

ON THE DIALECTIC OF THE ABSTRACT ON THE CONCRETE IN LABOUR

Boris Ikhlov

Perm State University

The opposition of the market and the plan is fictitious, since the plan is the product of the centralization of capital and the concentration of labor. At the same time, the idea of the absence of a market in the USSR is incorrect.

This opposition is only an ideologeme for manipulating mass consciousness in order to soften protectionism and facilitate access to domestic markets.

In many respects, the misunderstanding of the topic is due to the mistakes and misunderstandings that exist in the fundamental works of the classics of Marxism.

The controversy of commodity production

In the 1st volume of Capital, Marx defines the use and exchange value:

"The usefulness of a thing makes it a use value ... for example, a dozen hours, an yard of linen, a ton of iron, etc. ... Use values ... are ... material carriers of exchange value. Exchange value is primarily represented as ... the proportion in which use-values of one kind are exchanged for use-values of another kind ... A well-known commodity, for example one quarter of wheat, is exchanged for x boot polish, or for y silk, or for z gold, etc. .., in a word - for other goods in various proportions. Consequently ... different exchange values of one and the same commodity express something identical ... exchange value must be reducible to this third ... the exchange ratio of goods is characterized precisely by abstraction from their use values."

How does Marx define abstract and concrete labor as well as value?

"As the use values of goods differ ... qualitatively, as exchange values they can have only quantitative differences, therefore they do not contain a single atom of use value. If we ignore the use-value of commodity bodies, then they have only one property, namely, that they are products of labor. But now the very product of labor ... is no longer the product of the labor of a joiner, or a carpenter, or a spinner, or in general any other definite productive labor. Together with the useful character of the product of labor, the useful character of the types of labor represented in it disappears, and, consequently, the various concrete forms of these types of labor disappear; the latter do not differ ... but are reduced to the same human labor, to abstractly human labor ... from the products of labor ... nothing is left but ... a lump of human labor devoid of differences, that is, the expenditure of human labor, regardless of the form of this expenditure ... in relation to commodities, their exchange value appeared to us as something completely independent of their use-values ... that general, which is expressed in the exchange ratio, or the exchange value of goods, is their value."

So, value is what is produced by impersonal labor, labor in general, abstract labor: the expenditure of the physiological energy of a person in a certain social form, averaged

Labor embodied in a commodity creates value and use value. Therefore, every commodity has two properties: use value and value. The use value of a commodity acts as a carrier of its second property - value.

On the other hand, Marx understands the abstractness of labor only in terms of exchange value, in terms of exchange, market.

"How can one measure the magnitude of ... value? Obviously, the amount of labor contained in it ... The amount of labor itself is measured ... by labor time ... it might seem that the value of a commodity is the greater, the more lazy or unskilful the person who produces it, because the more time it takes him to manufacture the goods. But the labor that forms the substance of values is the **same** human labor ... The entire labor power of society, expressed in the values of the commodity world, appears here as one and the same human labor power ... since it has the character of a social average labor power ..., therefore, it uses for the production of a given commodity only the **average or socially necessary labor time** ... which is required for the production of any use value under existing socially normal conditions of production and with an average level of skill and intensity of labor in a given society. "

Thus, value also arises when abstracting from the individuality of the worker.

Let us make a reservation here that it averages the market, but the monopoly dictates the market conditions, setting the price of labor to a minimum, and the price of the product of labor to the limit of purchasing power. And this is also averaging.

Precisely because Marx put exchange at the forefront, in the third volume of *Capital* he does not speak about the need to transform socially necessary labor, but only about its reduction under communism to a vanishing little time.

But there are mistakes in the 1st volume of "There is enough capital." For example:

"... A thing cannot be a value without being a commodity. If it is useless, then the labor expended on it is useless, is not considered labor and therefore does not form any value. "

This is only partly true. Social labor is not only a spatial but also a temporal dimension. If physicists are not paid for the **now** useless work yesterday, corpses will not be able to produce useful work today. But the capitalist pays for physics and future utility, even if he is not working with immediate benefit today. The Mössbauer effect was considered purely academic; today it is even used in agriculture. But the mass of inventions or scientific works does not find a consumer, and this mass must be paid for.

