

---

---

## S.N. Mareev on Hegel and the paradoxes of Soviet philosophy

Copyright © 2020 E.V. Mareeva

*Moscow State Institute of Culture, Khimki, 141406, st. Library, 7;  
Moscow International Higher School of Business "MIRBIS" (Institute),  
Moscow, 109147, st. Marksistskaya, 34, bldg. 7.*

*E-mail: evmareeva@yandex.ru*

Received 01/17/2020

The article examines the features of historical and philosophical analysis, as understood by the Marxist, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor Sergei Nikolaevich Mareev (1941–2019), who proceeded from the dialectics of the historical and logical in scientific research in the interpretation of E.V. Ilyenkov. The author of the article emphasizes that in this tradition, following Hegel, every serious philosophical doctrine is considered as a moment of truth, which is immanent in the process of movement from the abstract to the concrete-universal. But in any historical research, including the history of philosophy, one must avoid the extreme of abstract dictate of regularity in relation to historical facts, as well as uncritical adherence to chronology. From these positions, the article examines the study by Mareev of the formation of dialectical and historical materialism in his monograph "From the history of Soviet philosophy: Lukach - Vygotsky - Ilyenkov": if dialectical mathematics has become a new version of ontology, then history mathematics is a new version of the philosophy of history. Mareev agreed with Ilyenkov that the metaphysical character of the official version of Soviet philosophy was not accidental. This was one of the consequences of the fact that Soviet society was able to realize only formal and not real socialization. But the failure of Soviet society was inscribed in the global crisis of modern society, where technological progress is combined with the aggravation of alienation in its various forms. that the Soviet society was able to realize only formal and not real socialization. But the failure of Soviet society was inscribed in the global crisis of modern society, where technological progress is combined with the aggravation of alienation in its various forms. that the Soviet society was able to realize only formal and not real socialization. But the failure of Soviet society was inscribed in the global crisis of modern society, where technological progress is combined with the aggravation of alienation in its various forms.

**Keywords:** Mareev, Ilyenkov, Hegel, Lenin, Soviet philosophy, dialectics, ontology, metaphysical form of dialectics, formal and real socialization.

DOI: 10.21146 / 0042-8744-2020-8-150-156

Citation: *Mareeva E.V. S.N. Mareev about Hegel and the paradoxes of Soviet philosophy // Problems of Philosophy. 2020. No. 8.P. 150–156.*

# SN Mareev on Hegel and Paradoxes of Soviet Philosophy

Copyright © 2020 Elena V. Mareeva

*Moscow State Institute of Culture, 7, Bibliotechnaya str., Khimki, 141406, Russian Federation;  
Moscow International Higher Business School "MIRBIS" (Institute),  
34, b. 7, Marksistskaya str., Moscow, 109147, Russian Federation.*

*E-mail: evmareeva@yandex.ru*

Received 01/17/2020

The article discusses the features of historical and philosophical analysis, as understood by Marxist Sergei Nikolaevich Mareev (1941–2019). He proceeded from EV Ilyenkov's conception of dialectic of the historical and the logical in scientific research. The author emphasizes that in this tradition, after Hegel, each serious philosophical theory is considered as a moment of truth, which is immanent in a movement from the abstract to the concrete universal. But in any historical research, including the history of philosophy, one should avoid abstract dictate of the laws of history over historical facts, as well as uncritical following the chronology. From this perspective, the author reviews Mareev's research of the genesis of dialectical and historical materialism in his monograph *From*

*the history of Soviet Philosophy: Lukács - Vygotsky - Ilyenkov: the very problem* of the identity of forms of thought and being disappears in dialect, which did not happen in Hegel. Mareev agreed with Ilyenkov that the official version of Soviet philosophy was metaphysical, and not by accident. That was one of the consequences of the fact that Soviet society could realize only formal socialization, and not the real one. But the failure of Soviet society was a part of the global crisis of modern society, where technological progress is combined with the aggravation of alienation in its various forms.

