

JPRS: 2747

17 June 1960

PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE HISTORY OF PRE-MARXIST
PHILOSOPHY IN V. I. LENIN'S WORKS

USSR

[DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 8

by
V. I. Pratasevich

RELEASE TO NEW FILE

19980108 114

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release

Distribution Unlimited

U.S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

JPRS: 2747

CSO: 3968-N

PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE HISTORY OF PRE-MARXIST
PHILOSOPHY IN V. I. LENIN'S WORKS

[This is a translation of an article written by V.I. Pratasevich in Vestsi Akademii Navuk BSSR (News of the Academy of Sciences BSSR), No. 2, Minsk, April 1958, pp 5-20.]

The 20th Congress of the CPSU set before all the workers of the ideological front, the task of raising the level of ideological work, waging implacable battle against bourgeois ideology, and developing Marxist theory creatively on the basis of the generalization of the historical question and on the analysis of the present actuality. The realization of this task depends essentially on the development of Lenin's ideological heritage. "Studying the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism", states the report of the CC CPSU of the 20th Congress of the Party, "fosters a deeper understanding of the rules of the development of society, gives a clearer perspective, strengthens the convictions of the Soviet people in the ultimate victory of communism, and aids in the construction of communism".¹ The works of V.I. Lenin are an inexhaustible source of wisdom on all principle questions of communist construction and on Marxist theory. Soviet philosophers and Marxist philosophers of other countries find therein a concrete answer or a patterned answer on any most difficult theoretical question.

Many works have been written in our country which are specially devoted to the study and popularization of Lenin's works and which are conclusive in their ideas. In these works all questions are at least discussed, which were ever discussed by V.I. Lenin. However, some phases of the creativity of V.I. Lenin have almost not been studied even to date. Among such little-studied questions is primarily the question of Lenin as an historian of pre-Marxist philosophy. This article is aimed at approaching V.I. Lenin's works from this standpoint. Without pretending to present an exhaustive resolution of this tremendous and difficult task, the author of this article aims to give a short explanation of Lenin's basic position on the following questions: 2) of the meaning to us of the knowledge of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy;

1. N.S. Khrushchev. Report of the CC CPSU 20th Congress of the Party, 1956, p. 131.

b) of the scientific (scholastic) understanding of the subject of this study; c) of the most important methodological principles on which a true scientific historical-philosophical investigation should be based.

I

It is known that Vladimir Il'ich placed great importance on the study and understanding of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy and always, in solving any philosophic problem, referred to it. To substantiate the foregoing, let us recall merely some of the facts from V.I. Lenin's creative biography. Thus, in the 90's of the past century, when throughout our land legal Marxism was spread, which strove on its theoretical side to exchange the basic philosophies of Marxism with Kantism, V.I. Lenin, in preparing to oppose it, studied the history of philosophy intensively. At that time Lenin did research in German, French and Dutch classical philosophy of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. In the police report on the belongings of V.I. Lenin, drawn up in 1900 when he was investigated during his exile, mention is made of books by Spinoza, Holbach (?), Kant, Fichte, Hegel, and other pre-Marxist philosophers.¹ V.I. Lenin himself verifies the fact that at that time he decided to devote himself completely to the study of the philosophy of the pre-Marxist period so that he would be fully prepared to repel the neo-Kantic critics of Marxism. In a letter from Shushenskiy Patresav, dated 27 June 1899, Lenin wrote that he had obtained the chief works of the leading philosophical classicists and that he was engaged in studying them, beginning with Holbach and Helvetz (?) and then going on to Kant.²

V.I. Lenin specially referred to the history of pre-Marxist philosophy in the following years during the struggle against Machism when Marxist illucidation of the newest finds in natural science became imperative, and when the theoretic foundations of our party were created and were defended against mutilation. Later, during the years of the First World War, while developing the theory of socialistic revolution and during the struggle against Menshivism, V.I. Lenin thoroughly studied and suitably utilized the works of ancient Greek philosophers, as well as those of Leibnitz, Feierbach and especially those of Hegel.

V.I. Lenin saw that the tremendous significance of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy as a science lies primarily in the fact that in the personages of its better representatives, ideologists of the leading classes, it teaches the proletariat to understand the meaning of revolutionary theory, it teaches them to understand that without it

1. V.I. Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks. Politizdat, 1934, p. 13.

2. The Lenin Collection IV, p. 33.

there can be no revolutionary practice. This idea of Vladimir Il'ich was expressed by him in his works "What to do?", "To the Memory of Herten", and others in relation to Russian revolutionary democrats of the 19th century. However, this idea has a methodological significance for and is applicable to all the representatives of the leading powers in the community of all epochs and in all countries.

The significance of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy lies further in the fact, according to Lenin, that it brings about a better knowledge and understanding of the theoretical positions of Marxism. In connection with this, Lenin's statement on Hegel is extremely interesting. V.I. Lenin emphasized in his "Philosophical Notebooks" that, without studying Hegel, and his "Logic" in particular, it is impossible to understand fully Marx's "Kapital", especially its first section.¹

Lenin further teaches that the understanding of all prior history of philosophic thought is also imperative for the successful development of the philosophy of Marxism. V.I. Lenin did not consider the development of contemporary scientific philosophy - dialectic and historic materialism - as being separate and apart from history. The continuation of the work begun by Marx on the materialistic application and development of Hegelian dialectics should, he stated, be concluded with a dialectic elaboration of the history of human thought, science and technique.² In the given case, the significance of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy lies in the fact that it warns against trampling philosophical thought forthwith, against trying to solve questions which have been already long-solved, and that as a result of it, it awakens the desire to go further, forward.

V.I. Lenin considered the history of pre-Marxist philosophy to be very important with regard to the struggle against contemporary bourgeois idealistic philosophy and religion. Naturally, not all savants in history bear any significance with respect to this but only the most progressive of them who expound and foster materialistic and atheistic ideas.

