From Lenin Reloaded! Toward a Politics of Truth, ed. Sebastian Budgen, Stathis Kouvelakis & Slavoj Zizek (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007)

7

The Rediscovery and Persistence of the Dialectic in Philosophy and in World Politics

Kevin B. Anderson

Today, evoking Lenin's name in any affirmative sense usually sounds naïve, if not jarring, even on the Left. Again and again since 1980, it has been said that Lenin laid the ground for Stalin's barbaric totalitarian system, that not only his actions, but also his political ideas, were authoritarian, crude, even violent. Again and again, it has been suggested that if one wishes to return to Marx, one needs to do so by creating a *cordon sanitaire* around Lenin and Bolshevism. Again and again, Lenin's name, if it is invoked at all, is mentioned as an example of how one can court disaster by getting caught up in "utopian" thinking.

I would argue that the proponents of such notions are themselves guilty of naïve and self-contradictory thinking, not to speak of arrogance. First, they fail to take account of some of the notable positive achievements of the Russian Revolution in its early years. Second, they fail to note Lenin's major original contributions to political thought. Third, they also forget the many important thinkers, still widely respected and referred to today, who themselves appreciated and were deeply indebted to Lenin. To remember these and similar points is in no way to avoid the needed critique of many aspects of Lenin's life and work. Remembering these kinds of issues is rather the precondition for any serious (rather than caricaturing) critique of Lenin and his legacy.

Since this chapter will stress Lenin's theoretical achievements, I would like to state at the outset that I also see some serious weaknesses in Lenin's thought. First, his espousal of the leading role of the vanguard party, a concept that cannot be found in Marx, has burdened us

for too long with a poor model of revolutionary organization.[1] Second, many of Lenin's actions after 1917, especially the establishment of the one-party state and the undermining of the workers' soviets, were no model of revolutionary democracy.[2] Third, although I will argue below that Lenin made a significant contribution to dialectical thinking, his work on this issue was uneven, as seen in his crude and mechanistic *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (1908).[3] These things said, one could still appreciate the many attractive features of this great revolutionary leader without in any way self-identifying as a Leninist, which in the dominant discourse usually means an adherence to his elitist concept of the vanguard party.

I would like to begin by citing a statement on Lenin by a well-known thinker whose whole image is that of a humanistic, even liberal leftist, whose life and thought, it would be assumed by many, were far removed from Lenin and Bolshevism. I refer to Erich Fromm, the noted Frankfurt school psychologist. It may surprise the reader to learn that, in the late 1950s, Fromm wrote of Lenin as someone who was imbued with "an uncompromising sense of truth, penetrating to the very essence of reality, and never taken in by the deceptive surface; of an unquenchable courage and integrity; of deep concern and devotion to man and his future; unselfish and with little vanity or lust for power." Fromm also contrasted Lenin to "the vengeful killer Stalin" and the "opportunistic conservative Stalin." Additionally, Fromm deplored "the general habit of considering Stalinism . . . as identical with, or at least as a continuation of revolutionary Marxism."[4]

This statement from the noted author whose books include *Socialist Humanism*, *Escape from Freedom*, *The Art of Loving*, and many other works in humanistic psychology, a man who supported both the peace movements and the Eastern European dissident movements of the 1960s, should give us pause. Fromm was certainly aware of the destructiveness of the Russian Civil War of 1918–21 and the authoritarian measures that Lenin took during those years, but, unlike most of today's commentators on Lenin and Russia, he also saw the grandeur of the vision of 1917. To Fromm and much of his generation, this was a revolution that had helped to end the carnage of World War I, that had brought to power a pro-working-class government, that had freed Jews and other minorities from tsarism, Europe's most intolerant political system, and that had also inspired great revolutionaries such as Rosa Luxemburg to

attempt the radical transformation of Germany, an attempt that failed when she was brutally murdered by precursors of Nazism in 1919.

Lenin, Hegel, and "Western Marxism": The Subterranean Relationship

None of Fromm's Frankfurt school colleagues, even those usually considered further to the left such as Herbert Marcuse, ever voiced openly such sentiments about Lenin. Instead, the Frankfurt school philosophers, when they mentioned Lenin at all, tended to disparage him as crude and vulgar (Theodor Adorno) or to view him a little less disparagingly but nonetheless as a precursor of Stalin, who was in fundamental continuity with him (Marcuse). Marcuse and Adorno never discussed Lenin's 1914–15 Hegel notebooks.[5] This is extremely surprising, given the fact that both of them wrote extensively on the relationship of Marxism to Hegel throughout their careers. Nonetheless, this silence on their part cannot alter the fact that they as well as the so-called Western Marxists of the 1920s—Georg Lukács, Antonio Gramsci, and Karl Korsch—were in important ways indebted to Lenin and the Russian Revolution, not least for the new impulse 1917 gave to the rediscovery of the dialectical core of Marxism.

Standard accounts of the history of Western Marxism and critical theory leave out or minimize two important facts. First, at a general level, there is the fact that Lenin wrote his most serious work on Hegel, the notebooks of 1914–15, nearly a decade before Lukács published *History and Class Consciousness* in 1923. And while Lenin's Hegel notebooks were not published until 1932 in German, some of his other post-1914 writings on Hegel and dialectics had begun to appear in German by the early 1920s. Thus, Lenin helped pave the way for Lukács.

West German critical Marxists of the 1960s almost never mentioned this fact, even though the same people tended to extol Lukács and Korsch. The dismissal of Lenin was true not only of Jürgen Habermas and of his students, but also of those then considered further to the left, such as Oskar Negt.[6] A rare exception was Iring Fetscher's long essay on Marxism and Hegel that was published in 1960, in which Lenin's writings on dialectics were considered quite seriously.[7] However, this aspect of Fetscher's writings had little impact. Its appearance did not mitigate the virulent rejection of Lenin by Rudi Dutschke and other

leaders of the West German New Left.[8] Even the Berlin-based journal *Das Argument*, which was known for its more "orthodox" Marxism, tended to discuss Rosa Luxemburg but not Lenin.

Second, in addition to Fromm's essay, there is considerable specific evidence of Lenin's influence on Western or critical Marxism. For example, even though he violently repudiated Lenin later on, Korsch's *Marxism and Philosophy*, first published in 1923, the same year as *History and Class Consciousness*, carried as its epigraph the following statement by Lenin written in 1922: "We must organize a systematic study of the Hegelian dialectic from a materialist standpoint."[9] Yet even so acute a philosopher as Maurice Merleau-Ponty viewed Korsch's book as a founding text of Western Marxism, which he contrasted to "Leninist orthodoxy."[10]

In contrast, the Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch, a contemporary of Lukács, Korsch, Marcuse, and Adorno, tied the revival of Hegel in the twentieth century directly to Lenin. He noted that there was nothing inherent in the German tradition that would necessarily have revived Hegel, because, he wrote, "Hegel was never so pushed aside as in Germany after 1850."[11] During the closing years of the nineteenth century and the first years of the twentieth, Hegel was still being discussed somewhat in Italy, France, and the English-speaking world. However, Bloch suggested, the real revival came only after 1917:

