

A Marxist-Humanist Pamphlet

TWO ARTICLES BY

Raya Dunayevskaya

FOOTNOTE ON THE DETRACTORS OF LENIN

THE THEORY OF ALIENATION—

MARX'S DEBT TO HEGEL

Foreword by Harry McShane

4787

Foreword

When Raya Dunayevskaya, the author of "Marxism and Freedom", and the writer of these articles, heard of our proposal to re-print the articles, she suggested that I introduce them. It is with some apprehension that I accept the honour.

This brilliant woman has been tireless in her efforts to rescue Marxism from the hands of those who can think of nothing higher than to have us all placed in our proper niche for the attainment of a production target fixed by those at the top. She has shown that this aim conflicts with Marxist theory and amounts to an unforgivable crime against the world working class.

Marx placed man on a higher level than that of being a cog in a soul-less machine. Man was seen by Marx as the creator of a new society with all his attributes and faculties directed towards the attainment of freedom and human development. In the first of the two articles (according to when they were written) Raya Dunayevskaya deals with the relationship of Marxist theory to the philosophy of Hegel, but because of the attention which Lenin is receiving just now we reversed the order of the articles. Both articles go a long way to kill illusions prevalent in the minds of those who know little or nothing about the extent to which Marxism has been distorted.

No one, nowadays, calls on the workers to join "the Party of Lenin and Stalin", but there are many who place the name of Lenin alongside that of Stalin for discreditable reasons. They would make Lenin take share of the responsibility for the savage policy pursued by the Russian leaders during the reign of Stalin, and inherited by the bureaucrats now ruling over the Russian people. It should be noted that the Communist Party avoid contrasting Lenin with Stalin while, of course, deploring the cult of the individual.

Raya Dunayevskaya takes Paul Cardin, author of "The Meaning of Socialism", as being representative of "the detractors of Lenin". Like others, Cardin ignores the persistent struggle made by Lenin against bureaucratic rule from above. Unfortunately, little is known in this part of the world about that struggle. The charge that Lenin stood for bureaucratic domination is completely demolished by the writer who shows that Lenin, in his discussion with Trotsky, insisted on the workers retaining their own organization for the purpose of protecting themselves "from their own state". She quotes from Lenin to prove conclusively that, above all else, he wanted "the workers themselves to draw up, from below, the new principles of economic conditions". He did not live to see the state he founded going in a direction opposite to what he desired. Russia has lessons for every man and woman who is really concerned about the future of society.

No limit was placed on the amount and viciousness of the slanders hurled at Lenin from 1917 onwards. Apart from a number of incurable reactionaries no serious-minded person now questions his integrity or his devotion to the cause of human emancipation. In the field of political theory his writings reveal him as a giant compared to the political leaders, on both sides of the Atlantic, whose careers are dependent on their efforts to introduce the appearance of stability into an unstable social order. In her book, "Marxism and Freedom", the author refers to Lenin having turned to a study of Hegel during the first world war - a point that has relevance to the subject of the second article which deals with the bearing of Hegel's philosophy on Marxism.

This article will not be welcomed by those "Marxists" who refuse to look beyond the Party directive for political wisdom. It may be spurned by those who, having seen Marxism distorted to justify acts of oppression, turned away in disgust. Those who take the trouble to read it will attach greater importance to Marxism than hitherto, and they will find that the emphasis placed on the philosophic foundations of Marxism gives it a new meaning for all prepared to play a part in the struggle for freedom.

Raya Dunayevskaya, bringing scholarship to the subject, places emphasis on the dialectic and its relevance to world events. She takes account of events from the East German rising of 1953, right down to the Vietnam war. She does not, and cannot separate theory from practice.

Getting to the heart of her subject she declares that Alienation was central to the Hegelian philosophy, and was also central for Marx. Readers will be impressed by her description of how Marx, when taking up what was central in Hegel applied it to the real world of ordinary human beings living in a particular social order. She denies, however, that Hegel was completely divorced from the real world and claims that on the contrary, he had "his finger on the pulse of history". She makes the point that Lenin found the revolutionary spirit of the dialectic in the works of Hegel.