Of the ancient Greek philosophers, V.I. Lenin regarded most highly the teachings of the ancient Greek atomists. V.I. Lenin corrected Hegel, who, in his "Lessons on the History of Philosophy", in discussing the question on the significance of the teachings of Epicurus, limited the value of his teaching only to the struggle against the superstitions of his time. With reference to this above-mentioned opinion of Hegel, Lenin stated: "And what about our present priests?"³ With this statement V.I. Lenin emphasized the thought that the teaching of the ancient Epicurus has not lost its anti-idealistic and atheistic significance in our day also, that regardless of its two

1. V.I. Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 154.

2. Ibid. p. 122.

3. Ibid. p. 276.

thousand year old antiquity it now aids us to rebuff all contemporary priests as a breed, or individually. V.I. Lenin valued highly the materialistic theories of modern times and allotted to them a suitably more important role with regard to fighting against all contemporary ideological reaction. Here belong the materialistic and anti-religious ideas of the French materialists of the 18th century, of Feuerbach and of the Russian Revolutionary Democrats of the 19th century.

The study and understanding of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy, according to Lenin, is of important significance also to natural scientists. Emphasizing in his works that the only correct theory of the understanding and methodology of natural sciences rests upon the theory of dialectic materialism, and indicating that it alone can defend contemporary science from the pressure of reactionary ideas, V.I. Lenin at the same time considered that pre-Marxian philosophy also played a definite role in the development of science.

The history of philosophy, states Lenin, teaches nature researchers to understand more profoundly the role of philosophy in natural science, it aids scientists to better assess the results of their investigations, and to draw theoretical conclusions. Agreeing completely with this thought as held by Engels, Lenin wrote in his "Philosophic Notebooks": "...Natural scientists should know that the results of natural science are known, but masterful operation with knowledge is not generated, it is the result of the two thousand year old development of natural sciences and philosophy."¹

Understanding the tremendous and many-sided significance of the knowledge of all the history of pre-Marxist philosophy and constantly using it in his political and theoretical activity, V.I. Lenin worked a great deal on its scientific illumination. V.I. Lenin read philosophic books and books on philosophers of the pre-Marxist period almost constantly, as they say, with a pencil in his hand, making synopses, making extracts, noting his remarks on the fly leaves of the books read, etc.

A brilliant example of this creative approach to reading literature is found in Lenin's literary heritage of his well-known "Philosophical Notebooks". On some questions on the history of pre-Marxist philosophy, when circumstances demanded it, Lenin wrote special articles ("Which Heritage are we Refusing?", "To the Memory of Herten", "On the Meaning of Militant Materialism" and many others). Most frequently V.I. Lenin expressed his relations toward the savants of the past or to an entire epoch, or to a whole philosophic trend, engaging them in various philosophic questions as though they were his allies or co-workers (as for example, in "Materialism and Empiric-criticism"). All of these synopses, remarks and works of V.I. Lenin, which contain his thoughts on individual concrete and general methodological questions on the history of pre-Marxist philosophy, are in their entirety an invaluable contribution in the creation of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy as a science.

1. V.I. Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 247

In his activity in working on questions of the scientific history of pre-Marxist philosophy, V.I. Lenin, as in all matters, based himself unconditionally on all that which had been achieved in this field before him. As Lenin himself wrote, in pre-Marxist philosophy, with regard to assessing all previous philosophies, the greatest traces were left by Aristotle of the ancients, and by Hegel in modern times. A significant contribution was made by the Russian Revolutionary Democrats of the 19th Century in working out historical-philosophical questions.

However, none of the pre-Marxist philosophers were able to create a scientific history of philosophy. Each of them built his understanding of the prior history of philosophical thought on the basis of the anti-scientific idealistic understanding of the community.

The way to the widest, truly scientific creativity in the field of studying community phenomenon was opened only by Marxism which overcame all the inadequacies of prior doctrines. The decisive revolutionary step in the matter of the lack of knowledge on the community in general, and on the history of philosophy in particular, was the materialistic significance of history as disclosed by Marx and Engels, which for the first time placed all community studies on a firm scientific basis. In addition, Marx and Engels further solved in their works, many special historical-philosophical problems and questions. In all of these questions V.I. Lenin continued their work, made it more profound and developed it further.

The main methodological principle which was worked out by the classicists of Marxism-Leninism and which was applied by them in the study of the philosophic thought of past generations is the principle of partisanship in philosophy. V.I. Lenin formulated his understanding of this principle most concisely in his explanations on Marx and Engels in his work "Materialism and Empiriocriticism". Marx and Engels, wrote Lenin, were partial in philosophy to the end, they were able to disclose departures from materialism and evidences of idealism and fideism in all and various tendencies and they evaluated each philosopher strictly from the point of view of persevering in materialism.¹ In other words, the principle of partiality in the history of philosophy means, according to Lenin, nothing else but a frank and consistent dissemination of the scientific view points of dialectic and historic materialism for the development of philosophy and placing them in opposition to idealistic and religious viewpoints, a defense of materialism against attack by its enemies, and a scientific criticism of all idealistic teachings in the history of philosophy.

1. V.I. Lenin. Works, Vol. 14, p. 325.

This one scientific principle runs through all of Lenin's works. Lenin considers it the leading thread in all the most difficult questions which are often extremely confused by bourgeois theoretists. Directed by the principle of partiality in philosophy, V.I. Lenin succeeded in evaluating according to their merits the historical-philosophical concepts of Hegel, Lasalle, Kuno, Fishar, Lange and other bourgeois philosophers and in giving a truly scientific elaboration of all basic generally theoretical questions of historical-philosophical science. There is not one, literally not even one, methodological question of this science which has not received a truly scientific Marxist elucidation in Lenin's works. We will next dwell on these basic questions which have been elaborated upon by V.I. Lenin on the basis of the principle of the partiality of philosophy.

