

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

M. Mitin

Hegel and theory
materialistic
dialectic

Party publishing house 1932

Proletarians of all countries, unite

ALL-UNION SOCIETY OF THE MILITARY DIALECTIC MATERIALISTS

M. Mitin

HEGEL AND THEORY
MATERIALIST
DIALECTICS

(TO THE 100 YEARS OF ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF HEGEL)

PARTY PUBLISHING HOUSE MOSCOW 1932

Table of contents

[CRISIS OF BURGEIOUS SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY AND MODERN NEOGELIENCY.](#)

[FASCISM AND SOCIAL-FASCISM AT THE SECOND HEGEL CONGRESS](#)

[THE IDEALISTIC ESSENCE OF HEGEL'S PHILOSOPHY AND CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE SYSTEM AND METHOD](#)

[MATERIAL DIALECTICS OF MARX, ENGELS AND LENIN](#)

[LEARNING HEGEL, FOLLOWING THE INDICATIONS OF MARX, ENGELS, LENIN AND STALIN](#)

CRISIS OF BURGEIOUS SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY AND MODERN
NEOGELIENCY.

On the basis of the deepest crisis experienced by the entire capitalist system, we have in the recent period of time an extreme aggravation of the crisis of bourgeois science and philosophy, a crisis that was analyzed by Lenin as early as 1908. The intensification of the class struggle between the two main classes of modernity, between the two socioeconomic systems — capitalist and socialist — is expressed in ideological terms in the form of the extreme aggravation of the class struggle in science. In his article “The Three Sources and the Three Components of Marxism,” Lenin wrote: “Marx's scholarship brings to itself in the entire civilized world the greatest enmity and hatred of all bourgeois (and official and liberal) science, which sees in Marxism something

like "harmful sect". A different attitude cannot be expected, for an "impartial" social science cannot exist in a society built on a class struggle. One way or another, but *in the camp* official and liberal science protects people's slavery, and Marxism declared a merciless struggle against this slavery. "

The revival on the bourgeois "philosophical front" that is taking place now in general and especially on the occasion of the centenary anniversary of the death of the great German philosopher, the idealist dialectic of Hegel, is a vivid illustration of the provisions of Lenin mentioned here, an excellent confirmation of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of partisanship philosophy. The struggle for dialectical materialism, with bourgeois philosophy turning to Hegel, is one of the sections of the class struggle of the modern era. The second Hegelian congress, which took place recently in Berlin, mirrored the processes of class struggle in science as a mirror.

This philosophical congress is extremely symptomatic in that it was a very important link in the process of fascization of science and philosophy, which takes place in the West.

The struggle between Marxism (dialectical materialism) and all kinds of idealism, the struggle between Bolshevism and fascism, social fascism "around Hegel" is one of the most vivid manifestations of the class struggle in science, in philosophy, it is one of the forms of class struggle.

Philosophy - the arena of fierce class struggle on the ideological front. Philosophy sharply exacerbated the struggle between the two main philosophical directions - between materialism and idealism. Very well characterizes the class character of these two ideologies (materialism and idealism), a well-known Catholic writer, who can not be suspected of Marxism, Max Scheler in his book «Die Wissensformen und die Gesellschaft» ("Forms of knowledge and society").

He considers in this book characteristic of proletarian thinking, or, as it is expressed, for the thinking of the "lower classes", the following features: realism, materialism, empiricism, optimism and the dialectical way of thinking. In contrast to these "categories", the Max Scheller system of thinking of the "upper classes" consists of the following elements: being, teleology, idealism, spiritualism, a priori, pessimism and formalism.

It is hardly necessary, regardless of the attitude to the general bourgeois concept of Scheller, to specifically criticize these provisions, which basically correctly characterize the specific thinking structure of the main classes of modern capitalist society.

It is well known that Hegelian idealistic philosophy had a reactionary conservative side in the form of its absolute, objective idealism and a revolutionary side in the form of its dialectic. "Hegel's dialectic," wrote Lenin, "as the most comprehensively rich in content and profound teaching on development, Marx and Engels considered the greatest acquisition of classical philosophy. Any other formulation of the principle of development, evolution, they considered one-sided, poor in content, disfiguring and crippling the actual course of development (often with leaps, catastrophes, revolutions) in nature and in society." However, the Hegelian dialectic was idealistic dialectics, and the dialectic and idealism he was not outwardly connected with each other, but organically intertwined and soldered. That is why Engels wrote in his review of Marx's book "To the Critique of Political Economy" that "Marx was and remains the only one who could take on the task of isolating from the Hegelian logic that core which contains actual Hegel's discoveries in this field, and to work out a dialectical method, freed from its idealistic shell, in the simple form in which it alone is the correct form of thought development."

Our interest in Hegel, as the largest representative of German classical philosophy, is in the dialectical method of Hegel, materialistically reworked, posed from "head to foot". The anniversary of the death of Hegel should be for us the moment, the reason for the further development of the struggle for the *materialist dialectics*, which, according to Lenin, is the "fundamental theoretical foundation", the "revolutionary soul" of Marxism. The turning of the bourgeoisie to Hegel obliges us in the new conditions to unfold from the point of view of Marxism-Leninism a criticism of Hegel's idealism. The anniversary of Hegel's death should be a moment for us to further develop the widest popularization of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, the Leninist stage in the

development of materialist dialectics and the struggle on two fronts - against mechanism as the main danger, not understanding and denying the dialectic, and against lesser idealism, martial. mainly in the Hegelian spirit.

What is causing the special interest in Hegel in bourgeois philosophical literature at the present time? What is the reason for the strong revival of the *Hegelian* or, more precisely, the Neo-Hegelian movement in a number of countries in Western Europe, and especially in Germany and Italy? What serves as the basis for the fact that the forgotten Hegel begins to occupy an honorable place in modern state universities again, that his works are intensively read, studied, commented and published?

This question must also be answered because now the situation has changed radically as compared with the second half of XIX in., when the theorists of the bourgeoisie carried out a great critical and destructive work in relation to Hegelian philosophy. Changing attitudes to Hegel especially striking after critical works Bachman, Schopenhauer, Trendelenburg, Haym, Mr. Hartmann, after characteristic oplo vyvaniya Hegel's treatment of him as a "dead dog", in the second half of the XIX at. , after turning to Kant and the boundless domination of neo-Kantianism in official philosophical literature.

Do not cross out the mockery and mockery of Hegel, for example, the "philosopher of petty-bourgeoisism" Schopenhauer, who is by no means alone in this matter, who called Hegel only as "a pack of nonsense and a destroyer of minds". In his work "On University Philosophy", he wrote: "How the worst that can happen to the state is if the reins of government fall into the hands of an unsuitable class, scum of the society, - and for philosophy and everything that depends on it, t. E. For all the knowledge and spiritual life of mankind, nothing can be worse than if a dozen head, differing only, on the one hand, by its ugliness, on the other - by its arrogance in writing nonsense, - in a word, some Hegel with the greatest, right proclaims himself to be the greatest genius with unparalleled perseverance, in which philosophy finally achieved its desired goal forever. "

And despite this, again the interest of the bourgeoisie to Hegel!

Bourgeois philosophy has long passed the historical milestone that separates the period of ascending development of this philosophy from the period of its decline and decay.

It is with Hegel that the period of the ascending development of bourgeois philosophy ends. The first period after the defeat of Hegelian philosophy, inflicted on it by Marxist philosophy, the philosophy of the revolutionary proletariat, the bourgeoisie fed on miserable eclectic philosophical systems. The era of the so-called organic development of capitalism, which began after the tumultuous revolutionary mid-century, made Kant's philosophy the most fashionable among the bourgeois philosophical camp. The bourgeoisie felt that with Kant, or rather neo-Kantianism, it is experiencing its second youth philosophy that begins a new phase of development of the rising bourgeois philosophy as in his time with the philosophy of Kant, the era of classical German idealist philosophy. However, the epoch of imperialism that began, the epoch of decay of capitalism, the epoch of proletarian revolutions introduced a new confusion into the ranks of bourgeois philosophy. Erupted at the very beginning of XX at. natural science crisis is even more exacerbated the confusion and decay of bourgeois philosophy. The best representatives of natural science spontaneously reached for dialectical materialism. The other part of natural scientists, together with bourgeois philosophy, searched in vain for answers to new questions put forward by the new era in the mold-covered philosophical systems of Hume, Berkeley, and others.

World imperialist war 1914- 1918 yy "Shook the entire system of world capitalism and marked the beginning of a period of its general crisis." This crisis has deeply seized both bourgeois philosophy and science. The current economic crisis that unfolded on the basis of the general crisis of capitalism and is "the most serious and deepest of all the world economic crises that have existed until now" (*Stalin*) most clearly revealed and aggravated those processes in the development of bourgeois philosophy that began with it. era of imperialism, and especially with the beginning of the period of the general crisis of capitalism.

The direction in the development of bourgeois philosophy in the modern period can be briefly defined as a turn towards Hegel's philosophy in its modernized forms.

The hype raised in the bourgeois philosophical camp in connection with the centenary anniversary of the death of Hegel, is only one of the external manifestations of the turn of bourgeois philosophy to Hegel.

In modernizing the philosophy of Hegel, the bourgeoisie is trying to find once again a philosophical weapon.

There are two main reasons for modern interest and the turn to Hegel in bourgeois philosophical literature.

The main reason for the revival of interest in Hegel is that due to the global crisis of capitalism and the aggravation of all its contradictions, we have a certain growth, strengthening and development of fascism in the main European countries, particularly in Germany. The reactionary, conservative, idealistic-mystical system of Hegelian philosophy is very attractive to fascism, can be used as a theoretical basis for it, can cause and really does attract special interest on its part.

The absolute idealism of Hegel serves as the basis for the wildest modern mystical, idealistic-religious views of the fascist bourgeois. The active feature of German classical idealism - the effectiveness of Hegelian philosophy is very attractive for the activist, offensive, effective character of the modern fascist movement. Consecration on the part of Hegel by the absolute spirit of his philosophy of the Prussian monarchy contemporary to him, nationalism and chauvinism, characteristic of Hegel's works — all this is extremely sympathetic to the mind and the heart, imperialist- conquering, nationalist- fascist moods of the bourgeoisie.

The modern Neo-Hegelian movement, largely intertwined with fascism, has deep social roots, a deep inner social basis.

The materials of the first international Hegelian congress, which took place last year in The Hague, provide a more or less comprehensive description of modern Neo-Hegelianism.

So, for example, one of the speakers at last year's Hegelian congress, Binder, on the question "Freedom as a right" (about Hegel's "philosophy of law") said that liberalism is not in a position to overcome the Marxist theory of the state, that it is helpless before the "extravagant demands of socialism" that only strong statehood, relying theoretically on the Hegelian theory of the state, can cope with Marxism.

He wrote: "It is quite consistent that socialism plays no role for Hegel: this is not due to the fact that Hegel was a philosopher to the well-fed bourgeoisie, as often argued in an undesirable sense for him, but because Hegel first found the correct concept of the state in which selfishness is removed as the driving principle of civil society. "

So Binder, relying on Hegel, using his legal philosophy, struggles with the "demands of socialism", with Marxism. He himself interprets in the following way the essence of Hegel's teaching on the state, on freedom and necessity:

"Since the spirit of God and the divine will are valid only in our consciousness and through our consciousness, and since the history of the development of the human spirit is at the same time the history of the realization of the divine spirit in the world, our freedom becomes all the more valid as we rise to our consciousness depending on the will of God, the more our individual will is killed in favor of the divine will ... We are all the more free, the more we are aware of ourselves puppets in the hands of God".