> The shock before the walls of the Kremlin did more than catch up to the shock of the Hegelian left; the dialectic had become, instead of a forgotten folly, a living scandal. . . . Nonetheless, it was no longer Hegel who was forgotten, but rather the chic ignorance of enlightened positivism. . . . Lenin renewed authentic Marxism not least by a return to the "core" of the Hegelian dialectic ("contradiction as the source of all movement and life") and through Hegelian logic itself: "It is impossible fully to grasp Marx's *Capital*, and especially its first chapter, if you have not studied through and understood the whole of Hegel's *Logic*. Consequently, none of the Marxists for the past half-century has understood Marx!!" (LCW 38:180).[12] In this way, it was precisely orthodox Marxism, as restored by Lenin, that presupposed knowledge of Hegel, as against a vulgar, schematic, and traditionless Marxism, which, like a shot out of a pistol, isolated Marx from Hegel, thus isolating itself from Marx.[13]

Surely, it was in a similar vein that Lukács wrote in "What Is Orthodox Marxism?," the opening chapter of *History and Class Consciousness*: "Orthodox Marxism, therefore, does not imply the uncritical acceptance of the results of Marx's investigations. It is not the 'belief' in this or that thesis, nor the exegesis of a 'sacred' book. On the contrary, orthodoxy refers exclusively to method. It is the scientific conviction that dialectical materialism is the road to truth and that its methods can be developed, expanded and deepened only along the lines laid down by its founders."[14]

These connections between Lenin and the Hegelian Marxism of the 1920s have usually been passed over by scholars of critical theory.

In this chapter, I want to concentrate on three points. First, Lenin's intellectual crisis in 1914, under the impact of World War I and the betrayal of socialism, led to a profound rethinking of his earlier categories. I will argue that his recovery of Hegel in his notebooks of 1914–15 and after made an important contribution to the dialectical perspective in Marxism. Second, Lenin's use of the new dialectical concepts he had developed out of his reading of Hegel led him to formulate some strikingly perceptive and radical perspectives on world politics. This was especially true of his analysis of colonialism and imperialism, on the one hand, and of the anti-imperialist national liberation movements—from India to Ireland and from China to the Middle East—on the other. Third, I examine how Lenin's new perspectives on Hegel and the dialectic affected later Marxist thinkers. While these points are often omitted in studies of Lenin's life and thought,[15] I believe that they are significant for an understanding of Lenin in his own time. I also believe that they are among those aspects of his thought that are the most relevant for today.

Lenin, Hegel, and the Dialectic

By the 1890s, many of the dominant thinkers of Central European Marxism had moved toward forms of neo-Kantianism or even positivism. None of the major figures, including Engels, seemed very interested in Hegel. Thus, when the sixtieth anniversary of Hegel's death came around in 1891, it was a Russian, Georgii Plekhanov, who wrote the article commemorating the founder of modern dialectics in *Die Neue Zeit*, at the time the world's leading journal of Marxist thought. Unfortunately, Plekhanov, who in this article coined the somewhat dubious term "dialectical materialism," also developed there an evolutionist and crudely materialist version of the dialectic. He saw no fundamental difference between the Marxian dialectic and Darwinian evolutionism, even though Marx had referred in *Capital*, vol. 1, to Darwin's perspective as an example of "the weakness of the abstract materialism of natural science, a materialism which excludes the historical process."[16]

Until 1914, Lenin followed Plekhanov not so much politically—for Plekhanov was often on the right wing of Russian social democracy—as philosophically. This is obvious in Lenin's mechanistic book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (1908). This book had two fundamental limitations from a dialectical perspective. First, it put forth a crude reflection theory in which Marxist materialism was "a copy, an approximate copy, of objective reality" (LCW 14:182). Second, Lenin dismissed all forms of idealism as "nothing but an embellished ghost story" (LCW 14:165).

Let us follow these two strands of Lenin's thought, theory as a photocopy of reality and the utter rejection of idealism, during his intellectual crisis of 1914, when he really began to study Hegel. The transformation of these two points will show Lenin's originality after 1914. As is well known, in the political sphere, Lenin was at this time breaking with the Marxism of the Second International. He was calling for a new international, for turning the imperialist war into a civil war, even for revolutionary defeatism. He and a few others, such as Luxemburg, Liebknecht, and Trotsky, were among the important figures who took a firm stance against a war that was eventually to result in some ten million deaths. Luxemburg, for example, was sent to jail for her principled opposition to the war.

From Switzerland, where he sought refuge in the fall of 1914, Lenin began for the first time to think of himself not only as a leader of Russian Marxism, but also as a crucial figure in the effort to rebuild international Marxism on the ruins of the old, discredited Second International. Thus, Lenin began his philosophical rethinking not in a period of calm when there was little to occupy him in the political sphere, but in a turbulent time that demanded a reorganization of his fundamental principles. He, too, had followed the very leaders of the Second Interna-

tional who had now betrayed socialism and the working classes, helping to send them into the slaughter in the trenches.

Lenin carried out his most intensive study of Hegel in the first months of the war, from September 1914 through January 1915. Major changes in his philosophical outlook took place as he began to summarize, outline, and comment upon Hegel's massive *The Science of Logic*. Lenin studied this work intensively, copying out whole passages in German, interspersed with his own comments, the latter most often in Russian.

First, there was the move away from crude materialism and toward a critical appropriation of Hegel's idealist dialectic. As with Engels, Lenin felt an affinity for the fluidity and flexibility of Hegelian thought: "Hegel analyzes concepts that usually appear dead and he shows that there is movement in them" (LCW 38:110). But soon he was moving toward something else, beyond the Engelsian dichotomy of "two great camps [*Lager*]" in philosophy, idealism, and materialism:[17] "The idea of the transformation of the ideal into the real is profound! Very important for history. But also in the personal life of man it is evident that there is much truth in this. Against vulgar materialism. Nota bene. The difference of the ideal from the material is also not unconditional, not boundless"(LCW 38:114).

Here he had introduced for the first time a new category, "vulgar materialism." Further on in his notes he wrote that Plekhanov had never analyzed *The Science of Logic*, in Lenin's eyes Hegel's most fundamental work, and he bluntly labeled Plekhanov not a dialectical materialist but a "vulgar materialist" (LCW 38:179). At a more general level, it should of course be noted that such remarks on Lenin's part are far closer to what is usually termed critical Marxism than to what is usually considered to be orthodox Leninism.

In addition, and this would later present problems for Marxist-Leninist students of Spinoza such as Louis Althusser, Lenin seemed to agree with Hegel's critique of Spinoza's deterministic system. Spinoza's philosophy, wrote Hegel, lacked a free and conscious subject, instead making thought, as Lenin put it, into a mere "attribute of substance" (LCW 38:168). Throughout the notes on *The Science of Logic*, Lenin seemed to be trying to avoid the one-sidedness of crudely materialist perspectives, to wit: "It is absurd . . . to reject the objectivity of notions [concepts]" (LCW 38:178). Part of this involved how one should

approach the critique of neo-Kantianism. Seeming to criticize his own earlier writings such as *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, as well as those of others such as Plekhanov, Lenin wrote, "At the beginning of the twentieth century, Marxists criticized the Kantians and Humists more in a Feuerbachian (and Büchnerian) than a Hegelian manner" (LCW 38:179). Something rather remarkable had occurred here. For the first time since the young Marx, a major figure in the Marxian tradition had suggested that a problem be approached in "a Hegelian manner," without the need to refer immediately to qualifiers about materialism. In fact, Lenin was tacking in the opposite direction, away from vulgar materialism, which, in his view, had developed a materialist but un-Hegelian, and therefore undialectical, critique of neo-Kantian idealism.