Or: "Part of the bread produced by a medieval peasant was given in the form of rent to the feudal lord, and part - in the form of tithes to the priests. But neither bread, alienated in the form of quitrent, nor bread, alienated in the form of tithe, became a commodity only because it was produced for others. In order to become a commodity, a product must be transferred into the hands of the one to whom it serves as a use value through exchange."

And this is only partly true, since the same quitrent was drawn into trade.

Also: "In the process of production, man can only act in the same way as nature itself acts, that is, he can only change the forms of substances ..."

Marx repeats F. Bacon: "In action," writes F. Bacon, "man cannot do anything other than unite and separate the bodies of nature. The rest is done by nature within itself." This, of course, is wrong, according to the level of the Bacon-Marx time. But even at that time it was possible to understand that if you did not combine and did not separate, but at least put it in rotation, you could also get something new.

More: "... in each factory labor is systematically divided, but this division is 34

not carried out in such a way that the workers exchange the products of their individual labor. Only the products of **separate, independent from each other** private works are opposed to one another as goods. "

It would seem, really: at a plant that produces trucks, steering wheels are not exchanged for bodies. But the cost of both steering wheels and bodies is estimated in hours of working time. On the other hand, a factory can be understood as a monopoly, a state-monopoly conglomerate, and the entire planet as a whole. That is why market relations existed in such a factory as the USSR, albeit in a latent form.

In the work "To the Critique of Political Economy": "... abstraction, which in the social process occurs every day ... no less real abstraction than the transformation of all organic bodies into air." Of course, not into the air, but into minerals, water, etc.

However, let's highlight the main thing. "Comparatively complex labor," writes Marx, "means only simple labor raised to a degree, or rather multiplied, so that less complex labor equals more simple labor. Experience shows that this reduction of complex labor to simple work is constantly being done. A commodity can be the product of the most complex labor, but its value makes it equal to the product of simple labor, and, therefore, itself represents only a certain amount of simple labor. The various proportions in which different types of labor are reduced to simple labor as a unit of their measurement are established by the social process behind the backs of the producers and therefore seem to be the last established custom."

That is, the synthesis of several "works" is a simple addition. It is proposed to approach the work of an engineer, chemist or teacher with the same yardstick. Of course, Marx understands the fundamental difference between mental and physical labor, but here is a characteristic mistake that testifies to ignoring the *content* of labor in this issue.

Now let's dot the i, which for Marx is abstract and concrete work:

"All labor is, on the one hand, the expenditure of human labor power in the physiological sense - and in this quality of its identical, or abstractly human, labor forms the value of commodities. All labor is, on the other hand, the expenditure of human labor power in a special expedient form, and in this quality of its concrete useful labor it creates use values."

That is: concrete labor is labor expended in a certain useful form and creating the use value of a commodity. Such labor is private labor, and its social character is expressed through abstract labor. Abstract labor - the expenditure of labor in general, the productive activity of the human brain, muscular and nervous systems. Abstract labor creates the value of a commodity. Abstract labor is devoid of 35

concrete definiteness and therefore is universal and homogeneous for all types of labor. He is a social phenomenon.

The capitalist's income and, accordingly, the worker's wages, regardless of his efforts, are determined by the market. The worker receives for his labor power according to the value of his labor power. By category, by minimum wage, by tariff. According to the alienated average, according to social relations, not according to use value, not according to living labor. Labor is specific because it is produced by a specific person. The abstract nature of labor is determined by the sphere of exchange, which alienates the product of labor from the worker and creates averaging.

Because, and only because, such a political economist as the English professor Hillel Tiktin (followed by the professor at Moscow State University, Alexei Gusev), claims that there was no abstract labor in the USSR. For there was no market in the USSR. There was, of course, the alienation of the product of labor. But the alienation that Marx writes about, which occurs under **independent, private producers**, did not exist. If there was no abstract labor, then there was no duality, there was no contradiction between it and concrete labor.

But, firstly, in the USSR there was not only the collective farm market, but also competition between the leading industries, including in the production of means of production for the production of means of production. Second, the market exchange in the USSR existed indirectly. Averaging in the USSR existed in exactly the same form as in any capitalist country: with the help of a system of grades, minimum wages, tariffs.

