

# On the way to the Kingdom of Reason: Irrational Rationality of the Early Soviet Period

Olga F. Rusakova<sup>1,\*</sup>, Vasiliy M. Rusakov<sup>2</sup> and Yan Yu. Moiseenko<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Dr. Habil. In Political Sciences, Professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Law, Ural Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, 16, Kovalevsky Str., Yekaterinburg, 620108, Russia*

<sup>2</sup>*Dr. Habil. Philosophy, Professor at Ural Federal University named after the First President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, 51, Lenin Av., Yekaterinburg, 620000, Russia*

<sup>3</sup>*Junior Researcher at the Institute of Philosophy and Law, Ural Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, 16, Kovalevsky Str., Yekaterinburg, 620108, Russia*

**Abstract:** The authors take a deep dive into the correlation between *rational* and *irrational* in both Enlightenment philosophy and classical Marxism, which is embodied in Russia in the form of Marxism-Leninism. The cult of Rationalism prevailed during the first years of Soviet power, which was expressed in V.I. Lenin's academic works and was implemented into political practice. However, the established rationality resulted in the Mythology of Reason and mystification of science, which, like magic, "is capable of everything". This kind of rationalism penetrated deeply into different forms of mass consciousness and gave birth to the irrational Kingdom of Reason, based on which all spheres of life within Soviet society were supposed to be transformed.

**Keywords:** Early Soviet period, Enlightenment rationalism, mass consciousness, irrational, rational.

## THE BACKGROUND ISSUE

The idea that human society should be transformed based on Reason and its principles became dominant in the Age of Enlightenment. Classical Marxism saw itself not just as an heir to the progressive line of Enlightenment ideology, but as a force able to overcome its limitations. The radical change of the Method declared by the founders of Marxism required revision of almost every philosophical concept and category, which resulted in a different attitude to the traditional dilemmas of the past – sensual vs. rational, rational vs. irrational, etc. Along with the new categories being developed by Marxists, (such as socio-economic formation, productive forces and production relations, the way of production, basis and superstructure, etc.) the old categories (such as matter, consciousness, subject, object, essence, phenomenon, etc.) also happened to be "reformed".

It's obvious that the dilemma of rational and irrational, which already reached its limit in terms of rationalism and irrationalism, was just an imperfect manifestation of the real problem that the predecessors of Marxism at best only posed. For example, it was F. Engels who expressed the necessity to create a rational dialectic by demystifying the positive core of Hegelian dialectics. K. Marx used the rational and

irrational categories in his *Capital* only to demonstrate the fundamental difference between him and the Enlightenment tradition.

V.I. Lenin appeared to have seen all these ideas being not implemented into practice, but they still could be used as more or less articulated instructions for further doings. That is why Leninism has always been grounded on the bundle of principles: a rational understanding of the essence of nature, society, and thinking and demystification of these; reasonable control over them as a form of dominating over the spontaneous nature of social relations. This trend could be traced in the works of K. Marx and F. Engels, who associated the construction of a new communist society with the demystification of public relations and the destruction of alienation and reification. The new Kingdom of Freedom was to become not just The Kingdom of Reason, but The Kingdom of Producers bound Together who reasonably controlled their social existence.

All the principles forming the bundle are fundamental and thus require proper articulation into practice. What else should be mentioned, we should remember that not all of K. Marx's works were published and known at the time of V.I. Lenin. Moreover, Lenin's everyday political struggles for revolutionary transformations burdened the solution of theoretical problems. Through analysis of his heritage, as well as the works of other Soviet leaders, it is necessary to reveal how the fundamental ideas of

\*Address correspondence to this author at the Dr. Habil. In Political Sciences, Professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Law, Ural Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, 16, Kovalevsky Str., Yekaterinburg, 620108, Russia; E-mail: rusakova\_mail@mail.ru

Marxism regarding the rational reorganization of society in the process of the socialist revolution were embodied in the practice of building socialism in Russia.

