MARX’S PHILOSOPHY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENCE AND THE TECHNICAL-SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION AT THE PRESENT TIME

**by KRISTAQ ANGJELI**

The influence of the technical-scientific revolution in capitalist society has been to raise the level of the social character of production and its antagonism with the capitalist form of appropriation. It has exacerbated and deepened the general crisis of imperialism, added to the unemployment, raised the level of capitalist exploitation, in this way influencing the preparation of the objective and subjective factors for the proletarian revolution, but it can never replace the proletarian revolution.

KARL MARX WAS A GREAT SCIENTIST. HE MADE ORIGINAL DISCOVERIES IN ALL FIELDS OF SCIENCE HE STUDIED, BUT THE GREATEST CHANGE AND THE MOST PROFOUND REVOLUTION WHICH HE BROUGHT ABOUT WITH THE CREATION OF THE NEW PHILOSOPHY OF THE PROLETARIAT IS BEYOND COMPARISON WITH ANY OTHER DISCOVERY IN THE WHOLE HISTORY OF HUMAN THOUGHT AND SCIENCE.


The historical conditions in the middle of the last century placed before scientific theoretical thinking the task that the world as a whole must be conceived according to its real content and the adequate image of it must inspire the proletariat, the most revolutionary class in history, to the heroic struggle for the true and complete emancipation of society. By discovering these laws Karl Marx arrived at the conclusion that «the head of this emancipation is philosophy, the proletariat its heart».

1. **KARL MARX ON THE DIALECTICAL INTERACTION OF SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY**

Marx and Engels proved that in the process of their development the individual sciences are based on a given ideological outlook. «Let the scientists say what they like, philosophy dominates them», «wrote Engels. From this stand-point Marx and Engels criticized the absurd pretensions of positivist philosophy about the alleged «absolute independence» of individual sciences from philosophy, and that allegedly «every science itself is philosophy». They advanced beyond positivism just as they had earlier advanced beyond the other extreme - the so-called «philosophy of nature», which considered philosophy as «the science of sciences.»
It was not idle curiosity which inspired Marx to follow the successes in the field of natural sciences carefully and step by step. This interest on his part was linked with a very important question — with the transformation of philosophy into a true science. For this the limitations of the existing philosophy had to be overcome and, in the first place, idealism had to be criticized because, in Marx's words, it reduces the world to abstract logical categories, seeks the essence of nature outside nature and the essence of man outside man, and seeks the object of philosophy where it does not lie — outside the real world. It was necessary to go beyond the idealist, dialectical methods of Hegel and criticize the metaphysics and mechanism of the early materialism.

"Hitherto," writes Marx in the German-French annual in 1844, "the philosophers had the solution to all mysteries on their desk and the foolish and uninitiated had only to open their mouths to imbibe the tasty morsels of absolute science ready cooked. Genuine philosophy," said Marx, "cannot and must not be an absolute science which claims to solve all the mysteries, but must be a science in the series of other sciences."

Marx and Engels appreciated the development of sciences and the great discoveries in science as one of these motive forces which advance materialist philosophical thinking and which impel this thinking to rise towards a higher and more consistent form, towards dialectical materialism.

Basing himself on the new discoveries of the natural sciences, Marx and Engels dealt with matter, motion, space, time and many other problems from the dialectical materialist standpoint and were able to rise above the inevitable limitations of natural scientific knowledge of that time. It is an undeniable fact that not only at the time when our classics lived, but also later, to this very day, the development of natural sciences is further living evidence which is brilliantly confirming the dialectical materialist views of Marx and Engels about the world. Such conclusions of the Marxist philosophy as those about the inexhaustability of the atom in depth and breadth and matter in general, the concept of infinity as a process which contains qualitative leaps, and of movement as the mode of existence of matter, find confirmation today in the development of modern natural sciences. The natural sciences today confirm once again the universal character of the law of opposites, of the law of the reciprocal transition of qualitative changes into quantitative changes, of the law of the negation of the negation, of categories of materialist dialectics, of the fundamental principles of the theory of cognition, etc. worked out by Marx and Engels. This development of the sciences has shown that they are consistently following a dialectical materialist course. That is why "...we clarify materialism and dialectics through the development and progress of sciences," says Comrade Enver Hoxha.