This is how the "puppet in the hands of God" and the real puppet in the hands of modern fascism, bourgeois professor Binder, are fighting with communism at the present time.

Fascist neohegelians are especially sophisticated on the issue of nation and state. At the center of the philosophical and sociological views of the fascist "theorists" is the question of the nation. Hegelian categories "whole and part", "general, special and individual", "unity", "integrity", etc. and t. p. are exploited in every

possible way by the fascists to justify their terrorist domination. Nation is integrity; a nation is a community that stands high above the individual — a person. The whole history, contrary to the hated Marxism, is not the history of the class struggle, but the history of the *struggle of nations*, the history of the struggle of "national spirits", "folk spirits", etc. Nationalism against communism, against Marxism — these are the main leitmotif of the fascist "theorists" and the fascist politicians; nationalism is an eternal category — these are the favorite conclusions of the fascist philosophers. Hegel's "Philosophy of History", his own "Philosophy of Law" - the main works from which they are sent. Prussian state philosopher of the first quarter of XIX at. - Hegel - the banner of modern fascism. In close connection with the problem of the nation is the problem of the state. A whole galaxy of fascist "theorists" is engaged in the theoretical development of this issue (Geller, Shpan, Binder, Moreau, etc.). It turns out that the "national spirit" - the nation - gets its highest incarnation in the state. It becomes above all, above culture, religion; she is the highest embodiment of morality. Hegel becomes the father of the modern fascist corporate state (Gentile). It is perfectly understandable that Hegel becomes even the spiritual progenitor of *modern imperialism* (Johann Plenche, Brunovic).

Secondly, interest in Hegel is undoubtedly associated with the current crisis of bourgeois science. This crisis, which has become *universal*, is characterized by the complete disintegration of the old form and thinking methods. More and more often, the voices of scientists in various fields of science, the voices of philosophers, naturalists, and sociologists are heard about the urgent need for a *logical, methodological* revolution. Increasingly, one can hear instructions about the need for a "new logic", "new philosophy", or, as some say, a "new table of categories". The keen need of modern science in a new methodology was expressed in its own way by Wigmans at the first Hegelian congress in The Hague, when he described the "tragedy of modern culture" and "longing for a single science of science".

The only way out of the *universal* crisis of science is possible only on the path of *dialectical materialism*, on the path of the methodology and ideology of the only progressive, revolutionary class of the modern era - the proletariat. This is the theoretical expression that the only possible way out of the *general* crisis of the entire capitalist system is possible only in the path of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of a socialist society.

However, imbued with class prejudice representatives of bourgeois philosophy and science, full of fear of materialism and dialectical materialism, "scientists men" do not bother to even meet with a rich literature on Marxist philosophy, filled with hatred for communism and the mortal terror of the proletarian revolution, seeking a way out of the crisis of science in the most extreme and diverse expressions of idealism, mysticism, and religious worldview. All this determines the interest in *idealistic methodology and idealistic dialectic*, the great creator and ingenious master of which was the absolute objective idealist Hegel.

It is time to get rid of a rather vulgar notion, which is found in the pages of our press, as if bourgeois philosophy refers only to the idealistic system of Hegel, leaving ostensibly the dialectical method completely aside. Modern Neo-Hegelianism is also characterized by the fact that it does not pass by Hegel's dialectics. Under the conditions of imperialism, in an environment of exceptional aggravation of class contradictions and class struggle, it is difficult for bourgeois, fascist "scientists" to pass by the logic of contradictions.

We have a lot of "works" devoted to Hegelian dialectics, dialectics in general. However, the "attention" of modern bourgeois philosophers to the dialectic is characterized by the fact that it is interpreted by them *exclusively mystically*. Hegel's dialectic is perverted in the sense that every revolutionary content is emasculated from it. "Divine" interpret vainly dialectic, turning it into sophistry, pre its rotation into a tool to justify the domination of capital, the conquest of power fascism, to fight the Marxist dialectic - this class, the political equivalent of the "attention" to the dialectic.

For us, therefore, of great interest is the modern interpretation of the issues of dialectics, the dialectical method in the philosophy of fascism and social fascism.

Let us here on these four basic kinds of bourgeois mystical interpretation of the Hegelian dialectic in recent years in the literature devoted to the issues of Hegelian philosophy: 1) to speculative dialectic, the main representative of which is the Kroner - Head of the International Union of Hegel; 2) on the subjective-idealistic interpretation of Hegel and his dialectic; the main representative of this direction is the former Minister of Public Education of Mussolini, the famous Italian fascist philosopher Gentile ; 3) on the critical dialectic, represented mainly by Jonas Kohn and the "left" social democrat, Breslavl professor Siegfried Mark, and finally 4) on the tragic dialectic represented by Arthur Libert .

Kroner is the most faithful Hegelian. Kroner is a pronounced idealist, a mystic. The path of Kroner is the path of the transformation of a neokantian into a neo-Hegelian In his main two-volume work " Von Kant bis Hegel " ("From Kant to Hegel"), he explicitly states that to understand Hegel is to see that it is absolutely impossible to go beyond its limits. Kroner says a lot about the idealistic mission of the German people. His philosophical works have a pronounced nationalistic -vinnistic hue.

"The great and sublime path of German idealism" is portrayed by Kroner in his work " Von Kant bis Hegel " as follows:

"In Kant, thinking focuses on itself in order to find in itself, in I, the basis of the world. In Fichte, it reveals God in the depths of I. In Schelling, it tends to seek God directly in the world (approaching Spinoza and Bruno). In Hegel, it ends up building worlds from an absolute or divine Self. There is no movement stopping anywhere on this path: whoever begins this path, he is drawn into motion and is carried further down to the end. "

Kroner considers the turn towards Hegel to be necessary in order to establish in the philosophy of the rule of *speculative metaphysics* instead of Kant's criticism, which dominated until very recently. Kroner emphasizes many times that the study of Hegel, even regardless of the general attitude towards him, is necessary because it is a high school, "which opens the spirit of scientific access to the problems of metaphysics."

If the Hegelian system of absolute idealism was such a system that was based, as it was repeatedly pointed out by Marx, Engels, Lenin, on a rich concrete historical material, then this epigon Hegel has a completely emaciated speculative speculation. He has a very strong intuitivistic , irrational interpretation of Hegel. This is how he defines what dialectics means: "Hegel is an irrationalist , because he is a *dialectician* , because *dialectics* is a *method* that has been transformed into rational irrationalism, because dialectical thinking is rational-irrational thinking."

Developing his "irrationalistic" interpretation of Hegel, he writes: "Hegel's thinking is as rational as it is irrational, super-rational or anti-rational " (Vol. II, p. 271). The meaning of this irrationalism in matters of dialectics in Kroner is very well revealed by his following consideration. He writes: "Dialectics is not rational, rational thinking, or it is not only it, but at the same time the self-movement of absolute spirit."

Let us now see how Kroner interprets the law of the unity of opposites, the law of contradictions. He distinguishes between "empirical contradiction" and "speculative contradiction." This is how he describes both types of contradictions associated with the two types of knowledge. "Empirical knowledge," he writes, "has no right to contradict itself: it must avoid contradiction." Here, according to Kroner , formal logic prevails. It is quite another thing speculative knowledge, speculative contradiction. "A speculative contradiction results from speculative reflection, just as an empirical contradiction results from an empirical reflection. But while experiential contradiction (as well as empirical negation) arises through false empirical judgment and therefore in a twofold sense must be avoided (firstly, because affirmative and negative empirical judgment cannot be both true, and, secondly, because denial of all here is merely the result of empirical fallacies that must be avoided, or, in other words, the consequence of false judgments are objective correlates empirical error) - speculative contradiction is absolutely inevitable, since pekulyativnaya reflection (and speculative negation)

owes its origin not to deviate from the positive and speculative knowledge is not based on deception and false judgment, but it is a necessary element of speculative knowledge.

Speculative knowledge is not empirical knowledge, for it is knowledge of Self (self-knowledge). ”

This is how Siegfried Mark characterizes the main idea of Hegelianism according to Kroner . He writes: "The path of the infinite divine spirit to itself through the world and through the finite spirit is the main motive of Hegelian philosophy."

So Kronerovskaya interpretation of Hegelian philosophy and dialectic is reduced to the following points: 1) instead of criticism of Kant - a requirement to return to the speculative metaphysics, 2) solid idealism, religious superstition, mysticism and irrationalism, 3) reduction of the dialectic only to speculative dialectic, 4) interpretation of the very dialectics as an expression of irrationalism. Such is generally Kroner's speculative dialectic .

The common basis of Hegel's Italian, fascist interpretation is the complete transference of dialectics into the "fold of spiritual activity." The subjective idealistic dialectic, the dialectic of the active thinking subject, is the basis of the "reform of Hegelian dialectics" on the part of the fascist Gentile . A very characteristic feature of the Italian neo-Hegelianism is its strictest activism, the rationale for extreme effectiveness, the extreme activity of the subject.

Fascist efficacy and activity in the struggle against the labor movement receives a rather vivid ideological expression in Gentile actualism . The main purpose of this "activity" of representatives of the doomed class is not in anything other than in sharp opposition to objective historical need, not in anything other than in an attempt to subdue the inexorable course of history with subjective activism, the necessary victory of the proletariat. Therefore, the philosophy of Gentile is a vivid expression of extreme subjectivism. He sees the only support of creativity and activity in the activities of the spirit itself. History, according to Gentile It turns out to be exclusively the product of this free creative spirit. Historical necessity is only the necessity of this spirit. Since the knowledge of real historical necessity, real historical laws for representatives of the bourgeoisie would only be able to sow despair, therefore, down with this necessity. Gentile reality is absolute, pure subjectivity. He distinguishes between *the thinking* mind and *imaginable* thinking. Not only things, the objective material world is dissolved by Gentile in thinking, but also thoughts are dissolved in thinking. This is the meaning of his conceivable thinking. Dialectic according to Gentile inherent only to the spirit. Things, nature, the world are inert products of the dialectic of spirit. Gentile dissatisfied with Heik's dialect . He is "reforming" her . From his point of view, Hegel's dialectic is too "objective", too "objective". The dialectic of Gentile is absolute freedom.

This is another type of modern Neo-Hegelian fascist interpretation of Hegel's dialectic.

The most widespread , especially in Germany, type of interest in Hegelian philosophy is the attempt to combine Hegel with Kant. Siegfried Mark, a representative of the so-called "critical dialectic", is just one of the characteristic philosophers who make such a connection.

To date, we can say, the official philosophy II Inta rnatsionala, along with a strong ma histskim course is neokantianism. Everyone knows the kind of work of the social fascists Forlender , Max Adler , etc. However, the fascist bourgeoisie turns to Hegel. Neo-Kantianism, Machism, phenomenologicalism among bourgeois philosophers gives way to Neo-Hegelianism, which organically merges with fascism. And the philosophers of modern social democracy, in accordance with the general process of fascization of social democracy, rush to unite Kant with Hegel.