## REASONABLE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SOCIETY: THEORY AND PRACTICE

### 1. The Foundations

The general idea was that revolutionary masses had to create a reasonably organized society. But what should this “reasonably organized” mean? The communist ideal of a reasonably organized society proposed by K. Marx could be summarized in the following way:

*“The structure of the social life process, i.e. the material process of production, will throw off its mystical veil only when it becomes the product of a free social union of people and will be under their conscious systematic control” (Marx 1961, vol. 24, 90).*

Returning to this idea from time to time, K. Marx tried to unravel it further:

*...associated producers rationally regulate their metabolism with nature, put it under their common control <...>, perform it with the least effort and under conditions worthiest of their human nature and adequate to it (Ibid.).*

F. Engels also attempted to make this idea more accurate:

*The conditions of life that surrounded people and still dominated over them now fall under the power and control of those people who for the first time become real and conscious masters of nature, because they become masters of their own association into society. The laws of their own social actions, which have opposed them to the laws of nature dominating over them, will be applied by people with full knowledge of the matter and will thereby be subordinated to their domination. The unification of people into society, <...>, is now becoming their own free cause. <...> And only from this moment will people begin to create their own history quite*

*consciously, only then will the social causes they set in motion have, <...>, the effects they desire (Ibid, vol. 20, 295).*

These fundamental ideas appeared to be the starting point for the Russian Bolsheviks to plan socio-political transformations. And they emphasized the fact that new socio-economic and political relations were to be created in the process of deliberate actions, since, unlike the bourgeois social system, a new system is not likely to spontaneously arise from the depths of the previous order. That was the idea V.I Lenin had expressed before the Bolsheviks came to power:

*Accounting and control are the main things that are required to impose the correct functioning of the first phase of communist society. (Lenin 1974, vol. 33, 101)*

Moreover, V. Lenin considered both accounting and control to be the essence of socialism (Ibid., 97). Further, he explained what they meant to him:

*Accounting and control, if they are carried out by the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' deputies as the supreme state power, or at the direction, by the authority of this power, – accounting and control <...> – are the essence of socialist transformation... (Ibid., vol.35, 199-200).*

As we can see, *the minds of the masses* began to shape in the form of a special type of state power – mass representative organizations. Thus an extremely dangerous and risky path begins that leads us from the heights of theoretical schemes into the midst of empirical phenomena of political struggle. It's risky because possible misunderstandings, and ambiguities in the original scheme will inevitably come to light. The idea of an organized, planned, and consciously implemented form of state power presented by V. Lenin was unprecedented. It differs much from the idea of "associated producers" conveyed by K. Marx as the basis for the rational reorganization of the society. V. Lenin wrote:

*“A socialist state can arise only as a network of productive and consumer communes that conscientiously take into account their production and consumption, save labor, and steadily increase its productivity...” (Lenin 1974, vol. 36, 185)*

It was an old socialist idea that had been already discussed in the framework of utopian socialism by S. Fourier, A. Saint-Simon and R. Owen, M. Bakunin, P. Kropotkin, etc.

## 2. Modification of The Foundations

Classical rationalism placed the source of Reason in a kind of *natural light* that falls on every ordinary person. That was quite a controversial idea since classical German philosophy emphasized that ordinary rationality could not comprehend the paradoxical nature of scientific truths. Reason reduces the whole matter of things to formal logical correctness and consistency, in extremes – to usefulness and efficiency.

K. Marx emphasized conscious control over human activity. V. Lenin shifted the emphasis to mass character, universality, inclusiveness of control, and the special properties of the carrier: the revolutionary masses, the working people. In other words, the whole matter must be decided by the revolutionary instinct of the masses, which is the carrier and criterion of Reason in the last instance. The Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' should only express their instincts. But the gap in the transitions from one element to another, the lack of agreement, has already arisen. After all, according to K. Marx's idea, it was associated with producers who should take control over uniting people in society.

But is it possible to cover all the life foundations of a human as a social being? Most likely, neither K. Marx nor F. Engels, knew for certain in what form this was possible. V.I. Lenin did not clear out this question when he was talking about universal, all-pervading accounting and control. But the logic of the political management and political struggle required complete certainty here, which could even lead to institutionalization.

