

© RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA, 1971

Raya Dunayevskaya, October 9, 1970.

Talos International  
Philosophic Conference

"Hegelian Leninism",  
or  
Dialectics of Liberation

I. "Dialectic Proper"

One word needs to be said about the title of my paper.

"Hegelian Leninism" is the title the Talos gave it as they "assigned" topics. I call it "Dialectics of Liberation." The four central points of "Hegelian Leninism, or Dialectics of Liberation" are: One, that which Lenin designated as "Dialectic Proper". Two, The Dialectic of Imperialism, on the one hand, and the National Question, on the other hand. Dialectic Development and Collapse of the Bolshevik Leadership is our third point of concentration. Finally, we come to Death of Dialectic: Inversion of Reality and Thought.

Now, then, let's go adventuring with Lenin as he meets Hegel. Inter-communication between the ages makes for an exciting happening when the mind of a revolutionary materialist is pitted against the mind of a bourgeois idealist philosopher who discovered a revolutionary dialectic. So strong is the illumination, it casts on the relationship of philosophy to revolution in Lenin's era that we get a glimpse also of the challenges we face today.

You, no doubt, know the historic moment of this occurrence -- the world falling apart as the outbreak of the first world war swept established Marxism along in a tidal wave of destruction. But more than facts, facts, facts are needed to grapple with the compulsion Lenin felt to unearth the past - not only the philosophic origins of Marxism in Hegel, but the never-ending return to that point of origin. By re-

12528

living the shock of recognition Lenin experienced in his encounter with Hegel, we become witness to the transfusion of the lifeblood of the dialectic -- the negation of the negation, the transformation of reality as well as of thought as Lenin writes:

"Who would believe that this - the movement and 'self-movement' ... spontaneous, internally-necessary movement, ... 'movement and life' is the core of 'Hegelianism', of abstract and abstruse (difficult, absurd, 'Hegelianism?')?" (Appendix, M&F, p. 331; Vol. 38, p.141) (1)

The activist, the Party man, the materialist, the proletarian revolutionary is undergoing "absolute negativity" as he moves in the opposite, absolute opposite direction, from the "photocopy" theory which had permeated his vulgarly materialistic Materialism and Empiric-Criticism.

Now he writes:

"Alias: Man's cognition not only reflects the objective world, but creates it." (M&F, Appendix, p. 347; Vol. 38, p. 212)

Lest anyone think that this is either sheer Hegelianism and, "therefore, pure idealism" -- or Maoist voluntarism, let him or her return to the solid ground on which Lenin stood as his mind prepared for revolution, proletarian revolution. Now, hold on tight to Lenin's new concrete universal -- "to a man" -- the population "to a man" running production and the state. It is the polar opposite of "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung" that deludes itself in believing that, by fiat, "the helmsman" can "abolish" the objectivity of Hegel's law of contradiction.

No matter how often Lenin reminded himself that he was reading Hegel "materialistically", no matter how he lashed out against what he called the "dark waters" of such abstractions as "Being-for-Self", and despite the fact that in his first confrontation with categories

of the Doctrine of Notion -- Universal, Particular, Individual -- he called them "a best means of getting a headache", Lenin, from the very start, grasped that these abstractions carry a historic meaning. He therefore, sided at once with Hegel's idealism as against what he called "vulgar materialism":

"The idea of the transformation of the ideal into the real is profound. Very important for history -- Against vulgar materialism. NB. The difference of the ideal from the material is also not unconditional, not excessive." (M&F Appendix, p. 329; Vol. 38, p. 114)

Not only was Lenin gaining a new appreciation of Hegel's idealism, of the movement and self-movement, both of thought and reality. He also stopped counterposing Essence to Appearance as if one were only "show" and the other the only "real". The one, and the other, were "moments" (the emphasis is Lenin's) of a concrete totality, from which even cause should not be singled out:

"It is absurd to single out causality from this. It is impossible to reject the objectivity of notions, the objectivity of the universal in the particular and in the individual ...