II

Among the most important principle questions in the history of pre-Marxist philosophy as a science which found scientific explanation in V.I. Lenin's works is the question of the subject of this branch of viewpoints. The importance of clarifying this question, and in particular with respect to its understanding by Lenin, takes precedence not only because no science, including also the history of philosophy, can successfully develop without a precise and completely scientific designation of its subject, but also because this question is extremely confused and embroiled by bourgeois philosophers.

All bourgeois history of philosophy in the subject of its teachings includes only idealistic teachings. Materialism is either completely dismissed by bourgeois philosophers or is interpreted as a gross "empirism" and is not considered at all. It is sufficient to give the following example as to the tendency of contemporary bourgeois philosophy and as to how its subject is understood by contemporary bourgeois theorists: of the three volumes of the "History of Philosophy" (covering the period from ancient times to the 16th century), written by the Professor of the History of Philosophy of Heythrop (?) College Frederick Copleston,¹ one and a half volumes are devoted to medieval scholasticism, and such thinkers as Bruno, Gossendi and Bacon are covered in only 25 pages, and, furthermore, these latter are indicated by Copleston either as pantheists, or as spiritualists, or otherwise, only not as they actually were - not as materialists. The most vehement contemporary bourgeois philosopher B. Russell treats pre-Marxian philosophy in the same manner. In the "History of Western Philosophy"² for example, he does not even mention the names of the French materialists of the 18th century. R

1. Frederick Copleston. A History of Philosophy, London, Vol. 1, 1946; Vol. II, 1950; Vol. III, 1953.
2. Bertrand Russell. History of Western Philosophy. London, 1948.

Russell's characteristic peculiarity as a historian of philosophy is only that, in agreeing with the positivist conception that the essence of philosophy is logic, he raises logical questions to the highest plane in the viewpoint of savants in the past. Furthermore, just as Hegel, Russell attempts to show that all the history of philosophic thought is a preparation for his own personal philosophic system. It is therefore not incidental that the chapter on the philosophy of logical analysis by Russell is greater than the entire history of philosophy.

All of these sciolisms of Copleston, Russell and others like them, all of their inventions regarding pre-Marxian philosophy have nothing in common, naturally, with science. Their aim is, with the help of falsification and calumny against materialism in the past, to undermine confidence in it at the present time and thus to prevent the thoughts of the workers from accepting the theory of Marxism.

Marxism-Leninism counterposes a truly scientific understanding of the subject to the idealistic and positivistic viewpoints on the history of philosophy. The only correct resolution of the question on the subject of the history of philosophy in general and the history of pre-Marxist philosophy in particular is given in the works of Marxist-Leninist classicists. The classicists of Marxist philosophy, V.I. Lenin in particular, understood the history of philosophy to be the study of the creation and development of the elements, laws and forms of materialistic theory and of dialectic method; the study of the struggle of materialism against idealism and agnosticism and dialectics against metaphysics; the study of the struggle of more progressive philosophic ideas against the theories of less progressive and reactionary ideas.

V.I. Lenin taught that all of philosophy, beginning with its primitive forms up to the all-encompassing developed systems of the present time, is partial. V.I. Lenin's understanding of these aforementioned words is primarily the struggle of materialism against idealism. "Could the struggle between idealism and materialism become old during the two thousand year development of philosophy? The tendencies or lines of Plato and Democritus in philosophy? The struggle between religion and science? The denial of objective reality and its recognition? The struggle of the above-mentioned learnings with its adversaries?" - asked Lenin. And he answered: no, - "the most modern philosophy is just as partisan as it was two thousand years ago. Materialism and idealism appear competing through parties in the essence of the matter, disguised by picayune - false new slogans or stupid non-partisanship".[†] According to Lenin, the struggle between materialism and idealism is the essence, the basic content of the subject of the history of philosophy in general, and the history of pre-Marxist philosophy in particular.

The theoretic cataract between materialism and idealism, said V.I. Lenin, in explaining and further developing the thoughts of Engels, is their contrary resolution of the basic philosophic question,

1. V.I. Lenin. Works. Vol. 14, pp. 117, 344.

the question on the relations of thought and reality. Materialism in full agreement with science resolves this question first in favor of matter and second in favor of consciousness. Idealism takes the opposite viewpoint and thus breaks with science and takes the side of religion and fideism. Concerning the correctness of the materialistic resolution of the basic philosophic question and the anti-scientific one of idealism, Lenin wrote that materialism was always the only progressive philosophy, true to all the teachings of the natural sciences, inimical to bigotry, superstition, etc., while idealism at the same time always degenerated in one way or another to the defense or support of religion.¹

The basic question of philosophy is this question, which directly or indirectly, openly or secretly was constantly posed and resolved by all philosophies and upon whose resolution depended the resolution of all other questions. Therefore it is called basic. The chief peculiarity of the basic question of philosophy is that only two partisan and contrary answers are possible - materialistic and idealistic. Thence arise the two partialities in all of philosophy and the struggle between these parties.

In addition to the question on the relations of thought to reality, according to Marxist-Leninist classicists, the question was always raised and considered in the history of pre-Marxian philosophy as to whether the world is perceptual, if man is able in his imagination and understanding to mirror it exactly. This question is the other side of the basic question of philosophy. Questions of gnoseology therefore make up the second important part of the subject of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy as a science.

In characterizing this second part, Lenin showed that, regardless of how meaningful are the materialistic or idealistic resolutions of the question on the relations of thought and being, history knows only two, confirming or denying, answers to this question also, to the question on the cognizance of the world.

The majority of philosophers, states Lenin in "Materialism and Empiriocriticism", evolve their theories of cognizance from the acknowledgement of the cognizance of the world. Here belong all the materialists and the most progressive idealists, despite Hegel. But we see that among them are also such philosophers who deny the possibility of knowing the world or even only partially knowing it. This tendency became a part of the history of philosophy under the name agnosticism. Marx, Engels and Lenin consider Hume and Kant to be their chief representatives.