But, secondly, the point is different: Marx studies only one side of the economy: namely, the sphere of exchange, capital. That is why Lenin insisted that textbooks on production had not yet been written.

The official "Soviet" political economy asserts that precisely in this social function of its own, connections through the market, the expenditure of human physiological energy are a specifically historical form of social labor - abstract labor as a source of value. That is, abstractness is expressed only through the market, the sphere of exchange. That is, under communism, abstract labor supposedly will not exist.

If use value is a material property of a commodity, then value is its social property, which expresses the social nature of the labor of commodity producers. Their labor in the conditions of the domination of private property is a private matter, they run the economy separately from each other. Diverse relations of production, division of labor, etc., make the labor of commodity producers social, their mutual dependence is hidden and is realized only through exchange in the market. The basis of this exchange is social labor embodied in a commodity - value.³⁶

The form of manifestation of value in the market is exchange value, the proportion in which various goods are exchanged for each other. The dual nature of a commodity is determined by the dual nature of the labor of commodity producers. The use value of a commodity is the result of concrete labor, that is, certain useful labor that creates a thing that satisfies a particular human need. Each type of concrete labor is characterized by a goal typical only for it, the nature of labor operations and tools. Features of this type of specific labor and determine the specific use value of its product.

Labor creates the value of a commodity, but has no value itself. Labor has value. In the conditions of domination of private ownership of the means of production, the dual nature of labor reflects the contradiction between the public and at the same time the private nature of the labor of commodity producers. Concrete labor in the sense of the concreteness of the producer acts as a private, abstract, which expresses the hidden-social nature of labor. The social character of labor requires the commodity producer to supply a socially necessary product to the market. But the private nature of labor makes possible only an indirect, market-based form of identifying demand.

The contradiction of labor is revealed in the market as a contradiction between the use value and the value of the goods. A commodity producer makes a product in order to sell it. This transformation of the material form into money is essentially contradictory. A private commodity producer does not know or does not want to know exactly what consumer values and in what quantity are needed by the consumer in order to receive the monetary equivalent of the value of the goods produced, he can falsify it. The seller's interest becomes opposite to the consumer's interest, not in the sense of the amount of monetary reward, but in the sense of the quality of the product. Moreover, the manufacturer, with the help of advertising and other means, tries to create demand for the product that the consumer does not need. Even if sociological surveys are carried out, if differential equations describing fluctuations in supply and demand are calculated, the picture will not change, the manufacturer's ability to plan runs into concrete implementation of the plan. The limited use value prevents the commodity from turning into money.

This gives rise to difficulties in implementation, a competitive struggle between commodity producers, during which their property differentiation occurs: small commodity producers go bankrupt, and the few with large capital get rich.

The contradiction between private and public labor is manifested in the contradiction between concrete and abstract labor. A commodity contains an antagonistic contradiction between use value and value. It is argued that this contradiction in its embryo is the basic contradiction of a simple commodity economy and is the starting point of all the contradictions of private commodity production.

Abstractness in the content of labor

But the struggle of these opposites is not all in contradiction, another aspect of it is the unity of opposites, use value and value, that is, abstract and concrete labor. Value and use-value are not simply opposed to each other, they are interpenetrating, mutually dependent. If the worker by training increases the use-value of his labor-power, the exchange form of its value must also rise — although the value of the commodity produced may fall. If the administrator of the enterprise cuts the prices (or the market does it for him), the workers break the new equipment, relegating their labor to the previous one. This relationship, which is the law of value in relation to the commodity "labor power", is shown by a lot of examples from the history of industry in the USSR. On the other hand, the sphere of exchange is not a basis, exchange is secondary, it is determined by the sphere of production.

It is possible to distinguish in the sphere of production the nature of labor - wage, but this character is secondary, they are produced by the social division of labor.

Thus, concrete labor does not exist without abstract labor.

Let us consider how, whence, why the abstractness of labor *arises* in the sphere of exchange as a homogeneous "simple", "theoretical" labor devoid of differences. Although, as Marx pointed out, this is a very real abstractness ("To the Critique of Political Economy").