**Keywords:** Mareev, Ilyenkov, Hegel, Lenin, Soviet philosophy, dialectical materialism, ontology, the metaphysical form of dialectics, formal and real socialization.

DOI: 10.21146 / 0042-8744-2020-8-150-156

Citation: Mareeva, Elena V. (2020) 'SN Mareev on Hegel and paradoxes of Soviet philosophy', *Voprosy Filosofii*, Vol. 8 (2020), pp. 150–156.

S.N. It is no coincidence that Mareev begins the article about Hegel presented in this issue with criticism of M.K. Mamardashvili. It was Hegel who believed that philosophy was impossible without the history of philosophy. "... The study of the history of philosophy," he writes in Lectures on the History of Philosophy, "is the study of philosophy itself, and it cannot be otherwise" [Hegel 1993, 93]. It was this view of philosophy that was alien to Mamardashvili, who, in this respect, was in solidarity with the philosophical tradition descending from Arthur Schopenhauer, the antipode of Hegel. But the same idea of the unity of philosophy and the history of philosophy was close to Mareev's teacher, E.V. Ilyenkov. In one of his last articles V.M. Mezhuev contrasts Ilyenkov and Mamardashvili as philosophical idols of the thaw and stagnation "[Mezhuev 2013]. Mamardashvili declares his disgust for precisely that in the Hegelian understanding of the history of philosophy, in which, according to Ilyenkov, lies his merit. For Mamardashvili, considering Kant "as a stepping stone to something" is a widespread "prejudice" [Mamardashvili 1992, 121–122]. In Ilyenkov, and after him in Mareev, the approach to Kant as a "step" does not deprive him of his philosophy of originality. But this self-beingness does not express itself, but represents in a particular universal - movement

to the truth in a true form adequate to it. For Hegel, this highest point is associated with his absolute idealism, for Ilyenkov, with Marxism.

E.V. Ilyenkov was not a professional historian of philosophy. What can we say about Mareev, who did not show meticulousness in textual analysis and preferred primary sources to commenting literature. He made his own translations from Polish and German. He needed Polish while studying at the Faculty of Philosophy of Moscow State University while writing his thesis for the Department of Logic. At that time, the Polish language provided access to the materials of the well-known Lvov-Warsaw logical school.

The German language revealed to him the true Hegel and Marx. For some time, Mareev worked in the sector of the works of K. Marx and F. Engels of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the Central Committee of the CPSU, where he worked with the texts of F. Engels. Later, he made translations for himself, so to speak, to understand the essence of the matter. The goal in this case was not the literal accuracy of the translation, but the meaning of what was written by the classics, which is revealed by subsequent philosophical development, because every serious philosophical doctrine is a moment of truth that is immanent in the process of movement from the abstract to the concrete-universal, Mareev believed.

But fixing on this point means not seeing the difference between Hegel and Marx. Abstract historicism of the Hegelian type is distinguished by the fact that the already identified regularity in the development of history dominates historical facts. In this case, specific features are dissolved in an a priori construction that ignores the originality of time and historical contingency. It is clear that Hegel's understanding of history is more serious than abstract world schematics. But the principle of concrete historicism in scientific research, as Mareev proved in his doctoral dissertation, is beyond the reproduction of a priori construction, on the one hand, and uncritical adherence to chronology, on the other [Mareev 1984].

In this work, he explored the dialectics of the historical and the logical using the example of Capital by K. Marx with historical and philosophical excursions. Moreover, it is logic, as Mareev shows, that is an objective criterion for selecting facts and a guideline in their interpretation. Understanding the logic of the process should save us from identifying history with blind chronology. "That is, Marx warns," he writes, "firstly, against historicism, which confuses history with chronology, and secondly, against historicism, which makes the logical point of view decisive for history, otherwise - against arbitrary schematism." [Ibid., 112]. In other words, at first in the study, they abstract from history in order to return to it again, which does not happen in abstract historicism of the Hegelian type.