Siegfried Mark is an extremely characteristic figure in this respect. Siegfried Mark is extremely eclectic. This "left" social fascist is a typical bourgeois professor of the old German school. He does not have any elements even of Marxist phraseology. But in his two-volume work "Dialectics in the Philosophy of Modernity" there are a number of pages specially devoted to criticism of Lenin's philosophical views. About them we will say next.

Siegfried Mark is a representative of "critical dialectics." "Critical dialectic", in his opinion, is the "type of philosophizing," which manifests itself in a number of philosophical trends of modern Germany ("The theory of the dialectic" Jonas Cohn, "The Psychology of thinking" Henigvalda , "The doctrine of ideas" B. Bauch , "Teaching on the significance of "P. Hoffman," Phenomenology of knowledge "by Cassirer ," Dialectical Phenomenology " Litt). "Critical dialectic" - in Z view . March - belongs to the future. In what What is the essence of this "critical dialectic"? - The idea of combining Hegel's dialectic with Kantian criticism. This idea was most fully and thoroughly developed by I. Kon in his book Theorie der Dialektik . Siegfried Mark repeatedly declares his agreement with Kohn. He contrasts the "critical dialectic" with the dialectic speculative or metaphysical, of which he considers the classic representative of Hegel himself, and among modern philosophers, the neo-Hegelian Kroner .

Jonas Kohn, with whom Mark agrees, believes that "the basic idea of his (ie , Hegel) dialectics must be freed from rationalistic delusion and its consequences: one-dimensionality, finitism and creative denial." By "one-dimensional", Cohn understands the monistic character of Hegel's philosophy, his attempt to derive his entire system from a single philosophical principle. By "finitism," Cohn understands an absolutely complete character, with a claim to which Hegelian philosophy advocated. Finally, denying the "creative nature" of denial, Cohn opposes the Hegelian law of denial. We see, therefore, that Cohn's criticism of Hegel, indicating at the reactionary nature of Hegelian idealism ("the absolutely complete character of the system"), at the same time also directed against the most important moments of Hegelian dialectics. The criticism of Hegel by Jonas Cohn is a criticism from the point of view of idealism more inconsistent, from the point of view of positivist eclectic idealism.

Siegfried Mark "deepens" the Kon's criticism of the Hegelian dialectic. He believes that the main drawback of this dialectic lies in "the main metaphysical premise ... in self-movement." Criticizing Hegel's idealism from the standpoint of vulgar, vulgar th, eclectic idealism, W . At the same time, Mark opposes the dialectic of self-movement, the dialectical law of the struggle of opposites. He tries to emasculate all the revolutionary moments from dialectics, especially the role of "creative denial" and "self-movement" as a result of the struggle of opposites.

Siegfried Mark believes that "critical dialectics should limit ourselves to the sphere of our thinking." Turning then to the Marxist dialectic, Siegfried Mark tries his best to prove its " unscientific nature ". Especially hateful to Mark is the deep inner connection that exists between dialectic and materialism. He directs a series of pages of his book against dialectical materialism, while revealing the typical ignorance of the bourgeois professor in matters relating to Marxism. Here is what he writes, for example: "In Marx, we find the preservation of the Hegelian technique, its original and profound transformation and at the same time its transfer to the soil where it is doomed to wither or die. Even in the consciousness of Marx himself, the simple "flirting" of Hegelian terminology stands side by side with the central importance of dialectics for all historical materialism. In the twists and turns of the development of Marx, the matter did not come (between the "criticism of the Hegelian philosophy of law" and the economic system) to build an independent methodology, which he designed as an all-encompassing dialectic. Therefore, for Marxist dialectics one has to turn to Engels's summarizing interpretation, which partly consciously popularizes these thoughts, and partly involuntarily vulgarizes them. However, on the basis of this interpretation, a *vulgar dialectic* developed , which was canonized by official communism (Lenin, Bukharin, Deborin) " .

It is hardly necessary for our reader to comment and criticize in detail this vulgarity against Marxism, which was written by the "left" social-fascist Siegfried Mark, revealing exceptional ignorance in the basic problems of Marxist philosophy.

First of all, the opposition of Engels and Marx is characteristic here. Mark is not "original" in this, he repeats the battered, moldy, but rather favorite "method of criticism" of Marxism by bourgeois professors and all kinds of revisionists. Further, what is worth the bawdy conclusion of this social-fascist "professor", this faithful dog of capitalism against Lenin's "vulgar dialectic". Finally, it is very symptomatic that Mark took Lenin, Deborin and

Bukharin by one bracket. However, he does not stop there. He continues to "criticize" Lenin's "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism".

That's one of the places, against Lenin: "Some hints of Lenin (he is referring to Lenin," Mate . And Empirico-criticism "- *M. M*) go in the direction of a real dialectic, also in the critique of cognition (ie. E in the area. epistemology); repulsing the subjective- empirical, and therefore uncritical, Machists idealism, Lenin expresses some just thoughts. But the stubborn retention of the naive basis and the pairing that follows from it (binding, violent connection (*Verkoppelung*) of dialectics with materialism is by no means ground for the all-embracing philosophy of Marxism, for the developed philosophy of Marxism, for the developed Marxist dialectics".

For the idealist Kantian sense, eclectically combining Kant to Hegel, for materialism enemy, Brand totally unacceptable *Connect* , *communicate* , materialism and dialectics plexus. And how much strength he has. he fights against dialectical materialism. This is the third kind of "dialectic", the so-called "critical dialectic".

We now turn to the next type of bourgeois interpretation of dialectics, the so-called "tragic dialectic."

An extremely interesting figure on the bourgeois "philosophical front" is the author and creator of the so-called *tragic dialectics* - Arthur Liebert . Perhaps, in the field of ideology, this philosopher of the bourgeoisie with the greatest vividness, courage and consistency expressed all the hopelessness of the position of the bourgeoisie and the hopelessness of its contradictions.

In his book "The World and the Spirit of Dialectics," he accuses Hegel of the fact that his dialectics allegedly is harmonious, humanistic, therefore Hegel "removes", resolves contradictions. From his point of view, a type of dialectic should be created, "which can no longer be for us the way to" remove "opposites". The dialectic should, in his opinion, help us to expose "indestructible antagonisms of reality", "dissonances of life", "existing contradictions in the commotion of life" with "inexorable".

He writes: " However, since the philosophical, historical, spiritual and moral conditions that caused this type of dialectics changed drastically, as we entered, together with modernity, into a new spiritual situation, full of the greatest crises and antinomies, then that dialectic, which we defend must take on new features ... A new type of dialectic must have a *tragic character* . Therefore, we can talk about the *tragic type of dialectics* . "

Developing these thoughts, Liebert reveals further, so to speak, the "social roots" of this type of dialectic. He writes: "At the same time, only she (that is , the tragic dialectic) responds to the spiritual situation that has developed in recent decades under the insurmountable pressure of severe external and internal experiences ...

The age of technology and economy, social battles and gigantic organizations of trade and industry caused such an outlook and a life-understanding that took us far from the classical frame of mind and understanding of being and which cannot directly convey the meaning to those ideals that were worshiped in the era of classicism. "

According to Liebert , Hegel "is below the concept of dialectics that was achieved by Kant," because he supposedly covered and softened the contradictions, because he did not understand "that deep tragedy that lies in the essence of dialectics."

In a number of places with a decent zeal he continued to emphasize its basic setting, that "The dialectic is our most fruitful th means to still more and more light shed on the dissonances of life, e g indestructible antinomy ... that" the concept of dialectics to we are no longer an aid to leveling and settling contradictions, but it is an expression of a completely tragic installation (that's it! - *M. M*), which again and again forces us to recognize the main Kantian antinomy of being and more of ... "

It is hardly required special comments to these places from the works of Liebert . Undoubtedly, his philosophical works are an excellent ideological expression of the crisis of the capitalist system and the crisis of capitalist ideology.

“The newest philosophy is as much of a party as it was two thousand years ago,” wrote Lenin. - The contending parties are essentially, to cover erudite -sharlatanskimi new nicknames or void of understanding non-partisanship are materialism and idealism. The latter is only a refined , refined form of fideism, which is fully armed, has enormous organizations and continues to work steadily on the masses, relying on the slightest wavering of philosophical thought for themselves”(Vol. XIII, p. 292).

Written in 1908 city of these lines of Lenin particularly fresh in the moment. The closer a capitalist society to its death, the more clearly and clearly the proletarian revolution knocks on the capitalist countries, the more the philosophy of the bourgeoisie becomes more reactionary , the more subtle forms of masking the masses are invented by its “ scientific clerks and footmen” all the more subtle forms of "filthy, stinking" (*Lenin*) and fideism dragging religious outlook.

In the present period of sharp aggravation of the struggle of the two systems - the intensification of the class struggle in science and philosophy takes on ever more distinct forms: in them - in the West - a process of decomposition, a crisis of ideology, a process of fascization of science and philosophy; here, in the USSR , we have a powerful flourishing of science and technology, a profound process of restructuring all science on the basis of dialectical materialism.

FASCISM AND SOCIAL-FASCISM AT THE SECOND HEGEL CONGRESS

The second Hegelian congress, convened by Hegelbund , took place from October 18 to October 22 in Berlin . The state of contemporary bourgeois philosophy that we described above, in particular the state of modern neo-Hegelianism, was clearly expressed in the works of the congress. This Hegelian Congress was the mirror that reflected the crisis, decay, marasmus, senile weakness, and the full and power of bourgeois science. At the same time, the congress passed under the sign of extreme militancy against materialism, Marxism, Bolshevism, communism. Hegelbund leaders turned this congress into a nationalistic -fascist celebration in the fascist religious demonstration. Let us use a number of opinions of bourgeois and social fascist journalists and writers on the nature of the work of the congress. It is unlikely that they can be accused of an "impartial" approach. We cannot find better witnesses.

A Ludwig Marcuse in " Berliner Tageblatt " 1931 22 October city of published article, "Professor Hegel," in which he gives an overall assessment of the Congress. Here is what he writes:

“In Berlin University, followers of Hegel from Germany, Holland, Italy gathered. In more than a dozen large reports, they set forth the main parts of Hegel's teaching: phenomenology, logic, state philosophy, aesthetics, and religion philosophy. Outstanding scholars have reported with scientific thoroughness and with deep love for their philosopher about Hegel's research in various areas of his universal thinking ... And yet ! We have received little more than a thorough exposition of Hegel's teachings. Hegel was not connected with our living consciousness, his thinking was not compared with the spiritual conjuncture of our time ... In the end, we saw Hegel under the glass bell of the philosophical seminary ... he was not taken out of the case of history and special terminology to show, freely interpreting his teaching, what answers he gives to the problems of our time. The language of the congress was not German, not Italian, but Hegelian. ”

Marcuse ends his assessment of the congress as follows: “The Hegelian Congress ended with the proposal of Pastor Lasson to rejoin his religious community. A good conclusion is the Sunday sermon - but is this really all that Hegel can give to our, who are in a restructuring, striving for spiritual order of the world? ”

Mr. Marcuse in general quite well describes in his article the helplessness, ideological flabbiness of modern "professorial" science. However, he vainly accuses the congress of the complete lack of effectiveness, of its lack of focus on modernity in the sense of defending fascism and fighting communism. Professors perform well the

“social order” of their masters. They were afraid that the word "Marxism" was mentioned at the congress. The leadership of the congress did not allow the Soviet delegation to the congress.

