"HEGEL'S logic is the algebra of the revolution."

Herzen's aphorism is often quoted, but rarely taken seriously. That Herzen had a real insight here is suggested by the fact that key periods in the thought of both Marx and Lenin followed hard upon a close reading of Hegel. The first classic statement of Marxism in The German Ideology was an outcome of Marx's struggle with the Phenomenology of Mind in 1844. The revaluation of Marx by Lenin after 1914 follows on his reading of the Science of Logic. "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 have understood Marx." What gives this crucial role to Hegel's philosophy? Hegel's picture of human activity as rational activity, and of rational activity as activity that has freedom as its goal. Certainly for Hegel this picture is ambiguous, hovering between assertions about the real human condition and statements of the ideal, not yet realised, form of human life. Certainly Marx had to transform Hegel. But the ferment of the concepts of freedom, reason and consciousness in Marx's philosophy is the Marxist debt to Hegel. Hegel without Marx is unrealistic, and in the end obscurantist. Marx without Hegel would have been rigid, mechanical, inhuman. And when later Marxism displays these characteristics it is often a sign of a neglect of the Hegelian stimulus in Marx. "The question of Hegel was settled long ago,"
said A. A. Zhdanov in 1947. "There is no reason whatsover to pose it anew." When would-be Marxists talk like this, it is usually a sign that the freeing of human nature is no longer the central goal of their socialism.

This is perhaps the most important theme in Raya Dunayevskaya's *Marxism and Freedom*. Miss Dunayevskaya was at one time Trotsky's secretary. When Trotsky declared in the last war that Russia was genuinely a workers' state which ought to be defended, she broke with him, and since then has played her own very individual part in the American labour movement. She only wrote the final draft of her book after earlier drafts had been discussed and criticised by groups of miners, steelworkers, auto-workers and students. A book that is the product of an interest in Hegel on the one hand and participation in a miners' strike in West Virginia on the other promises to have unusual qualities. And this book is unusual.

It has three great merits. The first is that she has tried to write a history of Marxist theory in which the development of the theory is linked at every point to the corresponding developments both in society and in the political experience of socialists. The second is that she has utilised some of the source material of Marxism more fully than any previous commentator. I have spoken already of her Hegelian concern. In this connection she has included in appendices translations of a major part of Marx's Economic-Philosophical manuscripts of 1844 and of those portions of Lenin's philosophical notebooks which deal with Hegel. But she has also been in a position to make use of the stenographic reports of the early congresses of the Russian party and especially of those of the Ninth Party congress of 1921 when the crucial debates on the role of the trade unions in a socialist society took place. The third merit of this book, and it arises out of the other two, is that it provides a framework for a revaluation of Lenin in which a change can be noted from an emphasis on the party as the revolutionary manipulator of a passive working class to an emphasis on the potential revolutionary spontaneity of the working class. And this change goes along with what we may call Lenin's Hegelian conversion.

It will be already clear that this book is an important contribution to socialist thought. What has to be said in addition is that it is a book in which important insights and scholarly research are often sacrificed to a new framework of dogma. For Miss Dunayevskaya this is the age of state capitalism, a form of economy common to both U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. This leads her into a fantastic undervaluation of socialist achievement in the Soviet Union. She writes of the Soviet state as though the Moscow trials, Vorkuta, and Hungary were its supreme and authentic expressions. And because of this standpoint she tends to treat as Soviet crimes and heresies what are in fact at least attempts to face the problems of a socialist society.

Miss Dunayevskaya criticises Soviet industrialisation; she says nothing of how industrialisation ought to proceed in a socialist society. She attacks Soviet collectivisation of agriculture; she says nothing of what socialist agriculture should be. And the result is that this portion of her book is negative and sterile. She sees no more hope in Yugoslavia than in Russia. Her only hope is in the world-wide working class. And the suspicion grows as one reads that she has an entirely idealised view of that class.

What has happened to her book seems to be something like this. She has been repelled by the arid, seminary textbook Marxism of the Stalinists and the Trotskyists (who share all the dogmatism of the Stalinists without any of their achievements). She has gone back to the sources and reread her Marx and her Lenin. But what she has in the end tried to extract from this is a new dogmatism, a new fixed scheme. And in doing this she misses seeing in Marxism a perspective on human affairs which her return to Hegel might have brought home to her. We are so used to having Marxism interpreted for us as the science which lays bare the laws of society, that we tend to take it for granted that Marxism presents us with a picture of man as a being whose behaviour is essentially predictable. But in fact it is truer to say that Marxism shows us how in class-divided society human possibility is never fully revealed. There is always more potentiality in human beings than we are accustomed to allow for. And because of this, human development often takes place in quite unpredictable leaps. We never perhaps know how near we are to the next step forward.

It is when Marxists lose faith in the possibilities of human life in our age that they begin to look for some substitute faith. In Stalinism it is belief in the party and above all in the party bureaucracy. For Miss Dunayevskaya it is her largely idealised version of the working class. And of course those who have to idealise the workers are precisely those who have lost their faith in the real flesh-and-blood working class.

Many socialists want to look out on society and be able to read off the signs of hope with some kind of theoretical barometer. Out of Marxism they have tried to fashion such an instrument. But if we look back at Marx and Lenin, perhaps the most impressive thing about their lives is the way in which they were prepared to live without signs of hope. I think for example of Lenin reorganising among the despairing Russian socialists after 1905 or isolated after the betrayals of 1914. It is from Lenin's stance of hope in a situation which to the ordinary eye would be one of hopelessness that we have to learn. And if we learn what Marx and Lenin have to teach here, and what Miss Dunayevskaya can help us to learn from them, one outcome will perhaps be that we shall no longer want to write books like hers.