Mareev liked to repeat that history forms its own logic, making all possible pretzels, moving backwards, in front, sideways and even somersault. As for Marxism, the twentieth century knew many of its forms associated with specific historical specifics. So, already at the end of the 80s. there was a tendency to deal with the phenomenon of Soviet philosophy, and in these works, for obvious reasons, the emphasis was placed on its subordination to the official ideology. More than 30 years have passed since then, the peak of enthusiasm for Russian philosophy of the 19th century has remained in the past, and in the interest in Soviet philosophy, the ideological bias is replaced by a certain academic thoroughness. But then, in the 80s and 90s, the very mention of the name of Marx caused a laugh at best. And against this background, Mareev began to study in detail, relying on the newly discovered sources, from which tradition in world philosophy do dialectical and historical materials come from and what was opposed to them, first of all, in the person of Ilyenkov. Later this material was included in Mareev's book From the History of Soviet Philosophy: Lukach - Vygotsky - Ilyenkov [Mareev 2008].

In his discussion of the Soviet philosophical officialdom, Mareev repeatedly refers to the books of A.V. Potemkin - "On the specifics of philosophical knowledge" [Potemkin 1973] and "The problem of the specifics of philosophy in the diatribic tradition" [Potemkin 1980]. Former front-line soldier Potemkin was not only a like-minded person, but also a friend

Ilyenkov. For most of his life he taught at the Faculty of Philosophy of Rostov State University. At the same time, Potemkin could not achieve in the 80s. awarding him the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, since this decision was exactly for those whom he had in mind when he wrote about the transformation of Marxist philosophy into a metaphysical doctrine. In the form of a diatribe, that is, a teaching that comes from antiquity and finally took shape in scholasticism, Marxist philosophy eventually appeared not only in educational, but also in scientific literature, finally losing its critical spirit, if by it we mean not indiscriminate negation, and removing criticism as an immanent property of any serious philosophy<sup>1</sup>.

Expanding this topic already in new conditions, Mareev shows how the formation of dialecticalism was the formation of a new version of ontology, which Hegel once opposed. Not only Russian Marxists, including G.V. Plekhanov, but also the theorists of the Second International - Karl Kautsky and others. "Where now," Mareev quotes Hegel, "will we hear, or where do they dare to hear the voices of the old ontology, rational psychology, cosmology, or even the old natural theology now?" [Hegel 1970 a, 75]. "He thought," Mareev writes further about Hegel, "that Kant had already finished all this. No, they buried "ontology" early. It was revived, who would have thought, within the most revolutionary, most critical trend in philosophy - within the "dialectic"!" [Mareev 2008, 9]. The point is that materialistic dialectics, the categories of which express not the dialectical method and the logic of scientific thinking, but the categorical structure of reality itself, of the entire universe, becomes a dogma and doctrine in Soviet philosophy. But isn't this moment in Hegel's idealistic dialectic, which is inseparable from his grandiose system of the world?

In his criticism of the diamat, Mareev emphasizes that in materialist dialectics (about which much has been written in the *Dialectic of Nature* by F. Engels<sup>2</sup>), categories as general forms of logic reflect the general forms of being. And in diamatics, we are already talking about dialectical laws and universal forms of being in themselves within the framework of the "general theory of development," while philosophers study the forms of thinking separately and not necessarily from Hegelian positions. Describing the current situation with materialist dialectics, Mareev uses the expression "metaphysical form of dialectics", which presents not a paradoxical play on words, but a particular contradictory content. "Within the framework of such materialism," writes Mareev, "dialectics also began to be interpreted ontologically. As a result, the Soviet "diamat" gave rise to a paradoxical phenomenon, namely *metaphysical form of dialectics*" [Ibid, 16].

In other words, the uniqueness of diamat as a new version of ontology, now developed on the basis of Marxism, lies in the fact that this metaphysical form is precisely *dialectics*. As a result, the very problem of the identity of forms of thought and forms of being was removed from philosophical consideration in diamatics, on which, in fact, the whole of Hegel's idealism stands. In fact, the essence of the philosophical problem was removed from it. *relations* thinking to being.