This led directly to Lenin's well-known aphorism, already cited earlier in this chapter: "Aphorism: It is impossible fully to grasp Marx's *Capital*, and especially its first chapter, if you have not studied through and understood the whole of Hegel's *Logic*. Consequently, none of the Marxists for the past half-century has understood Marx!!" (LCW 38:180).

Elsewhere, Lenin referred to Hegel's dialectic as "the inner pulsation of self-movement and vitality." Gradually, he came to reject his earlier rejection of idealism. The key now was to appropriate critically Hegel's dialectical idealism and to connect it to Marxist materialism. As against Engels's notion of two camps, idealism and materialism, Lenin was coming close to a position suggesting some type of dialectical unity between idealism and materialism. Unknown to Lenin, something similar had been espoused in 1844 by the young Marx, who wrote of "a consistent naturalism or humanism" that was "distinguished from both idealism and materialism, and at the same time constitutes their unifying truth."[18]

Second, I would like to look at Lenin's increasing rejection of crude reflection theory, another point of rupture with his perspectives of 1908. The most explicit evidence for this move is a statement near the end of Lenin's Hegel notebooks: "Man's cognition not only reflects the objective world, but creates it" (LCW 38:212). This is an example of an active, critical, revolutionary appropriation of Hegel's idealism. Here the cognition embodied in revolutionary theory is not only the reflec-

tion of material conditions. It is also a reaching beyond those conditions, toward the creation of a new world, one free of the dehumanized social relations of capitalism. Nor does the side materialism or reflection get priority "in the last analysis" here. If anything, the flow of the sentence leads in the opposite direction, moving us from the limitations of a reflection theory to the notion that ideas, concepts can "create" the objective world.

Leszek Kolakowski, despite his strongly critical view of Lenin, conceded that these notes on Hegel go beyond the orthodox Engelsian position that reduced the dialectic to a focus on fluid versus static forms. In his *Main Currents of Marxism*, Kolakowski writes that the Hegel notebooks "suggest an interpretation of Hegelianism that is less simplified than Engels's. The dialectic is not merely an assertion that 'everything changes,' but an attempt to interpret human knowledge as a perpetual interplay between subject and object, in which the 'absolute primacy' of either loses its sharpness."[19]

National Liberation Movements: A New Dialectical Opposition in the Era of Imperialism

As is well known, Lenin's "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" (1916) was one of his major theoretical works. Few, however, have examined its relationship to his writings on national liberation and anti-imperialist movements. Fewer still have explored the relationship of that book to his Hegel notebooks completed the previous year. That is what I will explore below.

Today there is a tendency on the Left to dismiss all forms of nationalism as reactionary. This is curious, since a generation ago, the tendency was often in the opposition direction, toward an uncritical support of all forms of Third World national liberation movements, from South Africa to Palestine and from Vietnam to Cuba. Lenin's writings, especially those after 1915, put forth a position that is far from uncritical of national movements. At the same time, however, he was the first major political theorist, Marxist or non-Marxist, to grasp the importance that anti-imperialist national movements would have for global politics in the twentieth century.

As mentioned earlier, up to 1914, Lenin had considered himself a

Russian Marxist leader rather than one of the leaders of international Marxism. In this sense, his trajectory is very different from that of Luxemburg, who had become a prominent fixture at international socialist gatherings during the years before World War I. Lenin's wartime activities and writings constituted his stepping out onto the world stage of revolutionary politics in at least four major ways. First, as we have seen, his Hegel notebooks were part of an evident attempt on his part to reconstitute Marxist theory after the betrayal of 1914. Second, his book *Imperialism* (1916) never mentioned Russia but concentrated instead on the leading capitalist nations, Britain, France, Germany, and the United States. It was only after the crisis of 1914 that Lenin decided to enter this debate, which had engaged world Marxism since around 1910, with important contributions by Luxemburg, Karl Kautsky, and Rudolf Hilferding, among others. Nor did his related writings after 1915 on anti-imperialist national liberation movements concentrate narrowly on nationalities within the Russian Empire; instead, they focus as much or more on Ireland, China, India, and the Middle East. Third, his *The State and Revolution* (1917) hardly mentioned Russian developments at all. It was a theoretical treatise that attacked the main line of German Social Democratic theory and practice since the death of Engels in 1895, a clear bid on his part to lay down a theoretical marker for world, not Russian Marxism. Fourth, his attempts to found a new International from 1914 onward, finally achieved in 1919, illustrate this shift at a more practical level. It is true that his young Bolshevik colleague, Nikolai Bukharin, also wrote treatises on imperialism and the state shortly before Lenin did so. In yet another of the innumerable attempts to underplay the originality of Lenin's thought and to portray him as mainly an organization man, key differences between Lenin and Bukharin have also been obscured, especially in the studies of Lenin by Tony Cliff and Neil Harding, who have argued at length that in both *Imperialism* and *The State and Revolution* Lenin was mainly following out points previously developed by Bukharin.[20]

When Lenin began to develop the notion that anti-imperialist liberation movements would be a major force of opposition to capitalism in its imperialist stage, his position met with strong opposition. Bukharin's argument that the centralization of world capital produced by the war would make nationalism obsolete had far more support among the

revolutionary Left.[21] That is why Lenin continued to be in the minority until after 1917 concerning what were then termed the national and colonial questions, even among those Marxists who had broken with the Second International. This can easily be seen in the polemics against his position, not only by Luxemburg and Bukharin, but also by Karl Radek and others.[22]

In his 1916–17 writings on imperialism and nationalism, written from exile, Lenin referred especially to the Irish uprising of Easter 1916, as well as to China, Iran, Turkey, and India. The Irish case, because it involved the war's only major anti-imperialist national uprising, the Easter Rebellion of 1916, touched off fierce polemics in which Lenin elaborated his own perspectives at some length. Lenin hailed the rebellion, also bringing in the issue of dialectics: "The dialectics of history are such that small nations, powerless as an *independent* factor in the struggle against imperialism, play a part as one of the ferments, one of the bacilli, which help the *real* anti-imperialist force, the socialist proletariat, to make its appearance on the scene" (LCW 22:357).

On the right wing of Russian socialism, Plekhanov had hailed the collapse of the Easter Rebellion, while Radek, a former colleague of Luxemburg's who was now working with Lenin, dismissed it as a "putsch": "This movement, called 'Sinn Fein,' was a purely urban petty-bourgeois movement, and although it caused considerable commotion, it had little social backing."[23] Trotsky took a position midway between Radek's and Lenin's, downplaying the significance of the revolt but seeing some potential for the movement if it were to overcome its nationalism. He was not very prescient when he wrote that, given the development of world capitalism, "the historical basis for a national revolution has disappeared even in backward Ireland." Thus, Trotsky concluded, "the experiment of an Irish national rebellion" exemplified "outworn hopes and methods of the past."[24] This debate has not received the attention it deserves, in part because the texts cited above by Radek and Trotsky were translated into Western languages only belatedly. The several lengthy studies of Lenin published since 1970, mainly by British scholars, either do not mention Lenin and Ireland at all, or give the topic short shrift.[25]

Again and again, Lenin wrote of the hundreds of millions of people oppressed by global imperialism and of their yearning for liberation. He

saw a profound difference between the emancipatory national movements inside oppressed nations and the chauvinist nationalism of dominant nations. National liberation was the dialectical opposite of global imperialism, whereas the nationalism of the great powers of Europe, the United States, and Japan promoted and underpinned imperialism.