In addition, emphasizing that the mind of the masses is shaped by their revolutionary creativity, it was impossible to overlook the ability of this mind to break something (e.g. “we will destroy the whole world by force” slogan), however, its abilities to create something, which was proclaimed with enthusiasm in theory, turned out to be very controversial in practice. In the late 19th and early 20th century, the boundaries of mass consciousness were complexly presented in social thought (e.g., G. Lebon's works).

V. Lenin's initial inquiry for a reasonable way how to organize life in a given society shows how difficult is to overcome the principles of Reason and rationality, which grew out from the capitalist industrial civilization. The revolutionary transformation of society was carried out under the idea of turning a man of labor into a true master of his destiny, the subject of the historical process. However there was a lack of mechanism to implement the plan.

*“The organization of accounting, and control over the largest enterprises, the transformation of the state economy into a single large mechanism when hundreds of millions of people are guided by one plan – this is the great organizational task that fell on our shoulders (Lenin 1974, vol. 33, 7)*

In all this duty, Lenin saw, first of all, the task of ensuring the victory of conscious planning:

*The struggle for the introduction to the masses the idea of Soviet state control and accounting <...> – this struggle is the greatest one, it has world-historical significance, the struggle of socialist conscious order against bourgeois and anarchist individuality. (Ibid., vol. 36, 185)*

Let's pay attention to the fact that this idea has to be *implemented* to the consciousness of the masses, state control was also implied here. The mind of the masses and the will of the state are imperceptibly identified here by Lenin, nevertheless, they are so different; that all the consequences of such identification will soon manifest themselves.

In Lenin's works relating to the early years of the Soviet period, we are constantly confronted with attempts to define, formulate, and develop in detail both the alleged “free association of producers” and the control mechanism over them, as accurately as possible.

Initially, his idea was rather vague and presented itself in the form of some consumer-marketing communes. However, in the “Outline of the Plan of Scientific and Technical Works” V. Lenin wrote:

*“... rational organization of industry in Russia from the point of view of the proximity of raw materials and the possibility of the least loss of labor <...>*

*rational, from the point of view of the newest largest industry and especially trusts, merger and concentration of production in a few largest enterprises..."* (Ibid., vol. 33, 101)

But we remember his idea that the capitalist organization of labor is incompatible with rationality, and there is nothing yet in these arguments that is beyond the efficiency provided by trusts and corporations. The idea is being intensively carried out that

*"...not a single product, not a single pound of bread should be out of account, because socialism is, first of all, accounting"* (Ibid., vol. 35, 57).

and, it is emphasized that the whole society will be "one office and one factory" with equality of labor and equality of wages," that

*"...what is most needed is a slender, strong organization, and probably millions of people working as accurate as the clock works".* (Ibid, vol. 36, 155)

How is that possible? It seems to be Laplace's view of the socio-economic universe: to set the initial conditions with unambiguity and accuracy in order to calculate the future, which is pre-determined! Moreover, we note a characteristic detail here: control is thought to be direct, not mediated, say, by finances and the market. K. Marx wrote:

*"There can be nothing more misleading and absurd than to assume that the control of united individuals over their aggregate production could be based on the exchange value and money"* (Marx, Engels, vol. 46, 101-102).

The same approach can be followed in Lenin's directives:

*"...what we need the most is a slender, strong organization, and hundreds of millions of people working as accurate as the clock works; organize them from the first to the last person, organize accounting over production, control over consumption"* (Lenin 1974, vol. 36, 263).

It is quite obvious that such organization can only be based on typically rationalistic ideas of

Enlightenment, where rationality is understood as universal calculability and attainability, which logically leads to universal, and therefore, formal equality (which was unacceptable in the Marxist tradition). Therefore, formal equality could not be reached by the market:

*"Each member of the society, performing a certain part of socially necessary work, receives a certificate from the society that he has worked such and such a quantity of work. According to this certificate, he receives a corresponding amount of products from public warehouses of consumer goods..."* (Ibid., vol. 33, 92)

It all sounds like a quote from T. More's Utopia, which had a longer title: "A Book as Useful as It Is Funny". Later, V.I Lenin would say, assessing this period:

*"We made a mistake that we decided to perform a direct transition to communist production and distribution <...> having believed that without a period of socialist accounting and control, it is impossible to approach even the lowest stage of communism"* (Ibid., vol. 44, 157-158)