Only the aforementioned pastor Lasson mentioned in a few words in his closing remarks about the “sect”, which drew the name of Hegel on his banner and at the same time dares to adhere to the slogan “religion is opium for the people”.

The report of Gentile on Hegel and the State testifies to how liberal Marcuse covers the fascist orientation of the congress . It should be noted that the German press especially describes the Gentile and its report. So “Hanover Courier” wrote that “the speech of Professor Gentile from Rome in relation to its historical impact on our time is the topic of inexhaustible content”. What kind of "ideas" did this "theorist" of black-shirts develop, who had come specially from Rome to glorify the fascist state, hiding behind the banner of Hegel. According to Gentile State (read: fascist state Mussolini) is the realization of the world reason in morality. Not the welfare is the goal of the state, but its existence as the freedom of a higher authority. The individual does not have any right to the state, except the right of sacrifice for him. Of this basic concept of the state, Hegel did, according to Gentile , more than commanders and politicians. Even tax legislation is fundamentally subject, according to Gentile , to the influence of the Hegelian spirit, for the modern doctrine of taxes recognizes that the state has the right to demand them from citizens as a victim and, moreover, unlimitedly. Hegel's theory of law, in the opinion of the "respectable" Gentile , overcame the rationalistic theory of natural law. Similarly, with regard to private law, Hegel, in the opinion of Gentile , overcame the view that it arose and is valid due to the contract concluded by individuals.

Do we need a brighter and more consistent defense of the "strong" fascist state, its terror against the workers, its squeezing of all the juices from the proletariat! Do we need a clearer sermon on the struggle against the labor movement than was illustrated by the “professor” Gentile in his report !

The open preaching of fascism was combined with the preaching of religion, clericalism, mystics. The same “Hannover Courier” writes: “Just as the philosophy of the life of Hegel found its apogee in the philosophy of religion, just as the real congress reached its peak in the report of the chairman and head of the congress Lasson on the“ Hegelian philosophy of religion ”. Another newspaper writes: “It was the uplifting spirit of the final moment of the congress, when Lasson , with sincere sympathy from the audience, could show that Hegel’s religiosity was not at all something played out for his personal gain, as he often tried to ascribe to him, it corresponds to the deep, repeatedly expressed features of his spirit. ”

For the sake of completeness, it is necessary to dwell on the fact that the Congress was addressed by the Prussian Minister of Public Education, the social-fascist Grimm , who welcomed the congress on behalf of the Prussian government. With its presence this social fascist sanctifies this most reactionary bourgeois nationalist congress. The social fascist welcomes the congress as a representative of the bourgeois state, as a faithful footman and an active defender of capitalism. After his speech at the congress, he receives spits from the hosts for daring in his speech to mention the name of Marx, the only time mentioned at all at the congress. We do not have a transcript of his speech, but it is not required. He wrote a big article about the congress in Forverto - Live Hegel. Required This article is somewhat to dwell on, since it is characteristic of the ideology of modern social fascism. Several times in his article, Grimme talks about "the fathers of the social democratic movement - Marx, Engels, Lassalle ". Lassalleanism, in its worst expression, is now becoming quite widespread in modern German social democracy.

We will not touch the idle talk, characteristic of the whole article by Grimm , the chauvinistic-nationalist moments with which it is imbued, the praises of Hegel in the spirit of the bourgeois press. Let us dwell on the question that directly interests us - on his understanding of the relationship between Marx and Hegel. That's what he writes on this issue: “With all this we do not at all mean to say that there can be no difference between Marx and Hegel. There is something substantially distinguishing them from each other ... It is not that Marx’s Hegelian dialectic is mistakenly applied to reality, for even Hegel understands dialectics as the law of real

processes (!!). The difference does not lie in the fact that Hegel allows historical development to reach its peak in an "absolute spirit"; Marx and Engels' word about a leap from the need for freedom turns out, on closer inspection, very close, if not identical in meaning (!!!). And just in the wrong lies difference that Hegel as if it did not know yet the contradictions between the bourgeois and the proletarian class. Hegel saw him with all clarity (!!); However, he thought that there is a possibility of eliminating this fundamental for modern society opposition between the thesis "bourgeoisie" and the antithesis "proletariat" within the given society itself ... And this is where the separation begins in the evaluation of the relationship between Hegel and Marx ... On the contrary, for Marx and Engels, the overcoming of contradictions is accomplished only when the working class conquers the only *planned consumption economy* as the basis of the new society, corresponding to the socialization of labor”.

The reader will not complain to us for the fact that we have given such a long extract from Grimme's article . The ideology of social fascism, in particular the question of the relationship between Marx and Hegel, in its interpretation here gets its distinct expression. Grimme identifies the dialectic of Hegel and Marx completely in the “ Storinsky ” style. Idealism comes through in every confused line of this Minister of National Education. What else is extremely curious is the petty-bourgeois view of the “basis of the new society” as a “planned use-based economy”.

In conclusion, we give another review of a certain Paul Feldkeller about the general character of the Hegelian congress. Here is what he writes: “The result of the congress was not the killing of Hegelian thought, but its dissemination among wider circles and the continuation of work on it. Only Nikolai Hartman touched upon the cognitive value of Hegel's dialectic and raised questions that concerned philosophy in the closest sense of the word. In other cases, we heard mostly confessions, not motivations, retellings, but not explanations. In this regard, we must not forget that, in spite of all school work, our time is unfavorable for philosophy in the sense that th e understood the Hellenic consciousness and the new time. People reconciled with the world and take it for what it is. But the time of the Faustian mood, the time of that philosophical pathos that once inspired German idealism and the subsequent philosophy up to Nietzsche, this time has now clearly passed. ”

Pessimism, “the absence of the pathos of the modern bourgeoisie”, its senile infirmity in the field of science and philosophy - Paul Feldkatep expressed quite well in these final lines. The bourgeois philosophy of the modern period is in a deep crisis, a complete disorder. Modern bourgeois philosophy is *incapable of* any serious creative development. The only thing that it is capable of is the restoration of certain past philosophical trends that are suitable for justifying capitalist slavery. All sorts neotecheniya , neonapravleniya - that's what it is. However, modern bourgeois ideologists are incapable of understanding even, incapable of rising to the level of their classics, incapable of comprehending what is truly valuable and historically vital that is in the works of the classics of bourgeois ideology. This is not surprising, since the modern historical stage in the development of the bourgeoisie is fundamentally different from the time when it was a revolutionary, rising, historically progressive class.

Modern bourgeois philosophy is completely in the bosom of mysticism, undisguised clericalism, in captivity of the wildest religious prejudices. Modern neo-Hegelianism is entirely in the service of fascism. External scholarship , school tinsel, university gilt cover its full ideological flabbiness and its impotence . The Second Hegelian Congress demonstrated all these processes with perfect clarity .

Only the proletariat is the sole heir not only of the material productive forces of bourgeois society and the values that it has created. He is also the only legitimate heir to the best that was created by bourgeois culture — science, philosophy. However, the proletariat does not simply assimilate this inheritance, it processes it on the basis of the only consistent revolutionary worldview - on the basis of dialectical materialism, ruthlessly sweeping out all the bourgeois trash, sweeping aside all harmful and reactionary traits, sides, moments.

THE IDEALISTIC ESSENCE OF HEGEL'S PHILOSOPHY AND CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE SYSTEM AND METHOD

Hegelian philosophy, like any other philosophy, is the product of its era. It is a product of the era of bourgeois revolutions, a magnificent theoretical construction. It is a reflection in the ideological sphere of class conflicts of the end of the XVIII and the first quarter of the XIX century. Hegelian philosophy is a product of the epoch of the Great French Revolution of the end of the 18th century.

The Hegelian dialectic, the revolutionary side of his teaching, this "algebra of revolution", is a theoretical generalization in abstract categories of the logic of the revolutionary processes of this historical period. Though Hegel's idealistic, but nevertheless revolutionary, the doctrine of unity and struggle of opposites, as the basis of any development, Hegel's doctrine of the leap, its revolutionary doctrine of denial of denial is the stamp of the revolutionary era, the era of bourgeois revolutions.

The direct influence of the revolutionary battles of this historical period is especially felt in the Hegelian Phenomenology of the Spirit, in this most revolutionary of his works.

Hegel always spoke with great enthusiasm about the French Revolution. In his "Philosophy of History" he wrote about it the following: "Since the sun shines in the sky and the planets are turning around it, it has never been before a man stands on his head, that is, he reconstructs reality according to his ideas. Anaxagoras was the first to say that reason controls the world, but only now for the first time a person has come to recognize that thought must dominate the sphere of spiritual activity.

It was a magnificent sunrise. All thinking people happily welcomed the advent of a new era. The solemn mood prevailed over this time, and the whole world was imbued with the enthusiasm of the spirit, as if for the first time its reconciliation with the deity took place."

In this description of the French Revolution, however, the whole of Hegel: Hegel is an idealist and at the same time Hegel is a dialectician; Hegel is a bourgeois *revolutionary of thought*, in which he feels, as he himself said, "explosions of the revolutionary oppression", and Hegel is a *reactionary*, Hegel is an idealist, Hegel is the creator of his system, which, according to him, cost him "more hard work of thought than the method", and aimed ultimately at the justification of the Prussian monarchy.

Marx, describing the philosophy of Kant, wrote that it was "the *German theory of the French Revolution*." This characteristic can be rightly applied to all German classical philosophies, especially to Hegel. In what is the essence of this specific characteristic, in which the essence of the German theory of revolution, Engels clears up well in "Ludwig Feuerbach." He writes there:

"Just as in France XVIII . - In the 19th century Germany, the philosophical revolution served as an introduction to political upheaval. But how different are these philosophical revolutions. The French are waging an open war with all official science, with the church, often with the state; their works are printed on the other side of the border, in Holland, in England, and they themselves often move to the Bastille. On the contrary, the Germans are professors, the state appointed mentors of youth; their writings were approved by the leadership authorities, and the Hegel system — the crown of all philosophical development — is, as it were, raised even to the rank of royal-Prussian state philosophy. And behind these professors, in their pedantically dark words, in their clumsy, boring periods was the revolution hidden ?!

The French bourgeoisie is storming the strongholds of feudalism, arranging revolutionary terror against the nobility, fighting the feudal reaction of the whole world; The German bourgeoisie, flabby and impotent in the struggle against feudalism, with the Prussian junkers, creates, in the person of its ideologists, a revolution in the field of spirit, in the field of thinking, in order to reconcile in practice with the Prussian monarchy and even this reconciliation is theoretically justified. Hegel's "Philosophy of Law" is a work that sanctifies the monarchy of Friedrich Wilhelm II with the absolute spirit of his philosophical system.