"Just as the simple value form, the individual act of exchange of a given commodity with another, already includes, in undeveloped form, all major contradictions of capitalism, -- so the simplest generalization, the first and simplest forming of notions (judgments, syllogisms, etc.) signifies the ever-deeper knowledge of the objective world connections. It is necessary here to seek the real sense, significance and role of the Hegelian Logic. This NB." (M&F, Appendix, p. 339; Vol. 38, pp. 178-9)

You can feel the liberating effect on Lenin of his battles with the categories in the Doctrine of the Notion -- the Universal, the Particular, the Individual, the very categories he had first called "a best way of getting a headache." He now begins hitting out, not against Hegel, but against Marxists, himself included. Though Moscow's English translator left out the emphasis, in the plural form of Marxists, there is no way to modify Lenin's conclusion that:

"None of the Marxists understood Marx. It is impossible fully to grasp Marx's Capital, especially its first chapter, if you have not studied through and understood the whole of Hegel's Logic." (M&F. Appendix, p. 340; Vol. 38, p. 180)

Now Lenin had no need to wait for the Doctrine of Notion to single out the unity of opposites to be the core of the dialectic. He had done as much in the Doctrine of Being.

Even from a purely technical point of view, it is crucial to observe what happened to Lenin after he "consigned God and the philosophic rabble that defends God to the rubbish heap", after he kept being wary of Hegel's "Absolute", once he entered that realm of "pure thought".

As against the 13 pages Lenin devoted to the Prefaces and Introduction, 22 pages to Doctrine of Being and 35 to the Doctrine of Essence, to the Doctrine of Notion he, not only devoted 71 pages/(that is more than the total pages devoted to all the rest of the Science of Logic), he also formulated, not merely "jottings", a five page article "On the Question of Dialectics", which ends with a veritable panegyric about "the living tree of living, fertile, genuine, powerful, omnipotent, objective, absolute human knowledge." (Vol. 38, p. 363).

Note the contradictory and true jamming up of opposites, "absolute" and "human". Toward the end of the Science of Logic, as Lenin stopped shying away from "Absolute", grasping that the true "Absolute" is "absolute negativity", the ceaseless negation, not only of the old, but also of the first negation, he held on tight to the Absolute Method, noting further, "This NB: The richest is the most concrete and most subjective" (Vol. 38, p. 232), criticising Hegel for making a distinction between "simple" negation and "the absolute":

"the difference is not clear to me, is not the absolute equivalent to the more concrete?" (Vol. 38, p. 229)

To grasp the full impact of the arising of the concrete and absolute, we must do what Lenin did throughout the battle with the Science of Logic; holding before his mind's eye, or to use a phrase of the young Marx, "the eagle eye of mind", something as concrete and universal as the mature Marx's Capital.

Thus, when Lenin said that a genuine abstraction is truer than sensuality, Lenin, (who is talking to himself, arguing with himself, and asking himself to return and further work out the meaning of this or that philosophic category and its relationship to Marx's economic categories), Lenin there points to the greater truth in "value" compared to the market manifestation of supply and demand.

By the time even the absolute loses its God-like fetishism and becomes concrete, human to Lenin, he explodes into all the generalizations about none having previously understood Marx, about Plekhanov, having written thousands upon thousands of pages on "the dialectic" hadn't understood "the dialectic proper" because he had not battled with Science of Logic itself, and the need first how to continue the work of Marx.

## II. Dialectic of Imperialism, and of the National Question

Put differently, the dialectic is the unity of opposites, when it is understood as the transition from one

to the other and the transformation also of first negation -- the second negativity alone being the turning point. First then can one grasp dialectical development through contradiction in Notion as the absolute mediation from the abstract Universal through the Particular moment to the Individual, the concrete. They then all begin to assume flesh and blood as the internal dialectic, not that of external reflection, but the process of becoming, in actuality, in the immediate phenomenon, so that Imperialism is not merely the phenomenal expression of the latest stage of Capitalism - monopoly - but is eve of proletarian revolution.

and, as against a phenomenal view, or what we now call "the sociology of knowledge", which degrades history, merely to furnishing "background" for making generalizations (as if it were sufficient merely to note that conclusions are not made up of the whole cloth, but are derived from actual facts), Lenin sided with the Hegelian dialectic in its attack on the synthetic method of abstract identity, that required all given material come from external reflection.

Lenin's notebooks on Imperialism discloses what worlds apart Lenin's study of imperialism is not only from the betraying Second International's theory of "ultra-imperialism", but from studies by revolutionaries like Luxemburg, and "the Dutch" -- Pannekoek,orter, Roland-Host -- whom Lenin had called "the best revolutionary and most internationalist elements of the Int," and yet thought that all of their views on the National question

betrayed attitudes of "imperialist economism." Lenin applied that designation to those who did not grasp the relationship, or, more correctly put, the direct opposition <sup>to imperialism</sup> of the struggle for self-determination which thereby gave special urgency to the National Question, not only as "principle", but as "bacillus" for proletarian revolution.