1. V.I. Lenin. Works. Vol 19, p. 4.

The creation of the agnostic tendency in the history of philosophy was constantly utilized by bourgeois philosophers as a weapon for fighting against the Marxist teaching of the partiality of philosophy. V.I. Lenin struck this slogan from the hands of the enemies of Marxism and in his works, especially in "Materialism and Empiriocriticism", he proved that regardless of what forms or aspects philosophic theories were divided into, no matter what evaluation philosophers gave to their conceptions, be it consciously or unconsciously, the unshakable rule in the development of philosophy has always been the division of all philosophers into two great camps - the camp of materialism and the camp of idealism - and the struggle between them. "Agnosticism... is in reality between materialism and idealism, which means that in practice it is in reality between materialistic teaching and clericalism".¹

Thus, the struggle of materialism against idealism and agnosticism, the struggle between parties in the history of pre-Marxist philosophy, is as Lenin taught, its most characteristic feature and composes the basic content of its subject, and the party approach to it is more important than its methodological requirements. However, Lenin indicated, the content of the subject of this science and the questions on its methodology are not as yet exhausted by this. V.I. Lenin emphasized that the history of philosophy along with the struggle of materialism against idealism includes also the history of the development of the scientific dialectic method and its struggle with metaphysics. He wrote concerning this: "Two basic (or two great? or two noted in history) conceptions of development (evolution) are: development as decrease and increase, as repetition, and development as a unit of opposites (cleavage of a unit into mutually-exclusive opposites and the relations between them)".²

The fact was noted yet by Engels in the "Dialectics of Nature", who stated the possibility and existence in history of two philosophic trends: metaphysical with constant categories, and dialectic with flowing, movable categories.

Marx and Engels denoted dialectics to be a science on the most general laws of nature, the community and human thought. They considered the basic dialectic laws to be the law of the transition of quantity into quality, the law of the mutual penetration of opposites, and the law of the refusal of refusal.

This same understanding of dialectics was also held by V.I. Lenin, in the article "Karl Marx", as well as in "Philosophic Notebooks", V.I. Lenin states that dialectics is the fullest teaching on development. Herewith is presented the imperative requirement to unite the all-encompassing principle of development with the principle of the unity of the world, i.e., a connection with it.³

1. V.I. Lenin. Works, Vol. 19, p. 60.

2. V.I. Lenin. Philosophic Notebooks. 1947, pp. 327-328.

3. V.I. Lenin. Works. Vol. 19, p. 60 and 38; "Philosophic Notebooks". 1947, p. 239.

V.I. Lenin was in full agreement also with the teaching of Marx and Engels on the question of the laws of dialectics. In his works V.I. Lenin always, stated, applied and defended from error these same three laws of dialectics which in their time had been acknowledged by Marx and Engels. At that same time, V.I. Lenin, as a true creative Marxist, did not limit himself here, but went on further to the disclosure of the content of these laws and to the establishment of some basic features of dialectics. In his work "Karl Marx" V.I. Lenin indicates the following features as such: development as the "refusal of refusal"; "leaping, catastrophic, revolutionary development; interruption of progress, the transformation of quantity into quality; - the internal impulses toward development which yield to dispute, to contact with various powers and tendencies, which influence given aims or within the limits of a given phenomenon or internally any given society; mutual dependence and a stronger indissoluble connection of all aspects of every phenomenon", ¹ and of a given phenomenon with another, which grants a sole lawful world-wide process of movement.

In "Philosophic Notebooks" Lenin continues even more profoundly the analysis of the contents of dialectics. Here V.I. Lenin enumerates sixteen elements of dialectics.²

All the laws, features and elements of dialectics indicated by Lenin were naturally not immediately recognized. They have their own history. The dialectic method, taught Lenin, similarly to the materialistic theory, appearing in general features and in a naive form yet among ancient peoples, developed ceaselessly, constantly becoming richer in content and changing with respect to its form, while, as has been mentioned, the development of dialectics occurred always through struggle with metaphysics. According to Marx, Engels and in the opinion of Lenin, metaphysics is a direct opposite of dialectics and in all methodological questions supports the point of view which is the reverse of dialectics. Thence arises their irreconcilability and the struggle between them which, just as the struggle of materialism with idealism, occurs throughout the history of pre-Marxist philosophy and and composes one of the parts of its subject.

Along with the study of the history of materialism and dialectics, the scientific history of philosophy should, in V.I. Lenin's opinion, also study the history of idealism, it should disclose its role in the development of the community. Special attention should be turned, teaches V.I. Lenin, to those moments in the teachings of idealists which influenced the further progress of scientific and philosophic thought. An illustration of Lenin's understanding of this question and his views on the scientific Marxist approach to the study of pre-Marxist philosophy can be Lenin's statement of his opinions on such idealistic systems

1. V.I. Lenin. Works. Vol. 21, p. 38

2. V.I. Lenin. Philosophic Notebooks. 1947, pp 192-193.

as the Pythagorean philosophy, the philosophy of Aristotle, Leibnitz, and others, in which V.I. Lenin, in branding their idealism, was able to ascertain and to evaluate the healthy outgrowths of scientific viewpoints according to their worth. Thus, for example, with regard to the Pythagorean concept of the soul which, as they thought, is composed of solar particles, V.I. Lenin noted that this is an allusion to the atomistic structure of matter and he called their comparison of the structure of the soul to the structure of the heavens as fabrication, phantasy or a similarity between the macrocosm and the microcosm.¹

V.I. Lenin felt that the greatest service rendered by the idealistic systems was their development of the dialectic method. It was primarily for this reason that V.I. Lenin valued the philosophies of Liebnitz, Kant and Hegel. Speaking of the historical origins of modern dialectics, V.I. Lenin says that dialectics is the costly offspring of the idealistic systems.