Things are quite different in Hegel's system of absolute idealism, which he builds on a different methodological foundation. If the spirit is immanent to natural and historical being, then the main problem is their *attitude* - from unreflected simple identity to dialectical mediation by the whole world of culture. But in order to see and appreciate these moments, "sewn" into the system of Hegel's absolute idealism, one must look at it through the eyes of Marx or Ilyenkov. Mareev often refers to the place in the "Phenomenology of Spirit", where it is said: "... the mind is *expedient action*" [Hegel 1994, 11]. And again: "In a tool or a cultivated, made fertile arable land, I own *opportunity, content* as a universal content" [Hegel 1970 b, 307]. There is no developed concept of labor here, but there is its source in the explanation of the categorical assimilation of the world by man.

So, if dialectical mathematics has become a new version of ontology, then history mathematics is a new version of the philosophy of history, which means that in both cases we have an abstract world schematic - about the structure of nature, on the one hand, and the structure of society, on the other. In this light, the movement from Kant to Hegel (in which Mareev fully agreed with Ilyenkov) is the formation of a different understanding of philosophy as dialectical logic, in which the doctrine of the historical essence of man is removed. In Marxism, the basis for the identity of categories as objective forms of thinking and universal forms of being is their active mediation - material practice, which we first learn about from Marx's Theses on Feuerbach.

Mareev always spoke with respect about Lenin as a philosopher, including his work "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", although he reread and quoted more often "Philosophical Notebooks". Behind all this was, most likely, a respectful assessment of the evolution in the understanding of both dialectics and materialism, which Lenin went through in six years from "Materialism and Empirio-criticism" to "Philosophical Notebooks." In essence, this was a movement of Lenin's thought from contemplative materialism to dialectical materialism in the spirit of Hegelianism, and Lenin's criticism of Plekhanov in Philosophical Notebooks was already a criticism of his previous views. As for the cult of Lenin's theory of reflection, in which in Soviet times they saw Lenin's main philosophical achievement, Mareev, like Ilyenkov, took a more restrained position on this issue,

In his work *From the History of Soviet Philosophy: Lukach - Vygotsky - Ilyenkov*, Mareev focuses, in particular, on how Lenin's concept of matter is transformed. "If in 1908 he defines matter as broadly as possible - within the framework of the main question of philosophy," writes Mareev about Lenin, "then in the "Philosophical Notebooks" we are talking about deepening the concept of matter to substance. <...> In the second case, it is important for him to understand *how exactly* matter gives rise to consciousness. And here one cannot do without Hegelian dialectics and Spinoza's concept of substance" [Mareev 2008, 36-37]. Moreover, in this case, emphasizes Mareev, we are not talking about the dialectics of nature, but about the dialectics of history and social life.

In this regard, there is a reason to turn to the work of N. Valentinov (Volsky) "Meetings with Lenin", in the part where he discusses the "Philosophical notebooks" and comes to the conclusion that they nullify Plekhanov's philosophical authority ... If in "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" Lenin, according to Valentinov, was furious at the mention of philosophical idealism, then in "Philosophical Notebooks" he already takes idealism under his protection when he writes: "Philosophical idealism is only nonsense from the point of view of rough, simple, metaphysical materialism" [Lenin 1969, 322]. N. Valentinov believes that "Lenin's previous views on materialism are breaking under the influence of Hegel" [Valentinov web]. "This is what a walk into the distant metaphysical jungle," he concludes, "made Vladimir Ilyich Lenin arm in arm with Yegor Fedorovich Hegel" [Ibid].

Valentinov, most likely, understands the metaphysical jungle here literally, assuming that Lenin wrote out all kinds of dialectical gibberish from Hegel in his philosophical notebooks. For us, however, Valentinov's other remark is more interesting, where he writes that from the "clever idealism" squeezed out of Hegel's "Logic", one can fabricate "a new kind of metaphysics in the form of a kind of dialectical ontology with" self-movement of all things " "[Ibid].