This claim for universality, which is typical for Laplace, considered all conditions at once, created practical difficulties at the level of public administration practice: Lenin, as chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, constantly complained that the supreme executive power was drowning in the ocean of minor concerns, that everyday routine prevented him from seeing the general picture. In the last years of his life, these complaints became more and more persistent, and he began to fall into a rage because of official red tape, bungling, and unproductive work of the bureaucracy. N. Bukharin had to note:

*"...we are building control over control, which improves 10%, and devours 20, 30, 50%; therefore, such control represents a colossal ballast on the entire Soviet organism... We create some control functions over others, control in a square, control in a cube, and the end there is control everywhere, however, stealing all the same takes place..."*. (Bukharin 1988, 312)

All-pervading, universal control, which does not leave any dark corner of life without its pervasion, becomes the signature of the time. Guided by rational

principles, Bolsheviks strived to reorganize not only *Rabkrin* (People's Commissariat of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection) but also matters of everyday life, nutrition, marriage, and family. Moreover, they proclaimed the necessity to *breed* a new type of human being. In order to do that a new pedagogical system has been created aimed at educating a person for the future communist society. Crowds made their pilgrimage to the colony planted by F.E. Dzerzhinsky, where one of the greatest educators, A. Makarenko reformed juvenile criminals and street children into citizens of the new world.

Scientists, politicians, and poets celebrated the power of science and scientific planning. For example, A. Bogdanov devoted several of his works to discussing them, including his "Tectology", where he attempted to express the idea of a national economic plan precisely:

*"What kind of economy can be called planned? It's one, where everything is harmoniously coordinated based on a single, methodically developed plan. How should we begin to solve this task, unprecedented in its difficulties? The principles can be established only from a scientific and organizational point of view. (Bogdanov 1989, 274)*

The application of a scientific, planned approach to the processes of production and distribution, according to Bolsheviks, makes it possible to rationalize and control product flow on the part of working masses, thereby narrowing the space of spontaneous market, as well as poorly managed relations of production and exchange.

### 3. Inevitable Consequences

In this regard, the atmosphere of that historical period very much resembled the one of the Great French Revolution, not only because the latter was referred to, quoted, and even copied. The merciless criticism of all previous orders (*Ancien regime*) was inspired by the belief in the universal triumph of Reason, which, in particular, was expressed in the creation of a very artificial cult of the Supreme Rational Being in France at that time and the renaming of churches into *Temples of Reason*. (Aulard, 199-204)

Very similar things occupied the ideologists of the Russian Revolution in 1917. Outstanding minds and great abilities were put at service for the transformation

of Russia, which was to be done precisely by asserting rational principles to everything, with Science being the embodiment of Reason. The atmosphere in Soviet society was rather tense, with *reasonable* (i.e. scientific, rational, conscious, planned, etc.) as opposed to *unreasonable* (i.e. spontaneous, unconscious), and both sides were characterized in absolute extremes.

In the same way as during the Great French Revolution, the cult of Reason was formed in Soviet Russia, and it was celebrated by poets, artists, writers, actors, etc. For example, to celebrate the third anniversary of the October Revolution in Petrograd a group of talented artists (N. Evreinov, A. Kugel, N. Petrov, K. Derzhavin, Yu. Annenkov, D. Temkin among them) staged an unprecedented open-air performance, which was called "The Capture of the Winter Palace", with 8,000 moving extra involved, orchestra, and the Aurora having fired the cannon, as it had happened on October 25, 1917.

It seemed to Bolsheviks that the most important rationalistic ideas were reflected in this Cult: the mind of the Revolution could reproduce any historical event with the confidence of presenting it in all details, exactly as it was, and in terms of its Essence. And here there was already a possibility to recreate the events anew. An outstanding personality of this period, A. Gastev, the organizer of the Institute of Labor was committed to a radical transformation of all types of human activity based on their rationalization. The meaning of this rationalization was to decompose each employee's behavior into the primary elements, and then weed out all unnecessary, useless, and ineffective, recreating finally the most rational and productive action. All methods of labor activity had to be illuminated by a reasonable and critical analysis and, as Hegel used to say, either justify their right to exist or be discarded.

