

MARXISM-LENINISM AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN PRACTICE FROM THE KARL KORSCH'S VIEW

Azer Binnatli
Vytautas Magnus University

The ideology of Marxism-Leninism was developed by Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin. Marxism-Leninism was created in the example of a situation in Russia, and was supposed to be an ideology that fought for a proletarian. This ideology was stated to be utilized in revolutions of working class as a guideline in Cuba. Karl Korsch was worry about the misdirection of working class with Marxism-Leninism ideology which was different from Marxism. According to K. Korsch, decaying of revolutionary Marxism for the proletarian class was its misused by J. Stalin. Marxism-Leninism doesn't serve for social welfare within society but pursue power of authority in Cuba. The absence of non-dogmatism in J. Stalin's Marxism-Leninism policy is considered to be the bad reputation of general Marxism for proletarian in the 21st century. The countries which utilized Marxism-Leninism to keep power seems because of dogmatic approach to Marxism-Leninism. Thus, this paper will focus on Marxism-Leninism and its implementation in 21st century in the frame of K. Korsch's Marxist philosophy.

Keywords: Karl Korsch, Marxism, Marxism-Leninism, Non-dogmatism, Philosophy.

Introduction. The ideology of Marxism-Leninism was developed by Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin. Marxism-Leninism was created in the example of a situation in Russia, and was supposed to be an ideology that fights for a proletarian. This ideology was stated to be utilized in revolutions of working class as a guideline in Cuba, Vietnam and Laos and so on.

One of the greatest events in American history has been the Cuban revolution. Since this revolution in 1959, Cuba is continuing to pursue the ideology of Marxism-Leninism till contemporary era. In addition, the ideology of Marxism-Leninism is taught in schools in Cuba.

Karl Korsch was worry about the misdirection of working class with Marxism-Leninism ideology which was different from Marxism. According to K. Korsch, decaying of revolutionary Marxism for the proletarian class was its misused by J. Stalin. Marxism-Leninism doesn't serve for social welfare within society but pursue power authority in Cuba, Vietnam and Laos.

For K. Korsch, the reason for this tendency is the dogmatic approach to Marxism Leninism.

K. Korsch wrote "Marxism and Philosophy" in 1923 and defended non-dogmatism within Marxism, based on historical facts. In addition, his "A Non-Dogmatic Approach to Marxism" (1946) is other work about this subject.

This research paper will investigate the main factors in misusing of Marxism-Leninism from the K. Korsch's point.

1. The problem is the abusing of Marxism-Leninism in 21st century.

2. The object – K. Korsch's Marxist Philosophy.

3. The goal – to investigate decay of Marxism-Leninism from the aspect of dogmatism in the frame of K. Korsch's Marxist philosophy.

4. The tasks: a) to analyse K. Korsch's approach to Marxism-Leninism in Soviet Union; b) his non-dogmatic approach to Marxism-Leninism; c) Marxism-Leninism and its implementation in practice.

K. Korsch's ideological life

K. Korsch is important The German Marxist theorist who was the political philosopher of Western Marxism (Korsch 2013) Karl Korsch was born on 15 August 1886 in Todsedt (Korsch 1972). He

studied law, philosophy and economics in the universities of Munich, Berlin, Geneva and Jana. He continued his study in London from 1912 till 1914. He became a member of Fabian society that its aim was to progress principles of democratic socialism and syndicalist movement affected him (Korsch. H 1972). His evident political life started with a 1st world war and when he became a member of Independent German Socialist Party (USPD) (Korsch & Halliday 2013). In addition, there was revolutionary excitement in European countries, especially in Germany after the Weimar Republic was founded in 1918. Spartacist rising also known as January uprising and the Munich Soviet Republic also known as the Bavarian Soviet Republic was defeated in 1919 in Germany. Marxism and anarcho-syndicalism turned to ideology and guidelines for proletarian movement which spread to wide areas for two years. K. Korsch was a member of this movement to reach his aims as well (Gordon & Oertzen 1965).