Valentinov's book about Lenin was written in 1953, when the deed was done, and the Soviet "dialectic" as a metaphysical construction about the "general laws of development" became the official philosophical doctrine in the USSR. Valentinov, who once professed Machism, for obvious reasons, negatively assessed Soviet Marxism, believing that the origins of the new "dialectical" metaphysics within the framework of Marxism can be found not only in Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, but also in a materialistic reading Lenin of Hegel. It was an interesting but unfounded claim

on the study of the foundations and formation of Soviet philosophy - the work that Mareev did in his own way in the monograph "From the history of Soviet philosophy: Lukach - Vygotsky - Ilyenkov."

Mareev's analysis of the transformation of Marxism in Soviet philosophy was no longer limited by the censorship framework that Ilyenkov and Potemkin had. And it turned out that within the Soviet philosophy we observe the opposition of forces that, by and large, existed during the time of Hegel himself. For a hundred and even two hundred years, with all the cataclysms and social revolutions, the historical circumstances that determine the form of philosophical knowledge have changed, but their essence has not changed. In the article "E.V. Ilyenkov and Socialism" "Mareev, after the" crushing "reforms of the 90s, shows that Soviet socialism was indeed doomed, since, as Ilyenkov wrote in a letter to Yu.A. Zhdanov (1968), in Soviet society did not succeed in making the most important transition from formal to real socialization.

\* \* \*

It is clear that Mareev in the history of philosophy did not confine himself to criticism of dialect. Sergei Nikolaevich Mareev considered the problem of the ideal in its interpretation of Ilyenkov to be the main problem, pulling together all philosophy - classical and non-classical -. Through the prism of removing criticism associated with the problem of the ideal, we tried to consider the history of philosophy in a joint textbook as early as the early 2000s. [Mareev, Mareeva 2004]. There was an idea to rewrite the textbook and strengthen this topic in it. But life decreed otherwise.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> One can agree with K. Popper that there is a claim to absolute truth in Marxism. But at the heart of his criticism of Marxism is the identification of the features of the historical form (dialectical and historical) with the universal. Thus, the basis of criticism of dogmatism turns out to be the same dogmatism, which blocks the path to removing criticism.

<sup>2</sup> Mareev points out that Engels gives a reason to interpret materialist dialectics as a "general theory of development." However, this is only a pretext, which is perceived as a guide to action, among others, by the patriarch of Russian Marxism G.V. Plekhanov (For more details see [Mareev 2008, 28]).

### Sources - Primary Sources in Russian and Russian Translation

Hegel 1970<sub>a</sub> - *Hegel G.V. F. Science of logic*. In 3 volumes. T. 1. M.: Mysl', 1970 [Hegel, Georg WF *Wissenschaft der Logik* (Russian Translation)].

Hegel 1970<sub>b</sub> - *Hegel G.V. F. Jena real philosophy* // *Hegel G.V. F. Works of different years*. In 2 volumes. M.: Mysl', 1970. T. 1 [Hegel, Georg WF *Jenaer Realphilosophie* (Russian Translation)].

Hegel 1993 - *Hegel G.V. F. Lectures on the history of philosophy*. In 3 kn. Book. 1. SPb.: Nauka, 1993 [Hegel, Georg WF *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie* (Russian Translation)].

Hegel 1994 - *Hegel G.V. F. The phenomenology of the spirit*. SPb.: Science. 1994 [Hegel, Georg WF *Die Phänomenologie des Geistes* (Russian Translation)].

Ilyenkov 1991 - *Ilyenkov E.V. Marx and the Western World* / *Ilyenkov E.V. Philosophy and Culture*. M.: Politizdat, 1991. S. 156-169 [Ilyenkov, Evald V. *Marx and the Western world* (in Russian)].

Lenin 1969 - *Lenin V.I. To the question of dialectics* // *Lenin V.I. Full collection* op. In 55 volumes. T. 29. M.: Publishing house of political literature, 1969 [Lenin, Vladimir I. *On the Question of Dialectics* (in Russian)].