Those who minimize Lenin's theoretical contribution, or view him as a mere tactician, should consider his prescience on these issues. Over three decades before India won its independence and more than four decades before the African liberation movements came to the fore in the early 1960s, he was already theorizing anti-imperialist national movements as a major factor in global politics.

In a 1916 critique of what he evidently regarded as Bukharin's formalistic rejection of all forms of nationalism, Lenin accused his young Bolshevik colleague of wanting to "paint . . . the future in monotonous gray": "The social revolution can come only in the form of an epoch in which are combined civil war by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries and a whole series of democratic and revolutionary movements, including the national liberation movements in the underdeveloped, backward, oppressed nations" (LCW 23:70).

In one of his very last writings, the "Notes on Sukhanov" (1923), Lenin attacked those who sought to enclose the particularity of non-European developments within an abstract universal:

> They call themselves Marxists, but their conception of Marxism is impossibly pedantic. They have completely failed to understand what is decisive in Marxism, namely, its revolutionary dialectics. They have even absolutely failed to understand Marx's plain statements that in times of revolution the utmost flexibility is demanded. . . . Up to now they have seen capitalism and bourgeois democracy in Western Europe follow a definite path of development, and cannot conceive that this path can be taken as a model only mutatis mutandis, only with certain amendments. . . . For instance, it does not even occur to them that because Russia stands on the borderline between the civilized countries and the countries which this war has for the first time definitely brought into the orbit of civilization—all the oriental, non-European countries—she could and was, indeed, bound to reveal certain distinguishing features. . . . (LCW 33:476–77, emphasis added)

As Lenin underlined above, all of this was tied to the lack of a dialectical standpoint.

In this sense, his Hegel studies and his writings on national liberation were of a piece. A year earlier, in 1922, Lenin had called for the study of Hegelian dialectics in Soviet Russia, linking this study to the awakening of oppressed and colonized nations:

> The contributors to *Under the Banner of Marxism* must arrange for the systematic study of Hegelian dialectics from a materialist standpoint, i.e., the dialectics which Marx applied practically in his *Capital* and in his historical and political works, and applied so successfully that now every day of the awakening to life and struggle of the new classes in the East (Japan, India, and China)—i.e. the hundreds of millions of human beings who form the greater part of the world population and whose historical passivity and historical torpor have hitherto conditioned the stagnation and decay of many advanced European countries—every day of the awakening to life of new peoples and new classes serves as a fresh confirmation of Marxism. (LCW 33:234)

As seen above, it was only the first part of this statement—but significantly, not the part on anti-imperialist movements in Asia—that the Western Marxist Korsch included as the epigraph to his *Marxism and Philosophy*. In this way, Korsch walled off the discussion of Hegel and dialectics, making that a "Western" issue. He left aside what he evidently disagreed with even in 1923, Lenin's embrace of the new "Eastern" liberation movements. This type of separation would impoverish many post-Lenin discussions of dialectics in the West.

The International Impact of Lenin's Writings on National Liberation: New Voices from India, Iran, and Black America

The new spirit introduced by Lenin into Marxism can easily be seen in the debates at the 1920 Second Congress of the Communist International. Lenin's "Draft Theses on the National and Colonial Questions" referred not only to geographically separate nations such as Ireland and the Ukraine, but also to national minorities such as "the Negroes in America" (LCW 31:144). Grigorii Zinoviev was one of the few Bolsheviks who during World War I shared many of Lenin's positions on

national liberation. However, just after the Second Congress opened, Zinoviev allowed himself, while speaking before an audience drawn in large part from predominantly Muslim societies during the Baku Congress of the Peoples of the East, to call for a "holy war, in the first place against British imperialism."[26] Lenin's 1920 theses called instead for "the struggle against Pan-Islamism" (LCW 31:144). However, he emphasized the notion "that all Communist Parties should render direct aid to the revolutionary movements among the dependent and underprivileged nations (for example Ireland, the American Negroes, etc.) and in the colonies" (LCW 31:148).

The Second Congress held an especially serious and wide-ranging debate on imperialism and national liberation. In addition to Lenin's theses, supplementary ones were presented by the well-known Indian Marxist M. N. Roy, who agreed with Lenin in arguing that "the break-up of the colonial empire, together with proletarian revolution in the home country, will overthrow the capitalist system in Europe."[27] Other parts of Roy's speech showed some disagreement with Lenin, however. For example, Roy attacked "the narrow circle of bourgeois-democratic nationalists" (223), acknowledging more tentatively than Lenin that "revolutionary nationalism will play a part" (224).

The important Iranian Marxist thinker Avetis Sultanzadeh,[28] whose position was somewhat closer to Lenin's, advocated the intertwining of anti-imperialist movements with the labor movement inside the developed capitalist lands:

> The Second International studied the colonial question at most of its congresses. It drew up elegant resolutions, which, however, were never put into effect. Often these questions were debated and positions adopted without the participation of representatives of the backward countries. What is more, when the Russian and British hangmen suppressed the First Persian Revolution[29] and the Persian social democrats turned for help to the European proletariat, then represented by the Second International, they were not even granted the right to put a resolution on this matter to a vote. (238)

With a sense of political realism all too rare at such congresses, Sultanzadeh also noted: "It is true that the capitalist drive in the colonies awakens the revolutionary spirit. But it is just as true that the capitalist

exploitation of the colonies creates a counter-revolutionary spirit among the labor aristocracy in the metropolitan countries" (238). However, the 1917 Revolution had created a different situation, he concluded: "The thunder of revolution in the West shook the Orient to the roots, giving strength to revolutionaries in Persia and Turkey" (239).

The U.S. journalist John Reed reported on white racist violence and black resistance during the race riots of 1919: "The first of these outbreaks happened in the national capital, Washington, where petty government officeholders came back from the war to find their places taken by Negroes. Most of these officeholders were southerners anyway. They organized nighttime attacks on the Negro part of town in order to terrorize the Negroes into giving up their jobs. Much to everyone's astonishment, the Negroes poured into the streets fully armed, and a battle raged . . ." (226–27).

After describing similar events in Chicago and elsewhere, Reed concluded: "In all of these fights, Negroes showed for the first time in history that they were armed, well organized, and absolutely unafraid of the whites. The effect of the Negro resistance was, first, belated government intervention and, second, the opening of the American Federation of Labor unions to Negro workers" (227).

Not since Marx's day had an American Marxist thundered like this on racial issues.