On reading this article one wonders how some of us could dismiss Hegel without knowing much about him. We were content to learn that Marx turned Hegel upside down and to leave it there. No thought was given to Marx having accepted Alienation and finding its roots in capitalist production. That is where the worker sells his labour power as a commodity, and where he is dominated by the products of past labour taking the form of capital. There the worker loses his individuality and becomes the most essential element in a system of production under which human freedom is impossible. The concept of alienation is truly revolutionary. With Marx it is a call for the overthrow of the present social order.

It is rapidly becoming obvious to most workers that emancipation does not come automatically with the abolition of private ownership. Conditions have become intolerable where private capitalists have been replaced by a brutal state machine. Alienation, which Marx detected under private capitalism exists also under state capitalism. The masses under both systems are dominated by their products. The hope of the future does not rest with the doings of top politicians, or with technology, but with thinking and acting

human beings. These articles justify our placing reliance on the struggle from below.

HARRY McSHANE

Notes: The figures placed in brackets in the first article indicate references appended at the end.

The reference mark (x) in the second paragraph of the article on Marx and Hegel indicates some points placed at the end.

Footnote on the detractors of Lenin

1970, the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birth is about to see a new facet of the Sino-Soviet conflict as the two state-capitalist giants calling themselves Communist vie with each other to grasp the revolutionary mantle of Lenin in order to cover up the reality of their respective exploitative systems. In this they will be aided not only by Western (private capitalist) ideologists who have always maintained that Stalinism flowed "logically" from Leninism, but also by some who, like Paul Mattick, consider themselves Marxists but have made a veritable profession of anti-Leninism.

The saddest aspect of the new outpouring of anti-Leninism is that some young revolutionaries show themselves to be not so new in their thought the moment they need to move from activity to philosophy. Thus, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the freshest face and most spirited voice of the near-revolution in France, May, 1968, has found nothing newer to say in his "Obsolete Communism", than the fact that he is a "plagiarist of revolutionary theory and practice"(1) which turns out in the main to be that of "Socialisme ou Barbarie"(Pierre Chaulieu), Paul Cardan, etc. Since these departures from Marxism and restatements of "the Meaning of Socialism"(2) are being played up as "the left-wing alternative" to totalitarian Communism, it becomes important to take issue with these detractors of Lenin. In this footnote I will limit myself to Cardan, but it is only because what he says here is representative of all.

The Allegation

"For some strange reason", writes Cardan, "Marxist have always seen the achievement of working class power solely in terms of the conquest of political power. Real power, namely power over production in day-to-day life, was always ignored." This vitiation of Marx's philosophy of liberation is but

prelude to the hammer and tongs approach to Lenin who, Cardan claims, was "relentlessly repeating from 1917 until his death that production should be organized from above along 'state-capitalist lines'". (emphasis added).

I know of no greater lie, but, for the time being, we will let it stand in order to call attention to the foundation for the diatribe. As proof of the slanderous statement, Cardan quotes from one of Lenin's speeches. "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" (3) and then only those passages which relate to the possibility of utilizing the "Taylor system."

Never mind that the Taylor system was never introduced in Lenin's lifetime. Never mind that the "single" will was not a reference to foremen or managers of production. (The point of contention in that first year of revolution when the discussion revolved around "single" vs "collective" referred to parallelism in organizations since the first national trade union organization arose only after the revolution, just when factory committees and Soviets likewise laid sole claim to running production). Never mind the objective situation, the backwardness of the economy, four years of imperialist war, civil war and countless counter-revolutionary attacks which were still going on as the new workers' state was struggling for its very existence. That speech was made when the state was but four months old. The references to "single will" and "iron discipline" are sufficient basis for Cardan to conclude: "We believe these conceptions, this subjective factor, played an enormous role in the degeneration of the Russian Revolution ... we can see today the relationship between the views he held and the later reality of Stalinism".

Cardan is standing everything on its head. No "subjective" factor could ever have produced an objective situation - the new stage of capitalism. State-capitalism first arose during the world Depression, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, assumed its most mature form in Russia during the Five Year Plans and Stalin's most notorious Moscow Frame-up Trials. (4)

4 7 3 4

Were we to acquiesce to anything so idiotic that a single article could sum up a period covering the greatest proletarian revolution in history, would it not be incumbent on the analyst to consider that article in its entirety? That speech consisted of more, a great deal more, than the passages singled out for quotation.

Lenin's Own Voice

The speech set forth the principal task of the proletariat to be "the positive or creative work of setting up an extremely intricate and subtle system of new organisational relationships extending to the planned production and distribution of goods required for the existence of tens of millions of people. Such a revolution can be carried out only if the majority of the population, and primarily the majority of the toilers, display independent historical creative spirit By creating a new Soviet type of state, which gives the opportunity to all the toilers and the masses of the oppressed to take an active part in the independent building of a new society, we solved only a small part of this difficult problem."

Far from the Taylor system (which Lenin most certainly did not understand) being the ruling conception, proletarian democracy was the guiding line which permeated his speech. This is what the Soviets meant to Lenin. This is why he put the whole stress on the fact that the soviet form of organization is justified because "for the first time a start is thus made in teaching the whole of the population in the art of administration, and in their beginning to administer". And he warns against "a petty-bourgeois tendency to transform the members of the soviets into 'members of parliament', or into bureaucrats. This must be combatted by drawing all the members of the soviets into the practical work of administration ... Our aim is to draw the whole of the poor into the practical work of administration ... our aim is that every toiler ... shall perform state duties". (6)

The four-months old state was in "a period of waiting for new outbreaks of the revolution, which is maturing in the West

4795

at a painfully slow pace". And Lenin was holding fast to the new universal, that he had elaborated on the eve of revolution in "State and Revolution", that unless the bourgeois state was so thoroughly smashed that production was run by the whole population "TO A MAN"; and the state without bureaucracy, without a standing army, without police, was administered by the whole population "TO A MAN", there would be no socialist society. Three months after gaining power, Lenin repeated: (7)

"We wanted the workers themselves to draw up from below, the new principles of economic conditions".

Indeed, Lenin was willing to let a single distinction sum up the difference between the Second International that had betrayed the workers and the new, Third International. That single distinction was that genuine Marxists "reduce everything to the conditions of labour". (8)

Lenin was concerned about how "shy" the workers still were. They had not yet "become accustomed to the idea that they are the ruling class now." He lashed out at "lackadaisicalness, sloveliness, untidiness, nervous haste", of the "educated" which was due, he said, "to the abnormal separation of mental from manual labour". He urged upon these intellectuals to begin listening to these shy workers: "every attempt to adhere to stereotyped forms and to impose uniformity from above must be combated. Stereotyped forms and uniformity imposed from above have nothing in common with democratic and Socialist centralism". "There is" he said, "a great deal of talent among the people - it is merely suppressed. It must be given an opportunity to express itself. It, and it alone, with the support of the masses can save Russia and can save the cause of Socialism". (9)

Nor was he talking only against the "petty-bourgeois intellectuals". He was talking about Bolsheviks, his co-leaders now that they had state power; his appeal was to the initiative of the masses from below. The famous trade union debate of 1920-21 discloses how desperately he worked towards this one truth, how he differed even on the question of

4795

designating Russia as a workers' state. His contention was that a precise description would show instead that the designation of "workers' state" was an "abstraction" while the reality was that it was a workers and peasants' state "with bureaucratic distortions". In arguing against Trotsky's administrative mentality, Lenin insisted that the only assurance there is for the workers protecting the state is through giving them the freedom to protect themselves from the state:

"The entirely organised proletariat must protect itself and must utilise the workers' organisations for the purpose of protecting the workers from their own state". (10)

This was not just a visionary concept of a Marxist who has no state power. This was the demand of a Bolshevik who had state power. A demand that his co-leaders, his Party, recognise that the workers' state can justify its existence only when the workers maintain their own non-state organisations to protect them from their own state. There is a veritable conspiracy between the Communists and the detractors of Lenin to portray Lenin's concept of the Party as if Lenin had never changed his position from 1902 to his death. Since space does not allow me here to deal with the question of "vanguardism", which I totally oppose, I must refer readers to "Marxism and Freedom", Chapter XI, "Forms of Organisation: the Relationship of the Spontaneous Self-Organisation of the Proletariat to the "Vanguard Party"".

-
1. Obsolete Communism, The Left-Wing Alternative by Cohn-Bendit, p.18 (Andre Deutsch, London).
 2. Solidarity Pamphlet No. 6 (London)
 3. Selected Works, Vol. VII, pp. 332, 342 and 345.
 4. For a full analysis of state capitalism see Marxism and Freedom Chapter 13, "Russian State-Capitalism vs Workers' Revolt". Lenin was warning of the possible

4 7 9 7

return to capitalism throughout the last two years of his life. Especially important on state capitalism is his speech to the 11th Congress of the Party. See Selected Works Vol. IX, pp. 332 - 371.

5. Selected Works, Vol. VII, pp. 315-316.
6. Ibid, pp. 345-347.
7. Ibid, p. 227.
8. Selected Works, Vol. IX, p. 440.
9. Ibid, pp. 419, 420, 422.
10. Ibid, p. 9.

The Theory of Alienation

Marx's Debt to Hegel

The question of Marx's Debt to Hegel is not an academic topic. Nor does it interest us now merely because 1970 happens to be the 200th anniversary of Hegel's birth. Rather, the reason for examining the relationship of Marx to Hegel is due to the fact that the actual freedom struggles now girdling the globe have pulled Hegelian dialectics out of the academic halls and philosophy books on to the living stage of history.

The dialectics of liberation has become the reality of our day, whether one looks at the near-revolution in France in May, 1968, undermining De Gaullism, or at Czechoslovakia in August, 1968, resisting the Russian invasion. The same holds true whether one turns back to the very first workers' revolt against the Communist monolith in East Germany on June 17, 1953, or recalls, instead, the birth of the New Left in England which had its start in English Communists tearing up their membership cards in protest against Russia crushing of the Hungarian Revolution in November, 1956.* Nor does the truth change when one looks at the year 1960 whether the point of concentration is Africa and its revolutions creating a whole new Third World, or at the continuing Black Revolution in the United States. In a word, whether one turns the clock back to the 1950's, or the 1960's, or is at this very moment participating in the still ongoing world wide anti-Vietnam War Movement against U.S. imperialism, which simultaneously, gave birth to a whole new generation of revolutionaries in the U.S. itself, the compulsion is to examine the underlying philosophy of these liberation struggles and work out a relationship of theory to practice which would finally unite the two and make what were struggles for freedom into a reality.

4 1 - 7 3

It is true that this transformation of Hegel into a contemporary has been via Marx. It is no accident, however, that Russian Communism's attack on Marx has been via Hegel. Because they recognise in the so-called mystical Absolute "the negation of the negation", the revolution against themselves, Hegel remains so alive and worrisome to the Russian rulers today. Ever since Zhdanov in 1947 demanded that the Russian philosophers find nothing short of "a new dialectical law," or rather, declared "criticism and self-criticism" to be that alleged new dialectical law to replace the Hegelian and objective law of development through contradiction, up to the 21st Congress of the Russian Communist Party where the special philosophic sessions declared Khrushchev to be "the true humanist", the attack on both the young Marx and the mystic Hegel has been continuous. It reached a climax in the 1955 attacks on Marx's Humanist Essays.

One thing these intellectual bureaucrats sense correctly: Hegel's Concept of the Absolute and the international struggle for freedom are not as far apart as would appear on the surface.

The Ideal and the Real are never far apart

It is this which Marx gained from Hegel. It is this which enabled the young Marx, once he broke from bourgeois society, to break also with the vulgar communists of his day who thought that one negation - the abolition of private property - would end all the ills of the old society and be the new communal society.

Marx insisted on what is central to Hegelian philosophy, the theory of alienation, from which he concluded that the alienation of man does not end with the abolition of private property - UNLESS what is most alien of all in bourgeois society, the alienation of man's labour from the activity of self-development into an appendage to a machine, is abrogated. In the place of the alienation of labour, Marx placed, not a new property form, but "the full and free development of the individual".

The pluri-dimensional in Hegel, his presupposition of the infinite capacities of man to grasp through to the "Absolute", not as something isolated in heaven, but as a dimension of the human being, reveals what a great distance humanity had travelled from Aristotle's Absolutes.

Because Aristotle lived in a society based on slavery, his Absolutes ended in "Pure Form" - mind of man would meet mind of God and contemplate how wondrous things are.

Because Hegel's Absolutes emerged out of the French Revolution which put an end to serfdom, Hegel's Absolutes breathed the air, the earthly air of freedom. Even when one reads Absolute Mind as God, one cannot escape the earthly quality of the unity of theory and practice and grasp through to the Absolute Reality as man's attainment of total freedom, inner and outer and temporal. The bondsman, having, through his labour gained, as Hegel put it, "a mind of his own", becomes part of the struggle between "consciousness-in-itself" and "consciousness-for-itself". Or, more popularly stated, the struggle against alienation becomes the attainment of freedom.