Mamardashvili 1992 - *Mamardashvili M.K. Kantian Variations* // *Quintessence. Philosophical almanac*. 1991. M.: Politizdat, 1992. S. 120-157 [Mamardashvili, Merab K. *Kantian variations* (in Russian)].

Mareev 1984 - *Mareev S.N. Dialectics of Historical and Logical and Concrete Historicism of K. Marx*. Moscow: Nauka, 1984 [Mareev, Sergei N. *Dialectic of the Historical and the Logical and Concrete Historicism of Marx* (in Russian)].

Potemkin 1973 - *Potemkin A.V. On the specifics of philosophical knowledge*. Rostov-on-Don: RSU, 1973 [Potemkin, Aleksei V., *On the Peculiarity of Philosophical Knowledge* (in Russian)].

Potemkin 1980 - *Potemkin A.V. The problem of the specifics of philosophy in the diatribic tradition*. Rostov-on-Don: Publishing house of the Russian State University, 1980 [Potemkin, Aleksei V., *The Problem of the Peculiarity of Philosophy in Diatribic Tradition* (in Russian)].

#### **Links - References in Russian**

Valentinov web - *Valentinov N. Meetings with Lenin* // <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=44025&p=72> Mareev 2004 - *Mareev S.N. E.V. Ilyenkov and socialism* // *Questions of philosophy*. 2004. No. 3. P. 101-110.

Mareev 2008 - *Mareev S.N. From the history of Soviet philosophy: Lukach - Vygotsky - Ilyenkov*. M.: Cultural revolution, 2008.

Mareev, Mareeva 2004 - *Mareev S.N. Mareeva E.V. History of philosophy (general course)*. M.: Academic project. 2004.

Mareeva 2015 - *Mareeva E.V. Two interpretations of Hegelian dialectics in the works of V.I. Lenin* // *Alternatives*. 2015. No. 4. P. 30-40.

Mezhuev 2013 - *Mezhuev V.M. Evald Ilyenkov and Merab Mamardashvili: From the Philosophy of the "Thaw" Period to the Philosophy of the "Stagnation" Period* // *Political Conceptology*. 2013. No. 1. P. 72 C.82.

#### **References**

Valentinov, Nikolai (1953) "Meetings with Lenin" // <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=44025&p=72> (In Russian).

Mareev, Sergei N. (2008) *From the History of Soviet Philosophy: Lukács - Vygotsky - Ilyenkov*, The Cultural Revolution, Moscow (in Russian).

Mareev, Sergei N. (2004) "EV Ilyenkov and Socialism", *Voprosy Filosofii*, Vol. 3 (2004), pp. 101– 110 (in Russian).

Mareev, Sergei N., Mareeva, Elena V. (2004) *The History of Philosophy (General Course)*, Academic Project, Moscow (in Russian).

Mareeva, Elena V. (2015) "Two Interpretations of the Hegelian Dialectics in the Works of VI Lenin", *Alternatives*, 4, pp. 30–40 (in Russian).

Mareeva, Elena V., Mareev, Sergei N. (2018) "Hegelian Dialectics and Soviet Marxism (from Vladi- mir Lenin to Evald Ilyenkov)", *Hegelian Marxism The Uses of Hegel's Philosophy in Marxist Theory from Georg Lukács to Slavoj Žižek*, Elanders, Stockholm, pp. 61-79.

Mezhuev, Vadim M. (2013) "Evald Ilyenkov and Merab Mamardashvili: From the Philosophy of Thaw to the Philosophy of Stagnation", *Political Conceptology*, 1, pp. 72–82 (in Russian).

#### **About the author**

**MAREEVA Elena Valentinovna** - Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Professor of the Department of Philosophy of the Moscow State Institute of Culture;

Head of the Department of General Education  
Moscow International Higher School of Business  
"MIRBIS" (Institute).

#### **Author's information**

**MAREEVA Elena V. -**  
DSc in Philosophy, Professor of the Department of Philosophy of the Moscow State Institute of Culture; The Head of Department of the General Subjects Moscow International Higher Business School

"MIRBIS" (Institute).