By the Fourth Congress of the Communist International in 1924, where the noted black writer Claude McKay participated as a U.S. delegate, there was for the first time an entire session devoted to "the Negro question." Where Reed had critiqued the attitudes of white workers, McKay's attack on racism hit closer to home, targeting the racial attitudes of U.S. Socialists and Communists themselves:

> The reformist bourgeoisie have been carrying on the battle against discrimination and racial prejudice in America. The Socialists and Communists have fought very shy of it because there is a great element of prejudice among the Socialists and Communists of America. They are not willing to face the Negro question. In associating with the comrades of America, I have found demonstrations of prejudice on the various occasions when the white and black comrades had to get together; and this is the greatest obstacle that the Communists of America have got to overcome—the fact that they first have got to emancipate themselves from the ideas they entertained toward Negroes before they can be able to reach the Negroes with any kind of radical propaganda.

McKay also spoke of how publicizing Marx's position on slavery and racism had shaken up African American opinion:

> In 1918, when the Third International published its Manifesto and included that part referring to the exploited colonies there were several groups of Negro radicals in America that sent this propaganda among their people. When in 1920 the American government started to investigate and to suppress radical propaganda among the Negroes, the small radical Negro groups in America retaliated by publishing the fact that the Socialists stood for the emancipation of the Negroes, and that reformist America could do nothing for them. Then, I think, for the first time in American history, the American Negroes found that Karl Marx had been interested in their emancipation, and had fought valiantly for it.[30]

While McKay advocated unity between workers across racial lines, he also called upon predominantly white labor and socialist organizations to take stronger stands in support of the black movement as a whole. This unprecedented session also resulted in a book manuscript by McKay, *The Negroes in America*, commissioned by the Comintern, as well as public dialogue between McKay and Trotsky in the Russian press.[31]

While Trotsky never made a very significant contribution to dialectics, by the late 1930s he came much closer to Lenin's position on national liberation. One example of this is his remarkable 1939 conversation with the Caribbean Marxist thinker C. L. R. James, then a Trotskyist. During their discussion of the setting up of a non-Stalinist organization of black radicals, a white Trotskyist stated, "I cannot see how the Negro bourgeoisie can help the Negro proletariat fight for its economic development." James replied, "In our movement some of us are petty bourgeois. If a bourgeois Negro is excluded from a university because of his color, this organization will probably mobilize the masses to fight for the rights of the bourgeois Negro student." Trotsky then replied, "I believe that the first question is the attitude of the [Trotskyist] Socialist Workers Party toward the Negroes. It is very disquieting to find that until now the party has done almost nothing in this field. It has not

published a book, a pamphlet, leaflets, nor even any articles in the *New International*. . . . Our party is not safe from degeneration. . . ." Trotsky seemed to be very open to new forms of anti-racist organizing. Given the color bar, he added, the Trotskyist party might under certain conditions support a black versus a white member of the Democratic Party: "We consider that the Negro's candidacy as opposed to the white's candidacy, even if both are of the same party, is an important factor in the struggle of the Negroes for their equality; and in this case we can critically support them."[32]

Another instance of Trotsky's new thinking on national liberation was his changing position on Jewish nationalism after Hitler had come to power and after Stalin had resorted to anti-Semitic innuendo during the purge trials of the 1930s. In a 1937 interview with a Jewish newspaper, Trotsky recounted his changed position:

> During my youth I rather leaned toward the prognosis that the Jews of different countries would be assimilated and that the Jewish question would thus disappear in a quasi-automatic fashion. The historical development of the last quarter of a century has not confirmed this perspective. Decaying capitalism has everywhere swung over to an exacerbated nationalism, one part of which is anti-Semitism. The Jewish question has loomed largest in the most highly developed capitalist country of Europe, in Germany. On the other hand the Jews of different countries have created their press and developed the Yiddish language as an instrument of modern culture. One must therefore reckon with the fact that the Jewish nation will maintain itself for an entire epoch to come.[33]

Today the issues of race, ethnicity, and imperialism take a different form, but despite the near demise of direct colonial rule, the patterns of exploitation and oppression between the wealthy capitalist nations and the peoples of Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America still exist. Along with these patterns came liberation movements by those oppressed by imperialism, as well as movements by those inside the imperialist countries who were in solidarity with them, one of the most notable examples being the struggle against the apartheid system in South Africa. A generation earlier, *national* resistance movements to fascism had developed, from China to Yugoslavia and from France to Poland. Many of these movements have inspired theoretical studies

that have drawn from Lenin's writings. In different ways, for example, C. L. R. James and Raya Dunayevskaya used Lenin's concepts to analyze the African liberation movements of the 1950s and 1960s, even though Lenin had not written directly on Africa very much.[34]

One of the differences today is that, alongside the continued domination they face from globalized capitalism, formerly colonized or occupied nations, once they are independent, can themselves become oppressors of national minorities within and without their borders. Here Lenin's focus on whether a specific form of nationalism tended toward reactionary or emancipatory politics becomes actual. His notion of reactionary nationalism was not limited to that of great powers such as Britain or the United States. As seen above, he also had condemned pan-Islamism even though it strongly opposed British imperialism in the Middle East. In addition, he attacked pan-Slavism throughout his life, which he linked to Russian imperialism and the repression of ethnic minorities. Using his writings as part of their foundation, over the past decade several writers have mapped out a strong opposition to genocidal Serbian nationalism in the Balkans, while at the same time critically supporting the more emancipatory national movements of the Kosovars and especially the Bosnians in the former Yugoslavia.[35] Another example of the complexity of this issue is the Zapatista movement in Mexico, which has represented indigenous communities left out of the 1910 Revolution, while also winning mass support across Mexico, as well as significant support from the international movement against globalization.

Lenin's Impact on Later Debates over the Dialectic: From Henri Lefebvre to Raya Dunayevskaya

As against the Frankfurt school philosophers, two strands of twentieth-century Marxism outside Germany did appropriate Lenin's writings on Hegel in a manner that made them central to their overall understanding of dialectics. These were of Henri Lefebvre in France and of C. L. R. James and especially Raya Dunayevskaya in the United States. Each developed new forms of Hegelian Marxism, in part through a discussion of Lenin and Hegel.

Few outside France are aware that Lefebvre, together with Norbert

Guterman, published an independent, scholarly edition of Lenin's Hegel notebooks in French in 1938. (Five years earlier, they had also published a translation of Marx's "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" of 1844.) Issued by Éditions Gallimard, still today France's most prestigious publisher, their volume on Lenin, *Cahiers sur la dialectique d'Hegel*, helped to make Lenin's writings on Hegel prominent among the French intellectual public in a unique way. Elsewhere, especially in Germany and the English-speaking world, discussion of Lenin's writings on Hegel tended more often to be limited to a narrower circle of either partisans of Lenin or the usually anti-Lenin academic specialists. Lefebvre and Guterman's substantial 130-page introduction barely mentioned *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* in an oblique reference to the progress Lenin's thought had made since from 1908 to 1914. Their introduction broke new ground by attacking those who wished to use Hegel's method but not his system.[36] Instead, they argued that the "content of Hegel" needed to be appropriated. In a bow to Communist Party orthodoxy, however, they failed to mention that this had been Engels's position.