On the other hand, as Ilyenkov notes, for various neo-Kantian schools the abstract is only a form of thought, while the concrete is only the form of a sensually visual image. That is, for the neo-Kantian school, concrete work is the work of a concrete, given by name and surname, a visually sensual worker.

Concreteness can be abstract, such as a concrete triangle or abstract painting. "Concreteness' is neither a synonym nor a privilege of the sensory-figurative form of reflection of reality, - writes Ilyenkov, - just as 'abstractness' is not a specific characteristic of rational-sensory cognition" [1]. In principle, the concept of concrete labor is clearly an abstraction from the labor of a given worker.

We will consider concrete work in the sense that, following Pascal, Marx put into the concept of the concrete as "the unity of diversity."

If the abstractness of labor that arises in the process of exchange is generated in the production process - by simplifying labor, splitting it into unit operations (we will consider a developed form of the abstract), then concreteness is formed by the reverse process - the complication of labor. For understanding, we will give polar situations: the nut produced, one of a thousand identical, is abstract, therefore, the labor of the worker who produces it is abstract. Marx, following Adam Smith, writes about monotonous, stupefying, *depersonalizing* labor. By this nut it is impossible to judge which worker produced it. In contrast to this, according to the style of work, one can establish the authorship of a scientific article, especially a poem, piece of music or a picture, as A. Fetisov accurately noted in his "Homosapiensology". It is difficult to evaluate poetry or music in the market, they are unique. Their production is not measured by working hours. For example, Alexander Ivanov wrote "The Appearance of Christ to the People" for 20 years, and Repin created "Portrait of Verevkina", lying sick in bed, in half an hour. Moreover, the value of these paintings has changed several times. The nut is instantly assessed by the market, it is not unique, it is comparable - in terms of working hours.

The worker's labor is more abstract, only a couple of thousands of almost identical nuts will be rejected from his mistake. The work of an engineer is more concrete, more socially significant: the shop can stop because of his mistake.

Thus, abstractness is an attribute not only of the nature of work, but also of its content, that is, a concept that expresses the distribution of functions (executive, registration and control, observation, adjustment, etc.) in the workplace and is determined by the totality of operations performed, reflects production - the technical side of labor, shows the level of development of productive forces, technical methods of combining personal and material elements of production, that is, it reveals labor primarily as a process of human interaction with nature, means of labor in the process of labor activity, etc. **The abstract nature of labor is due to its abstract content [2].**

The abstract content of labor will by no means disappear with the disappearance of commodity production, market exchange, i.e. under communism. For example, such a flow of concrete labor into an abstract one, as the replacement of creativity in solving differential equations by monotonic computer programming in analytical functions, has nothing to do with class antagonism. In the same way, say, metal casting at the dawn of mankind was a creative work, with the dominance of not abstract, but concrete content. And vice versa: the labor of a skilled worker develops into a kind of art, into "golden hands".

Thus, abstract labor did not disappear in the USSR either.

The topic of a specific work was developed in the works of Ilyenkov, Batishchev, Bibler.

Marx introduces the concept of universal labor: "... One should distinguish between universal labor and joint labor. One and the other play their role in the production process, each of them passes into the other, but there is also a difference between them. Every scientific work, every discovery, every invention is called 39

universal. It is conditioned partly by the cooperation of contemporaries, partly by using the labor of predecessors. Joint work presupposes direct cooperation of individuals. ... In spiritual production, another type of labor acts as productive... "[3]. Here Marx uses not an essential or even functional, but an attributive definition. That is, it leaves the wording of the definition for the future, when this type of labor appears at the level of the special. Bibler notes that Marx does not specifically consider this work [4]. Although it is obvious that this work cannot but be present in any kind of labor, the most abstract. That is why he is labor, which is not just social, but personal, through awareness, and that differs, as Marx himself points out, from the actions of a bee.