V.I. Lenin also felt as worthwhile considerations and relations between each other those occurrences in the history of pre-Marxist philosophy when one idealist criticized from more progressive positions the philosophic bases of another idealist. In such an instance, V.I. Lenin said, the materialist always won. Thus, for example, valuable moments in the history of philosophy which influenced the development of philosophic thoughts were in V.I. Lenin's opinion Aristotle's criticism of Plato's theory of ideas, and Hegel's fight against Kant's subjectivism.

Thus, V.I. Lenin solved in generalized features the question on the subject of historical-philosophical science.

The significance of the resolution of this question is difficult to overestimate. V.I. Lenin's ideas on the subject of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy and mainly the teaching developed by them on the partiality of philosophy as the struggle of materialism against idealism make up the essence of the scientific methodology of this branch of viewpoints. The law on the struggle of two parties in philosophy, first disclosed and formulated by Marx and Engels, developed further and concretely applied to pre-Marxist philosophy by V.I. Lenin, is the nucleus of this science around which all of its complex formulations could appear and be created in the future. It was for this reason that V.I. Lenin, in distinguishing the distinctions and varieties of philosophic theories in history and indicating the necessity to keep them in mind, demanded primarily of Marxist philosophers that they be constantly partial in philosophy, he demanded that in all differences they should know how to see the struggle of materialism with idealism in all periods of human history and in every question. Impartiality in philosophy and the application of so-called positivism to the history of philosophy was described by V.I. Lenin in his works as an absurd, dull pretension to raise materialism and idealism higher, as a party of the center, which confuses every principle question of materialistic and idealistic resolution.

1. V.I. Lenin, Philosophic Notebooks. 1947, p. 235.

Understanding the tremendous and fundamental significance of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the struggle of parties in philosophy, the enemies of Marxism, science and progress, the ideologists of the contemporary imperialistic bourgeoisie are doing their utmost to discredit it. Having nothing to say in essence against the Marxist principle of the partiality of philosophy, they first rage against it, and in raging, they begin to destroy their own creations, thus giving the impression that they are destroying Marxism-Leninism. Those especially acting in this manner are the Austrian Jesuit-philosopher Gustav Veter, the White Russian N.O. Lossky who is now living in the United States, the Polish revisionist Kalokowski and others. Lossky, for example, seeing the reflection of V.I. Lenin in any materialistic philosopher or idealist, maliciously calls it in his "History of Russian Philosophy" the expression of a typical bolshevik tendency",¹ projecting into these words a sense of subjectivism and arbitrariness. Kalakowski repeats Lossky's tone. In his article "The Actual and Non-Actual Understanding of Marxism", published in 1957 in the newspaper "Nova Kul'tura" [New Culture], he constantly avers that the Marxist philosophers are not guided in their work by scientific principles, but by directives of the "intelligence", i.e., the Communist Party and its CC, stating further, as does Lossky, that they are subject to the Communist Party and not to science.

The CPSU, the Communist Party of other countries, and all the Marxist-philosophers are systematically disclosing the mockery and calumny of bourgeois philosophy and place the dialectic-materialistic teaching of Lenin on the partiality of philosophy into the foundation of their activity. It is specially stated in the "Declaration of the Conference of the Representatives of the Communist and Workers Parties of the Socialist Countries" that dialectic materialism is the only scientific philosophy which is applicable to the past as well as to the present and to the future.

III

An exclusively important significance in creating the scientific methodology of the history of the pre-Marxist philosophy is possessed by the completely worked out teaching by V.I. Lenin on the class, gnoseologic and theoretic roots of all philosophies and on the concrete-historic approach in research. Through elaboration of this teaching, V.I. Lenin solved the question concerning those concrete methods and means which should guide the disclosure of the contents of the subject of the history of philosophy. Here also V.I. Lenin concretized the principle of the partiality of philosophy with regard to the history of philosophy and caused a successive crushing blow to all bourgeois philosophy.

1. Lossky, N.O. History of Russian Philosophy, N.J., 1951, p. 57.

Pre-Marxist sociology and historiography, as well as all contemporary bourgeois philosophy in most cases only recognize the theoretic source of philosophy. The class and gnoseologic sources of philosophic theories are completely ignored by it or are treated idealistically, in the sense of the precedence of the spiritual history of humanity over the materialistic. Hegel, for example, in his "Lectures on the History of Philosophy" presented the matter thusly, that the development of philosophy is not conditioned by any social reasons, and is an independent process of the self-development of the "absolute spirit". Contemporary bourgeois philosophers hold the same point of view in essence, although slightly different in form. For example, what is the announcement by the contemporary American philosopher Prof. Brand Blanchard worth when he states that he agrees neither with Hegel, nor with Marx, nor with Freud when he preaches the very same idealism as does Hegel and Freud, and only wars against Marxism. According to Blanchard, the mind and intellectual intuition, are not conditioned by any social factors. "It is undoubtedly true - he writes - that because Aristotle and Whitehead (?) belonged to a definite social class this influenced their theoretic activities and it definitely inclined them toward it, but to assert that in the "Second Analytics" or "Principles of Mathematics", in Metaphysics" or "Understanding of Nature" the thought process should be interpreted from the point of view of economic pressure seems fantastic to me. Furthermore, there are such things as a national mind or the pressure of opinion which neither separately nor together appear the function of any economics".¹

Truth in this question, according to Blanchard can be formulated as follows: "The nature of man represents a series of desires, one of which is the impulse for knowledge. This power has its own peculiar aim, which is: the earth's constellation, what it is". And further: "This is the basic motivating factor, because all other and more practical motives depend on it in the sense that each of them should agree with how perceptive power discloses the world. That which we know, or think that we know, stipulates the circumstances, nucleus and conditions of what we do".² This is clearly the idealistic position. And the difference between it and the idealism of Hegel or Freud is the same, in Lenin's words, as the difference between a blue devil and a yellow devil.