Lefebvre's subsequent writings on Lenin and Hegel were even more circumspect. This was true of his *Logique formelle, logique dialectique* (1947), as well as his major study, *La Pensée de Lenine* (1957). In fact, it was only after he had finally been expelled from the French Communist Party that Lefebvre finally stated openly what had been at stake all along. In his 1959 autobiography, *La Somme et le reste*, Lefebvre wrote of Lenin: "He did not read or study Hegel seriously until 1914–15. Also, if one considers it objectively, one notices a great difference in tone and content between the Hegel Notebooks and *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. Lenin's thought becomes supple, alive . . . in a word, dialectical. Lenin did not truly understand the dialectic until 1914, after the collapse of the International." Lefebvre adds in a footnote: "Here we see the significance of the profound reticence of the Stalinists toward the Notebooks, who for a long time put them aside in favor of *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*."[37]

This rather late acknowledgment of the core issues, which Lefebvre published not in any of his major books or essays on Lenin, but as a passing statement in a very long autobiography, left the door open to the anti-dialectical, anti-Hegelian, proto-Maoist[38] interpretations of

Louis Althusser and his school in the 1960s and 1970s, as seen especially in Althusser's *Lenin and Philosophy*. The title essay of that book, first delivered as a public lecture in 1968, concentrated on *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and Lenin's economic writings, never mentioning the Hegel notebooks. After Jean Hyppolite publicly called this to his attention, Althusser finally wrote an article specifically on the Hegel notebooks. There and elsewhere in his comments on Lenin and Hegel, Althusser was often evasive, attributing critiques of Hegel to Lenin by splicing together texts that actually stated the opposite. In response to Lenin's well-known statement, cited earlier, that one needed to study Hegel's *Logic* to grasp fully Marx's *Capital*, Althusser subjected Lenin's words to a virtual "deconstruction," at the end of which he informed the reader rather peremptorily: "it is impossible to understand Hegel without having thoroughly studied and understood *Capital*."[39] In attempting to elide Hegel from Lenin's thought, Althusser was carrying out a crucial part of his overall project of erasing Hegel from Marxism. Clearly, any notion of a return to Hegel by Lenin constituted a grave threat to Althusserianism, which had proclaimed that Marx had gotten rid of most of his Hegelianism by 1846. For, if Lenin had really returned to Hegel in 1914, it would be much harder for Marxists to "drive the shade of Hegel . . . back into the night," as Althusser had proposed in 1962.[40]

In the United States, C. L. R. James and Raya Dunayevskaya began to write on Lenin and Hegel during the 1940s. In 1948, James wrote some informal reflections on Lenin and Hegel that he later published.[41] Dunayevskaya had translated the whole of Lenin's Hegel notebooks by 1949 but was unable to find a publisher. This was very likely due to positivist opposition to Hegel, which was quite common at the time in the United States, even among prominent leftist philosophers such as Sidney Hook. Unlike Lefebvre, James and Dunayevskaya were members of the Trotskyist movement. Using Lenin's Hegel notebooks as an important part of their philosophical foundation, they took several positions that moved them some distance from orthodox Trotskyism. First, they developed a theory of state capitalism to describe Stalin's Russia. Second, they critiqued Lenin's concept of the vanguard party as elitist and anti-dialectical. Third, they called for a systematic study of dialectics based on Hegel, Marx, and Lenin, drawing a separation

between Lenin's 1908 philosophical stance and that after 1914. Fourth, they posed the notion that African Americans were an independent and potentially revolutionary oppositional force to American capitalism.

In the 1950s and 1960s, after she and James had moved in different directions, Dunayevskaya developed these somewhat unformed concepts as part of what she called Marxist humanism. No Marxist thinker, before or since, has delved as deeply or as creatively into Lenin's Hegel notebooks, appropriating them critically as ground for a contemporary dialectics of revolution. For example, Dunayevskaya pioneered the linking together of Lenin's perspectives on dialectics and on national liberation that I put forth above. She also published the first English translation of major parts of Marx's 1844 Manuscripts and Lenin's Hegel notebooks, each as an appendix to her *Marxism and Freedom* (1958). In her *Philosophy and Revolution* (1973), Dunayevskaya took up Lenin's return to Hegel alongside that of Marx as part of a discussion entitled "Why Hegel? Why Now?": "Lenin certainly didn't mean that all students of *Capital* must first labor through the two volumes of *The Science of Logic*. What was crucial was Lenin's break with old concepts, which is nowhere more sharply expressed than in his commentary that 'Cognition not only reflects the world, but creates it.' . . . Lenin had gained from Hegel a totally new understanding of the *unity* of materialism and idealism. It was this new understanding that subsequently permeated Lenin's post-1915 writings."[42]

At the same time, Dunayevskaya developed several cogent critiques of Lenin's appropriation of Hegel. First, she argued that he had left an ambiguous legacy by not having referred more openly to his new thinking on Hegel and dialectics:

> The emphasis that Lenin put on "dialectic proper, as a philosophic science" separated him from all other post-Marx Marxists, not only up to the Russian Revolution but also after the conquest of power. . . . What was most manifest of what he had gained from the 1914–15 Hegel studies was that the Hegelian dialectic needs to be studied "in and for itself." . . . That Lenin kept his direct encounter with the Hegelian dialectic—his Abstract of Hegel's *The Science of Logic*—to himself, however, shows the depth of the economist mire into which the whole Second International, and not just the German Social-Democracy, had sunk; revolutionaries stood on the same ground![43]

To Dunayevskaya, all of this was compounded by the fact that Lenin had allowed *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* to be reprinted in Russian in 1920. For the record, it should be noted that he did not have it translated into other languages, as he had done with *Imperialism* and *The State and Revolution*. In 1927, however, the increasingly Stalinist apparatus published *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* widely in foreign translations, and the international Communist Parties made good use of its crude attacks on idealism to call intellectuals to account, among them Lefebvre.

In her second critique of Lenin on dialectics, Dunayevskaya argued that, at crucial junctures, Lenin had overplayed the practical, activist side of dialectics, here minimizing the theoretical side. This was seen especially in his discussion of the section on the idea of the good, near the end of *The Science of Logic*.

Third, Dunayevskaya argued that at several points Lenin interpreted Hegel in too narrowly materialist a fashion, especially in his discussion of the last pages of *The Science of Logic*, on the Absolute Idea. It was true that Lenin had broken partially with Engels's notion in *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy* (1886) that Hegel's Absolute Idea embodied a non-dialectical and abstractly idealist notion of the end of history. To Engels, the Absolute Idea was an especially prominent example of Hegel's "system," which had to be rejected in favor of Hegel's dialectical "method." In *Ludwig Feuerbach*, written long after his youthful enthusiasm for Hegel, Engels cited no textual evidence for these conclusions, probably because little could have been found. Lenin, during his careful study of the last chapter of *The Science of Logic*, took a different tack, arguing that the Absolute Idea chapter contained not so much idealism as materialism and could thus be appropriated by Marxism. Nonetheless, Dunayevskaya argued that Lenin, while going deeper than Engels, had made two crucial errors. Lenin gave very little weight to the core Hegelian concept of negativity, instead focusing on contradiction. Here he paid the price for not having been familiar with Marx's crucial discussion of the dialectics of negativity in the 1844 Manuscripts, a text that in 1914–15 lay forgotten in the archives of the Second International. Dunayevskaya also argued that Lenin had interpreted Hegel's Absolute Idea in too narrowly a materialist fashion. To be sure, he seized upon the fact that, in the closing paragraphs of the last chapter in *The Science of Logic*, Hegel

had written of a transition from logic to nature. Here, Lenin wrote, Hegel "stretches a hand to materialism" (LCW 38:234). However, as Dunayevskaya pointed out, Lenin ignored what followed immediately after this in Hegel, for Hegel now developed another transition, this one from logic to spirit or mind [*Geist*].