The largest philosophical systems that impose an imprint on the development of philosophy, which are certain historical steps in this development, such as, for example, Hegelian philosophy, are the product, reflection and expression in the field of the ideology of the class relations of their era as a whole. In this sense, we are talking about Hegelian philosophy as an ideology and product of the entire epoch of bourgeois revolutions. However, one or another ideologue grows out of the relationship of classes, from the state of the class struggle of their homeland. Being the product of the whole era of bourgeois revolutions of the end of the XVIII and beginning of the XIX century. On the whole, Hegelian philosophy at the same time is a product of German conditions, German class relations. Hegel is the ideologist of the German bourgeoisie of the first half of the XIX century. This explains the specific reactionary conclusions of his system. Engels, in the same "Ludwig Feuerbach", wrote: "So, the internal contradictions of the system alone sufficiently explain why the extremely revolutionary method of thinking led to a very peaceful political conclusion. However, we owe the specific form of this conclusion to the fact that Hegel was a German and, like his compatriot Goethe, is a decent philistine. Hegel, like Goethe, was in his area Zeus-Olympian, but neither could completely get rid of the spirit of the German branch office."

Such is, in general terms, the social background of the main contradiction, penetrating from beginning to end into Hegelian philosophy — the contradiction of its method and system. "But this meant admitting absolute truth," Engels writes, "all the dogmatic content of Hegel's system and thus become in contradiction with his dialectical method, decomposing everything dogmatic."

Hegelian dialectics as the most comprehensive, as the richest in content, as the most profound teaching on development, Lenin believes, is the greatest acquisition of German classical philosophy. The Hegelian dialectic, was Marx - Engels turned from head to foot, was materialistically reworked. The materialistic dialectic is the "fundamental theoretical basis of Marxism." It is not my task now to give a detailed description of the entire Hegel system; I will dwell only on some basic points that characterize Hegel's theory as a theory of idealistic dialectics, so that the analysis and disclosure of the limitations and internal contradictions of this theory show how Marx, Engels overcome these contradictions, like Marx, Engels *they create the theory of materialist dialectics* and how Lenin develops it further.

Undoubtedly, the Hegelian "Science of Logic", which is his unfolded idealistic theory of dialectics, is the largest work in the entire world philosophical literature, after the brilliant pleiad of French materialists.

What are the main characteristics of the Hegelian idealist theory of dialectics? Here we have to mention, from the whole sum of these problems, only those that are necessary in order to understand the essence of this theory, as well as the main problems of the theory of materialist dialectics. These are the following problems: 1) *Hegel's absolute, objective idealism*, 2) *Hegel's unity, logic* and theory of knowledge on an *idealistic basis*, 3) a comprehensive picture of the dialectical laws on an idealistic basis, 4) basic, internal contradictions of Hegel's system as a whole and Hegel's Logic "in particular.

It is known that Hegel is an absolute idealist. The absoluteness of his idealism lies in the fact that in the center of his entire philosophical system, in the center of all his logic in particular, is the development of an absolute idea. We can say this: the Hegelian philosophy, its entire system as a whole have essentially *a single object*, and the only one subject - is *the development of the absolute idea in various e e forms and types of manifestation and realization*.

Hegel is an *objective idealist*. Hegel understands the subject completely differently than the subject is understood in other philosophical systems, particularly in Kant, etc. The Hegelian subject is not a concrete empirical person; the Hegelian subject is not an individual with limited individual consciousness; the Hegelian subject is not the finite human spirit. The subject of his philosophy is an *objectified consciousness*, it is an infinite thinking spirit, a thought in and for itself; the Hegelian subject is an absolute idea, manifesting, among other things, in the finite human spirit. That is what is the main subject of his whole "Logic." In this sense, Hegel is an absolute objective idealist.

How does he, on the basis of his identity of subject and object, on the basis of his objective and absolute idealism, understand what logic is?

In the Science of Logic, he defines in the following way what is the subject of logic and what it is:

“Thus, pure science offers liberation from the opposition of consciousness. It contains a thought, because the latter is also a thing in itself, because it is also a pure thought. As a science, truth is a *purely self-developing consciousness and has an image of the self, which is the cognizable concept in itself and for itself, the concept as such is the essence in itself and for itself. This objective thinking is the content of pure science* . The latter, therefore, is so formal in such a small measure, how little it is devoid of matter for real and true knowledge, that its content, on the contrary, is the only absolutely true, or if the word “matter” can be used here, but such matter, the form of which is not something external, since this matter is actually pure thought, therefore, it should be an absolute form. *Logic should therefore be understood as the system of pure reason, the realm of pure thought. This kingdom is truth, as it is without cover in itself and for itself* . It can therefore be expressed in such a way that: this content is the *image of God* , what it is in its eternal essence before the creation of the world and the finite spirit. ”

In this rather long statement, the essence of the Hegelian interpretation of logic is given. Here the absolute, objective idealism of his philosophy is very pronounced, his dialectic and the internal organic contradiction of his system are also expressed. First of all, the following conclusion can be drawn from this characteristic of Hegelian logic: Hegel on an idealistic basis *tries to solve the problem of content and form in logic, the problem of historical and logical abstract and concrete, and so on* . From this definition of logic, it turns out that logic itself is true, and is the content of the developing thinking itself and in itself. The surrounding external world according to Hegel is essentially only applied logic. History is also applied logic. Nature and society are the same. Everywhere and everywhere he tries to find definitions of logic, instead of comprehending "the peculiar logic of a peculiar subject," as Marx said. We give some characteristics of Marx from his “Critics of the Philosophy of Law”, which contain an exceptional in depth criticism of Hegelian idealism. Describing the system and the method of Hegel, Marx writes: "Interest is directed only to the fact that in each element, be it an element of the state, be it an element of nature, again find a pure idea", "logical idea", the real subjects, such as here " political structure ", become simple *names of ideas* , and we as a result have only the appearance of real cognition. These subjects are the essence and remain incomprehensible, definitions that are not comprehended in their specific features "(“ Archive M. - E. ”, vol. III, p. 149). Marx discovers the emptiness of Hegel’s constructions, which he gets as a result of his idealism, and *the arbitrariness of many of his constructions* , resulting - in spite of his dialectical method - from his idealistic system, from his desire for a complete, closed system.

Marx and Engels were the only thinkers who gave the most profound interpretation of the “living” in Hegelian philosophy, brilliantly revealing the inner struggle of the “living” and “ dead ” in the system of the great German idealist-dialectic. Here is another place from Marx “Critics of the philosophy of law”, which characterizes the weaknesses of Hegelian idealism, as well as idealism in general. “Concrete content,” writes Marx, “a real definition acts as a formal moment, and an absolutely abstract definition of form acts as a concrete content. The essence of state definitions is not that they are state definitions, but that in their most abstract form they can be viewed as logical and metaphysical definitions. The center of gravity of interest lies not in the sphere of the philosophy of law, but in the sphere of logic (“Archive of M. - E.”, vol. III, p. 153).

From the above Hegelian definition of logic, we saw that Hegel, on the basis of his idealism, wanted to solve the problem of form and content in Logic. Lenin repeatedly notes this moment, describing Hegelian logic. Thus, regarding the Hegelian position, in which he criticizes Kant, “it is not true that they are” external forms “,” forms that are only forms on the content, not the content itself ”, Lenin notes:“ Hegel demands logic, which form would be meaningful forms, forms of living, real content, connected inseparably with the content itself ”(IX collection, p. 39). Further, Hegel’s idea that not only “external form” but also content should be involved in “mental consideration”, that “with this introduction of content into considerations of logic” “it is not things that

are the subject, but the essence, the concept of things" - Lenin, noting the importance of these moments, gives at the same time, an extremely profound materialistic interpretation of this problem: "not the things, but the laws of their movements are materialistic," he writes ("Lenin's Collection" IX, p. 43).

Putting this way the question of form and content, Hegel gives an extremely interesting and deep criticism of formal logic. Pages Hegel, devoted to criticism of formal logic, especially in its 3rd - the second part, where he analyzes the formal judgment, concluding s and the formal concept, and in the 2 - nd part, the chapter of the unity of opposites - a wonderful page.

Which line goes from him this criticism of formal logic? He criticizes the *emptiness of formal logic*, the *separation of form from content*, he says that formal logic is *only an empty enumeration of the forms of thinking, that formal logic does not know the transition of one form to another, does not know the movement of these forms*. It shows the lifelessness and frozen dead logic of formal logic and, in contrast to this, puts forward its own understanding of the concept associated with his system as a whole. The Hegelian concept is the opposite of the formal-logical concept. However, it is the antipode idealistic. The concept in Hegel is the identity of form and content, subject and object, the complete reduction of being to thought. Hegel's concept is the demiurge of reality. Its concept is the idealistic unity of opposites.

To overcome the lifelessness, the dead emptiness of formal logic, "worthy of contempt and ridicule," as he puts it, Hegel gave the concept of vitality, internal struggle of contradictions, self-movement. In order to overcome formalism, Hegel in his philosophy, in his teachings on the concept, spliced a mental form with content. *However, this fusion, identification turned out to be such that the concept overcame, devoured the objective, objective world.*

To strike a static, empty dead forms of formal logic, Hegel gave them self-motion. However, this is a self-movement of the concept as a demiurge of validity. In order to criticize and overcome the dualism of form and content, characteristic of Kant, in order to abandon the "appearance" of forms, Hegel introduces content into the consideration of logic; However, this content is not at all the content of an objective material process - it is a mental content, it is a spiritual content.

Thus, the unity of form and content, which Hegel gives in his Science of Logic, is unity on the basis of idealism. As a step forward compared to the empty formalism of formal logic, compared with priori ornymi forms of Kant, Hegel all the same gives only the appearance of solving the problem. Only the dialectical materialist point of view, only the logic in its Marxist understanding, consistently and fully carried out Only this point of view of the unity of opposites really solves the problem of form and content. In this connection, the profound content of Lenin's definition of logic becomes clear. "Logic," he writes, in the IX Collection, on p. 41, "is a teaching not about external forms of thinking, but about the laws of development of" all material, natural, and spiritual things, "that is, the development of the entire concrete content of the world and knowledge his, that is, the sum, the sum, the conclusion of the *history of the knowledge of the world.*"

In his article "On the Question of Dialectics," Lenin points out: "Dialectics is the theory of knowledge (Hegel and) Marxism." On the basis of this indication, the Menshevik idealists *identified the* solution of this question in Hegel and in Marxism. Meanwhile, such an identification is completely wrong, is an idealistic revision of Marxism. Dialectics as a theory of knowledge from Hegel is given on the basis of idealism. Hegel has an idealistic solution to this crucial question, in Marxism it has a materialistic solution. The fact is that for Hegel the dialectic is the theory of the knowledge of idealism, and for Marxism the dialectic is the theory of the knowledge of materialism. With this radical opposition, the commonality here lies in the fact that Hegel and Marxism does not tear apart and does not oppose dialectics and the theory of knowledge, - both Hegel and Marxism provide a model of historicity in approaching this problem, but Hegel has historicity idealistic, in Marxism true historicity, historicity on the basis of materialism.

In Che m is the meaning of the resolution of this issue in Hegel? Hegel, the first in the history of the new philosophy, dealt a severe blow to the *anti-historical, metaphysical*, so to speak *critical*, theory of knowledge

of Kant. Since the whole pleiad of neo-Kantians, up to Max Adler, stands entirely on Kant's positions in this matter - so far Hegelian criticism is also directed against them.