Unfortunately, further research continued in a liberal direction and led to the use of various terms such as creative, reproductive, etc. labor, not as characteristics, but as political economic concepts, and outside the pair of categories "abstract - concrete". Liberalism lies in the fact that, for example, Bibler believes that under capitalism, due to the dominance of abstract labor, "universal labor ... is concentrated exclusively in spiritual production" [ibid.]. It immediately follows from this that the working class cannot break out of the economic struggle on its own. He needs a guide, busy with universal labor, as Bernstein, Kautsky, Bebel formulated. Bibler does not take into account that the domination of capital, which consisted in the arrangement of abstract content in labor, ends. If earlier the fragmentation of labor led both to a decrease in training costs and to an increase in labor productivity, today this fragmentation inhibits the development of productive forces (which is especially clearly seen in the case of the conveyor belt, strikes against the conveyor system in the late 60s and the emergence of non-conveyor systems with a greater labor productivity, say, in Japan, the kanban system, etc.).

Bibler does not see the process of growth of concrete content in the work of the worker, does not understand that capitalism, as technology develops, increasingly needs a worker with higher education.

Bibler, like Friedrich Schlegel, Andrei Bely or Ortega y Gasset in the demiurge of history, exposes a man of art, a creative, "competent" man. The logical conclusion of this substitution is such a substitution in the relation "class – party", when the party is declared primary, and the class is declared a secondary, obedient instrument in the hands of a reasonable party being [5, 6]. V.V. Orlov cites the point of view of VM Mezhev, which coincides with the liberalism of Bibler - Glinchikova, that abstract work "by itself cannot generate new ideas that feed the scientific, technical and cultural progress of society" [4]. V.V. Orlov objects that "in relation to concrete labor, abstract labor acts as a powerful revolutionary force" [7]. Nevertheless, in Orlov's work, the abstractness of labor also does not leave the sphere of exchange, and in the class-party pair, saying that abstract labor is 40

capable of something *only* in combination with concrete labor, he implicitly puts the party as primary. Lenin in *What Is To Be Done* follows the line of Bernstein-Kautsky. However, the mass of their articles ("The proletarian revolution and the renegade Kautsky", "The order from the SRT to local Soviet institutions", "The state and the revolution", "April Theses", etc.), the demand to learn from the workers, especially the repetition of Marx's formula "socialism as living creativity of the masses" sharply objects to this line.

The discourse ends with the fact that, say, Glinchikov, seemingly quite in the spirit of the dialectician Marx, who saw the resolution of the contradiction of the old political economy in the emergence of a new type of commodity - labor power, introduces a new type of labor power - creative labor power. And he defines it as such a labor force, "the production process and the reproduction process of which coincide" [8].

It would seem obvious that the growing need for labor in society, of course, not in every way, as the ideologists of the CPSU misunderstood Marx, speaking of the "need" for labor, means that labor becomes a "commodity", enters the consumer basket, serves to restore vitality, develops thinking, spirituality, etc. However, Glinchikova believes that it is this creative labor force that appeared in society by itself, and this is where the development is completed.

In fact, Glinchikova's definition is incorrect. The creative workforce needs food and is sold in the market. According to Glinchikova, the working class has only one destiny - to wither away. Glinchikova does not understand that the new labor force, before throwing off the commodity form, must mature in society from the old, and not free itself behind the back of the whole society, like a separate nobility.

But if abstract labor is so good that it will not go anywhere, how does one social system differ from another? Under communism, the concrete content is **dominant** in the work of the individual, while under capitalism it is abstract. That is, communism is the absence of not only the bourgeoisie, but also the working class, i.e. a class whose work is dominated by abstract content. V.V. Orlov, without deviating from the Marxian meaning of abstract labor, nevertheless, exclaims: "In the USSR, 50% of rough manual labor, what the hell is socialism."

Moreover, dominance does not at all mean temporary dominance. For example, in the work of a physicist or pianist, abstract work dominates in time. But its specific content is defining, subordinating.

So, Marx does not take into account that the products of labor as use values differ qualitatively, forming two classes.

Marx in the first volume of *Capital* notes: "A thing can be use-value and not be value. This happens when its usefulness for a person is not mediated by labor. These are: air, virgin lands, natural meadows, wild-growing forest, etc. A thing can be useful and be a product of human labor, but not a commodity.