The great merit of the founders of our philosophy is that they proved with theoretical argument the unity of this philosophy with the natural sciences and realized it in practice in their own scientific activity. Proceeding from the universal principles of dialectical materialism, they made a philosophical synthesis of the achievements of natural sciences with the aim of elaborating the dialectical materialist picture of the world and disclosing the dialectics of nature. In his works, Engels devoted great attention to the philosophical synthesis of the achievements of physics, chemistry, biology and other natural sciences. While Marx displayed special interest in the philosophical problems of mathematics, not to mention that concern they both displayed to sum up, synthesize and draw scientific conclusions from the development of political, economic and social life. For this reason, points out Comrade Enver Hoxha, "...the work of Marx is the summation of science, the quintessence of science, it is the profound elaboration of human thinking and activity through the centuries..."

Marx and Engels analysed the development of natural sciences up to that time in the light of materialist dialectics and summed up and correctly interpreted the results which they brought. Thus, the classification which they made of the main forms of movement, and in conformity with this, their classification of natural sciences and their definition in broad outline on the basis of the Marxist methodology of the correct road of development of these sciences, are well-known. No less important is the treatment and solution by Marx and Engels of a series of specific problems in the field of these sciences which the limitations of the prevailing world outlook had led into an impasse as,
for example, the problem of two masses in mechanical motion, the essence of electricity, the essence of life, the concept about labour, etc.

The great classics assisted the development of natural sciences, also, by smashing the «shackles» of idealist interpretations of discoveries in the field of these sciences. Thus, with scientific argument they exposed such openly fideistic conclusions as the so-called «theory of the thermal death of the universe», or the alleged existence of «the world of spirits in the fourth dimension», «physiological idealism» and «social Darwinism», which extended the laws which operate in the world of animals to human society. They showed that mechanical materialism left such gaps in which reactionary idealist ideas were easily introduced.

Through their work Marx and Engels gave a resolute reply to all those who attempted to «base themselves» on the natural sciences for the purpose of «refuting dialectical materialism». In this connection they proved that the natural sciences did not negate dialectical materialism, but on the contrary, completely confirmed it. Moreover, they showed that the results of the natural sciences could be understood correctly and summed up theoretically only on the basis of materialist dialectics. They showed that all efforts which were made to stretch the sciences of nature to fit the procrustian bed of idealism and metaphysics, had a definite class content. Applying the principle of partisanship, they discovered the direct connection between philosophical reaction in the ranks of naturalists and politics and the class struggle, demonstrating which were the social forces whose interests were served not merely by openly preaching obscurantism and idealism, but also by the slightest deviation from dialectical materialism. In this connection Karl Marx writes, «The absolute interest of the ruling classes requires the perpetuation of absurdity. After all, why are the wordy sycophants paid? To boast in science with things about which... generally, it is impermissible even to think?»

In our days, too, the unity of materialist philosophy with the natural sciences is essential and very useful. The theory of dialectical materialism cannot be developed fruitfully, without being based on the achievements of physics, chemistry and biology, just as the naturalist scientists are unable to synthesize the process and results of the rapid development of science correctly from the theoretical standpoint if they are not guided in their world outlook by the philosophy of dialectical materialism. «Without a sound philosophical backing, neither the natural sciences nor materialism can cope with the struggle against the pressure which the bourgeois ideas and outlook exert,» wrote Lenin. «This pressure can be withstood successfully when you are a conscious partisan of that philosophy which Karl Marx created.»

Whereas the Marxist philosophy has achieved a close connection with scientific thinking, present-day bourgeois philosophy has proclaimed its open hostility to it. And it could not be otherwise. A positive or negative stand towards science is determined by the stand towards the truth. Present-day bourgeois philosophy is trying in refined ways to distort the true dialectical materialist significance of the contemporary scientific material. Many bourgeois philosophers are quite uninhibited in their efforts to reinforce their views with the baggage of science, indeed, they do not hesitate to «modernize» these views with new data from scientific knowledge. They make great efforts to ensure that new discoveries are interpreted in the spirit of idealism, regardless of whether it presents itself in «realist», «naturalist» or other forms. All trends vigorously propagate agnosticism. This ancient ghost, which has long been out of date, is employed against the healthy development of modern sciences, but is nothing but an expression of the fear and distrust of those social forces which see no future for themselves. Today agnosticism goes much further than that of Kant, to the denial of the existence of the external world and the transformation of scientific laws into a bunch of voluntarist opinions. Irrationalism and intuitivism have gone openly on the offensive against the materialist conclusions which emerged from the development of sciences. Fearing the revolutionary content of modern sciences bourgeoisie philosophy wants to divide the «spheres of influence» with science through neo-positivist compromises, which advocate the separation of sciences from philosophy, leaving sciences in a blind alley, at the mercy of idealism. There are many bourgeois philosophers who, in order to strip science and philosophy of their true values, try to transform them into mythology and to make mythology the foundation of science and philosophy. The chorus of screams from the abyss of present-day idealist philosophy in utter cacophony yells: the discoveries of modern sciences must not be taken into consideration for the philosophical interpretation of the world! Science needs no kind of philosophy. Its close allies, religious mysticism and spiritualism, are «celebrating» the age of unification with bourgeois philosophic thinking and drawing it more deeply into the mire of anti-science. In such a situation the philosophical revolution of Marx which, amongst other
things, ensured the close alliance of dialectical materialist philosophy with the development of individual natural and social sciences, becomes even more important.