In casting aside the economic conditioning of philosophy, bourgeois philosophers also cast aside the tie between philosophy and science. The viewpoint of bourgeois philosophy on this question was quite clearly demonstrated at the second international "Congress of the Philosophy of Sciences", which took place in Zurich in 1954. As is evident from the papers read there, the basic idea of contemporary

1. The Journal of Philosophy, Vo. LI, No. 24, N.J., 1954, p. 745

2. The Journal of Philosophy, Vol. LI, No 24, N.J., 1954, pp. 746-747.

bourgeois philosophy is the positivistic thesis - disclaiming philosophy as a world outlook and as the sole method for all sciences. The president of the congress Prof. F. Hanset (?) commenced his paper as follows: "Can philosophy be used as the method for other sciences"? The answer was as follows: "The development of science does not permit giving a set answer to this question". "In science, - the continued - only hypotheses exist which are either justified or unjustified by life. This also certifies that there can be no philosophy which could perform as a method of science".¹

Characteristic of contemporary bourgeois philosophy and history of philosophy is alienation from concrete historical conditions, denial of the connection between philosophy and science, chaos and scholasticism. The basic methodological principle of bourgeois philosophers is denial of all high principles in research. It is characteristic that bourgeois philosophy does not even express the desire to suppress the chaos which is rampant within it. Furthermore, some bourgeois philosophers are attempting even to place a theoretic foundation under it. At this same congress one of the foreign philosophers announced that he is working out dialectics which has nothing in common either with previous dialectics or with the present. The basic demand of this "new" dialectics is to introduce the principle of the right of each researcher to present problems and modes of research according to their own considerations.

As is known, the Marxist history of philosophy repels such an approach, demonstrating its baselessness. Marxism-Leninism places in opposition to the arbitrary work and lack of principle of bourgeois philosophers an orderly system of scientific principles of historical-philosophical research. As worked out by V.I. Lenin, the teaching on class, gnoseologic, and theoretic roots of all philosophy and his demand for a concrete-historical approach in research which is turned directly against all contemporary bourgeois false philosophy is now a powerful weapon in the hands of Soviet philosophers and Marxist philosophers of foreign countries, and is a truly scientific creation in the field of the history of pre-Marxist philosophy.

The class-partisan character of ideology in general and philosophy in particular was indicated yet by the founders of Marxism - Marx and Engels. This question is, in actuality, materialistic teaching concerning society as partially created by them. V.I. Lenin justified the adaptation and significance of this teaching to historical-philosophic science and indicated concrete forms for its adaptation, at the same time developing it further.

V.I. Lenin showed that since all activities of individuals in a class society are reduced in the final result to the activities of the classes, whose struggles denoted the development of society, therefore, an understanding of all the differences and disturbances of various

1. "Questions of Philosophy" No. 6, 1954, p. 197.

teachings, thoughts and theories in the history of social thought can be achieved only through a strict adherence, as a basic line of direction, to a division of society into classes, changing the forms of class rule.¹ The class struggle, Lenin teaches, is that foundation on the background of which, and on the activities of which, are mirrored all ideological battles. The very struggle of materialism with idealism in philosophy is the expression of class struggle. Philosophy, according to the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, is a class viewpoint. It serves one class or another in that it defends the ideas which conform to the economic and political position of a given class and fights against ideas which are inimical to it. Here materialism expresses, as a rule, the interests of progressive classes, idealism those of the reactionary classes.

V.I. Lenin developed the principle of materialism in history and the principle of a class-partisan approach to all philosophic ideas, constantly struggling against all its apostasies and errors. During their time Marx and Engels were forced to defend this principle against various attacks. V.I. Lenin continued their work. He brilliantly conducted the struggle against the idealism of Hegel, Lasalle and other bourgeois philosophers, as well as against bourgeois objectivism and vulgar materialism. Since Lenin's criticism of idealistic conceptions in the history of philosophy was given more attention in Soviet literature, we will permit ourselves to dwell more minutely on Lenin's struggle against the last two anti-Marxist trends.

Lenin considered the characteristic feature of objectivism to be the "incomplete conduct of materialism" in history and the "unsteadiness of the theory of class struggle". The objectivist, said Lenin, in speaking of any historical process, or event, or theory, characterizes it generally, merely skimming the surface of the facts, without indicating those antagonistic classes from whose struggle the process arises, or whose struggle denotes a given event or a given ideology. This approach has nothing in common with science and is inevitable in idealism in evaluating any philosophic school or point of view. Thus, V.I. Lenin labelled as abstract and idealistic the objectivist characterization given by Struve to populism, in which he merely indicated the theoretic position of this ideology, but did not demonstrate either its class situation nor its materialistic source.²

In addition, objectivism, in cloaking itself with phrases concerning the necessity for the objective examination of facts, concerning its, supposedly, lack of bias and lack of prejudice in science, in actuality always risks tearing down the viewpoint of the apologist of these facts and always silently supports the interests of certain definite community (social) powers.