Kant assumed that in the interpretation of the main problems of philosophy, in the interpretation of the questions of knowledge, he did such a historical matter, such a revolution, which can be compared with the revolution that Copernicus accomplished in astronomy. The essence of this revolution, in the opinion of Kant himself, is that he created an *a priori* theory of knowledge, previously given before any process of knowledge; he created a super- and nadistoricheskuyu , reasoned *out* the process of learning the theory of knowledge. At the same time, Kant proceeded from a completely false premise that in order to substantiate knowledge, knowledge, one must go beyond it, one must distract from the process of knowledge, one must *indicate in advance* its boundaries. In a word, according to the apt expression of Hegel, who criticized him just at that time, he wanted to learn how to swim without entering the water.

In this respect, Hegel makes a giant step forward in comparison with Kant . On the basis of his absolute, objective idealism, he wants to give a *theory of knowledge*, which takes into account the historical process, the historical path of knowledge. On the basis of his idealism, he tries to give a logical picture of the world-historical experience and historical knowledge of humanity. This side of Hegel's "Science of Logic" Lenin repeatedly noted in their journals (IX collection, page 79.): "It seems Hegel ber e t its self-development concepts in connection with the history of philosophy. It gives more *new* side of the whole "logic". Particular attention should be paid to the following place of Lenin: "the concept (knowledge) in being (in immediate phenomena) reveals the essence (the law of cause, identity, difference, etc.) - such is the *general course of all human knowledge* (of all science) in general. Such is the course of both *natural science and political economy* (and history). Hegel's dialectic is so far as a generalization of the history of thought "(XII collection, p. 291).

Noting this important side of Hegel's understanding of logic, dialectics and theory of knowledge, noting this, Hegel tried to solve the dialectical problem of the unity of the historical and the logical - we should not avoid Hegel's limitations on this issue - because he had an idealistic solution to this question. The actual history of the actual process of cognition on the basis of practice does not constitute for it the basis for logical laws and categories, which constitute the thinking forms reflecting this process, but, on the contrary, its basis, the basis of the historical, is logical.

Hegel's "Phenomenology of the Spirit" and "Science of Logic" are the essence of two works that complement each other, being in organic connection with each other. It is difficult to understand one of these works without the other.

For the question of "Phenomenology of the Spirit" that interests us, it is extremely important. Engels in Ludwig Feuerbach characterized this work of Hegel in the following way : "It could be called parallel to the embryology and paleontology of the spirit, the development of individual consciousness at its various stages, viewed as *abbreviated reproduction of the stages* historically passed by human consciousness". "Phenomenology of Spirit" because of its *historical approach* , due to the huge historic flair and the material that the author has worked, thanks to the deep revolutionary saturation, which is contained in this book, is much higher than the so-called "critical" Kant's works, devoted questions of the theory of knowledge. However, here, too, Hegel's idealism, which is filled with this book from the beginning to the end, does not give Hegel the opportunity to completely resolve the questions posed. The result of his whole "Phenomenology of the Spirit" is the identity of subject and object, consciousness and object, pure thought, pure self-consciousness, an absolute idea.

Historicism is the greatest idea of the theory of knowledge, carried out by Hegel in the interpretation of logic. However, in Hegel the real story is subordinate to logic: the real story according to Hegel is the story of the self-development of the spirit, or rather, the real story is the realization of the development of absolute spirit. Practice is introduced by Hegel into the theory of knowledge, into logic. About this, we also find a number of instructions from Lenin. However, here too, the practice of Hegel is understood in an idealistic spirit; practice is only spiritual practice, thinking.

So, Hegel gives the formulation of the most important questions that raise him high above Kant. He gives us the identity of dialectic, logic, theory of knowledge, but identity on an idealistic basis. It is Hegel's idealism that makes all its limitations and the contradictions that are characteristic of his philosophy.

The main internal contradiction of Hegelian philosophy is, as we have already seen, the contradiction between the method and the system, the contradiction between absolute idealism and the dialectical method. For the dialectical method there is nothing fixed once and for all; absolute, absolute. The dialectic sees the seal of the inevitable fall on everything and "nothing can stand against it, except for the continuous process of emergence and destruction, an endless ascent from the lowest to the highest" (*Engels*). Meanwhile, Hegel himself built an all-encompassing, absolute, complete and self-contained system: "And the same Hegel, who in his logic pointed out that the eternal truth is nothing but a logical one (m. This means the historical process, the same Hegel saw himself compelled to put an end to this process, since he had to finish his system ... But this meant proclaiming the absolute truth of the whole dogmatic content of Hegel's system and thus becoming contrary to his dialectic method of decomposing entirely g dogmatic " (*Engels* , Feuerbach).

This contradiction runs as a red thread in all the philosophical works of Hegel. The method requires a concrete analysis of the concrete material, the actual historical path of development - goes Whether it's nature, about society, about the various forms of social consciousness of law and state . Etc. . Etc. , between the system requires put everything into the Procrustean bed of categories, the absolute idea , pure thought , etc. , etc. Hence, sometimes freaks, surprising in their naivety, arbitrariness in the construction and construction of the system, mysticism in understanding transitions , etc. , rape of reality, if only the system's honor has not suffered.

However, one should not understand the *vulgar* contradiction between the method and the system in Hegel. Sometimes they imagine things in such a way that Hegel's dialectic and idealism are located on different shelves, that they are exclusively related to each other, that it is very easy to take dialectics and discard the system.

Between the dialectical method of Hegel and his idealistic system there is not only a contradiction, but also an internal unity. Hegel has dialectical idealism or idealistic dialectics. His dialectic and idealism, the method and the system, not only contradict each other, but also internally consistent with each other. This is a historical fact caused by certain historical conditions, caused by a certain historical situation. In Germany, the end of the XVIII century. and the first half of the nineteenth century. *the dialectical method could develop only in an idealistic form* . However, this same historical situation with an internal contradiction, with a certain class attitude, *caused* also in ideological reflections (one of such most powerful is Hegelian philosophy) deep internal contradictions.

Hegel's philosophical system itself is the best example of the dialectical unity and struggle of opposites, the best example of the correctness of its method in front of the system.

Feuerbach already gave a magnificent materialistic criticism of Hegel's idealistic system, its initial idealistic point. He wrote: "Hegel's teaching that the *idea is* relied upon before reality and nature is only a rational expression of the theological teaching that nature, the material essence, is created by God, an immaterial, that is , abstract, being. "At the end of" Logic, "it even leads an absolute idea to a" fantastic *solution* "to autograph yourself and document its origin from the theological sky" (Vol. I, p. 71). Feuerbach correctly notes that, thanks to idealism, "the essence of Hegelian logic is the essence of nature and man, but *without essence, without nature, without man* . "

It must be said that even idealist philosophers correctly groped the internal contradiction of the Hegel system. Of particular interest in this regard is Trendelenburg . Trendelenburg collapses in his criticism of Hegel on the *substantive , meaningful* nature of his logic, from the point of view of a pure formalist.

Criticism of Trendelenburg, which seems to him the most crushing criticism of dialectics, is interesting for us in precisely this respect; that it beats against Hegel's original idealistic point and shows only the correctness of materialistic dialectics. "When one idealist hits another idealist, materialism wins" (*Lenin*).

Trendelenburg does not agree with Hegel's revolutionary *dialectic*, he wants to beat her, and it's great (not in the eyebrow, but in the eye) to Hegel's idealistic starting point, to the *idealistic* character of the dialectic.

Marx's Critique of Hegelian Philosophy of Law is extremely important for critics of Hegel's idealism, for revealing the internal contradictions of his philosophical doctrine. This work is insufficiently studied and used. This is not surprising, because in its previous work, Menshevik idealism did not even see the task of criticizing Hegel's idealism. Marx, in the mentioned work, shows how, by virtue of his absolute idealism, Hegel falls into dualism in his teaching. This dualism is of course a completely different type than that of Kant. Hegelian dualism is a result, a consequence of his whole idealistic concept, an expression of the limitations of his idealism, as well as idealism in general. Marx characterizes these contradictions in Hegel in the following way: "The real subject in Hegel becomes the mystical substance, and the real subject is presented as something else, as the moment of the mystical substance. It is precisely because Hegel, instead of emanating from a real being, emanating from predicates, from universal definitions, and yet there must still be some kind of carrier, a mystical idea becomes this carrier. It is here that Hegelian dualism manifests itself, by virtue of which Hegel does not at all regard the real essence of the truly finite as t. e. the corresponding, definite, or real being does not consider a *true subject of the infinite*."

Marx points out that this is one of the main drawbacks of the Hegelian concept. Marx shows how this dualism is manifested in Hegel in various forms. For example He shows how Hegel's disregard for empirical reality in general, stemming from his assessment of the sphere of development of absolute spirit, causes Hegel to turn to the first empirical reality due to the inevitable "longing for content." Marx writes: "This is the transformation of the subjective into the objective and the objective into the subjective (which is a consequence of the fact that Hegel wants to write the history of life of an abstract substance, of an idea, a consequence of the fact that according to his concept, therefore, human activity must act as activity of something else, a consequence of the fact that Hegel wants to make act, as some imaginary *individuality*, a human being, taken by itself, instead of forcing him to act in his *real human existence*) has as its necessary consequence, that the *empirical reality* uncritically assumed to be the actual truth ideas, because we are talking not about to empirical reality reduced to the truth, and that truth to be reduced to an empirical reality" in this case, the first empirical reality that emerges develops as a real moment of the idea."

Marx's criticism of Hegel's philosophy of law requires a special analysis. We cannot dwell on this issue here in more detail; we wanted to show two examples of how great the internal contradictions of the Hegelian philosophical system, its idealistic theory of dialectics. Lenin, speaking of the contradictions of Hegelian idealism, gives a very deep description of them. He wrote: "The absolute idea of Hegel brought together all the contradictions of Kant's idealism, all the weaknesses of Fichteanism." The idealism of Hegel, being the highest form of idealism, reveals in the "removed" form all the contradictions of every type of idealism that preceded it, all the absurdities of idealism. Hegel's idealism, "coming close to materialism and partially even growing into it", at the same time gives a picture of the deepest contradictions into which idealism in general falls. Knowing how to criticize and expose Hegelian idealism, we must, by Lenin's instructions and examples, be able to discover rational grains in Hegelian philosophy, materialistically reworking them. In no way can one forget the high assessments of Hegelian dialectics in the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, who at the same time showed that genuine dialectics can only be materialistic dialectics, that real dialectics is compatible only with materialism, that real overcoming the contradictions mentioned above occurs only on the basis of dialectical materialism.

MATERIAL DIALECTICS OF MARX, ENGELS AND LENIN

The dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels is a brilliant product of the new historical era, when the working class came to the stage, when the axis of contradiction, the antagonism of a lot of labor and capital, the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, when the historical mission of the proletariat in modern society was clearly defined, emerged. In their early work *The Holy Family*, Marx and Engels characterize this historical role of the proletariat as follows:

“But he cannot liberate himself without abolishing his own living conditions. He cannot abolish his own living conditions without abolishing *all the* inhuman living conditions of modern society, concentrated in his own position. He is not in vain passes the harsh, hardening school of *labor*. It is not a matter of what the individual proletarian or even the entire proletariat *sees* at the moment as its goal. The point is *what the* proletariat is, what it will historically have to do according to its *existence*” (Marx and Engels, Vol. III, p. 56).

The dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels is a product of an era when anarchy and crises of capitalist society were already revealed to a high degree, when they put the proletariat in front of the need to fight not only for *partial* improvements, but against the capitalist society as a whole; a product of the era when the first start of the uprising workers, such as the June 1848 uprising city of Paris, where the labor movement begins to make the first advances, to break through their local national framework, to acquire global character; the product of that historical epoch, when the terrible signs of the proletarian revolution appear on the horizon, when the “specter of communism” is already wandering around Europe”.

Being the brilliant brainchild of this revolutionary era, the scientific revolutionary method and worldview of the proletariat, the materialistic dialectic of Marx and Engels inspires malice and horror to theorists and ideologists of the bourgeoisie. The dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels, being the ideology and worldview of the proletariat, grows out of the previous development of German classical philosophy, in particular from Hegelian dialectics. However, he did not have a *direct* and immediate continuation of dialectic Hegel, as it is thought in Menshevik-Vyushchie idealists; he is not also a simple borrowing of Hegel's dialectic; he is not as mechanical “synthesis” of Hegel's dialectics and Feuerbach's materialism, as it is imagined by Axel Rance and Deborin and mechanists, and Menshevik-Vyushchie idealists.

The dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels is the result of overcoming the idealistic dialectic of Hegel and at the same time the limited nature of Feuerbach's materialism; it is the result of the materialist reworking of Hegel's dialectics, based on the richest material of the class struggle and the study of the historical tasks of the proletariat by Marx and Engels; at the same time, it is the overcoming of the contemplative nature of Feuerbach's materialism, who did not understand the historical path of human development and “practically critical revolutionary activity”.

The materialistic dialectic of Marx and Engels was the “revolutionary soul” of Marxism as a whole, its “fundamental theoretical foundation”. Using the method of materialistic dialectics, Marx creates his “*Capital*”. Using this method, Marx and Engels create their brilliant historical works, their strategic and tactical works, etc. “The application of materialistic dialectics to the processing of all political economy, from its foundations, to history, to natural science, to philosophy, to politics and the tactics of the working class — this is what interests Marx and Engels most of all, this is what they bring in the most essential and the most new, in what is their ingenious step forward. in the history of revolutionary thought”, - wrote Lenin, describing the correspondence of Marx and Engels.

Lenin develops Marxism in the new historical epoch, in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Lenin introduces a new one and specifies the Marxist doctrine in all its constituent parts as applied to the conditions of the new era. “Lenin was and remains the most loyal and consistent student of Marx and Engels,” wrote t. Stalin in the response of the American working-class delegation in 1927. , - entirely based on the principles of Marxism. But Lenin was not only the executor of the teachings of Marx - Engels. At the same

time he was the follower of the teachings of Marx and Engels. What does it mean? This means that he developed further the teachings of Marx-Engels in relation to the new conditions of development, in relation to the new phase of capitalism, in relation to imperialism. This means that, by developing further the teachings of Marx in the new conditions of class struggle, Lenin introduced into the common treasury of Marxism something new compared to what could have been given in the period before imperialistic capitalism, and this new, introduced Lenin to the treasury of Marxism, is based entirely on the principles given by Marx and Engels. In this sense, we speak about Leninism, as Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. ”

The Leninist stage in the development of dialectical materialism, representing the organic component of Leninism as a whole, is a product of the development of materialist dialectics as applied to the era when "the contradictions of capitalism reached an extreme point, when the proletarian revolution became a matter of immediate practice, when the old period of preparing the working class for revolution rested and grew into a new period of direct assault on capitalism" (*Stalin*).

The Leninist stage in the development of materialist dialectics, being the product of a new highly revolutionary era, is the concretization and further development of the method of Marx and Engels, his materialist dialectics.

Tov. Stalin wrote: "In fact, if Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution, and the dictatorship of the proletariat is the main content of the proletarian revolution, then it is clear that the main thing in Leninism is in the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the development of this question, in substantiation and concretization this issue. " This position should be the starting point for understanding the fact that it was a defining moment for the development of all the constituent parts of Marxism given by Lenin in relation to the new era, including the philosophical basis of Marxism. However, this does not at all imply a direct identification of the philosophical basis of Marxism-Leninism with the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the theory of the proletarian revolution.

Lenin gave further development of materialistic philosophy as "philosophical science." Basically, the new that Lenin introduced into the understanding of materialist dialectics as a "philosophical science" consists in the further development of the theory of materialist dialectics as logic, as a theory of knowledge. The identity of dialectic, logic, theory of knowledge - this is the most important link in the understanding of dialectical materialism, which is further developed, specified by Lenin in comparison with Marx and Engels.

In his verse, "On the Question of Dialectics", Lenin wrote: "Dialectics *is the theory of* knowledge of (Hegel and) Marxism here on what" side "of things (this is not a" party "of the case, and *d s* case) to which Plekhanov, not to speak of other Marxists. " Giving this issue an exceptional importance, Lenin returned to it many times in his philosophical notebooks. So for example, in IX "Collection", on p. 119, he writes: "So, not only the description of the *forms of* thinking and not only the *natural-historical description of the phenomena of thinking* (how it differs from the description of the forms ...), but also its correspondence with the truth , t. e ... *quintessence, or, more simply, the results and results of the history of thought ...* "In the margin on this last phrase, Lenin makes the following postscript:" In this understanding, logic coincides with the *theory of knowledge* . This is a very important question. ”

So further, on p. 203 IX of the Collection, Lenin again writes: "Logic is a teaching about knowledge. There is a theory of knowledge. Knowledge is a reflection of nature by man. But this is not a simple, not direct, not a complete reflection, but a process of a number of abstractions, formulation, formation of concepts, laws , etc. , which concepts, laws , etc. (thinking, science are a "logical idea") and *encompass* conditionally about the universal pattern of the ever-moving and evolving nature. "

Lenin returned to the same question again in the XII Collection, when he wrote: "Dialectics, logic, theory of knowledge (three words are not necessary) are one and the same".

So, how can we understand this Leninist interpretation of the essence of Marxist philosophy, that is, unity, the identity of dialectics and the theory of knowledge? In order to understand this question, it is necessary first of all to look at how the question of the relationship and unity of the logical and the historical is resolved in materialist dialectics. Let us turn to Engels, who gives the classical formulation of this question. In a review article on Marx's "Critique of Political Economy," he wrote: "The advantage of Hegel's way of thinking over the way of thinking of all other philosophers is rooted in the enormous historical flair that underlayed the first. Despite the abstractness and idealism of the form, the course of his thoughts always unfolded parallel to the course of history, and the latter was to serve only as a test for the first ... "

In the same article, Engels develops a number of thoughts about the relationship between the historical and the logical, which are extremely important in connection with the consideration of Lenin's notes. He points out that any historical development goes in leaps, zigzag, with large deviations to the side, with a return back. If the theorist of any science would have to use *all* this material, he would often have to pay very significant attention to low-value material, interrupt the train of thought, etc. "The logical method of research was therefore the only suitable one. The latter, however, is the same historical method, only freed from its historical form and from violating the orderliness of presentation of historical accidents. "

Engels develops the question of the unity of the logical and historical method of research, which Marx laid at the basis of his Critique of Political Economy. Lenin in his philosophical notebooks, especially when considering the question of dialectics and the theory of knowledge, proceeds from these provisions.

As we saw above, Hegel took a step forward in approaching these questions in comparison with Kant. In his system of categories, Hegel wanted on an idealistic basis to give a theory of knowledge that solves the problem of logical and historical, to give a theoretical picture of world-wide historical experience and knowledge of humanity, understanding this experience and the knowledge and historical development of humanity itself idealistically. History, however, turned out to be subordinate to the logical development of the absolute spirit. The historical, actual movement turned out to be a derivative of the logical movement. Lenin for the scholastic, dark "Hegelianism" reveals the content that Hegel has on these questions, and at the same time gives a remarkable materialistic interpretation of these problems, thereby developing the most important problems of the theory of materialist dialectics.

In one of his definitions of logic, Hegel writes in the first line: "Logic is pure science, that is, pure", and in another line: "knowledge is fully in its development". Lenin's comments on this subject as follows: "1 - I line - nonsense, 2 - I line - ingenious." Knowledge in full of its *development* is the essence of our dialectics as a theory of knowledge. On this question, Lenin pays central attention in his philosophical notebooks. He gives the following definitions: "the movement of scientific knowledge", "itself constructing the way of knowledge", "the way (here is the key, in my opinion) of actual knowledge, the cognitive movement". Lenin tirelessly stresses in different variations of this idea: "a new march of our knowledge about things *all the deeper and deeper*", "categories are a step allocation, t. e knowledge of the world.", the result of the experience of Sciences, and so on. d., and so on. n.

However, materialistic logic, dialectics is not just an empirical history of knowledge, a descriptive history of sciences, ideologies, history of philosophy, etc. Here we have a unity of logical and historical in the sense that Engels wrote about it. In our theory of materialist dialectics, we have a *history of knowledge* that is set forth in the abstraction from historical accidents, which is given in the laws that generalize this history of knowledge, in categories.

"The history of thought from the point of view of the development and application of general concepts and categories of logic is what we need!" (IX Lenin's Collection, p. 195).

All the practical, theoretical, scientific experience of mankind, studied in the process of historical development, is the basis of the materialist dialectics, logic, the materialist theory of knowledge. Lenin revealed the content to find out that the story, the path of knowledge, world-historical experience of mankind given in generalizing

the way of development categories, in their mutual perepleto nnosti , communications, they need to move - that it is our logic, dialectics, theory of knowledge.

In fact, can there be a theory of knowledge claiming to be of scientific importance, not based on the process of human cognition in its full development. Could there be any theory of knowledge that stands outside the historical process of knowledge?

In accordance with this understanding of dialectics and the theory of knowledge, one can proceed to clarify what categories of dialectics are, how they are developed by Lenin in his "philosophical notebooks. The categories of the concept are the "moments of man's knowledge of nature" (IX "Collection", p. 231). "By practicing himself, man proves the objective correctness of his ideas, concepts, knowledge, and science. Repeating and confirming in the practical activity of people, billions of times certain connections between these concepts acquire the character of logical laws, we recognize as the most common forms of movement of material and spiritual phenomena "(cf. IX" Collection ", p. 219).

And to clarify this, Lenin draws the following picture: "The river and the drops in this river. The position of each drop, its relation to others; her connection with others; the direction of its movement; speed; the line of motion is straight, curved, round, and so on - up, down. The amount of movement. The concept of taking into account individual aspects of movement, individual drops (= " things"), individual "jets" , etc. Here's an approximate picture of Hegel's "Logic" world - of course, minus god to the absolute "(IX" Collection ", p. 139). Logic, the theory of materialist dialectics, studies the most common forms of communication, transitions, interdependencies between these drops and jets. In accordance with this, Lenin gives the following definition of logic:

"Logic is a teaching not about external forms of thinking, but about the laws of development of" all material, natural and spiritual things, "that is , the development of the entire concrete content of the world and its knowledge, that is , the result, the sum, the conclusion of the history of world knowledge (IX "Collection", p. 41).