Karl Marx regarded science as a weapon of theoretical knowledge which precedes social development. In his work «Critique of Political Economy», he writes, «Unlike the other architects, science... erects several stories of a building, still without having laid its foundations.» Like every other science, the Marxist philosophy has many examples of such foresight in the field of natural sciences. For instance, the prediction of Marx and Engels that the future development of natural sciences would concentrate mainly on the creation and development of intermediary disciplines has now become a reality in today's cybernetics, bionics, informatics, biophysics, etc. Likewise, Engels's forecast that physics would fall into a crisis if it continued to think metaphysically during the solution of its problems became a reality at the beginning of our century. The development of modern physics has proved the idea advanced by the classics that infinity in the structural organization of the matter, of space and time, must be conceived in the spirit of a gradual quantitative process which includes qualitative leaps at given nodal points, etc.

Like cognition and practice, the development of sciences is ceaseless, too. More and more each day man is discovering the secrets and laws of nature. This development has not threatened and cannot threaten, let alone overturn, the fundamental theses of dialectical and historical materialism. On the contrary, their quantity is enriched and deepened. Any claim to the contrary, by old or fashionable philosophical currents, about these problems has fallen to the ground. It is a deception with definite class aims in order to open the doors to idealism and fideism and to throw mud at the philosophy of Marx, which is perpetually new.

In our days, reaction has mobilized all its most sinister forces and has gone on the attack against the whole scientific philosophy of the proletariat which Karl Marx created. A great deal is being said and written about it. Marx's works are being studied and interpreted in the universities, colleges, academies, and seminars of the capitalist countries including those of the Catholic Church. All this is being done to falsify and distort the philosophy of Marxism, to adapt it to the interests of the bourgeoisie. Such fashionable trends as pragmatism, existentialism, fascism, structuralism or anthropologism, strive to devalue the Marx's philosophy and to find ways to unite and blend their idealist, irrationalist, and voluntarist views with the Marxist philosophy, with the aim of «breaking its rigid bounds» and making it acceptable to them. The current of existentialism describes Marx's philosophy as if it were still in its swaddling clothes and had just begun to develop. Therefore, it needs to be nurtured with existentialist ideas. First of all, however, continue the existentialists, historical materialism must be separated from dialectical materialism, because the latter, with its acceptance of objective reality and determinism, hinders precise knowledge of the social reality. For them, historical materialism assumes real value only if it is, according to them, amalgamated with existentialist anthropology. Meanwhile, neo-positivism regards Karl Marx's philosophy as a «metaphysical» doctrine which has brought nothing new to science since he «operates» with apriori truths, as his predecessors did.

Today the followers of pragmatism regard Marx's philosophy as a variant of their idealist philosophy, distorting the concept of practice as the unity of acting and transforming man with nature, by absolutizing its subjective factor. They oppose the methods of individual sciences to the materialist dialectical methods and make every effort to reject it allegedly as a remnant of Hegelian philosophy. The neo-Freudists consider it essential to supplement and amalgamate the ideas of Freud with those of Marx. The representatives of structuralism, anthropologism, etc. proceed on a similar course. There are also more than a few lackeys of the bourgeoisie equipped with diplomas, like the neo-Tomists, who treat the Marx's philosophy as a dogma, as mythology. It is in this arsenal of bourgeois philosophy that the philosophers of various revisionist currents find their ideological nutriment to revise the philosophical materialism of Marx. Among the revisionist philosophical currents of the Eurocommunists, whom Comrade Enver Hoxha calls revisionists «with the gloves off», it is fashionable to oppose one part of Marxism to other parts, to oppose Lenin to Marx, etc. By «digging» into the works of Marx and employing misrepresentations and sophisms, they want to prove that the «real» Marx, the «humanist» Marx, is the Marx of the early works and not of those works in which he advocates the class struggle, the historical mission of the proletariat, the necessity for the overthrow of capitalism and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. There are many attempts to try to «prove» that Marx based all his doctrine on Hegel's philosophy, that he did not go beyond the bounds of that philosophy, and especially, the Hegelian idea of alienation. They transform Marx into a successor of
either Hegel or Feuerbach, in order to deny and reject that change he made in philosophical thinking.