Fourth and finally, Dunayevskaya argued that while it was Lenin's great achievement to have reinterpreted world politics dialectically around the contradiction between imperialism and national liberation, he had failed to reinterpret dialectically the elitist concept of the vanguard party, which, although modified greatly under the impact of the spontaneous creativity from below during the revolution, nonetheless remained essentially unchanged from *What Is to Be Done?* (1902). She pointed instead to the need to develop a new concept of organization, one rooted in what she termed the dialectics of organization and philosophy.[44] It would have to be grounded not only in Hegel, but also in Marx's extensive but ignored work within organizations, as well as his writings on organizational issues, from the Communist League of the 1840s, to the First International of the 1860s, to the *Critique of the Gotha Program* (1875).

Conclusion

All of these dimensions of Lenin's encounter with Hegel in 1914–15 are an important part of the legacy of Marxism, as are issues flowing from them. To skip over them is to ignore some of the richness of that tradition. The fact that the Russian Revolution was transformed under Stalin and his successors into its opposite, a totalitarian state capitalist society, is all the more reason to face squarely the deeply contradictory nature of the history of twentieth-century Marxism. That is why efforts to return to Marx without also coming to terms with Lenin and his generation have important limitations. This is true even of the best-known recent attempt to recover Marx for today, Jacques Derrida's *Specters of Marx* (1993).

I have outlined three major achievements of Lenin with regard to dialectics and national liberation. First, he opened up the issue of the dialectic proper as the ground for revolutionary Marxism as opposed to reformist Marxism, thus paving the way for subsequent authors

such as Lukács. Second, his dialectical analysis of imperialism and national liberation constituted a prescient analysis of the importance of anti-imperialist movements for the twentieth century and beyond. By widening the orthodox Marxian notion of the revolutionary subject, he helped pave the way for later attempts to widen this still further, to embrace not only, as Lenin had begun to do, national and ethnic liberation movements, but also those of women, ecologists, gays and lesbians, and youth. However, unlike contemporary identity politics, Lenin also pointed us toward a form of dialectical unity of these various particular forms of resistance. Third, his work on Hegel and dialectics had a direct impact on a number of creative strands within Hegelian Marxist thought, especially in France and the United States.

All of these points show not only the importance of Lenin's rediscovery of the dialectic, but also the persistence of the dialectic within revolutionary thought and activity. It is a heritage that we ignore at our peril. Still, we need to appropriate it most critically if we are not to repeat the wrong turns of the last century, which have left us with a crisis in Marxian and radical thought far deeper than the one faced by Lenin in 1914.

Notes

I would like to thank Shannon Linehan, Heinz Osterle, and Albert Resis for helpful comments on earlier versions of this essay.

1. On this point, see especially Raya Dunayevskaya, *Marxism and Freedom: From 1776 until Today* (New York: Bookman, 1958).
2. See Samuel Farber, *Before Stalinism: The Rise and Fall of Soviet Democracy* (New York: Verso, 1990).
3. For a serious critique of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, see Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Adventures of the Dialectic*, trans. Joseph Bien (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1973; orig. French edition 1955).
4. Fromm made these comments in an unpublished review of *Trotsky's Diary in Exile* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958). Fromm's comments cited here concerned not only Lenin, but also Trotsky, Marx, and Engels. For the full text, see Kevin B. Anderson, "A Recently Discovered Article by Erich Fromm on Trotsky and the Russian Revolution," *Science and Society* 66:2 (summer 2002): 266–73.
5. See Herbert Marcuse, *Reason and Revolution* (New York: Oxford, 1941), a path-breaking Marxist study of Hegel and social theory. While Marcuse referred very briefly to one of Lenin's discussions on dialectics (314, 401), he did not mention the

Hegel notebooks at all. Later, in his *Soviet Marxism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), Marcuse made no reference at all to Lenin and Hegel in his chapter on dialectics, while presenting the transition from Lenin to Stalin as an example of "the dialectical law of the turn from quantity to quality" (74).

6 See Oskar Negt, ed., *Kontroversen über dialektischen und mechanistischen Materialismus* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1969).

7 See Iring Fetscher, "The Relationship of Marxism to Hegel" (orig. 1960) in his *Marx and Marxism* trans. John Hargreaves (New York: Herder and Herder, 1971). For more detailed discussion of this and many other issues in this chapter, see my *Lenin, Hegel, and Western Marxism: A Critical Study* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995).

8 See Rudi Dutschke, *Versuch, Lenin auf die Füsse zu Stellen* (Berlin: Verlag Klaus Wagenbach, 1974); and Bernd Rabehl, *Marx und Lenin* (Frankfurt: Verlag für das Studium der Arbeiterbewegung, 1973).

9 Karl Korsch, *Marxism and Philosophy*, trans. Fred Halliday (London: New Left Books, 1970), 29; Lenin, "On the Significance of Militant Materialism," *Collected Works* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1961) 33:233, hereafter cited parenthetically in the chapter text as LCW followed by the volume number and the page number.

10 Merleau-Ponty, *Adventures of the Dialectic*, 64.

11 As Friedrich Nietzsche wrote in "Schopenhauer as Educator" (1874), earlier there had been "a fine bumper crop of Hegelian corn standing in the fields. But now that harvest has been ruined by the hail and all the ricks stand empty," cited in Donald N. Levine, *Visions of the Sociological Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 193.

12 Here and elsewhere, while I refer to the standard English edition of Lenin's Hegel notebooks in volume 38 of his *Collected Works*, in most cases I am actually using the more precise translation by the Hegelian Marxist Raya Dunayevskaya, published as an appendix to the first edition of her *Marxism and Freedom* in 1958.

13 Ernst Bloch, *Subjekt-Objekt: Erläuterungen zu Hegel* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1962), 382–83.

14 Georg Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, trans. Rodney Livingston (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1971), 1.

15 Despite their many contributions in other areas, the lengthy studies of Lenin published in English in the past three decades have tended to ignore or minimize the importance of the 1914–15 Hegel notebooks. Tony Cliff's four-volume *Lenin* (London: Pluto Press, 1974–79) devotes one sentence to them. Neil Harding's two-volume *Lenin's Political Thought* (New York: St. Martin's, 1978, 1981) does not mention them at all. Robert Service's three-volume *Lenin: A Political Life* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985, 1991, 1996) takes them up in a couple of pages but stresses that their importance has been overrated. Harding's later *Leninism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1996) devotes a chapter to Lenin's philosophy but dismisses even the Hegel notebooks as dogmatic. Service's more recent *Lenin: A Biography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000) represents a backward

step on the issue of Lenin and Hegel, since in this book he devotes greater attention to Lenin's very brief notes on Aristotle from the same period than to the Hegel notebooks. Such a nearly total avoidance of the issue of Lenin and Hegel has not been the case in France. There, ever since Lefebvre's discussions in the 1930s (I take these up later in this chapter), it has been impossible to ignore the issue of Lenin's debt to Hegel. See, for example, Marcel Liebman, *Leninism under Lenin*, trans. Brian Pearce (London: Jonathan Cape, 1975, orig. French edition 1973), as well as the more philosophical considerations by Michael Löwy, *Dialectique et révolution* (Paris: Éditions Anthropos, 1973). I treat Louis Althusser's writings below.