During this movement, there were contrasts between K. Korsch and Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci's attitude on factory councils and Leninism (Gramsci 1968). A. Gramsci understood the necessity to develop a theory for workers as an expression of their movement. Both Marxists did not recognize the main problem of proletarian movement. After the failure of proletarian movement in 1920, K. Korsch and A. Gramsci investigated the main shortcomings of this insurrection. K. Korsch adopted Leninist theory to establish an organization of proletarian and to fight against the bourgeois. A. Gramsci had a different opinion about the theory of proletarian movement (Korsch & Halliday 2013).

After Hamburg Uprising was defeated in 1923, Communist Party of Germany lost the majority of its members. The leftist Arkadi Maslow and Ruth Fischer came to power (Moore 1994). The Party altered its way and focused on revolutionary policy (Korsch & Halliday 2013). K. Korsch started to work in the journal of Party, in *Die Internationale* as an editor and spokesmen of Party. Communist deputy in Reichstag was one of his other political activities. (Korsch 2013). After breaking his ways with Bolsheviks in 1926, he continued his career as a spokesman of left-wing of the Communist Party (Hammer 1978).

K. Korsch travelled many European countries and lived in the USA until the end of his life. He worked here at Tulane University from 1943 till 1945 as sociology teacher. For next 5 years, his workplace was International Institute of Social Research. His some articles about Marxism was published during that time (Korsch 1935). K. Korsch who moved to America in 1936 did not participate in political activities here because of the situation which would have bad impacts (Korsch. H 1972). He wrote interpretation about Mao Tse-tung's essays and indicated that they are theoretical original. There was development in Asia and Africa, therefore, K. Korsch showed his optimistic view about this tendency. He had been in Europe last time in 1956 and serious illness was seen in his health during that time. He died in 1961 in Belmont (Korsch H. 1972).

K. Korsch's approach to Marxism in Russia

Karl Korsch was worry about the misdirection of working class with Marxism-Leninism ideology which was different from Marxism (Mattick 1962).

Therefore, historians of that period in Third International, called K. Korsch's position as a 'revisionist heresy' and they declared restoration of Marxism to its original form through Leninism as a right way, however K. Korsch accepted this way as a 'heretical' one. In 1923, the communist strategy failed in Germany, so K. Korsch continued to criticize Leninism in his books thus, he and his group were deported from this organization. During early 20th centuries, capitalism movements revealed but in a weak sense. Paul Mattick stated, "To prepare for it required, in Korsch's view, a sharpening, not a softening, of the class struggle and a greater determination to win political power." (Mattick 1962). At that time, counter-revolutionary movement arose through combining Left and Right reformists in Germany against Leninism as a solution of the crisis. The reason of this counter-revolutionary movement was that Marxism stopped to be as a revolutionary force in Russia and Bolsheviks started to use and spread communism as a tool of Russia policy to be strengthened. After communism proletarian was aware of that, tried to be away from Third International, but their enemies had enough power to defeat minority. Because of K. Korsch's wrong opinion about support for the proletarian movement, all opposition groups to J. Stalin were defeated.

A statement that Marxism requires capitalist state and thus proletarian movement must be suppressed in this state, establish situation for the weakening of Marxism in Russia. In this case, Russian Marxism and Western Marxism can be seen similar however there were some differences. Russia which could not be united state which pan-slavists wanted, is similar to England, France and Germany. In Russia, J. Stalin utilized Marxism as a tool for invasion by making propaganda between workers, Benito Mussolini with "corporative state", Adolf Hitler with "national socialism" ideologies did the similar action. Therefore, in the days of J. Stalin, the confidence of Marxism was reduced in the eyes of the proletarian compared to previous time. Marxism was no longer the main weapon of the workers' war (Korsch 1938).

According to him, decaying of Marxism arose from capital state and limitation on proletarian by Russian Marxism (Korsch 1938). J. Stalin edited Marxism not only upon orthodox Marxism, on Marx and Friedrich Engels as well to improve his capitalism ideology. Thence, J. Stalin created his new Marxism which as if, it served for proletarian and social revolution, however, aim of his Marxism was to suppress revival of movement of working class:

"Yet it cannot be denied that even such apparently anti-Marxian slogans as the recent Stalinist "theory" of building up socialism in one country, misusing Marxism as an ideological cloak for a development which in its actual tendency is capitalistic, can appeal not only to the precedent set by the orthodox Marxist Lenin, but even to Marx and Engels themselves. There is only this difference, and a remarkable difference indeed, that Marx, Engels and Lenin did so in order to promote a future revolutionary movement while Stalin definitely applied the "Marxist" ideology for the defence of a non-socialistic status quo, and as a weapon against every tendency of revolutionary realization." (Korsch 1938).

As it has been mentioned in this quote from K. Korsch "The Marxist Ideology in Russia" (1938), J. Stalin utilized altered Marxism not in favour of the proletarian or social movement, but against them. In this way, this Marxism which differed from Marxism prepared by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, was a tool for development of bourgeois capitalism, not for proletarian class. This Stalinist Marxism stayed alive in Soviet for a long time by blaming tsarist, deporting anti-Stalinist people.

According to K. Korsch, decaying of revolutionary Marxism for the proletarian class was its misused by J. Stalin (Korsch 1938). Thence, he analysed Stalinist Marxism from beginning to end in historical events and its culmination periods. In this case, he came to decision that Marxism-Leninism was changed by J. Stalin according to his political interests and restricted social movements and revolutionary characters of proletarian class, thus Marxism in Russia was less useful for the proletarian class to use it as a weapon in their struggle.

A Non-Dogmatic Approach to Marxism by K. Korsch

K. Korsch attempted to find a non-dogmatic character of Marxism in his "A Non-Dogmatic Approach to Marxism" (1946) The first task for him, was to analyse the relationship between Marxism and its dialectic with a social movement. Later, he emphasized dogmatism on Hegelian theory. The most important answer was laying on the difference of development of Marxism and Hegelian theory.

According to him, any social theory must be related to social movement, after that, it is acceptable to discuss this theory (Korsch 2013). Social theory belongs to some groups, parties and it is interpreted by them according to their aims, tactics. Now, K. Korsch settled the question "what Marxism really meant?" To answer this question, for J. Stalin and V. Lenin, Marxism was serving their own state policy, accordingly they and other Marxists defended orthodox Marxists. However, proletarian classes perceived Marxism as a tool in their struggle, and it became a weapon for them, as time goes on, their thought and aims changed according to different time conditions, so Marxism ideology was changed by them as well.

Non-dogmatism of Marxism and Hegelianism in K. Korsch's view

In his "Theses on Hegel and Revolution" (1931), K. Korsch analysed relationship between Hegelian dialectic and revolution. According to him, revolution is the vital fact to understand Hegelian dialectic and revolution. In his opinion, Hegelian philosophy was created and inspired by revolutionary movement and it took over tasks of the proletarian class (Korsch 2013). However, as time goes on, conditions changed, new societies appeared, and when it lost its revolutionary character, Hegelian philosophy lost its revolutionary dialectic character as well.

According to K. Korsch, revolutionary philosophy changes the society, things and this new society affect people's opinion and they change their opinion. When society changes, then people's opinion will change as well. If people are changed from revolutionary consciousness to non-revolutionary one, afterwards, their interpretation will change about Hegel philosophy. Thus this social theory will be separated from the social movement.

In addition, according to K. Korsch, if a man wants to understand dialectics of Hegelian philosophy, its relationship with social movement, and time conditions must be considered (Korsch 2013). Thence, Hegel's revolutionary philosophy is specific, not general and includes bourgeois revolution at 17-18th century. Hence, Karl Marx and V. Lenin utilized bourgeois revolution happened in the same century, while benefited from Hegelian philosophy. In contrast to Hegelian dialectic philosophy, Marxism developed over the years. The answer to this contradiction according to K. Korsch was Marxism to be non-dogmatic.

K. Korsch came to decision that, Marxism is a non-dogmatic theory which it had been changed according to different time conditions and therefore it was still alive and, developed in contrast to Hegelian philosophy. K. Korsch's aim to find non-dogmatism of Marxism was to revive it. Therefore, he re-emphasized relationship between Marxism and social movement, and the difference between latter improvement of Marxism and Hegel philosophy.

The contradiction between K. Korsch and Orthodox Marxists about non-dogmatism of Marxism

K. Korsch wrote "Marxism and Philosophy" in 1923 and his work defended non-dogmatism within Marxism, based on historical facts. Materialistic conception of history was the main part of Marxism which was applied by K. Korsch, and orthodox Marxists showed oppositional position. According to Orthodox Marxists all these oppositional statements about "Marxism and Philosophy" (1923) was un-dogmatic and based on historical facts, however, K. Korsch claimed that their attacks were only covering to hide their main aims. According to Orthodox Marxists, the Second International has been a great help in the development of Marxism, but after the assertion by K. Korsch that there was no such development, the Second International, especially the Orthodox Marxists like Karl Kautsky and Rosa Luxemburg attacked him. Marx and Engels made many important changes on their theories, and K. Korsch was accused of ignoring these alterations (Korsch & Halliday 2013).

K. Korsch criticizes Orthodox Marxist K. Kautsky in his "The Present State of the Problem of 'Marxism and Philosophy' – An Anti-Critique" (1930), who stated different opinions about the development of Marxism. K. Korsch indicated his attitude to Orthodox Marxist especially K. Kautsky:

"Later he went much further. His most recent major work, The Materialist Conception of History, eliminates any essential connection between Marxist theory and proletarian struggle whatever. His whole protest against my alleged 'charge' that Marx and Engels impoverished and banalized Marxism is merely a cover for a scholastic and dogmatic attempt to base his own betrayal of Marxism on the 'authority' of Marx and Engels." (Korsch & Halliday 2013).

As it had been written in this work, in Second International, there were many different tendencies about Marxism. The other fact was that K. Marx and F. Engels wrote Inaugural "Address of the International Working Men's Association for First International" in 1864 and afterwards. "The Class Struggles in France (Introduction by

F. Engels)” was written in 1895 by K. Marx and F. Engels. Till second work, Marxism was a theory for proletarian movement, afterwards in this work, it was claimed that: “theory valid not only for revolutionary phases but also for non-revolutionary periods” (Korsch & Halliday 2013). These actions made different tendencies in Second International. K. Kautsky was leading Orthodox Marxism in this period. Thence, K. Kautsky claimed that Marxism had no revolutionary character, however, he did not reject Marxism as a theory of class struggle yet. In 1896, he wrote “The Materialist Conception of History” and the statement by him was that there is no the relationship between proletarian movement and Marxism (Kautsky 1902). According to K. Korsch, Orthodox Marxists like K. Kautsky was dogmatic and they protested his statement about K. Marx and F. Engels that they obstructed the development of Marxism, to cover their real aims (Korsch & Halliday 2013). Because K. Kautsky and others didn’t recognize and accept the Marxist theory. K. Korsch’s attitude about them was harsh.

In this period, Communists like Bammel started to support ideas of Orthodox Marxists. Afterwards, Marxism began to weaken and Karl Korsch mentioned about Marxism of Second International in his *Marxism and Philosophy* (1923) which he analyzed reasons why Marxism degenerated in Second International.

K. Korsch complained about Second International to stop its revolutionary character. K. Korsch indicated that Bammel criticizes his attitude to Second International as an “excessively abstract and schematized problematic” (Korsch & Halliday 2013). The main purpose of the use of this expression by Bammel was to conceal the degeneration of Marxism in the Second International and the dogmatic attitude of Orthodox Marxists to Marxism theory (Korsch & Halliday 2013). K. Korsch emphasized one tendency of Communist critics: they did not find importance to save the honour of Second International. K. Korsch claimed that: “Instead he hides in V. Lenin’s ample shadow” (Korsch & Halliday 2013). Bammel explained to “Marxism and Philosophy” (1923) in his “abstract and schematic” approach, that this book blurred the Second International and made it even more ambiguous. For Communist and Orthodox Marxists, Second International helped workers’ movement. Thus, the quote from V. Lenin “historical contribution of the Second International” to advancing the modern workers’ movement” (Lenin 1960). was utilized by Bammel to hide their dogmatic purposes. In fact, V. Lenin used tactics as he wrote these words. That is, he mentioned the practical help to the Second International to workers’ movement, not theoretical.

K. Korsch wrote about Marxism of Second International in his *Marxism and Philosophy* (1923). There was rising social movement in the late nineteenth century, which was getting stronger and did not utilize Marxism with its all principles as their theory in their struggle (Korsch & Halliday 2013).

In K. Korsch’s view, orthodox Marxists and others who supported dogmatism in Marxism were different. According to them, the theory and practical aspects of Marxism have been fully expressed in this social revolution. The Marxism adopted by social revolution was truncated one. Thence econom-

ic, politic and social theories which are the basis of revolutionary Marxism had been removed from it by Orthodox Marxists. K. Korsch stated that: “Their general meaning had thereby been altered, and their specific content usually truncated and falsified.” (Korsch & Halliday 2013). There were many statements claimed that social revolution included whole Marxism theory, however, according to K. Korsch these statements were wrong. Because the new Social Democratic workers’ movement which adopted Marxism mostly part of revolutionary Marxism was different from these statements claimed by Orthodox Marxists. According to K. Korsch, after K. Marx died and crisis began to rise, these asseverations were the signs of revisionist attitude. Marxism was not adopted as whole even by revolutionary movements which happened in the 1870s and was included by populism and democratic. According to K. Korsch, in new socialist movement happened in the late 19th century was “formal avowals of the Marxist system as a whole emerged as a kind of theoretical defence and metaphysical consolation.” (Korsch & Halliday 2013). K. Korsch claimed that K. Kautsky’s Orthodox Marxism was a supplement of Eduard Bernstein’s revisionism (Bernstein et al., 1929).

According to Korsch, the attitude of Orthodox Marxists to his Marxist approach was unfounded, meaningless after all these historical facts (Korsch & Halliday 2013). According to him:

“In the light of this real historical situation, the complaints of orthodox Marxist critics against my work are not only unjustified but null and void. I am alleged to have a predilection for the ‘primitive’ form of the first historical version of the theory of Marx and Engels, and to have disregarded its positive development by Marx and Engels themselves, and by other Marxists in the second half of the nineteenth century.” (Korsch & Halliday 2013).

As K. Korsch claimed that he was claimed that development of Marxism by K. Marx and F. Engels was underestimated by him. Orthodox Marxists stated that Marxism of Second International was formed on original principles of Marxism and this is the development form of Marxism. According to K. Korsch “Yet in fact, it was a new historical form of proletarian class theory, which emerged from the altered practical context of the class struggle in a new historical epoch.” (Korsch & Halliday 2013). As time goes on, conditions were altered by time and context and demands of proletarian were changed as well. K. Korsch claimed that this theory emerged from new context and was different from Marxism of K. Marx and F. Engels. K. Kautsky’s Marxism that was replaced by the present viewpoint of proletarian movement was not true Marxism. (Korsch & Halliday 2013). The proletarian movement had not their own theory and K. Korsch stated that weakening of this movement was related to decay of Marxism, thus reviving of proletarian movement will be parallel with rising of Marxism. After Social Democrat Party (SPD) started to be Marxist, a gap emerged within the party about the relationship between revolutionary Marxist theory and practice. Because Marxism was claimed to be “pure” theory which indicates only historical facts however after Marxism was adopted by workers’ movement, the gap widened within the party.

K. Kautsky and V. Lenin claimed that proletarian movement can achieve socialism thanks to bourgeois ideology (Bernstein et al., 1929). R. Luxemburg was in favor of this statement as well and showed bourgeois ideology as weapon for proletarian movement: “the one had creative power because he was armed with all the resources of a bourgeois education, while the other remains tied to ‘the social conditions of existence in our society’, which will continue unaltered throughout the capitalist epoch.” (Trotsky 1924). As it had been mentioned there was contradiction and gap in Marxism of Second International about relationship theory and practice, therefore, to understand and solve the problem was to be applied to historical fact. K. Korsch applies to this historical fact: Proletarian movement utilized Marxism as a weapon in their struggle but from a practical aspect, movement adopted theory side of Marxism in the narrow sense. Thus, K. Korsch claimed that:

“This height was attained during the final phase of the first major capitalist cycle that came to an end towards 1850. At that time, the workers’ movement had achieved a peak of development. But it then came to a temporary yet complete halt, and only revived slowly, as conditions changed.” (Korsch & Halliday 2013).

As it had been stated in this quote, in 1850 when capitalism was in the last stage of its development, the proletarian movement was in its culmination point. As time went on, conditions changed for proletarian movement and development continued slowly. In this case theory of revolutionary Marxism was changed by K. Marx and F. Engels according to new time conditions. However proletarian movement was already dead. K. Marx and F. Engels were not inspired by any present movement thus they started to continue writing Marxism in a theoretical way. Marxism was not formed from “pure” theory, as it had always a relation with a movement which happened recently and it was conceived according to insurrection. Afterwards, K. Korsch claimed that later works of K. Marx and F. Engels were written for proletarian movement, however, Marxism was on its way to development from a theoretical aspect (Korsch & Halliday 2013). In this case there were two developments. K. Korsch indicates these developments: 1) the development of theory according to new time conditions on the basis of old theory 2) the development in practice of proletarian movement.

K. Korsch’s Marxist Philosophy and Modern Century

K. Korsch’s main goal in research Marxism was to develop Western Marxism according to present and further time conditions. His all attempts were to revive Western Marxism as theoretical expression of proletarian movement. For this aim, he approached Marxism from its non-dogmatic side. K. Korsch searched non-dogmatism on the Marxism to revive it and saw a non-dogmatism side of Marxism on its alteration by decades depending on time condition.

The dogmatism of Stalin’s Marxism-Leninism and absence of theoretical expression for working class allow this ideology to be utilized by authorities in their political aims. K. Korsch saw colonial countries as the last hope for Marxism to revive. However, in countries like Cuba and Vietnam, Marx-

ism-Leninism was used by the authority to take and keep power as Stalin did. To understand being used of Marxism-Leninism as propaganda, firstly it would be better to look at Cuba revolution.

Cuban revolution started in 1953 with 26th of July Movement under the leadership of Fidel Castro to overthrow the present regime and establish a new one. In 1959, the regime of Fulgencio Batista was defeated and Fidel Castro took over the control of the state.

No one expected that this revolution, which started in the mid-20th century, would grow bigger and larger. The Cuban revolutionaries have stated that the main purpose of the revolution is to implement the socialist principles in the Cuban state. It would be appropriate to present the Cuban revolution as an advanced revolution with the help of the middle class and the peasants. The armed workers and the poor peasants nationalized the private capitals belonging to the USA after the police and military forces were defeated in Cuba. Tensions began between them and the representatives of the bourgeoisie (Mage et al., 1960). The attendance of revolutionary socialist party and the autonomous action on the part of the working class were a basic factor in revolutionary socialist movement, however, both were absent.

This revolution against the bourgeoisie would be a true sociological revolution if the Marxist party and the working class was a leader in this revolution. The Cuban state continued its existence under the name of the workers and farmers’ government.

Even dodging that undodgeable question, we are still confronted with a very queer animal – a “workers’ and farmers’ government” in which there are no workers or farmers and no representatives of independent workers’ or farmers’ parties! (Mage et al., 1960).

It is doubtful to call the socialist or workers’ state which was established with the leadership of the middle class, without the participation of the working class or the Marxist party. Calling the state, workers and farmers, or a socialist state in which the workers’ and farmers’ parties are not represented in the state create a question in the head. The main purpose of the Cuban revolution was to eliminate the poverty that has arisen as a result of years of colonization. There was an obstacle in front of them to achieve this goal: American imperialism. According to “The Cuban Revolution and Marxist Theory” (1960): “To do this required one absolute precondition – a radical land reform.” (Mage et al., 1960). America had taken over control of sugar factories in Cuba. Therefore, as a first step, it was important to end the economic domination of the USA in Cuba.

The main purpose and tasks of the revolution were modernization, land reform, national independence. However, these tasks and revolution were not similar to K. Korsch’s Marxist philosophy. This revolution was a step forward for the establishment of only the future Cuban state. The late expropriation is due to the absence of any workers’ party or workers’ organization in power. Thus, this led to increasing dissatisfaction of working class and poverty (Mage et al., 1960).

The absence of non-dogmatism and theoretical and practical features in Stalin’s Marxism-Lenin-

ism which K. Korsch opposed, leading to decay of Marxism as theoretical expression of proletarian in the 21st century in Cuba.

Conclusion. K. Korsch's Marxist ideology have the possibility to be developed as a theory for proletarian movement according to present time conditions thanks to its freedom from dogmatism in the 21st century. The absence of these feature in Stalin's Marxism-Leninism policy is considered to be the bad reputation of general Marxism for working class in

the 21st century. The countries which utilized Marxism-Leninism to keep power seems as the main reason for this decay. His last hope was colonial countries to develop revolutionary Marxist theory. However, it was misused in Cuba. For instance, this type of Marxism-Leninism doesn't serve for social welfare within society but pursue state power. This tendency causes the formation of opinion about Marxism not as a theoretical expression of working class but as a means for the authority to maintain its dictatorship.

References:

1. Bernstein E., Fisher I. & Meiner F. (1929). Die Volkswirtschaftslehre der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen. Leipzig: Meiner.
2. Gordon H.J. & Oertzen P.V. (1965). Betriebsrate In Der Novemberrevolution: Eine Politikwissenschaftliche Untersuchung Uber Ideengehalt Und Struktur Der Betrieblichen Und Wirtschaftlichen arbeiterrate in der Deutschen Revolution 1918/19. The American Historical Review, 71(1), 230. doi:10.2307/1863171.
3. Gramsci A. (1968). Soviets in Italy. New Left Review, 51(28).
4. Hammer K. (1978). The Fur Trade in Minnesota: An Introductory Guide to Manuscript Sources by Bruce M. White. The Journal of Economic History, 38(3), 833-833.
5. Kautsky K. (1902). The Materialist Conception of History. Social Democrat, 6(8), 242-248.
6. Korsch H. (1972). Memories of Karl Korsch. New Left Review, 76(35), 35-38.
7. Korsch K. (1935). Why I am a Marxist. The Modern Monthly, 9(2), 88-95.
8. Korsch K. (1938). The Marxist Ideology in Russia. Living MaT: lCism, 4(2), 44.
9. Korsch K. (1972). Three essays on Marxism. NYU Press.
10. Korsch K. (2013). Karl Korsch: Revolutionary Theory. University of Texas Press.
11. Korsch K. & Halliday F. (2013). Marxism and philosophy. New York: Verso Books.
12. Lenin V.I. (1960). V.I. Lenin: Collected Works. Foreign Languages Publishing House.
13. Mage Wohlforth, & Robertson (1960). Cuba and Marxist Theory. Retrieved March 25, 2018, from <https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/document/ibt/ibt10.htm>.
14. Mattick P. (Autumn, 1962). Karl Korsch: His Contribution to Revolutionary Marxism, Controversy 1(1), 11-21.
15. Moore B. (1994). Abtrunnig wider Willen: Aus Briefen und Manuskripten des Exils. The English Historical Review, 109(431), 525-527.
16. Salvadori M.L. (1990). Karl Kautsky and the socialist revolution, 1880-1938. London: Verso.
17. Trotsky L. (1924). Literature und Revolution. Wien: Verlag für Literatur und Politik.

Азер Биннатли

Университет имени Витаутаса Великого

МАРКСИЗМ-ЛЕНИНИЗМ И ЕГО ПРАКТИЧЕСКОЕ ВОПЛОЩЕНИЕ С ТОЧКИ ЗРЕНИЯ К. КОРША

Аннотация

Идеология марксизма-ленинизма была разработана Владимиром Лениным и Иосифом Сталиным. Марксизм-ленинизм был создан на примере ситуации в России и должен был быть идеологией, которая боролась за пролетария. Было заявлено, что эта идеология используется в революциях рабочего класса на Кубе в качестве руководства. Карл Корш беспокоился о неправильном руководстве рабочего класса идеологией марксизма-ленинизма, которая отличалась от марксизма. По словам К. Корша, причиной упадка революционного марксизма для пролетарского класса было его неправильное использование И. Сталиным. Марксизм-ленинизм не служит общественному благополучию в обществе, но обладает властью на Кубе. Отсутствие недогматизма в политике марксизма-ленинизма И. Сталина считается плохой репутацией общего марксизма для пролетария в XXI веке. Страны, которые использовали марксизм-ленинизм для сохранения власти, объясняются догматическим подходом к марксизму-ленинизму. Таким образом, эта статья фокусируется на марксизме-ленинизме и его реализации в XXI веке в рамках марксистской философии К. Корша.

Ключевые слова: Карл Корш, марксизм, марксизм-ленинизм, недогматизм, философия.