In Hegel's Absolutes there is imbedded, though in abstract form, the full development of what Marx would have called the social individual, and what Hegel called individuality "purified of all that interfered with its universalism", i.e. freedom itself.

Freedom, to Hegel, was not only his point of departure. It was his point of return. This is what makes him so contemporary. This was the bridge not only to Marx but to our day, and it was built by Hegel himself.

As Lenin was to discover when he returned to the Marxian philosophic foundations in Hegel during World War I, the revolutionary spirit of the dialectic was not super-imposed upon Hegel by Marx; it is in Hegel.

4 8 0 1

Marx's Critique of, and Indebtedness to,
The Hegelian Dialectic

The Communists are not the only ones who try to spirit away the integrality of Marxian and Hegelian philosophy. Academicians also think that Marx is so strange a progeny that he has transformed Hegelian dialectics to the point of non-recognition, if not outright perversion. Whether what Herbert Melville called "the shock of recognition" will come upon us at the end of this discussion remains to be seen, but it is clearly discernible in Marx.

Marx's intellectual development reveals two basic stages of internalising and transcending Hegel. The first took place during the period of his break with the Young Hegelians, and thrusts at them the accusation that they were dehumanising the Idea. It was the period when he wrote both his Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right, and the Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic.

There was nothing mechanical about Marx's new materialist outlook. Social existence determines consciousness, but it is not a confining wall that prevents one's sensing and even seeing the elements of the new society.

In Hegel, too, not only continuity as relation between past and present, but as attraction exerted by the future on the present, and by the whole, even when it does not yet exist, on its parts, is the mainspring of the dialectic.

It helped the young Marx to found a new stage of world consciousness of the proletariat, in seeing that the material base was not what Marx called "vulgar", but, on the contrary, released the subject striving to remake the world.

Marx was not one to forget his intellectual indebtedness either to classical political economy or philosophy. Although he had transformed both into a new world outlook, rooted solidly in the actual struggles of the day, the sources remained the law of value of Smith and Ricardo, and Hegelian

dialectics. Of course, Marx criticised Hegel sharply for treating objective history as if that were the development of some world-spirit, and analysing self-development of mind as if ideas floated somewhere between heaven and earth, as if the brain was not in the head of the body of man living in a certain environment and at a specific historic period. Indeed Hegel himself would be incomprehensible if we did not keep in front of our minds the historic period in which he lived - that of the French Revolution and Napoleon. And, no matter how abstract the language, Hegel indeed had his finger on the pulse of human history.

Marx's Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic is at the same time a critique of the materialist critics of Hegel, including Feuerbach who had treated "the negation of the negation only as the contradiction of philosophy with itself".

Marx reveals, contrariwise, that principle to be the expression of the movement of history itself, albeit in abstract form.

Marx had finished, or rather, broken off his Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic, just as he reached Absolute Mind. Marx's rediscovery of the Absolute came out of the concrete development of the class struggles under capitalism, which split the Absolute into two:

- (1) The unemployed army which Marx called "the general absolute law" of capitalist development, the reserve army of unemployed. That was the negative element that would cause its collapse.
- (2) "The new forces and passions", the positive element in that negative, which made the workers the "gravediggers" of the old society, and the creators of the new.

It is here - in the second stage of Marx's relation to the Hegelian dialectic - that Marx fully transcended Hegel. The split in the philosophic category of the Absolute into two,

like the split of the economic category of labour into labour as activity and labour-power as commodity, forged new weapons of comprehension. It enabled Marx to make a leap in thought to correspond to the new, the creative activity of the workers in establishing a society on totally new foundations which would, once and for all, abolish the division between mental and manual labor and unfold the full potentialities of man - a truly new human dimension.

The Human Dimension

Of course it is true that Hegel worked out all the contradictions in thought alone while in life all contradictions remained, multiplied, intensified. Of course where the class struggle did not abolish contradictions, those contradictions plagued not only the economy, but its thinkers. Of course, Marx wrote, that beginning with the first capitalist crisis, the ideologists turned into "prizefighters for capitalism".

But, first and foremost, Marx did not separate philosophy and economics as if the latter were the only fundamental, and the former nothing but "show". Marx maintains that they are both as real as life. Throughout his greatest theoretic work, Capital, Marx castigates "the fetishism of commodities" not only because relations of men at production appear as "things", but especially because human relations under capitalism are so perverse that that it not appearance; that is indeed what they really are: Machine is master of man; not man of machine.

Marx's main point was that the driving force of the dialectic was man himself, not just his thought, but the whole of man, beginning with the alienated man at the point of production; and that, whereas bourgeois ideologists, because of their place in production have a false consciousness because they must defend the status quo and are "prisoners of the fetishism of commodities", the proletarian, because of his place in production is the "negative principle" driving to a resolution of contradictions.

In the History of Philosophy Hegel had written "It is not

so much from as through slavery that man acquired freedom". Again we see that "Praxis" was not Marx's discovery, but Hegel's. What Marx did was to designate practice as the class struggle activity of the proletariat. In Hegel's theory, too, praxis stands higher than the "Ideal of Cognition" because it has "not only the dignity of the universal but is the simply actual".

It is true that Hegel himself threw a mystical veil over his philosophy by treating it as a closed ontological system. But it would be a complete mis-reading of Hegel's philosophy were we to think that his Absolute is either a mere reflection of the separation between philosopher and the world of material production, or that his Absolute is the empty absolute of pure or intellectual intuition of the subjective idealists from Fichte through Jacobi to Schelling, whose type of bare unity of subject and object - as Prof. Bailie has so brilliantly phrased it - "possessed objectivity at the price of being inarticulate".

Whether, as with Hegel, Christianity is taken as the point of departure or whether - as with Marx - the point of departure is the material condition for freedom created by Industrial Revolution, the essential element is self-evident: man has to fight to gain freedom; thereby is revealed "the negative character" of modern society.

Now the principle of negativity was not Marx's discovery; he simply named it "the living worker"; the discovery of the principle was Hegel's. In the end, Spirit itself finds that it no longer is antagonistic to the world, but is indeed the indwelling spirit of the community. As Hegel put it in his early writings, "The absolute moral totality is nothing else than a people ... (and) the people who receive such an element as a natural principle have the mission of applying it".

The humanism of Hegel may not be the most obvious characteristic of that most complex philosophy, and, in part, it was hidden even from Marx, although Lenin in his day

caught it even in the simple description of the Doctrine of the Notion "as the realm of Subjectivity OR Freedom." Or man achieving freedom not as a "possession", but a dimension of his being.

It is this dimension of the human personality which Marx saw in the historical struggles of the proletariat that would once and for all put an end to all class divisions and open up the vast potentialities of the human being so alienated in class societies, so degraded by the division of mental and manual labour and not only is the worker made into an appendage of a machine, but the scientist builds on a principle which would lead society to the edge of an abyss.

One hundred years before Hiroshima, Marx wrote, "To have one basis for science and other for life is a priori, a lie." We have lived this lie for so long that the fate of civilisation, not merely rhetorically, but literally, is within orbit of a nuclear ICM, now expanded to the humanly impossible to conceive but actually existing MIRV. Since the very survival of mankind hangs in the balance between the East's and the West's nuclear terror, we must, this time, under the penalty of death, unite theory and practice in the struggle for freedom, thereby abolishing the division between philosophy and reality and giving ear to the urgency of "realising" philosophy, i.e., of making freedom a reality.

*Once the Sino-Soviet conflict came into the open, Chinese Communism actually dared boast of the fact that it urged Khrushchev to undertake the counter-revolutionary inter-vention. Preparatory to the so-called "proletarian cultural revolution", the Chinese Communists increased their attacks on Marx's Humanism. (Cf. The 4th Enlarged Session of the Commission of the Department of Philosophy and Social Science of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (Foreign Languages Press, 1963)).

4 8 0 6

Neither these attacks nor the subsequent deification of "Mao's Thought" could stop the rise of a revolutionary opposition to Mao's state machine, as can be seen from the Manifesto of the Sheng-wu-lien, or the Hunan Provisional Proletarian Revolutionary Great Alliance, consisting of twenty organisations: "The 9th National Congress of the Party about to be convened ... will necessarily be a Party of Bourgeois reformism that serves the bourgeois usurpers in the Revolutionary Committees ... Let the new bureaucratic bourgeoisie tremble before the true socialist revolution that shakes the world! What the proletariat can lose in this revolution is only their chains, what they gain will be the whole world!" (Survey of China, Mainland Press 4190, Hong Kong).

4806

19.