Thus, the difference between dialectical materialistic logic as a theory of knowledge is that it considers its laws and categories not as empty, content-independent, indifferent to it, as it takes place in formal logic, and not as moments of self-developing regardless of material world of ideas, as is the case with Hegel, but as an expression reflected in our brain, translated and processed in the human head of the material movement.

How does dialectical logic differ from formal, metaphysical in its essence? Engels pointed out that metaphysics views the world as a collection of *ready-made things* , while dialectics considers it as a combination of *processes* . And in order to correctly express movement, our concepts must also be mobile, must be connected with each other and go into each other. "Human concepts are not immovable, but eternally move, transform into each other, overflow one into another, without it they do not reflect living life. Analysis of the concepts, the study of "the art of treating them" (*Engels*) always requires the study of the movement of concepts, their relationships, their vzaimopereho rows "(the XII" Collection ", pp. 181- 183).

These are some of the most important provisions that are necessary for understanding the theory of the material of the historical dialectic and its whole difference from the theory of idealistic dialectics, developed and created by Hegel. As we have shown here the development problems of the theory of materialist dialectics, which gives Lenin, we have a consistent answer to the most important questions of philosophy. Materialistic dialectics gives the only consistently to the end materialistic solution to the problem of the unity of form and content, abstract and concrete, logical and historical, sensuality and thinking, questions about the nature, systematic connection of categories and their transitions. Before us is serious the task is to expand widely and show the theoretical richness of Marxism on all these problems.

Special attention should be paid to the "core of dialectics", to the law of unity and struggle of opposites. This basic and most important law of dialectics receives special development in the works of Lenin. In the IX

Collection, Lenin, speaking of this law, writes: “ *Dialectics* is a doctrine of how *opposites* can be and how are (how they become) *identical* , — under what conditions they are identical, turning into each other — why the mind a person should not take these opposites for dead , frozen, and for living, conditional, mobile, turning one into another.

Lenin, applying this law of dialectics to the analysis of the complex processes of the reality of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, - applying it, at the same time theoretically developing and specifying it. Take, for example, the most important slogans and interpretations of the fundamental political problems of Bolshevism: the bourgeois-democratic revolution *developed* into a socialist revolution, the imperialist war *turned* into a civil war, the *dictatorship of the* proletariat as proletarian *democracy* , the destruction of classes in the process of fierce class struggle - we will see that they are “clusters of dialectics , Application and further theoretical development of the law of the unity of opposites.

LEARNING HEGEL, FOLLOWING THE INDICATIONS OF MARX, ENGELS, LENIN AND STALIN

In his speech at a meeting dedicated to the 10th anniversary of the Institute of Red Professors, Comrade Kaganovich said: “We must approach the studies in a Bolshevik manner and be able to take from Hegel, for example , what is needed for us, for our struggle. In particular, you need a Bolshevik, a Leninist approach to the history of the past, to the history of the previous day, and to come so that the history of this yesterday linked to the general line of the party, with the immense new challenges that face us today and which will be more stand tomorrow. ”

Here the thesis about the partisanship of science, about the partisanship of our approach to learning is expressed with great clarity , to the Marxist-Leninist education of personnel. Our interest in Hegel is to take from him what is necessary for us, for the Bolsheviks. Our interest in Hegel is the interest in his dialectical method, which was materialistically reworked by Marx and Engels and further developed by Lenin. Our interest in Hegel is an interest in revolutionary dialectics, although developed by him, proceeding from a false initial idealistic point, but at the same time giving a complete, most comprehensive picture of dialectical development. Our interest in Hegel is the interest in the dialectical method, which, being materialistically reworked, is a weapon for the knowledge of objective laws and a revolutionary change in the surrounding reality.

Materialistic dialectics is the theoretical basis of all the practices of the struggle of the working class; the materialistic dialectic of Marx, Engels, Lenin is the theoretical basis of the general line of our party. Leader of world communism - . T , *Stalin* is the best disciple of Lenin, the greatest dialectical materialists of our age, are developed and applied to the complex situation of full-scale offensive along the entire front of Leninist dialectics.

A special place in the works of Comrade Stalin is given to the development of the question of the unity of theory and practice, of the effective, creative character of our world view and method, as opposed to the dogmatic nature of “Marxism” among representatives of the Second International and among all opportunists and draft deviants. A common thread in all his works is this opposition of the effectiveness of the Marxist method, the effectiveness of the atheistic dialectics - metaphysics, sophistry, and "quote Marxism" - opportunism. And precisely because m. Stalin gives us a sample of such an effective understanding and application of Marxism, that is why he gives us and samples of further theoretical development of the questions of materialist dialectics. Indeed, it is worth recalling the work of t. Stalin on the issue of the link, on the subjective and objective factors of historical development, on the categories of possibility and reality, his criticism of the theory of equilibrium and the theory of gravity , so that it becomes clear what theoretical

development of materialistic questions dialectics he gives us . It is t. Stalin truly, in the spirit of Lenin's testament, given in his article "On the Meaning of Militant Materialism", "develops this dialectic from all sides," using "those examples of dialectics in the field of economic, political relations, which are recent history, especially modern imperialist war and revolution , gives unusually much "(*Lenin*).

Dialectics is the soul of Marxism, Comrade Stalin follows Lenin . At the XVI Congress of the Party, Comrade Stalin described the dialectic of Marxism as follows: "This is the vital truth of Marx's dialectics, which enables the Bolsheviks to take the most impregnable fortresses." Criticizing further opportunism, he said: "Whoever did not understand this dialectic of historical processes, he died for Marxism. The trouble with our draft dodgers is that they do not understand and do not want to understand Marxian dialectics. "

We want here to give two or three samples of the dialectic of Comrade Stalin, which gave and enables the Bolsheviks to take the most impregnable fortresses. Take the analysis of the nature of the collective farms given by Comrade Stalin in his speech at the conference of Marxist agrarians. Defining the type of collective farm economy as one of the forms of socialist economy, t. Stalin approaches this definition from the point of view of analyzing the attitude of people in the production process, t. that is, from the point of view of the only consistent Marxist criterion for determining the social nature of the economy. And from this only correct point of view, "doesn't the collective farm represent the socialization of the main instruments of production on land belonging to the same state? What reason is there to assert that collective farms as a type of economy do not represent one of the forms of socialist economy? "(" Questions of Leninism ", p. 560). Establishing the socialist nature of collective farms as a type of economy, Comrade Stalin turns to an analysis of the internal contradictions of the collective farm, distinguishing it from the consistently socialist type of farms and enterprises. Of particular interest is the analysis of the elements of class struggle on collective farms. He writes: "This is exactly the mistake of our " Left " phrase phrase that they do not see this difference. What does the class struggle *outside the collective farms* , *before the* formation of collective farms? This means fighting the *kulaks who own the tools and means of production and enslaving themselves to the poor with the help of these tools and means of production*. This struggle is a struggle for life and death. What does class struggle based *on* collective farms mean ? This means, first of all, that the fist is broken and lacking tools and means of production. It means, finally, that the case goes to a fight between members of collective farms, some of which have not been delivered yet from individualistic and kulak survivals and trying to use some inequality to their advantage, while others want to expel from the collective farms these remnants and this inequality. "

Thus we see how t. Stalin reveals *a qualitative* difference which exists between the class forest boy in the village *d of* the collective farm and the elements of the class struggle in the collective farm. Only by proficiently using the materialist dialectic method, the method of truly concrete analysis of complex concrete reality, only knowing how to apply the most important laws of dialectics, the laws of quality, quantity, measure, the law of the unity of opposites in Leninist , can one give such a clear analysis of the social nature of collective farms. One thing - the contradictions in the village *outside the collective farms* on a qualitatively different basis, another thing is the existing contradictions in collective farms already on a different qualitative basis, in a different type of farm. It is one thing - the struggle with the fist, the owner of tools and means of production, the struggle for life and death, and the other thing is the struggle against kulak, individualistic remnants on the basis of collective farms. One thing is the first type of contradictions, another thing is second-order contradictions.

All the works of t. Stalin are an inexhaustible number of such samples of materialistic dialectics. We note here only more the next question - is the question of national and socialist culture. Everyone is familiar with the Stalinist analysis of the nature and slogans of the national culture under the rule of the bourgeoisie and under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Here are *two types of* resolution of the unity of form and content, which gives us a living reality and which were opened with such skill by Comrade Stalin. This is what Comrade Stalin said at the XVI Party Congress: "What is national culture under the rule of the national bourgeoisie? *Bourgeois* in its content and national in its form culture, which has as its goal poison the masses, the poison of nationalism, and strengthen the rule of the bourgeoisie. What is national culture under the dictatorship of the proletariat? *Socialist* in its content and national in form culture, which aims to educate

the masses in the spirit of internationalism and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat. How can these two fundamentally different phenomena be mixed without breaking with Marxism? ”

The main point in T. Stalin’s approach to analyzing these phenomena is the difference in class structure and class nature of the dual type of domination — the domination of the national bourgeoisie and the domination of the socialist proletariat and its dictatorship. Extremely characteristic in this analysis is the materialistic primacy of content in the dialectical unity of form and content. Tov. Stalin does not come from once and for all the given unity of form and content — he analyzes the historical, class background of this unity. The application of the theory of development to the question of culture is extremely characteristic. We give this classic place from the works of t. Stalin. He wrote: “It may seem strange that we, the *supporters of the merger* In the future, national cultures in one common (both in form and content) culture with one common language, are at the same time supporters of the *flourishing of* national cultures at the moment, in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But there is nothing strange about it. It is necessary to allow national cultures to develop and unfold, to reveal all their potencies in order to create conditions for their merging into one common culture with one common language. The flowering of national in form and socialist in content cultures under the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country *to merge* them into one common socialist (both in form and content) culture with one common language, when the proletariat wins all over the world and socialism enters in everyday life, this is precisely the dialectical nature of Lenin’s formulation of the question of national culture. ”

Here are vivid examples of materialistic dialectics. The one who would consider that we have here only the *application of* dialectics, and not its development, not the development of the theory of materialist dialectics, would be deeply mistaken . It must be understood that the actual creative application of the method of materialist dialectics is at the same time its actual theoretical development. In this case, the example of the unity of form and content shows what theoretical wealth we get here. In addition to the two types of unity of form and content - the theory of development, applied to the national question, gives a new type of unity of opposites: uniform in form and content of the culture of a communist society.

We gave here two examples of the application and development of materialist dialectics, in order to show how the party, and so Stalin, fulfilling Lenin’s directives and instructions, develop from all sides materialistic dialectics, without which Marxism is, according to Lenin, . In the light of the creative understanding of Marxism, the effective understanding of dialectical materialism, the scholastic development of dialectics, which was “conducted” by Menshevist idealism in isolation from the practice of socialist construction , looks completely clear .

Our party attaches exceptional importance to revolutionary theory, without which revolutionary practice is unthinkable. The materialistic dialectic is the revolutionary soul of Marxism-Leninism. That is why, in connection with the centenary anniversary of the death of the idealist dialectic of Hegel, we again emphasize the task of strengthening the study and development of materialist dialectics, following the instructions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.