

## On the Nature of Production Power

Sang Hun Lee

November 1972

Vice Chairman of IFVC, Korea



*President [Young Hwi] Kim addresses 17th General meeting of Sunghwa Student's Association. 181 Senior High School students attended, Oct. 22- 24, at SootaekRI Training Center.*

Marx said that *production power* means production tools and labor power, and that the progress of production power is materialistic progress. However, according to dialectical materialism, things progress because of the contradiction of two elements existing within them and by the conflict and struggle between them. It is Marx' assertion that when there is no struggle between contradictory elements, progress cannot exist. Therefore, the progress of production power cannot be excepted.

If the progress of production power is truly materialistic, then within production power itself there must be two material elements of contradiction, conflict, and struggle.

Production power means *production tools* and *labor power*. Then, are these the contradictory elements? If so, how do they conflict? In that conflict, which is affirmation and which negation? Strangely enough, Marx left no concrete clarification to this question. Even Marx' successors gave no rational explanation on this matter. Izchenko said that "The cause of the progress of production power must be sought within the inner-characteristics of the labor process. Once production power is generated, it is led to progress through inner dialectic method.

The cause of the progress of production power is the dialectic mutual operation of production power and production relationship, as content and form. Production power always operates within a certain social form (having a certain content of class relationship) and within a certain form of production relationship." (Dictionary of Philosophy).

This appears to be a dialectical explanation of the question presented above. But this does not explain the cause of the progress of production power. Izchenko's explanation is, in short, that by creating mutual dialectic opposition between production power (content) and production relationship (form) through the union and struggle of contradictory elements (production power and production relationship) production power progresses. This is, in effect, an attempt to explain the cause *by* the result. It is only circular reasoning.

According to the materialistic view of history, production power constantly progresses, whereas production relationship has the tendency to remain static. Production relationship at some point becomes a hindrance to the progress of production power. Then how can that hindrance be at the same time the cause of the progress of production power? This is a futile argument, akin to saying that the brake of a car is the same as its accelerator.

Marx and Stalin suggested indirectly that man's desire for life was the basic motivation for the progress of production power. It was implied that man constantly developed production power according to his desire in order to improve his commodities and living conditions and at the same time to shorten his labor time and simplify his labor. It is certainly true that man's desire motivated the development of production power. If no such desire existed, production power could not have developed. Then why did Marx not clarify this directly? If he had clearly stated this fact as a law, it would have meant he recognized that production power progressed from a definite cause and for definite purpose (the purpose of satisfying man's desire) and the fact that matter (production power) is developed by spirit (desire). Accordingly, it would have meant that Marx would have had to deny his own method and philosophy (dialectical materialism), since his dialectic method denies purpose in progress, and his philosophical materialism

asserts that matter controls spirit.

It is important to recognize that the explanation of the cause and reason for the progress of production power which is the core of the materialistic view of history is extremely ambiguous and inconsistent.

### **Our View**

According to the Unification Ideology, man, like everything in the universe, exists in polarity of feeling and reason, spiritual and physical, male and female. The interaction of two complementary elements is the foundation for anything to be created or for energy to be generated. This creative interrelationship resembles the polarity and creative power of the Source of Creation, the First Cause, or God. In other words, man's creativity resembles the creativity of God Himself. Man's production power (labor power) is derived from this: creative power.

God's creative power is not mere blind force, but bears the element of conscious purpose, or intelligence. This is proven by various facts in the creation. That is, the entire creation is not only supported by energy, but each individual element comprised in the universe has a mathematical precision and intelligent content which is beyond the grasp of the most scientific mind. Furthermore, each thing has purpose within itself. If there is no intelligent element in addition to physical energy, how can the things created have purpose and move according to law?

God's creative power has polarity of inner and outer. Therefore, man's creative power, which reflects that of God also has inner and outer aspects of polarity. The outer aspect in man's creative power is physical, the inner element is mental. Because of this, production power (labor power), which is an extension of the creative power of man, is also a composite of these two fold elements, mental and physical power. Production power progresses according to man's creative desire and will, and not material conditions alone.

This is a far more coherent explanation of the nature and progress of production power than that presented by Marx and followers. The progress of production power is derived from the creative desire of man, through the harmonious give and take between the polarity of mental and physical power, all of which are derived from God, the First Cause. Material conditions affect man's desire and will, but do not *determine* them.

Man has the freedom to will what he desires in accordance with the principles of creation derived from God. It is when man violates these principles that his freedom to will goodness is lost.