As we can see, the bloom of rationalist mythology was diverse in its manifestations. The policy of War communism disturbed this mass utopian consciousness, preoccupied with Rationality: theoretical rationalism (i.e. rationalistic mythology of Reason) has retired to the socio-psychological shell. But such a deliberate (or not) flirt with the myth, as T. Mann would say later, might be very dangerous. Moreover, flirting is dangerous not only with the myth of Race, Soil, and Blood but also of Reason. Extraordinary minds were able to discern these dangers. As a reaction to rationalistic utopias, several literary dystopias appeared to depict disastrous

consequences of the mythology of Reason that have been implemented into practice. E Zamyatin was one of the first to point out them in his novel named 'We'.

### **INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE RATIONALITY PARADIGM**

The history of Soviet society demonstrated how quickly the worst fears concerning this flirt with the myth of Reason have been confirmed. Socio-political institutionalization of the Enlightenment paradigm with its claim for rational universality and direct control, led to the "eternal and-all-conquering teaching" becoming the only legal theory of the time and the party "of the new type" become the only subject, which at the same time appeared to be "the mind, the honor and the conscience of the epoch". The universal state based on such a theory and ruled by such a subject of power demonstrated complete political control over all life aspects of the society. V.S. Shvyrev rightly noted:

*"If you like, you can talk about the existence of officious scientism in our society, which was part of the prevailing ideology. Of course, in reality, this ideology was very far from the true spirit of science with its critical attitude and its supremacy over illusions and myths. However, this ideology tried to speak on behalf of science and this alone forced it to proclaim science officially as ideological value. This is the difference between the Communist ideology and the totalitarian ideologies of nazism, racism, chauvinism, religious fundamentalism, etc. They all did not flirt with the ideals of rationality and science, having preferred irrationality. It is fundamentally important, however, that such metamorphosis of rationality is determined not only by external, social factors but also those inherent to the very nature of rational knowledge. (Shvyrev 1992, 92)*

The institutionalization of Soviet rationality resulted in both explicit and implicit disputes between Marxism and the classical rationality of the Enlightenment. Marxism in its original version (K. Marx, F. Engels) explicitly declared a break with the tradition, which concerned the fundamental categories of consciousness, reason, and human being. Marxism in its Soviet version (i.e. Marxism-Leninism) asserted a revolutionary break with the entire preceding

philosophical tradition (rationalism, idealism, metaphysics). At the same time, Lenin, in his "Philosophical Notebooks" had to assume that there was still a huge task to be solved: to revise the content of all philosophical knowledge, to relieve it from archaic content, to reformulate philosophical categories and traditional philosophical problems.

Nevertheless, Soviet society has been finally drowned in *rational irrationality*. Z. Brzezinski noticed the peculiarities, having pointed out that

*"...history would no longer be a spontaneous, mostly random process, but would become an instrument of the collective mind of mankind and would serve moral purposes. Thus, communism sought to merge, through organized actions, political rationality with public morality. But in practice, excessive faith in the human mind, the complexity of a very acute struggle for power led to the translation of preliminary historical judgments into the category of dogmatic statements, moralizing into political hatred..." (Brzezinski 1990, 266).*

At the same time, it is a mistake to simplify here the real complexity of both the eternal philosophical problem and the powerful idea of "reasonable reconstruction" of the society proposed by Marxism. We should admit that the idea of total calculability which was implemented not only in the research but also in practice, was impressive. At first glance, fantastic opportunities were presented to the Soviet society: five-year plans for the economic development of a huge country, amazing achievements of those who rationally organized their work, outstanding records of athletes and pilots who calculated their success in advance, alteration of the entire social structure, landscape, climate, and finally, the person himself!

The manifestation of such universal calculability transformed mass consciousness on purely rational principles. Mass consciousness has been purified from everything dark, unclear, and obscure (e.g. from everything based on unconscious impulses, feelings, intuition). From this point of view, a military campaign was launched against various kinds of prejudices, misconceptions, and ignorance. However, blind faith in the ultimate triumph of certain ideas, patterns, and programs has immediately become obsessive, such as collective duty to society became a really important

value. Any feelings and beliefs appeared to be legal only when they were matters under control.