In the second half of the 20th century, official Soviet revisionist philosophy, also, has gone on the attack against the Marx's doctrine. The Soviet revisionist philosophers, faithful to their cunning tactics, try to conceal the character of this attack to present it as a natural thing, which is in conformity with the creative character of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

The main objective of the attack which the Soviet revisionists make on dialectical historical materialism is to deny the universal character of its fundamental theses. Initially, they launched this attack on a few universal theses. According to them, the development of individual sciences, especially the development of the natural sciences, is allegedly raising the need for amendment of these now «obsolete» theses. In fact, the development of natural sciences, especially from the middle of this century, began to raise a series of acute problems in connection with the concept of velocity, space, time, physical reality etc. It turned out that new facts accumulated could not be explained in the framework of the existing natural-science concepts about cause, space, time, etc. which meant that now the latter had become obsolete and had to be superseded and replaced with new concepts. But the process of dating and replacement affected only the physical, mathematical, etc. concepts, that is, the natural-science concepts about these problems, and not at all the respective dialectical materialist categories. By equating the philosophical concept with concrete natural-science concepts the Soviet revisionists try to carry over this process of «dating», artificially, to the field of philosophical categories in order to «provide scientific backing» for their rejecting and revising of these categories. The thing that strikes the eye immediately when one reads revisionist philosophical literature is the open advocacy of the need which is allegedly imposed by the development of modern sciences and the demands of social practice to discuss and question a number of the fundamental theses of dialectical materialism. Soviet revisionist philosophy distorts the instructions given by V.I.Lenin, that for the achievement of the alliance of materialist philosophy with the natural sciences, materialist dialectics must be developed all-sidedly. The Soviet revisionists have set to work with unrestrained zest to carry out their so-called creative development of philosophy. The powerful weapon of dialectics, which Marx discovered through the study of nature, society and in particular, of political economy, and the awakening of the proletariat and the peoples and their going over to revolution, the Soviet revisionists have turned into a sterile, abstract, speculative and subjective theory, divorced from the objective dialectics of the natural and social reality. Amongst the Soviet revisionist philosophers there are some who say that the dialectics which Marx and Lenin could not create completely must be created on the basis of «contemporary science».

According to various Soviet revisionist philosophers the classics were allegedly unable to work out a series of fundamental problems of dialectical materialist philosophy, and these are being studied for the first time in the Soviet revisionist philosophy of today. Among these problems they describe the questions of the creation of the general theory of development as the more important constituent part and the essence of the dialectics; the question of the elaboration of a complete general theory of cognition of dialectical materialism down to the question of the construction of dialectics as system. Such statements are in flagrant opposition to the historical truth, because the fact is that even Hegel's dialectics, despite its idealist essence, constitutes a synthesis of dialectical categories and laws, and Marx's dialectics, which marked a turning-point and a culmination in dialectical materialist thinking even more so.

This ever more hostile stand towards problems of Marx's philosophy, not to mention other things, brings out the real truth about the propaganda clamour which the Soviet revisionists have set up and which has become particularly loud now, in the context of the 100th anniversary of the death of Marx. They can use mountains of paper and rivers of ink, as they are doing, to express their loyalty to Marx's doctrine, but the diabolical aim of such an unrestrained propaganda is to put Marx in the museum, to present the colossal theoretical and practical work of this titan as simply a historical phenomenon which is allegedly outdated and without value today.

2. KARL MARX ON THE ROLE OF THE TECHNICAL-SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION IN THE LIFE OF SOCIETY

Following the development of technical and natural sciences attentively, Marx pointed out that this development could no longer take place except in the context of the technical-scientific revolution. He conceived this process as a necessary historical phenomenon at a given stage of the development of society. Science has al-
ways exerted an influence on the development of production and has been closely linked with it. But in the context of large-scale industry, the application of scientific discoveries becomes indispensable. «The principle of machine production, which seeks to solve the problems which arise in this way by means of the use of mechanics, chemistry, etc. in a word, the natural sciences, becomes the determining principle everywhere,» said Marx. Today large-scale industry has put a colossal amount of natural material under intensive technological processing. This has made extension of the spectrum of the problems dealt with by science indispensable, has brought the need for the birth of new scientific knowledge, and the discovery of the most profound laws of nature. The need to find new sources of energy, the necessity of replacing the strength of man with machinery and automation, also dictate these things. In his work «Capital», Marx gives a brilliant presentation also of those fundamental features which characterize the essence of the technical-scientific revolution. For Marx technical-scientific progress has the features of a revolution because it is not restricted to isolated spheres of material production, but has swept them into its maelstrom, both through applying it in the most varied fields of production which have been constantly extended and through the influence which these advances exert on one another. The transformations which occur in the context of technical-scientific progress are profoundly revolutionary. The old methods of production, the old technology, are overturned and replaced with the newest, most advanced ones. In this framework, new scientific knowledge emerges and constitutes a revolutionary development and advance, a qualitative leap of science itself. Thanks to the progress of industry, pointed out Marx, the means of labour undergo continual revolutions, therefore they are not replaced with their previous forms, but with the revolutionized forms. For Marx this program has the character of a revolution in science and technique, also, from the standpoint of the greatly accelerated rates of qualitative changes which it brings about in production. Likewise, the participation of the masses in it gives the technical-scientific progress the dimensions of a true revolution in science and technique.

For Marx and Engels the technical-scientific revolution always has a profound philosophical content. It is a concrete manifestation of the close and inseparable dialectical connection between theory and practice. Another confirmation that theory serves practice, generalizes it and makes it conscious and opens the way to the future while developing itself in breadth and depth on the basis of the needs and requirements of the practice. Expressing this dialectical unity, Engels said, «If technique depends to a large degree on the level of science, science depends to a larger degree on the level and needs of technique. When a technical need arises for society, this drives science far forward than ten universities.» Today large-scale industry has revolutionized the links between science and practice in the context of the technical-scientific revolution. It has expanded the sphere of the practical application of scientific discoveries to very large proportions and has strengthened the arsenal of the technical means in the service of scientific knowledge, has combined the application of new scientific discoveries with the technological process of industrial production, while it has shortened the time required to turn a theoretical discovery into an applied practice, etc. In these conditions the development of science and of productive practice is realized not only on the basis of a more extensive and profound dialectical interaction between them, but also with more accelerated rates. «Under the influence of science and technical-scientific process,» Comrade Enver Hoxha teaches us, «the material and intellectual potential of society increases and this, for its part, gives a fresh stimulus to the development of science.»

Karl Marx made a scientific analysis of capitalist society. In this context, he reached the conclusion that «...the specific limit of capitalist production... is not at all an absolute form of the development of productive forces..., on the contrary, at a given moment, it comes into conflict with this development...» This scientific conclusion, amply supported by evidence in the brilliant work «Capital», remains completely valid to refute the preachings of bourgeois and revisionist ideologists who spread the idea that capitalism and the progress of science are allegedly «synonymous». In reality, in bourgeois and revisionist society the general crisis of capitalism cannot but inhibit the development of science and technique. The existence of monopolies, the economic crises, the militarization of the life of those countries and many other social factors, which are eroding the world of capital today, exert a direct influence, either to inhibit or to bring about a one-sided and contradictory development of science, technique and technology.

Marx pointed out that in capitalist society science and technique are an alienated social product. This the links, first of all, with the alienation of their content and social mission. Science and technique are social factors which give mankind a possibility to increase its domination over nature and steadily improve its life. In bour-
Karl Marx produced scientific evidence to prove the necessity for the socialist revolution. He pointed out that a given new historical level of the development of the productive forces does not lead automatically to the creation of a new system of relations of production, does not give rise automatically to a socio-economic formation of a higher level. In this context the development of science and technique exerts an influence on the development of new productive forces, but cannot itself overturn the capitalist relations of production with which the interests of the exploiting classes are linked and which are defended by the bourgeois-revisionist state. This requires the violent proletarian revolution which smashes the old state machine and establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat. The influence of the technical-scientific revolution in capitalist society has been to raise the level of the social character of production and its antagonism with the capitalist form of appropriation. It has exacerbated and deepened the general crisis of imperialism, added to the unemployment, raised the level of capitalist exploitation, in this way influencing the preparation of the objective and subjective factors for the proletarian revolution, but it can never replace the proletarian revolution. The development of the technical-scientific revolution has never brought about and cannot bring about the overthrow of capitalist relations of production in any country, has not eliminated the capitalist exploitation and the ulcers of bourgeois society, let alone threaten the political domination of the bourgeoisie. Hence, the claims of the bourgeois and revisionist ideologists about the alleged "replacement" of the proletarian revolution by technical-scientific progress, about the technical-scientific revolution which has allegedly "overcome" the class antagonism of capitalist society, removed the proletariat from the stage of history, and "brought out" the intelligentsia in the key role, are quite unfounded. These so-called theories which are preached by a series of bourgeois philosophers and propagated by the Yugoslav, Soviet, and Eurocommunist revisionists who try to present them as "Marxists", have nothing in common with the theory of social revolution which Marx discovered. As Comrade Enver Hoxha has pointed out, for Marxism-Leninism "...the technical-scientific revolution and the development of technocracy, linked with it, do not and cannot save capitalism or modern revisionism from their inevitable collapse and destruction. They (the bourgeoisie and the revisionists) cannot alter the objective laws of social development, first of all, the law of the class struggle and the revolution. The introduction of science and technique in production on an extensive scale, which the capitalist monopolies of the West and the new bourgeoisie of the revisionist countries are obliged to do on account of the internal and interstate savage competition, to ensure maximum profit does not smooth out the class economic contradictions in the least... does not save it from ever more destructive and incurable crisis. On the contrary, it makes the contradictions and crises more acute... and in the end, when the subjective factor is at the necessary level, leads to the triumphant socialist revolution." 11

The development of the technical-scientific revolution in capitalist society is never an impartial development overriding class divisions. It is directed by the bourgeoisie and serves the oppression and exploitation of the proletariat and the working masses. Of course, in the conditions of
the development of the technical-scientific revolution the numbers of the intelligentsia have increased, but the numbers of the working class and the level of exploitation of that class by the capitalists have increased to even greater proportions. Therefore, this intelligentsia cannot replace the historic mission of the proletariat or play any new historical role. There are bourgeois ideologists who claim that the main motive force of society lies in a group of \textit{humanitarian} scientists who will \textit{direct} the technical-scientific revolution to \textit{the benefit of mankind}. But such views are utterly utopian and reactionary, because they ignore the fact that the means of production in bourgeois-revisionist society are in the hands of capitalists, that the universities and other scientific institutions are financed by the capitalist trusts and have no economic and political independence from them. Moreover, the top strata of the intelligentsia are very closely linked with the bourgeoisie from both the material and the ideological aspects.

The experience of our country demonstrates the opposite of what the bourgeoisie and the revisionists claim. It proves in practice what Marx demonstrated in theory, that it is the socialist revolution which opens the way to the ceaseless development and progress of science and technique and not vice-versa. In our country the creation of large-scale modern production and the development of technical-scientific revolution are the work of the Party and socialism.

In the conditions of the existence of our socialist society and in the conditions of the existence of the capitalist-bourgeois society, the technical-scientific revolution today is taking place simultaneously in two diametrical opposite socio-economic formations and in this way, manifests in each of them completely opposite social class content. In regard to this, Comrade Enver Hoxha, defending and further developing Marx's teachings on the technical-scientific revolution, has pointed out that the technical-scientific revolution, like every genuine revolution \textit{...is guided by politics, first of all.}\footnote{12} The ideological and political class content of the technical-scientific revolution which is taking place in our country has determined the rapid rates of its development, the directions and extent to which it is spread. Thus, the technical-scientific revolution in our country has influenced the development of the productive forces in that direction which has served the complete construction of socialist society on the basis of self-reliance. Its revolutionary class essence is manifested also in the social consequences it has brought to our country. They are expressed in the creation of modern industry and the developed socialist agriculture, in the ceaseless rise of the well-being of the working masses the perfection of the socialist relations of production and the rise of the productivity of labour, in the narrowing of the main social distinctions, as well as in the scientific and technical and professional uplift of the working masses. In our country science and technique belong to the working masses and have been placed completely in their service.

Today when we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the death of Karl Marx, we cannot but feel that profound respect and inspiration which the majestic and immortal revolutionary thinker of genius arouses.

The \textit{citadels} of the mysteries of science fell before the titanic mind of Marx. With an unprecedented breadth and depth of thought, Marx successfully accomplished the mission with which the proletariat and history charged him and indicated the way to the overthrow of capitalism and the construction of socialist and communist society. \textit{...Marx fought, worked and thought for us,}\footnote{13} said Comrade Enver Hoxha. He rose above the centuries and worked for the centuries.