1. V.I. Lenin. Works. Vol. I. p. 390, and Vol. 29, p. 441.

2. V.I. Lenin. Works, Vol. I, p. 374.

The materialist, in contrast to the objectivist, Lenin teaches, analyzes facts more deeply and more systematically, disclosing their class sense and class source, openly declares his sympathy toward one or another class, and denotes its class-party point of view. "...Materialism includes in itself partiality, so to speak - wrote Lenin - obligating itself in all evaluations of events to take a stand directly and openly on the viewpoint of a definite social group".¹

As shown by V.I. Lenin, objectivism in its essence and extraction is a bourgeois idea, which illustrates the bourgeois fear of an objective illumination of history, demonstrates its striving to conceal class struggle in society and its bond with its ideology, and also the striving to present its interests and its ideas as the interests and ideas of humanity in general, over and above class ideas. Impartiality - Lenin declared - is a bourgeois idea. Partiality is a socialist idea".²

Lenin first came in contact at the beginning of this century with the other extreme of introduction of materialism into history, with vulgar-economic materialism, which, not understanding the dialectic nature of the connection of ideology with economics, oversimplified this connection and thus fell into error on the question of the true class-economic sources of these or other ideologic forms. Even then, in defeating economists in tactical, organizational and ideological questions, Lenin rebuffed also their absurd theoretical definition concerning the direct and one-sided dependence of ideology on material circumstances in the process of the development of society.³

A bit latter after this question, V.I. Lenin criticized Patresav who asserted that the philosophic dispute between Engels and Dzyuryng (?) had a "living concrete significance" for the movement of the German working class. V.I. Lenin showed Patresav that it cannot be stated that "the most abstract theses (Engels vs. Dzyuryng (?)) truly had a concrete significance for the movement of the German working class". This would be too rude, vulgar and undialectical. Engels' most abstract theses had only this significance, Lenin writes, that they explained to the ideologists of the working class wherein the errors lie in abandoning materialism for positivism and idealism.⁴³

However, Shulyatsikov tried more than all the others to vulgarize the principle of materialism in historical science. Shulyatsikov altered the teaching of Marxism on the class character and partiality of all philosophy until it was unrecognizable. In his book "Justification of Capitalism in West European Philosophy (from Descartes to Mach)" he explained the situation thusly, that, in his own words, all philosophic terms and formulas without exception, with which philosophy

1. V.I. Lenin. Works, Vol. 1, p. 380
2. V.I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 10, p. 61.
3. V.I. Lenin. Works. Vol. 5, p. 349 (remarks).
4. V.I. Lenin. Works. Vol. 17, pp. 52-52.

operates, serve it only as conventional signs for classification of social classes, groups, and cells, and their inter-relationships. After reading these words by Shulyatsikov, V.I. Lenin twice declared: "That's not true! That's not true!"¹

V.I. Lenin, basing himself on the positions of Marx and Engels and concretely applying and developing them further, disclosed and rebuffed all the vulgarizing inventions of all the despoilers of Marxism. In all of his statements on this question, and especially in his remarks on the title of the above-mentioned book by Shulyatsikov, V.I. Lenin constantly conveys the thought that philosophy is connected with an economic basis and class struggle not directly, not indirectly, but obliquely, being an intermediary between political, statutory and moral norms; that philosophy is the origination and illustration of a material basis, it animates these illustrations in their specific, abstract and world view-point forms. Philosophy, Lenin teaches, is the world viewpoint of a class, illustrating mainly its fundamental interests and ultimate aims.

The connection of philosophy with the economic and class basis of society, V.I. Lenin teaches, is complicated and in order to disclose it a serious and profound analysis is required as an historical setting which gave birth to a given philosophy, as well as suitable theoretical conditions. Such and only such a principle in the history of philosophy is a Marxistic, class-partisan and scientific approach to a definite branch of human opinions; every other point of view in this question is incorrect, is not true and does not lead to verity.

Along with the question of the class-Partisan character of philosophy, V.I. Lenin studied completely and solved the question on the connection between philosophy and science, on the existence of not only class sources but all gnoseologic sources in all philosophic systems.

The working out of this important question is a special service rendered by Lenin. It is true that Engels also indicated the connection of philosophy with science and with natural science. V.I. Lenin further developed Engels' position on this question. He showed the connection with scientific knowledge not only of materialism, but also of idealism, he explained the reasons for the gnoseologic sources of idealism, showed the connection between gnoseologic sources with class sources, and studied the question on the form in which the development of philosophic thought occurred in the pre-Marxist period.

V.I. Lenin presented the entire course of human knowledge as a perpetual live, many sided (with a constantly increasing number of sides) process with a great number of evaluations of every approach, and the closer approach of man's mind to purposefulness.² In the various stages of development this process appeared differently.

1. Journal "Under the Banner of Marxism". No. 6, 1937.
2. V.I. Lenin. Philosophic Notebooks. 1947, p. 330.

Initially, abstract data prevailed in it and all aspects bore the name of philosophy. Later, in modern times, the basic kernel and contents of understanding were contributed by various concrete sciences, which had developed by that time into an independent branch of views. However, even in modern times, regardless of whether the philosophers and scholars themselves understood this or not, philosophy always remained closely knit with concrete views. It grew out of them and on the basis of them and, inversely, appearing in relation to their theory of understanding, it influenced their development to one extent or another.

The connection and inter-relation of philosophy with science will, naturally, always be different, depending on whether the philosophy is materialistic or idealistic.

Lenin teaches that materialism, in asserting the possibility of understanding the world and having the exactly same aim as science - to become profoundly cognizant of nature and humanity, - is tightly and indispensably connected with it. Presenting a true generalization of the results of science, it itself grows out of it; science derives its methodological principles from materialism's positions. Therefore, materialism, in disclosing and formulating the basic laws of understanding, influences the development of all sciences and the speedy understanding of the real world by man. And furthermore, without exaggeration we can say that without the use of materialistic principles science would not be able to make even one step forward. Even where this is done unconsciously, teachings in their practical conclusions come dangerously close to the conviction on the primacy of matter and the secondary place of knowledge and their understanding, i.e., to materialistic convictions. Thanks only to such convictions are scientists able to make discoveries in science, thanks only to it is science possible. This ignorant, philosophically unformulated, but in essence materialistic conviction of scientists is that which V.I. Lenin called elemental or natural-science-historical materialism.