16 Marx, *Capital*, trans. Ben Fowkes (London: New Left Books, 1976), 1:494.

17 As is well known, Engels used this somewhat martial metaphor—as with the English word "camp," the German *Lager* can refer to a military encampment—in his *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, in Marx and Engels, *Collected Works* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1990), 26:366.

18 Marx, "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" (1844), in Erich Fromm, *Marx's Concept of Man* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961), 181. The 1844 Manuscripts, which the Second International (and Engels) had ignored, were not published until after Lenin's death, as part of the work around the first *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe* (MEGA). The first MEGA (MEGA² is proceeding today) commenced in the early 1920s with Lenin's strong support. It was discontinued under Stalin, who had its main editor, David Riazanov, executed.

19 Leszek Kolakowski, *The Golden Age*, vol. 2 of *Main Currents of Marxism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 464. Kolakowski is not the only non-Leninist philosopher to have appreciated the Hegel notebooks. See, for example, Louis Dupré's more probing study, *Marx's Social Critique of Culture* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1983).

20 For alternative views, see Raya Dunayevskaya, "Hegelian Leninism," in *Towards a New Marxism*, ed. Bart Grahl and Paul Piccone, 159–75 (St. Louis: Telos Press, 1973), as well as my "Lenin, Bukharin, and the Marxian Concepts of Dialectic and Imperialism: A Study in Contrasts," *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 15:1 (1987): 197–212.

21 This was another result of Second International Marxism. By the late 1890s, Kautsky and Viktor Adler had distanced themselves from Marx's and Engels's strong support for the Polish and Irish independence movements. The leftist revolutionary Luxemburg had long rejected all forms of nationalism as bourgeois but had the intellectual honesty to make her disagreement with Marx and Engels explicit.

22 I leave aside here a third strand of this debate, Otto Bauer's theory of national and cultural autonomy.

23 See Karl Radek, "Their Song Is Played Out," in *Lenin's Struggle for a Revolutionary International*, ed. John Riddell (New York: Monad Press, 1984), 375.

24 Leon Trotsky, "Lessons of the Events, in Dublin," in *Lenin's Struggle for a Revolutionary International*, ed. John Riddell (New York: Monad Press, 1984), 372–73.

25 The following works fail to mention Lenin's writings on the Irish uprising: Service's

Lenin: A Biography (2000), a 500-page study otherwise notable for its discussion of ethnicity; Cliff's *Lenin* (1974–79), a work that goes into enormous detail on political issues and debates; Harding's *Lenin's Political Thought* (1978, 1981); and Harding's *Leninism* (1996), even though the latter has a chapter entitled "Nationalism and Internationalism." Service's earlier *Lenin: A Political Life* (1985, 1991, 1996) devotes a few lines to Ireland in 1916. On this issue, Liebman's *Leninism under Lenin* (1973) is not very helpful either, since it hardly mentions the whole issue of imperialism and national liberation.

26 See John Riddell, ed., *To See the Dawn: Baku, 1920—First Congress of the Peoples of the East* (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1993), 78.

27 See John Riddell, ed., *Workers of the World and Oppressed Peoples Unite! Proceedings and Documents of the Second Congress, 1920*, 2 vols. (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1991), 219. Further page references are given directly in the text.

28 Sultanzadeh perished in Stalin's purges, and Iran's fawningly pro-Soviet Tudeh (Communist) Party expunged even his name from its official history.

29 For a study of this often forgotten and surprisingly secular upheaval, see Janet Afary, *The Iranian Constitutional Revolution, 1906–11: Grassroots Democracy, Social Democracy, and the Origins of Feminism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

30 Fourth Congress of the Communist International. *Abridged Report of Meetings Held at Petrograd and Moscow, Nov. 7–Dec. 3, 1924* (London: Communist Party of Great Britain, n.d.), 260–61.

31 Claude McKay, *The Negroes in America*, ed. Alan L. McLeod, trans. Robert J. Winter (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1979). The American Communist Party was evidently so uninterested in his book that the English text seems to have been lost. For this 1979 publication, it had to be retranslated into English from a Russian version, also unpublished, that had been discovered by chance in the Slavic Division of the New York Public Library. For one of the few Marxist discussions of the importance of McKay's intervention at the 1924 Congress, see Raya Dunayevskaya, *American Civilization on Trial* (Detroit: News and Letters, 1963).

32 See Leon Trotsky, *Leon Trotsky on Black Nationalism and Self-Determination* (New York: Merit Publishers, 1967), 42, 48.

33 Leon Trotsky, *On the Jewish Question* (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970), 20. See also Enzo Traverso, *The Marxists and the Jewish Question: The History of a Debate, 1843–1943*, trans. Bernard Gibbons (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press International, 1994).

34 See, for example, C. L. R. James, *Nkrumah and the Ghana Revolution* (London: Allison and Busby, 1977), and Raya Dunayevskaya, *Nationalism, Communism, Marxist Humanism, and the Afro-Asian Revolutions* (Chicago: News and Letters, 1984, orig. 1959).

35 See especially Peter Hudis, "Kosova: Achilles Heel of the Left," in *The Kosova Reader*, ed. Danny Postel (Cybereditions: forthcoming), a book that includes a contribution by Slavoj Žižek. See also the contributions of Hudis and others, including the present writer, to *Bosnia-Herzegovina: Achilles Heel of "Western" Civilization* (Chicago: News and Letters, 1996) and *Kosova: Writings from News and Letters, 1998–99* (Chicago: News and Letters, 2000) as well as Joanne Landy, "Self-Determination and Diplomacy," *New Politics* 27 (summer 1999): 27–33.

36 For background on Lefebvre in this period, see especially Fred Bud Burkhard, *French Marxism between the Wars: Henri Lefebvre and the "Philosophies"* (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1999).

37 Henri Lefebvre, *La Somme et la reste* (Paris: La Nef, 1959), 85.

38 On Althusser's philosophical affinity to Maoism, see Gregory Elliott, *Althusser: The Detour of Theory* (London: Verso, 1987).

39 Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*, trans. Ben Brewster (New York: Monthly Review, 1971), 112. I go into much more detail on this point in my *Lenin, Hegel, and Western Marxism*.

40 Louis Althusser, *For Marx*, trans. Ben Brewster (New York: Vintage, 1970), 116. (The essay in question was first published in French in 1962.)

41 C. L. R. James, *Notes on Dialectics: Hegel-Marx-Lenin* (Westport, Conn.: Lawrence Hill, 1980).

42 Raya Dunayevskaya, *Philosophy and Revolution: From Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao* (New York: Delacorte, 1973), 103.

43 Raya Dunayevskaya, *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991, orig. 1982), 116.

44 See Raya Dunayevskaya, *The Power of Negativity: Selected Writings on the Dialectic in Hegel and Marx*, ed. Peter Hudis and Kevin B. Anderson (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2002).