An impressive form of calculability was all-pervasive control, which meant awareness and universality of accounting: from birth rate and food production to traffic regulation, Siberian river flow, climate, etc. From his/her very infancy a person became accustomed to various forms of control – economic, political, ideological, administrative, and psychological. This was considered normative, and everyone had to take part in at least a small fraction of the control functions. In all these accounting procedures, science was the official worship, which was able to calculate, justify, discover, and predict everything in advance (the only question is the presence of purely extensive factors - time, strength, energy).

The rationalistic construction and alteration of the environment also took place: rational nutrition, rational organization of labor, rationally organized recreation, organized life, housing, and parenting. Truly, it was proclaimed that everything valid in Soviet society is reasonable, and everything reasonable will be implemented. However, the euphoria of waiting for rationalistic miracles resulted in the indoctrination of the population, complemented by extensive punitive procedures.

One reason why reaching The Kingdom of Reason seemed to be very close was political will and political power combined with political reason. After all, since the Age of Enlightenment, rationalistic thinking and theorizing have been known as something separated from practice, from real actions. It seemed that the theoretical nature of the Enlightenment had finally been overcome and the Mind had eventually found the Body. The rational idea no longer remains in dreams, but in fact, it was formatting nature, labor, and everyday life of people. And if in the early years of Soviet power, it was stated that all these working bodies (committees, councils) were only instruments of the collective mind of the masses, then soon quite certain repressive bodies began to claim the very role of the supreme mind.

Another reason for the powerful influence of the proclaimed rationalization of social life was the combination of political reason and goodness. After all, in the European tradition, the Kingdom of Reason challenged not only madness and obscurity but also the Kingdom of Evil. The rationalistic ideal of the light-bearing mind was socially and ethically attractive: the

light of reason not only dispels the darkness of ignorance but helps to defeat social evil. In the XX century, long after the age of Enlightenment, Reason was again recruited to the cause of political revolution, but it was not *natural light* anymore, it was *the collective mind of the working masses*, which inherited all the best, advanced and progressive.

V.I Lenin's death seemed to be the final chord in this tragic symphony of Reason having been performed in that short period of utopian projects. His death resulted in apocalyptic despair experienced by the Soviet society: undoubtedly, it was perceived in the context of specifically rationalistic mythology as the death of *Reason himself*. The flavor of this mythology was successfully captured by N.V. Valentinov in his notes:

*On January 22, an autopsy was performed in Gorki <...>, which lasted almost 5 hours. As a result, a report on the pathoanatomical condition of the deceased appeared <...> Everything was opened. Nothing is left without analysis. The most detailed report is given about everything and all the flaws <...> It seems that never before and nowhere in the world have the deceased rulers of the country, kings, kings, etc., been represented in such a naked to the last, extreme anatomical degree (Valentinov 1991, 142).*

Having tried to elucidate all the secret aspects of V.I Lenin's death with the merciless light of scientific analysis, the political machine of the Soviet State, which was generated by Lenin himself, was behaving in a self-contradicting way: it immortalized the Leader and gave his remains a sacred prominence. That was the moment when a new important period started, with a new mystery of Reason, which was already passing to transcendent rationality. That was the highest of the possible rationalities, and it was revealed only to the competent authorities. Soviet society had been diving into *irrational rationality*.

## CONCLUSIONS

During the Soviet period, a real attempt was undertaken to create a rationalistic model of the Socialist state based on the centralized system of planning, widespread public administration, and control. This model was successfully implemented during the socialist modernization, the Great Patriotic War, and the Cold War between the USSR and the USA, with nuclear parity having been reached and the first man having flown to Space. However, the classical

problem concerning the relation between *rational* and *irrational* categories failed solution: educational rationalism remained untouched in the official Soviet philosophy and ideology, where various types of reasons continued to exist in different mystical formats. Representatives of the creative trend in Marxist philosophy have been developing the latest problems of *rational* and *irrational* under certain censorship, on the verge of being accused of opportunism and the threat of political repression. Critical studying of the new social reality was substituted by pseudo-rationalistic *planning* ("the plans of the party are the plans of the people"), in which utopian desires of the political leadership were expressed (e.g. "catching up and overtaking", "developing virgin lands", "turning rivers", "draining and flooding", etc.).

The fetishization of Reason, which was characteristic of the Enlightenment, led in the Soviet years to the birth of a real cult of rationality. According to the principle "Science can do anything", miraculous abilities were attributed to science, resulting in its mystification. Soviet type of rationality was by no means dialectical and materialistic, it was *irrational*, especially when identifying Marxist philosophy and science. The obvious expression of that was the definition given to the official ideology of the Soviet state: it was proclaimed as exclusively scientific.

The primitive understanding of rationality as a reasonable, formally logical activity was reduced in practice to efficiency (e.g. "rationalization of production"), which at the same time resulted in an equally primitive idea of *irrationality* being something illogical, absurd, and, accordingly, inefficient. For example, all phenomena of everyday consciousness and religion were declared *irrational* in this sense.

That is why the theory and practice of revolutionary transformations were predetermined to face their dead ends (e.g. methodological, ideological, praxiological). That is why many important issues remained unattainable for this theory, such as technological revolution (especially in biotechnology, and social engineering); post-anthropology; post-industrial society,

colonial system collapse and neocolonialism, global digital society, and many others.

Different concepts which have been established in Marxism were inevitably subjected to mystification and transformation: the working class, i.e. "the most revolutionary force in the entire history", the Communist Party (*its vanguard*), Marxist philosophy and ideology, Marxist revolutionary practice ("Marx's teaching is omnipotent – because it is true"). At the same time, the Soviet state model can be quite perceived as a kind of, albeit not fully realized, but the generally successful project of the Kingdom of Reason, the homeland of "all working people", of all "progressive humanity".

## REFERENCES

- Aulard, Francois V. 1892. *Le Culte de la Raison et le Culte de L'Etre Supreme*. Paris: Essai historique
- Bogdanov, Alexander. 1989. *Tectology*. Book 2. [In Russian. Moscow, 1989]
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. 1990. *Big Failure. The Birth and Death of Communism in the 20th Century*, Quintessence. Philosophical almanac. Moscow
- Bukharin, Nikolai. 1988. *Industrial propaganda*. Selected works. [In Russian. Leningrad, 1988]
- Lenin, Vladimir. 1974. *Another Tasks of the Soviet Power*. Collected works. Vol. 36. [In Russian. Moscow: Politizdat, 1974]
- Lenin, Vladimir. 1974. *How to Organize a Competition?*. Collected works. Vol. 35. [In Russian. Moscow: Politizdat, 1974]
- Lenin, Vladimir. 1974. *New Economic Policy and Tasks of Political Enlightenment*. Collected works. Vol. 44. [In Russian. Moscow: Politizdat, 1974]
- Lenin, Vladimir. 1974. *Outlining the Plan for Scientific and Technical Work*. Collected works. Vol. 35. [In Russian. Moscow: Politizdat, 1974]
- Lenin, Vladimir. 1974. *Report on the Immediate Objectives of the Soviet Power*. Collected works. Vol. 36. [In Russian. Moscow: Politizdat, 1974]
- Lenin, Vladimir. 1974. *The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power*. Collected works. Vol. 36. [In Russian. Moscow: Politizdat, 1974]
- Lenin, Vladimir. 1974. *State and Revolution*. Collected works. Vol. 33. [In Russian. Moscow: Politizdat, 1974]
- Marx, Karl and Fr. Engels. 1946. *Collected works*. Vol. 46. Part 1. [In Russian. Moscow, 1946]
- Marx, Karl. 1961. *Capital*. Collected works by K. Marx and Fr. Engels. Vol. 24. [In Russian. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Politicheskoy Literatury, 1961]
- Shvyrev, Vladimir. 1992. *Rationality as a value of culture*. Questions of Philosophy. №6. Moscow
- Valentinov, Nikolai. 1991. *NEP and the Crisis of the Party after Lenin's Death*. [In Russian. Moscow, 1991]

Received on 03-01-2024

Accepted on 16-01-2024

Published on 14-02-2024

<https://doi.org/10.6000/2817-2310.2024.03.07>

© 2024 Rusakova et al.; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open-access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.