Idealism resolves all gnoseologic questions completely opposite to the learning of materialism and science. However, even it is connected with leaning, Lenin stressed, and has its roots in it. Idealism is clericalism. This is true, said Lenin, but clericalism is not without foundation with relation to leaning, it is not merely a contrivance of ideologists of one or another reactionary class and it is not connected with it, but it is such which has its roots in leaning, which grows from it and lives on it. "In clericalism (= philosophic idealism) - writes Lenin - there are, naturally, gnoseologic roots, it is not without foundation, it is a barren flower, incontestibly, but a barren flower which thrives on the living tree of the vital, fluent, true, mighty, omnipotent, objective, absolute knowledge of mankind".¹

1. V.I. Lenin. Philosophic Notebooks. 1947, p. 330

Idealism was contrived by the exploiting classes and is supported by them in every way because it defends religion and, together with it, draws away the thoughts of the peoples masses from real reason, from the class struggle.

Idealism, therefore, is possible only in a society which was founded on class struggle. In it, as in religion, the chief roots are social roots. With the disappearance of antagonistic classes and the building of a classless society in the whole world, idealism will vanish, and the only world-viewpoint of scholars will be the philosophy of dialectic materialism.

After all, the pre-Marxist period in history is the period when society, with the exception of the primordial social order, was based on the exploitation of one class by another. Therefore knowledge here gave birth to idealism and to some extent or another was always subject to its influence. Thence comes the complexity and intricacy of its course in this period. And when now, from the heights of our time, we look at this course as a whole and attempt to picture it graphically, it takes on the form of a complex, spiral-like line, on whose every twig in its course are innumerable small spirals. It was Hegel yet who expressed this thought on the course of man's knowledge. V.I. Lenin approved Hegel's idea, calling it a comparison of the history of knowledge with deep and true cycles.¹

V.I. Lenin applied the concept of a "circular" (spiral-like) movement of knowledge in history to the history of pre-Marxist philosophy. V.I. Lenin represented the historical course of the entire pre-Marxist philosophy as a series of "circles", which rise one above the other. Lenin divides the individual "cycles" into ancient philosophy, the philosophy of the Renaissance period, and modern philosophy. The chief representatives of the first are considered by Lenin to be Democritus, Plato, and Heraclitus; of the second - Descartes, Gassendi (or Spinoza); of the third - Holbach, Hegel, Feuerbach and Marx. In his fragment "On the Question of Dialectics" Marx writes as follows concerning this: "Circles" in philosophy [is a chronology necessary regarding individuals? No!]

Ancient: from Democritus to Plato and the dialectics of Heraclitus.

Renaissance: Descartes versus Gassendi (Spinoza?).

Modern: Holbach - Hegel (through Berkeley, Hume, Kant).

Hegel-Feuerbach-Marx."²

In this manner, "cycles" in philosophy are definite periods, definite stages in its development which have in common for all philosophies of a given period all its fundamental features. The philosophers

1. V.I. Lenin. Philosophic Notebooks. 1947, pp. 281 and 322.

2. Ibid. p. 330.

named by Lenin are representatives of opposite parties in philosophy who most fully illustrate in their theories and philosophic systems the tendencies of their epochs.

It has already been stated above that Marxism does not deny ideological and theoretic succession in philosophy. However, since Marxism, and V.I. Lenin especially, place a completely different meaning on this understanding from that understood by this question in non-Marxist literature, we should dwell on this in more detail.

First of all, the following should be made quite distinct. Not even speaking of the fact that all of pre-Marxist (as well as contemporary bourgeois) philosophy did not see and did not understand the dependence of the connection of philosophic ideas in history on the development of material creativeness and natural science, it could not, as derived from its principles, also understand correctly and show the theoretical connection in the history of philosophy. Of all the pre-Marxist and generally non-Marxist theorists of the history of philosophy, Hegel made the greatest contribution in resolving this question.

However, even he, due to idealism, was far from the essence and in his "Lectures on the History of Philosophy" distorted quite a bit. Only Marxism, and its creators Marx and Engels, placed the question of imitation in the history of philosophy on a completely scientific plane. Lenin also gave a great deal of attention to it. What V.I. Lenin basically accomplished regarding this question is that he discovered the dialectic essence of the very phenomenon of imitation, showing its indispensable place in the process of development, and he drew a series of conclusions for the practice of historical-philosophical research.

Theoretic imitation is not an external act of linking ideas in the history of philosophy, but is one of the moments in the development of philosophy. All development, V.I. Lenin showed, bears a dialectic character. Constantly progressing, i.e., going from the lowest to the highest, it occurs with the help of denying the old and asserting the new. But denying the old does not mean completely discarding it. Dialectic denial, denial as a moment in the process of development along with discarding of the obsolete and changing is in itself an important element in the retention of the constant achieved in the old form. "Not naked denial - writes Lenin - not useless denial, not skeptical denial, vacillation, are actually characteristic and essential in dialectics, which without doubt includes in itself an element of denial and this is here one of its most important elements; - No, but denial, as a moment of connection, as a moment of development, with the retention of the constant, i.e., without all kinds of vacillations, without all kinds of eclectics."¹ Which means that the development of philosophy also occurs (the only way possible) as a result of denial, on the one hand, and ideological imitation on the other. Such is the conclusion.

1. V.I. Lenin. Philosophic Notebooks. 1947, p. 197.

In its form, imitation can appear in various aspects. V.I. Lenin showed the possibility of imitation between theories or systems which are not separated in time. This is the imitation, so to speak of immediate teachers and students. Imitation can also exist between philosophic ideas which are not found in temporary contact with each other. In such a case it follows mainly the framework of a particular philosophic trend, while in the first instance it can also exist between philosophic systems belonging to various parties. Ideal imitation, according to Lenin, can exist (existed, and exists now) independently of its temporary characteristics between various countries and peoples. The latter, naturally, has nothing in common with cosmopolitanism as an unprincipled bowing and scraping before all that is foreign just because it is foreign.

END

1057

THIS PUBLICATION WAS PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT TO THE
UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ESTABLISHED
TO SERVICE THE TRANSLATION AND RESEARCH NEEDS
OF THE VARIOUS GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS