as the philosopher who restored materialism to its 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 from Feuerbach's materialism its "main grain", developing it further into the scientific-philosophical theory of materialism and discarding its idealistic and religious-ethical layers. It is known that Feuerbach, being basically a materialist, rebelled against the name - materialism. Engels has repeatedly stated that Feuerbach "despite the materialist basis, has not yet freed himself from the old idealistic fetters", that "Feuerbach's real idealism comes out as soon as we approach his ethics and philosophy of religion" [11].

In fact, there were no "usual references", Stalin expounds the history of philosophy in an extremely simplified way, as if there were no great atomists Leucippus, Democritus, materialists Epicurus, Anaxagoras, materialistic fragments in the philosophy of Stagirite, etc. As if Marx himself did not write a dissertation on the difference between the philosophy of Democracy and the philosophy of Epicurus.

Stalin describes the very emergence of dialectics as follows: "Dialectics comes from the Greek word "dialect", which means to conduct a conversation, to conduct polemics. In ancient times, dialectics was understood as the art of achieving truth by revealing contradictions in the opponent's judgment and overcoming these contradictions. In ancient times, some philosophers believed that the disclosure of contradictions in thinking and the collision of opposing opinions is the best way to discover the truth. This dialectical way of thinking, later extended to natural phenomena, turned into a dialectical method of cognizing nature, which considered natural phenomena as eternally moving and changing, and the development of nature as a result of the development of contradictions in nature, as a result of the interaction of opposite forces in nature."

That is: it turns out that ancient philosophers argued with each other, and then transferred their way of thinking to nature. I.e. without exploring nature, not in social and historical practice, people found and developed a dialectical approach, dialectical thinking in relation to nature, according to Stalin, emerged from the polemics of the demiurges.

Here Stalin acts as a neo-Platonist of the XX century (in contrast to the neoplatonists of late antiquity, the late Middle Ages and the early Renaissance), for Plato the dialectician is above practice, the dialectician "through only reason, strives to the essence of any object" [12].

To substantiate the supremacy of the party, it is necessary to remove the lower classes from theory, appropriate theory, the ability to generalize, and then put theory over practice.

Marx and Lenin, as materialists, argued that practice is higher than theory.

This is also why Stalin is a neo-Platonist, if we take into account the point of Plato's "program" on strengthening the role of the state, as well as dividing people into special managers of society, into those who are governed, and into guards who supervise the governed and protect the state. This fully corresponds to Stalin's understanding of the party elite as special people, standing above society, "a kind of order of the sword-bearers," as Stalin put it.

Stalin begins to expound dialectics, to put it mildly, illiterately:

"Dialectics is basically the opposite of metaphysics. The Marxist dialectical method is characterized by the following main features: a) In contrast to metaphysics, dialectics considers nature not as a random accumulation of objects, phenomena that are torn off from each other, isolated from each other and independent of each other, but as a coherent, unified whole, where objects, phenomena are organically linked to each other, depend on each other and condition each other. Therefore, the dialectical method believes that no phenomenon in nature can be understood if we take it in an isolated form, without connection with the surrounding phenomena, for any phenomenon in any area of nature can be turned into nonsense if it is considered outside of connection with the surrounding conditions, in isolation from them, and, conversely, any phenomenon can be understood and justified if it is considered in its inextricable connection with the surrounding phenomena, in its conditioning from the phenomena around it. b) In contrast to metaphysics, dialectics considers nature not as a state of rest and immobility, stagnation and immutability, but as a state of continuous movement and change, continuous renewal and development, where something always arises and develops, something collapses and obsolesces century."

Metaphysics also does not consider nature as a state of rest and immobility. It presupposes both circulation and transformism. Metaphysics does not at all deny the regularity or interconnection of objects and phenomena.

By the way, not a single phenomenon can be understood if you do not take it in an isolated form, but try to investigate it in connection with the surrounding phenomena and conditions. How, then, did capitalist scientists, not being dialectical materialists, create quantum mechanics and the theory of relativity?

By the way, the scientific method obliges to limit the task, to pull the phenomenon out of the whole variety of connections. So, Giordano Bruno, Leibniz considered space and time dependent on material bodies, tried to consider them "organically connected with each other." Newton, in the spirit of Plato, "took space-time in an isolated form," which is why he was able, together with Hooke, to build a classical mechanics.

It should be noted that even Engels explained the emergence of metaphysics in a rather peculiar way, not from social-historical practice, but from the observations of scientists.

"It was necessary," wrote Engels, "to investigate things before one could begin to investigate processes. You must first know what a given thing is, so that you can deal with the changes that take place in it."(F. Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of classical German philosophy, 1952, p. 37).

This "method of study has left us with the habit of considering things and processes of nature in their isolation, outside their great common connection, and because of this - not in motion, but in a motionless state, not as changing in a significant way, but as eternally unchanging, not alive, but dead. Transferred by Bacon and Locke from natural science to philosophy, this way of understanding has created a specific limitation of the last centuries - a metaphysical way of thinking"[13].

Indeed, it was metaphysical thinking that created the caloric and phlogiston versions. Linnaeus argued that there are as many species as they were created by God, Newton believed that the conjunction of the Sun and the planets could not happen otherwise than by the will of God.

But one cannot deny the fact that both versions, as well as Linnaeus's classification, as well as the absolutization of space-time, served the development of chemistry, physics, and biology.

On the other hand, the dialectician Hegel in 1801 presented his doctoral dissertation "On the circulation of the planets", where he argued that it is pointless to look for celestial bodies between Mars and Jupiter. Although a few months before the presentation, the Italian astronomer Piazzi discovered Ceres between Mars and Jupiter.

Engels himself almost rejected Newton's mechanics and believed in the existence of the ether. There are many mistakes in his book "Dialectics of Nature". This is indicative, since in his work Stalin constantly quotes

Engels' statements about physics, chemistry, and biology. Stalin's work was written in 1938, the Michelson-Morley experiment, staged in 1915 and showing that the speed of light does not depend on the speed of the light source, refuted the ether version. Consequently, Stalin was poorly acquainted with the achievements of science of the XX century.

"... the dialectical method", Stalin points out, "requires that phenomena be considered not only from the point of view of their mutual connection and conditioning, but also from the point of view of their movement, their change, their development, from the point of view of their emergence and withering away. For the dialectical method, it is important, first of all, not what seems to be strong at the moment, but is already beginning to wither away, but what appears and develops, even if it looks fragile at the moment, because for it only what appears and develops is irresistible."

What, for example, can a physicist or biologist learn from such an indication? They view nature exactly as it should be investigated, and do their job without any direction.

"New social ideas and theories," asserts Stalin, "appear only after the development of the material life of society has set new tasks for society."

This is not true, the ideas of socialism emerged many centuries before October, when society faced completely different tasks. Stalin expressed himself in the spirit of crude objectivism that Marx criticized.

Or: "...in order not to be mistaken in politics, the party of the proletariat must proceed both in the construction of its program and in its practical activity, first of all, from the laws of the development of production, from the laws of the economic development of society."

But are bourgeois politicians constantly wrong? Or maliciously ignore the laws of production and economic development?

"Under the slave system," Stalin writes further, "the basis of production relations is the ownership of the slave owner to the means of production, as well as to the worker in production, the slave ... Rich and poor, exploiters and exploited, full and disenfranchised, cruel class struggle between them - this is the picture building."

"Rich and poor" and so on — this is the picture of both the feudal and capitalist systems.

There were, of course, slave revolts, and there were quite a few of them. But it was not the slave uprisings that determined the picture of the system, and it was not their class struggle that led to the collapse of slavery. Engels noted that "...the ancient world does not know the destruction of slavery by a victorious uprising" [7].

"...capitalist relations of production, - asserts Stalin, - have ceased to correspond to the state of the productive forces of society and have become in irreconcilable contradiction with them. This means that capitalism is fraught with a revolution designed to replace the current capitalist property with the means of production by socialist property."

And so for more than 80 years, since 1938, since Stalin wrote his work, the productive forces have been in irreconcilable contradiction with the outdated capitalist production relations, and capitalism is still not fraught with revolution.

Criticizing metaphysics, Stalin himself shows himself as a metaphysician:

"If the connection between natural phenomena and their mutual conditioning represent the laws of the development of nature, then it follows from this that the connection and mutual conditioning of the phenomena of social life are also not an accidental matter, but the laws of the development of society. This means that social life, the history of society ceases to be an accumulation of "accidents", because the history of society becomes a natural development of society, and the study of the history of society turns into a science ... So, the science of the history of society, despite all the complexity of the phenomena of social life, can become the same exact science as, say, biology, capable of using the laws of development of society for practical application."

Denying randomness, Stalin does not understand that if everything in nature is natural, then everything is accidental. It is not so much about the new understanding of determinism, which was given by the theory of probability, quantum mechanics and stochastic mechanics. If Kant and Hegel endured the random as a substance, for them randomness is external to the substance, not included in the calculation, then, among other things, quantum mechanics confirmed a more correct understanding of randomness as a quality of an essential, immanent substance.

But Stalin in this fragment, speaking about patterns in history, highlighting only one side of the matter directed against the idealistic understanding of history, remains a metaphysician. Society is not arranged like a

horse of Kozma Prutkov, which you click on the nose, it flaps its tail, in view of some kind of mechanical transmission from nose to tail. Marx, on the other hand, emphasized that there are no rigid laws in history, that tendencies operate in it that may not be realized. Because, for example, such a "parameter" as value, which determines the dynamics of society, is not an immanent commodity, but is contained only in the minds of people. And we see on the example of globalization that the tendency of capital to centralization, to breaking state borders, revealed by Marx, is encountering fierce resistance, nationalism is growing, countries are introducing protectionist measures, an uprising against the United States has begun and continues in Latin America.

"...the material life of society is an objective reality that exists independently of the will of people, and the spiritual life of society is a reflection of this objective reality, a reflection of being," Stalin repeats the classics. He forgets to add "transformed in consciousness", that is, remains here at the level of Aristotelian materialism, which understood the reflection of the world in consciousness like the imprint of a copper coin on hot wax. This mistake in the spirit of crude objectivism was repeated by Soviet philosophers Yudin and V.V. Orlov, who argued that there is isomorphism between objects of the external world and their reflections in consciousness, and also by the physiologist Bekhtereva, who tried to detect this isomorphism (patterns) in the electrical activity of the brain. The Soviet Marxist Ilyenkov subjected this campaign to devastating criticism.

Stalin quotes Lenin: "Development is a struggle "of opposites" (Lenin, v. XIII. p. 301).

But he immediately writes that in the USSR "production relations are in full compliance with the state of the productive forces ... Therefore, socialist production in the USSR does not know the periodic crises of overproduction and the absurdities associated with them."

For the relations of production are so benevolent that they give full scope to the development of the productive forces, "the productive forces are developing here at an accelerated rate."

In his 1952 work, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR," Stalin again asserts that there are no contradictions in Soviet society.

But if there are no contradictions in Soviet society, then, based on the above quotation from Lenin, there is no development either. Nothing can secure the movement towards communism.

After Stalin, Soviet philosophers agreed with the existence of contradictions in the USSR, but declared them not antagonistic, which, of course, is absurd.

More interesting is the following mistake of Stalin: "... c) In contrast to metaphysics, dialectic considers the process of development not as a simple process of growth, where quantitative changes do not lead to qualitative changes, but as such a development that moves from insignificant and hidden quantitative changes to open changes, to fundamental changes, to qualitative changes, where qualitative changes do not occur gradually, but quickly, suddenly, in the form of an abrupt transition from one state to another state, occur not accidentally, but naturally, occur as a result of the accumulation of imperceptible and gradual quantitative changes. Therefore, the dialectical method believes that the development process should be understood not as a movement in a circle, not as a simple repetition of what has been passed, but as a forward movement, as a movement along an ascending line, as a transition from an old qualitative state to a new qualitative state, as development from simple to complex, from lowest to highest. "

Stalin is probably describing the boiling of a kettle on the stove.

But from what has been said in point c) it does not at all follow that development is an ascent from simple to complex, from higher to lower. Catastrophes, these qualitative changes leading to regression, also occur quickly, suddenly, in the form of an abrupt transition from one state to another, they do not occur by chance, but naturally, they occur as a result of the accumulation of imperceptible and gradual quantitative changes. That's why they are disasters. Such processes are described by the theory of catastrophes, Whitney's theory of singularities.

For Stalin, the world is developing only "upward", he does not understand that regression is an obligatory moment of development. Today we are witnessing a regression in the entire world economy, despite scientific breakthroughs, and in the psyche of people.

Conclusion

Stalin showed scientific inconsistency in the question of language [14], put forward an obviously incorrect theory of the growth of the class struggle as socialism strengthened [15]. Stalin borrowed the definition of nations from Bauer and Kautsky, respectively, it is incomplete. In his work on the national question he took a

lot of fragments from Lenin without reference. Stalin's theoretical work "Economic problems of socialism in the USSR" completely contradicts Marxism, Stalin does not understand the category of contradiction, abstract and concrete labor, value [16].

"The level of development," wrote Marx, "is determined by how much science has become a productive force." In the 30-50s, over 40 thousand of the country's leading scientists were destroyed in the USSR, hundreds of thousands were placed in concentration camps and "sharashkas", genetics, microbiology, quantum mechanics were destroyed.

On such a very shaky basis, the USSR approached the mid-50s.

References

1. *Emelyanov V.S. About time, about comrades, about myself. M.: Soviet Russia. 1968.*
2. *Gorbatov A.A. Years and wars. M.: Military Publishing, 1965. 384 P.*
3. *Simonov K. Conversations with Marshal of the Soviet Union I. S. Konev. M.: 1988.64*

4. Starinov I.G. *Notes of a saboteur*. M.: Almanac "Vympel", 1997.
5. Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin. *Short biography*. M.: Gospolitizdat. 1947.
6. Ikhlov B.L. *Socialism can neither be attempted nor built*. <http://shtirner.ru/stati/>, in the list, or here: http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=582403
7. Engels F. *The origin of the family, private property and the state*.
8. Stalin I. V. *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*. 1938. Op., V. 14.
9. Ilyenkov E.V. *Philosophy and Culture*. M.: Politizdat. 1991. 464 P.
10. K. Marx. *Preface to the second German edition of the 1st volume of "Capital"*.
11. K. Marx, F. Engels, PSS, V. XIV, P. 652-654.
12. Plato. *State*. Book VII. M.: Op. 1968.
13. Engels F. *Anti-Dühring*. M.: 1952. P. 21.
14. Ikhlov B.L. *Genius of the XX century*. http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=433674.
15. Ikhlov B.L. *Stalin's theory of the growing class struggle*. <https://www.proza.ru/2020/03/09/695>
16. Ikhlov B.L. *On Stalin's brochure "Economic problems of socialism in the USSR."* <https://www.proza.ru/2016/02/07/14476>