Similarly, poems, scientific articles, palaces, malachite boxes, individual cars, experimental technical samples, architectural or space projects, secret military developments, etc. are produced by labor, but cannot be compared in the market due to their uniqueness, therefore, they do not have an exchange cost. And, just as natural resources or luxury goods, being drawn into the prevailing commodity-money relations, become commodities, unique products of labor, paintings, films, books, classical concerts, etc., acquire exchange value. It is quite obvious that the division of goods into two classes corresponds to the division of labor into mental and physical, that is, the division of society into classes engaged in mental labor and physical labor.

Marx wrote *Capital* at a time when the class of engineers, scientists, and artists was still extremely small.

There is no division of hired workers into mental proletarians and workers, physical proletarians, in the *Communist Manifesto*: "Of all the classes that are now opposed to the bourgeoisie, only the proletariat is a truly revolutionary class. All other classes decline and are destroyed with the development of large-scale industry, while the proletariat is its own product"[9].

Although it is the workers who oppose capital, while creative labor is much freer, much less impersonal. There is no need for representatives of creative professions to eliminate the old social division of labor, on the other hand, the class of these representatives will not decline and will not be destroyed.

On the other hand, despite being drawn into private property relations, the difference between the two types of goods is radical: the value of a worker's product is estimated in hours of labor time, the value of a product of creative labor in hours of labor time cannot be measured.

"At the highest phase of communist society," writes Marx, "after the enslaving subordination of man to the division of labor has disappeared; when the opposition between mental and physical labor disappears along with this; when labor ceases to be only a means of life, but becomes itself the first need of life [10].

However, Marx does not associate the elimination of the contradiction between mental and physical labor with the form of exchange of labor products, on the other hand, Marx refers it only to the stage of communism.

From the idea that value is generated by abstract labor, which arises only in the process of market exchange, it follows that if the market and money are eliminated, abstract labor will disappear, and with it value. This is exactly what the Bolsheviks did.

In 1918, during the period of war communism, when money (kerenki) depreciated, Lenin wrote about the exchange of goods in kind. In 1919, Lenin asserted: "Nationalization of banks alone is not enough to combat this vestige of bourgeois robbery. The RCP will strive to destroy money as quickly as possible ... first of all, to replace them with savings books, checks, short-term tickets for the right to receive public goods, etc., the establishment of mandatory keeping money in banks, etc." [11]. That is, there is no call for the immediate cancellation of money, this process should be gradual - but mandatory. In 1920, Bukharin wrote in his book *The Economy of the Transition Period*: "In the transition period, in the process of the destruction of the commodity system as such, the process of "self-denial" of money takes place. It is expressed in the so-called "depreciation" of money. " [12] The decree of 15.7.1920 prohibited settlements in cash, checks and direct appropriations, instead of checks – "cash-less negotiable transfers". On 8.16.1920, the payment for the carriage of goods by rail was canceled, the Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of 12.23.1920 canceled the payment for fuel for state-owned enterprises and government agencies.

However, the economy immediately collapsed. From October 1917 to June 1921, the money supply increased 120 times, retail prices almost 8000 times. Compared with the pre-war 1913 prices increased by almost 81 thousand times [13]. Businesses stopped.

The proletariat, Lenin believed, ceases to be a proletariat (wage) if it takes ownership of the main means of production.

However, the working class, due to the old social division of labor, does not cease to be a working class in terms of the content of its labor, in which abstract labor dominates. In this, the worker differs from other strata of hired workers.

The abstract content of the worker's labor will inevitably return the hired character of labor after the legal assignment to the working class of ownership of the means of production. On the other hand, since the sphere of production defines the sphere of exchange, the abstract labor of the worker necessitates market relations. That is why commodity-money relations existed in the USSR. The product of labor throws off its commodity form only after overcoming the distinction between physical and mental labor.

Realizing Marx's mistake in practice, Lenin in 1921 introduced the New Economic Policy (NEP). This was not a temporary concession, as the ideologists of the Communist parties now represent. According to Lenin, the NEP was calculated for decades. Stalin began to wind down the NEP already in 1927 and in 1932 he eliminated the standard market relations, which led to a slowdown in the development of production, which manifested itself in a chronic significant lag in labor productivity in the USSR compared to developed countries.

Oppression by labor

To analyze the labor process, Hegel introduces two concepts of objectification and de-objectification.