Lenin was intransigent in his debates with his Bolshevik colleagues on the question, hitting out especially against Nikolai Bukharin whose book on the world economy and imperialism he had glowingly introduced but ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> related to his opposition to the National Question a few months back, but whose analysis he now called "imperialist economism". As can be seen from his massive Notebooks on Imperialism, he considered, as one, the analysis of imperialism and its opposite, the struggle for self-determination, and the latter as one, with all the forces of revolution against the state (State and Revolution was first called "Marxism and the State"), which was the methodology by which imperialism became "eve of socialist revolution."

Serious Marxist revolutionaries, aware that their task of restating Marxism for their age, keep their eyes glued on the objective situation, not as if it were a mere compiling of the latest headlines, but requiring serious analysis in strict relationship to the "subjective situation." What, however, none were oppressively aware of before 1915, was that the objective situation has a dialectic, and the subjective a dialectic of its own; the jamming up of these opposites is a great deal both more complex and more concrete than the mere repetition of the words, capital/labor.

At the turn of the century, it had become clear that a totally new stage in the development of capitalism had been reached. Analysts began facing that reality. The first was by liberal bourgeois economist, Hobson,

whose study of Imperialism in 1902, held that capitalism "should" change this "policy."

The first Marxist study of the new phenomenon, by Hilferding, was published in 1910, Finance Capital. It was praised for singling out this new feature, bank capital, and for asserting that this high stage of capitalism made it easier for the dictatorship of the proletariat "to take over" this new organization of industry. Like the categories in Essence, the new economic categories all led to Absolute Substance. Hilferding's analysis disclosed no new beginning, no self-developing Subject that would determine the end. No Marxist noted that, however.

In 1913 Rosa Luxemburg published her study of Accumulation of Capital, concentrating her study on the relationship of capitalism to non-capitalism, that is, imperialism's carving up of the colonies. We cannot here <sup>(2)</sup> go into the why what began as a supplement to Marx's Capital, an updating of "primitive accumulation of capital" as the real, the actual, the ongoing accumulation of capital, ended as a revision of Marx's greatest theoretical work. All that concerns us here -- outside of the fact that Lenin opposed both its under-consumptionism and its wrong counterposition of theory to reality -- is that the present claims by the Sweezys, Mandels and youthful exponents of the "Third World" as the only revolutionaries notwithstanding, Rosa Luxemburg completely denied that she had unearthed a new subject, either in theory or in fact. She insisted that "long before" capitalism



will have exhausted itself from having no capitalist areas to exploit, the proletariat would overthrow it.

In 1915, Bukharin published his study, "Imperialism and World Economy". Again, there was no criticism of Finance Capital; the latest "updating" expanded the geographic area globally, and, like "the Dutch" and Luxemburg, and all Marxist revolutionaries, he uncompromisingly fought the socialist betrayers and their apologists, the Kautskys with his theory of ultra-imperialism. Again, the proletariat was treated as object. Again, Lenin did not note it, and glowingly introduced Bukharin's work.

In a few months, however, he turned against all previous studies. He started anew the analysis of Imperialism as transformation into Opposite of completion into monopoly capitalism. Krupskaya notes in her *Memoirs* that she had never seen him in a more <sup>un</sup>compromising mood. We also have Bukharin's letter from New York, begging Lenin not to conduct his polemics on the National Question in a way that would exacerbate relations within the Bolshevik group.

In the struggle against the betrayers and for the re-constitution of Marxist internationalism, Lenin found that even among revolutionaries there was no grasp at all of the dialectic of revolution, the catalyst for proletarian revolution that ~~the~~ struggle for self-determination was. The dialectic was not "philosophy" or, to phrase it more precisely, philosophy, dialectic was not an abstraction; it was the algebra of revolution that was inherent in economic relations. As if

those magnificent Irish revolutionaries hadn't upheaved the world, the Marxist theoreticians continued to treat the matter quantitatively, or, more precisely out, sans subject.

Even before those masses were in motion -- the major part of the Notebooks on Imperialism were done in mid-1915 -- Lenin had been closely following developments on the National Question by Marxists, he found they were totally deaf to this potential force for revolution. He took careful note of the fact that the SP in the US had made but one proclamation for Negroes in 1901, adding (p. 582) that in the State of Mississippi the socialists organized Negroes "in separate locals!"

