

REGARDING THE LATEST DISCUSSION REGARDING THE NATIONAL QUESTION

INTERNAL MAC DOCUMENT

This is not intended to be as a polemic or an attack on Kokkinos, rather, it is intended to be a an analysis on the characterizations i was given with. That kokkinos gave these to me made me think that perhaps i should seriously address these characterizations because they will surely be given to me by other people in the future, and perhaps i should include the contents of this small article on my book on the issue, as a pre-emptive so to say strike against any would be accusers.

Kokkino's characterizations were the following:

I think there are issues with your conception of nations. I think you take an un dialectical, idealist and ultimately a profoundly unmarxist approach sometimes. In some criticisms of your theories, smokeuptheweed is absolutely correct.

Why this was said and the content of the discussion is irrelevant for the scope of this small article, precisely because as i said, this is not an attack against my dear brother Kokkinos. Thus, my explanations of these characterizations will end up with me explaining what would indeed constitute the above when speaking about nations, without trying to explain what is or not is a nation.

Lets take them one by one.

A) Undialectical. What does it means to be undialectical? It of course means that one does not think of a dialectical manner. What is a dialectical understanding on things? It is the understanding that things move all the time, that nothing is static, that things essentially change from quantities to qualities and vice versa, the negation of the negation.

It needs to be specified that the latter two, quantity to quality and the negation of the negation were parts "invented" by Hegel and later adopted by Marx/Engels, i.e, as philosophical concepts, they are part of the Hegelian dialectics. What Marx/Engels did was to take the content and turn it in its head, i.e, applying these concepts to the material reality as the basis instead the *heads of men*.

Thus, the basis of dialectical thought, i.e, that things move constantly and nothing remains static, the conflict of opposites, e.t.c, is part of the ancient philosophy and can be find in Heraclitus and other ancient thinkers. In this manner, what it would mean to say that there one's conception of nations is undialectic? It means first of all, that someone does not think nations as moving existences, but in fact, as static. I.e, that a X nation always existed, it exist, and it will always exist e.t.c, without ever having any difference in its content. It is to think of nations out of history and out of development, and consequently, as dead objects stuck in a black hole, since where is life there is movement and vice versa, i.e life = movement.

Thus, to be undialectic regarding nations, is to be first and foremost someone who thinks of nations as without them having history, i.e, to think that god created on day 8 nations and thats it, or to go even further, that the nations are infinite, since the creation of god even here

signifies a beginning, i.e a move. We could go on and on with this, and i hope you brothers understand what i wish to said.

Now lets move on Hegelian dialectics, i.e, the philosophical parts added by Hegel.

First, the movement of quantity and quality and vice versa. What would mean for someone to be undialectic in this specific issue and regarding the national question? It would mean again, for someone to think the nations as static, since the quantity from quality and vice versa *explains precisely the movement* we spoke about, the living movement of the nation. It would in practice mean to think of the nations as moving without having any moving content, quite the absurdity! What is the content of this movement? It just moves, but then, it moves where, when, and to what exactly? How can movement be described without change? It is precisely this why thinking dialectically, in its logical conclusion, necessitates the hegelian improvement.

The second part, is the negation of the negation. According to this, things have inside them the conditions for their own "disappearance", or rather, to be more "dialectic", the conditions of its *own change*. What would again mean to think of nations without the negation of the negation? It would mean that nations, again, do not have inside of them, in their internal cohesion, elements which produce change within it, and since change = movement, it would mean, at the end of the day, that nations dont have a dialectical movement, that there is no content in their movement, that nations are stuck in a black hole were time and thus life, is dead.

This is means to be undialectic regarding the nations.

B) Idealist. Now the other accusation is definitely connected with Marxist dialectics, and this is the word "idealist". One can think in a dialectical way, quite

indeed, but of course this one can also think purely of Hegelian, i.e, idealist dialectics and not materialist dialectics. The latter is precisely part of the essence of marxism, if its not completely its philosophical essence, since at the end of the day, "historical materialism" is materialist dialectics applied to history. What would mean to for one to be idealist regarding the national question? It would mean precisely that nations are in fact, ideas, artificial constructions in the minds of men, and not actual, material so to say realities. It would mean at the end of the day, the denial of the nation as an objective thing, existing outside of the thought of men.

We summarized what these words mean in context to the national question. Now to wrap up, how does these relate to my person? *I would be un-dialectic if i thought and write on these terms*, but i think that anyone can read my written work, which is plenty, on the issue, and pinpoint me *where* exactly my writing expressed an undialectical understanding. I could say, quite the opposite, my written work, both published and unpublished, uses Marxism to "*clear*" the un-dialectic and un-materialist parts of Marxist bibliography in the question. One of what i consider my biggest contribution to the marxist understanding of the national question is the *concept of race*, and how this relates to the nation, and in fact, the developement of the nation within the race is basically the biggest part of the content of the nation's living movement, of the quantity and quality, and thus, of the negation of the negation.

Thus, in Francesko Kuqe's theory of nations, there exists dialectic thinking, i.e, an understanding that there is movement of nations, and that they arent static creations. There is an understanding that there exist opposites and conflict within and outside of nations, which explains their internal development and the "negation of the negation" within them, and outside them,

i.e, that the nations have a movement, and precisely what is the content of their movement.

Furthermore, in Francesco Kuqe's theory, *he always denied* that nations are *precisely a creation of the human mind, which is what* would constitute idealism, in fact, Kuqe has critiqued multiple times marxists, Lenin, Stalin, e.t.c, for essentially falling to this line of thinking and explained why *in their own terms*. Part of this idealist thinking is that nations in general exist only in capitalism and socialism and they are a "modern creation". What we see here is marxists *confusing* the nationalist consciousness (idea) which mostly (and not absolutely) *developes* with capitalism, *for the nation itself*. As we explained above, to think so is to be an idealist on the issue to a degree, and within Stalin's own work this is a heavy contradiction, since one could take point by point, verbatim, Stalin's definition of the nation, and thus find out that nations existed since humanity itself existed. It would indeed invalidate most communities we consider as nations today, *but it would not invalidate the existence of nations before capitalism in and in itself*. It would just mean that capitalism created (or to be precise, "merged", assimilated some nations into others) some modern nations, which, as we said, we don't deny. Nonetheless, even if we exclude language and common lookings (historical constitution), and we stick in culture and economy, let's take for example a prominent example Stalin gives, Georgia, where we end up too? We end up to the understanding that the Georgian nation, during feudalism, did not exist as such, rather, there were multiple Georgian nations (thus, Georgia, according to this, should be considered as a race), which with capitalism "merged" into the modern Georgian nation.

There are huge contradictions and basically, unmarxist thinking on this, but this is something I explain in my book. Anyone will read my full argumentation as to why

when it is published, and the reason i dont go deeper on this is because the context of my discussion with Kokkinos was me saying that nations existed before capitalism. I never said that all nations that exist in 2022 existed before capitalism, i am saying that nations *in general* did.

I think there is no more to be said. This is not written with the expectation of a response by Kokkinos, precisely because the scope of this small article is general and not specific to the argument i had with him. He as a person, can take this piece and read it if he wants, ignore it, use it as toilet paper or do what he likes with it, and this is valid for everyone on MAC who happens to read this. As i said, because the characterizations that were given to me are a general occurrence, i wished to explain a little more theoretically if they are indeed valid for future reference.

F. U. Kuqe 30-3-2022