Objectification is the embodiment in the product of labor of the image of this product in the head of the worker. Disobjectification is the reverse effect of the created product, the production process, on the worker's brain. If a worker, roughly speaking, has been producing the same identical nut for ten years in a row, a stereotype is formed in his mind, similar to this non-unique, that is, abstract nut. This is how an abstract "average", "identical" worker arises in the process of depersonalizing (in the words of Marx) labor.

Just as the abstract content of labor generates its abstractness in the sphere of exchange, it, by virtue of the social division of labor, determines another aspect of labor - its wage character.

Leo Tolstoy believed that the situation could be improved by engaging in self-improvement. After the shift. Stop eating meat, etc. The practice of yoga, American ideology with the thesis "change yourself", etc., profess the same in various forms.

Ilyenkov also quite idealistically believed that the problems existing in the USSR would be solved by the upbringing system [14]. Ilyenkov created a school of upbringing, in which he applied the dialectical-materialist method in a narrowly concrete way, one of his blind-deaf-mute pupils even became a doctor of sciences - but this is only a private, secondary direction.

In the life of a worker, the determining factor is not the sphere of education, but the time during the work shift. In the process of his work, neither philosophy nor political economy is required. Serrated, they will not leave a trace, fade from consciousness under the noise of a lathe. The only knowledge that will be useful to him is the

knowledge of how to sell his labor force with the greatest profit. Even if formally the means of production are in the hands of the working class, it - due to the abstract content of labor - will entrust management (command, planning) to a narrow social stratum (capitalist or general director with a CPSU ticket in his pocket, and that, in turn, to the minister). Oppression, therefore, does not consist only in the fact that the worker receives less than he sees as just. Oppressive labor itself, which produces oppression in the form of subordination - as a result of the usurpation of control of a narrow social stratum. Consequently, the way out of the situation lies in something else.

"Influencing ... the external nature," writes Marx, "and changing it, he (man, B.I.) at the same time changes his own nature" [15].

This is - in contrast to the reduction of socially necessary working time to "vanishingly small amount"- **transformation of the most socially necessary time into creative work**, in which concrete content dominates. **The demand for this transformation should ripen at the general level**, and not only as strikes against the conveyor depersonalization, for example, in the United States in the late 60s or in Kuibyshev in the 70s. This process of the formation of science as a productive force is hindered by a new form of contradiction between labor and capital - the contradiction between the growth of the concrete content in labor (the complication of production in its elementary cell and the growth of the variety of economic ties) and the private form of management. This is as trivial as the fact that the solution to this contradiction is the expropriation of the functions of government from the ruling class.

References

1. Ilyenkov E.V. *Dialectics of the abstract and the concrete in Marx's Capital*. M., USSR Academy of Sciences, 1960. 286 P.
2. Ikhlov B.L. *Why the CPSU and the CPRF are anti-communist bourgeois parties*. Permian, 2012. ISBN 978-5-905465-04-8.
3. Marx, Engels, *Op.*, V. 25, Part I, P. 116, 279.
4. Bibler V.S. *Thinking as creativity*. M.: Publishing house of polit. lit., 1975. 400 P.
5. Ikhlov B. L. "Class and Party", "Vibir", Kiev, №1-2, 1996.
6. Ikhlov B. L. *On the dialectics of the "class - party" relationship*.
7. Orlov V.V. *Labor and social progress*. Abstracts of the conference "Labor and Social Progress", Perm, April 1989. P. 3-7.
8. Glinchikova A. G. *Can an intellectual and a product of his labor be a commodity? Philosophy questions*. 1997. №3.
9. *Communist Manifesto*. K. Marx, F. Engels. Works, V. 4, P. 434.
10. K. Marx. *Criticism of the Gotha program*. *Op.*, V. 19. P. 13.
11. Lenin. *Full collection of Op.*, 5th ed. V. 34 P. 98-100.
12. Cit. by Dalin SA *Inflation in the era of social revolutions*. M., 1983 P. 187.
13. Borisov S. M. *Ruble - the currency of Russia*. M., 2004 P. 49.
14. Ilyenkov E.V. *Philosophy and Culture*. M., Publishing house of polit. lit., 1991. 464 P.
15. Marx, Engels, *Op.*, V. 23. P. 188.