After 1917 he will list the Negro question as a National question and by 1919 when the German Revolution was beheaded, the National question became the International question - with a possible new point of departure for world revolution - (Peking instead of Berlin<sup>(3)</sup>) and in that critical year 1920, the Negro question remained central, too. But for the moment (1916) the potential of the National question as the masses in motion becomes actual in Dublin.

With this revolution, Lenin's principled stand on the National question gained a new dimension. He became most intransigent with his Bolshevik co-readers, with Rosa Luxemburg, with "the Dutch", whose position he called the most internationalist, but so abstract that they recognized neither the actual unleashed revolution -- the Irish uprising -- nor the dialectic of revolution theoretically -- masses as Reason, the masses in motion. The national revolutions were not "substitutes"

for proletarian revolution, but they <sup>were</sup> unwilling for it, and no catalyst of revolution is "subordinate", something over which the internationalists may superimpose their "principles" as ultimatum for participation.

As revealed in Lenin's Notebooks on Imperialism, which are by no means limited to the economic study of the latest phase of capitalist development, but include also the outline of articles on the war itself, on the National Question -- and on "Marxism and the State", that which later became State and Revolution. Here you can see Lenin's dialectic mind in action as he moves to an analysis of the state by taking the unity of opposites -- "the transformation of monopoly capitalism into state - monopoly capitalism" -- and its absolute opposite, not just "in general" -- the world proletarian revolution -- but concretely, the not "taking over" of the state, but smashing it, smashing it to smithereens.

Again, however, there will be watching of the spontaneous upheaval to see what new forms of revolt and of rules would emerge. Once the self-developing Russian proletariat had recreated the Soviets in February, 1917 -- Lenin has his answer; "No police, no army, no officialdom. Every worker, every peasant, every toiler, everyone who is exploited, the whole population to a man." Lenin's new concrete Universal is "TO A MAN." He has prepared himself theoretically to be there, and as he phrased it when he found he had no time to finish "the book", State and Revolution:

"It is more pleasant and useful to go through the experience of the revolution than to write about it."

### III. Dialectical Development and Collapse of Leadership

One thing the Lenin Institute did make available to the public in those empty introductions to Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks and that is the requests Lenin made for books. It is clear that he had not stopped studying the Hegelian dialectic once the revolution was successful. Nor was this "academic", or limited to the fact that he asked "the theoreticians", the editors of the new theoretical organ, UNDER THE BANNER OF MARXISM, to act as "Materialist Friends of the Hegelian Dialectic" and continue to publish Hegel's works themselves, with commentary. No, it was the way he applied it in life, in theory, in his battles with his co-leaders.

There is no more tragic moment in all of history than the will Lenin left. The criticism of his Bolshevik co-leaders was directed not only against Stalin whom he asked be "removed", or Zinoviev-Kamenev whose publication of the date of the planned seizure of power in the bourgeois press was "no accident", or against Trotsky's "administrative mentality." No, also damning is Lenin's criticism of "the most valuable and biggest theoretician of the party", Bukharin, not to mention that he is "the favorite of the whole party"; but his theoretical views can only with the very greatest doubt be regarded as fully Marxian, for there is something scholastic in him (he never learned and I think never fully understood the dialectic.)

The ramifications of this shorthand expression about the dialectic can best be grasped when something concrete is held on to tightly, and the continuous "something concrete" that was being debated with Bukharin throughout the decade, 1914-1924, was Bukharin's abstract revolutionism when it came to the National question not only re. imperialism but after the success of the October Revolution, regarding its obligation to the self-determination of nations, and, again, as the black dimension, depth on the Negro question in the US and the African peoples as Bukharin mindlessly dragged it into the question of the New Program of the Russian Communist Party,

Finally, some of the dimensions of the problem of the dialectic of world revolution Lenin was asking others to work out. Time does not allow us to develop this crucial question here, but we can get a glimpse of the new dimension from Lenin's Theses on National and Colonial question:

Petty-Bourgeois nationalism declares the recognition of the equality of nations, and nothing else, to be internationalism, while preserving intact national egoism ... proletarian internationalism demands, firstly, the subordination of the interests of the proletarian struggle in one country to the interests of the struggle on a world scale ..."

We have yet to work this out. Impatient academic Marxists like Marcuse notwithstanding, the theoretical point of departure for working out the dialectic of world revolution was laid down in 1920, a near half-century before Marcuse, in trying to throw overboard Marx's concept of

revolution, held forth that to Lenin national revolutions were only "auxiliary" whereas today, with the rise of Third World, we (he) can look at matters "globally."

In any case, what is of the essence dialectically, historically, in tracing Lenin's "Hegelianism" inseparable from the concrete "universals" that alone can assure the coming of world revolution is to hold on tight to Lenin's heritage philosophically as well as nationally, what erupts spontaneously as well as what comes out of organization, extended all the way, as Lenin did, to leadership and organization.

What Lenin was summing up, whether it was in Theses, or in Will, is a lifetime spent in the revolutionary movement at the point where, concretely, it achieved the greatest proletarian revolution in history, and where, philosophically, dialectics became the pons asini of all of Lenin's thought.

It was no small, abstruse matter when he wrote that the greatest theoretician in the party did "not fully understand" the dialectic" any more than it was a minor question that he warned that if the factional struggles reflect actual class divisions, nothing, nothing whatever he or any one else can say, could stop the proletarian state from collapse.

It should not be necessary to say, but Trotskyism makes it necessary to say that "if it were a class question" meant nothing as simplistic as Stalin representing "the peasantry" and Trotsky "the proletariat."

IV. Death of Dialectic: Inversion of Reality and Thought

Nothing stopped the transformation into opposite of the workers' state because, once the world revolution had no new points of outburst that were successful, world capitalism had gained more than a breath.

Foundation was laid for capitalism's development into state-capitalism as a state of development of world economy. Which is precisely what Lenin feared when he kept reiterating, in his warnings to his Party, that they were moving "backwards to capitalism"; that history had witnessed many retrogressions, and it would "be utopian to think we will not be thrown back."

Although in so strange a form that few recognized it, Soviet Russia had been thrown backward. It took a second World War before it dawned on any to fear state capitalism, so long as the "commanding heights", (means of production) were in the hands of the "worker" state. It took a movement from below -- the workers' uprisings in East Europe, particularly the Hungarian Revolution -- before the world grasped in full that the freedom workers hungered for was freedom from the State Party, from the State Plan, from the State, and what they hungered for were decentralized Workers' Councils, Intellectual Councils, Youth Councils form of rule.

Mao was so terrified of the objectivity of the "Hegelian" contradiction, that is to say, opposition to the Communist State from the Left, from the proletarians, from the youth, from the mass that he declared the contradiction to be / manipulatable when "handled correctly" by the Party or, better yet, the Thought of Mao. Cut into bite size this "theory" became the quotations in the little Red Book.

The fact that it did take the form of a cultural revolution really proves its impotence. Long, long ago, the idealist Hegel pinpointed the inverted relationship to reality characteristic of "culture":

"Inversion of reality and thought, their entire estrangement of one from the other; it is pure culture." (5) This only led to voluntarism; "the world for it is absolutely its own will." (6)

It is no accident that the modern impatient ones, though they talk glibly enough of revolution, world revolution at that, held out something quite short of that as the task of Left intellectuals; "Radical Enlightenment, of others." (7)

What we need, instead, however, is some "seriousness, labor, patience and suffering of the negative". That needs to be done on two levels. It must start where Lenin left off -- That is the foundation but not the whole. The new -- the reality of our age, is not to be considered as a mere updating. No, the new begins by listening to new impulses arising from below, arising from practice, not the elitist practice of theoreticians "going to the peasants" but theoreticians learning from the masses at which point they first begin to develop theory. For our era, the new erupted first in East Berlin on June 17, 1953 and has continued, not only in East Europe but throughout the Third World as well as in the US. Here, all recognize at least the new generation of revolutionaries as black and as "having been born" in the 1960's. However, I began with the wildcats/<sup>or workers</sup> that battled automation in the 1950's.

"The void in the Marxist movement since Lenin's death."

I wrote in 1957, (8)...

"would have a significance only for Marxists except that Marxism is in the daily lives and aspirations of working people. Marxism is neither in the pathetic little theses gathering dust in small radical organizations, nor in impressively big tomes gathering dust on the shelves of large conservative universities.



" The main difficulty in seeing the elements of the new society in the present is that workers repeat many of the ideas of the ruling class until the very day that an explosive break actually occurs. . . .

No single human being, nor even the Bolshevik Party of Lenin, could have predicted, far less organized the Soviet. No one could have guessed it was coming until it came. But it isn't obvious now, that the Russian workers, in their own way and among themselves, were coming to the conclusion that they wanted something other than parliamentary democracy? They thought so as far back as 1905 when they created the St. Petersburg Soviet. No one told them to. No one organized it. No one made a new category out of it when it did arise. The only ones who remembered the 1905 Soviet, and held fast to that vision and that act, were the Russian workers. They recreated them in 1917, this time on a national scale.

Intellectual sloth just accumulates and accumulates to the point where the self-complacent "scientific individual" is permitted to write, with impunity and unthinkingly, of "Man Viewed as Machine." Evidently no human passion nowadays is beyond a mathematical formula that can forthwith be made practicable in "a buildable machine."

Intellectual growth will first begin when new ground is broken. The elements of the new society present in the old are everywhere in evidence in the thoughts and lives of the working class. Where the workers think their own thoughts, there must be the intellectual to absorb the new impulses. Outside of that there can be no serious theory. Philosophy springs from the empirical sciences and actual life, but incorporation of these laws and generalizations into philosophy, Hegel showed, "implies a compulsion of thought itself to proceed to these concrete truths."

Since the concrete truths, like the Montgomery Bus Boycott, that I mentioned then have multiplied many times and since new forces of revolution -- youth, women -- have been born and ~~and~~ its concept, "power comes out of the barrel of a gun", has an attraction for them, I would like to end with a quotation from the second edition of my work that contrasted Mao's to Lenin's dialectic: (9)

"Mao's failure to grasp dialectic logic has nothing whatever to do with "understanding philosophy." Dialectic logic is the logic of freedom and can be grasped only by those engaged in the actual struggle for freedom. Therein lies the key to the fulfillment of human potentialities and therein lies that new relationship between theory and practice which could lessen the birthpangs of industrialization. Anything else is the type of subjectivism which hides Mao's compelling need to transform the struggle for the minds of men into a drive to brainwash them. . . .

12544

"It is a sad commentary on our times and exposes how totally lacking in any confidence in the self-activity of the masses are today's claimants to the title, "Marxist-Leninist." Their militancy gains momentum only where there is a state power to back it up. ... The challenge is for a new unity of Notion and Reality which will release the vast untapped energies of mankind to put an end, once and for all, to what Marx called the pre-history of humanity so that its true history can finally unfold."

This is where Lenin began in 1917 and continued till his death in 1924. It is time we picked up the thread of world revolution.

\*\*\*\*

Footnotes:

- (1) I am using my translation of Lenin's Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic, which appeared as Appendix to Marxism and Freedom, (N.Y.) and giving cross-references to the Moscow translation, Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38.
- (2) My 1941 Study of Luxemburg's Work has been re-published as Appendix to the 1967 pamphlet, State-Capitalism and Marxist-Humanism, (Detroit).
- (3) "The road to Berlin may be through Peking ... In the last analysis the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, and China constitute the overwhelming majority of the people."
- (5) Hegel, Phenomenology of Mind, p. 549
- (6) Ibid., p. 601
- (4) The Black Dimension isn't something that I am superimposing upon Lenin. In 1912, it first appeared in Lenin's Work, New Data on the Laws of Development of Capitalism in Agriculture. Part I. Capitalism and Agriculture in the United States of America. (Selected Works, Vol. XII., pp. 190-282. In 1915, in his Notebooks on Imperialism, he carefully noted that the IWW had a more correct position on the Negro question than had the Socialist Party which, in 1901 had only a single resolution on the Negro Question and in Mississippi, the Party had built separate locals for Negroes and Whites!! (The double exclamation marks on Lenin's.) In 1919, in the Debates on Revising the Party Program, he took Bukharin to task for the manner in which he used the word Hottentot. The Debate on the National Question continued into 1919-1920 and 1922. (See Selected Works, Vol. VIII., pp. 311 to 367, Vol. X., pp. 231 to 244; also see Claude McKay's Speech at the 4th Congress of the Communist International. See Herbert Marcuse's "Reexamination of the Concept of Revolution," New Left Review, No. 56, 7/8 - 1969.
- (8) Marxism and Freedom, pp. 282-283, p. 286.
- (9) Ibid., pp. 329 to 330

12545