

REGARDING THE NEGATION OF THE NEGATION

“The causes of the transformation of matter is to be found not without, but within. It is not because of the impulsion of external mechanical forces, but because of the existence within the matter in question of two components different in their nature and mutually contradictory which struggle with one another, thus giving an impetus to the movement and development of the matter.” — Mao, ‘Dialectical Materialism’

This document is a response to the ongoing line struggle between the groups organized in the International Communist League, previously under the auspices of the Coordinating Committee for the Unified Maoist International Conference [CCIMU] and the Communist Workers' Union of Colombia (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) [UOC] on the question of the relevance and accuracy of the so-called "law of the negation of the negation." We aim to consolidate our philosophical understanding and advance our position on the rightful place of this so-called law—the dustbin of history.

We reject that the negation of negation (NOTN) is a law of dialectics and uphold Mao's conception of the law of scission—that one divides into two—as the only law of dialectics. The theory of spiral development, the fact that one aspect of a contradiction can eliminate another only to give rise to the possibility of its own elimination, and the transformation of quantity into quality are all mere expressions of one dividing into two and the unity of opposites. Further, we argue that the "law" of the negation of the negation's implicit determinism engenders a stagist, idealist conception of history prone to (and which has led to) making revisionist errors in the fight towards socialism and eventually communism.

As students of dialectical materialism who unite with the call to wield the science of MLM to combat modern revisionism, we write this document to help consolidate the Maoist trend around a correct understanding of dialectics and its political stakes. We value the process of starting from a place of unity, struggling in good faith, and transforming our consciousness to arrive at a more advanced understanding.

The Current Debate

Both parties agree that the unity and struggle of opposites is the fundamental law of dialectics, but they differ in whether other, lesser, laws of dialectics exist. That this issue is their point of rupture highlights an ongoing debate on philosophical "monism" and "triplism"—terms used idiosyncratically within this debate to refer to positions on the enumeration of the laws of dialectical materialism. These two camps clearly cannot co-exist.

In 2022, the CCIMU Proposal established that the main task of the International Communist Movement is to define the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party line and combat non-proletarian (revisionist) lines. Thus the CCIMU proposed a stance on practical and ideological issues faced by communists across the world and called for discussion and line struggle over their document, to which several groups have contributed. In particular, a debate was sparked between the CCIMU and UOC, which brought out philosophical differences regarding each side's understanding of laws of dialectics and the position on the "law of negation of the negation," a debate which remains ongoing.

The CCIMU listed a basic set of principles beginning with: "The Contradiction—sole fundamental law of the incessant transformation of eternal matter."¹ Throughout the debate the CCIMU uphold Mao's conception that the law of contradiction is the sole law of

dialectical materialism, correctly rejecting that negation of the negation is a law at all. We broadly agree with the CCIMU's position, articulated below, and seek to explore the philosophy behind it more deeply through this document.

"Recapitulating the process of knowledge followed to arrive at this result, which implies a leap of great importance in the fulfilment [sic] by the Chairman of the task left by Lenin, in his Philosophical Notebooks, we say: Marx and Engels said three, one being the main; Lenin, deepening the problem, developing it, said: contradiction is the key; Chairman Mao went further, he said: "the only fundamental law."²

In response, the UOC have argued that the negation of the negation should be elevated to a third general law of dialectics in addition to (1) the law of contradiction and (2) the law of transformation of quantity into quality. Their rationale for this elevation is that the negation of the negation indicates the direction of movement, expressed as spiral development, and is thus a characteristic of the development of any dialectical contradiction.

Our Position

The Law of Contradiction and the direction of development

The unity of opposites, also known as the law of contradiction or scission, has been established as the fundamental method for analyzing history through a materialist lens. In 'On Contradiction,' Mao quotes Lenin outlining the two basic world views (metaphysical and dialectical):

"The two basic (or two possible? or two historically observable?) conceptions of development (evolution) are: development as decrease and increase, as repetition, and development as a unity of opposites (the division of a unity into mutually exclusive opposites and their reciprocal relation)."³

He then goes on to say that,

"The interdependence of the contradictory aspects present in all things and the struggle between these aspects determine the life of all things and push their development forward. There is nothing that does not contain contradiction; without contradiction nothing would exist."⁴

While the UOC defend the negation of the negation as a law due to its representation of the direction of movement, this quote clearly defines that the interactions of contradictory aspects present in all things are the motive force acting as the cause and direction of development. The UOC, through Lenin, use spiral development to visualize negation of the negation—where a phenomenon moves in a direction along a spiral or helix and as such appears to come back to where it started, while at the same time being in an entirely different geometric plane. UOC quote Lenin to defend the negation of the negation:

"[...] This idea, as formulated by Marx and Engels on the basis of Hegel, is much more complete, much richer in content than the usual theory of evolution. It is a development which, it seems, repeats stages already travelled, but in another way, on a higher basis ("negation of the negation"), a development, so to speak, in a spiral and not in a straight line."⁵

Does the reality of spiral development justify negation of the negation? We argue that Lenin's definition here is simply a representation of scission and scission alone. In this document we use the terms "scission" and "unity of opposites" to refer to the division of a phenomenon (unity, one) into two mutually exclusive, contradictory, yet interconnected internal aspects (opposites). The interaction of these aspects of a contradiction, amid influence from external conditions, drives the motion of the phenomenon through the continuous transformation of each aspect into its opposite until resolution. In this way we acknowledge that this division—this struggle of opposites—is the basis for motion and that any given state of unity is only transitory.

Mao continues in 'On Contradiction,'

"But is it enough to say merely that each of the contradictory aspects is the condition for the other's existence, that there is identity between them and that consequently they can coexist in a single entity? No, it is not. The matter does not end with their dependence on each other for their existence; what is more important is their transformation into each other. That is to say, in given conditions, each of the contradictory aspects within a thing transforms itself into its opposite, changes its position to that of its opposite. This is the second meaning of the identity of contradiction."⁶

Thus, the law of contradiction contains within itself the explanation for spiral development (the internal forces decide the direction), which describes the apparent return to a previous state but at a new, higher, more advanced stage. It is the continuous transformation of the two aspects of a contradiction into each other (under the correct conditions) until its resolution that produces the character of "apparent return."

Negation of the Negation, Barley and Idealism

Negation of the negation arises first from Hegel as a fundamental principle of his conception of dialectics. To Hegel, the dialectic is understood in three parts, as affirmation, negation, and negation of negation. In this framework, a fundamental part of any dialectic is the return to a previous state, and anything that is negated shall eventually itself be negated, moving eventually towards a metaphysical ideal. Though Hegel first developed dialectics in the form recognizable to Marxists, he was not a materialist thinker. Marx's philosophical breakthrough was to wrestle the dialectic away from idealism, and apply it to materialism. The development of Marxist philosophy ever since this initial breakthrough has been the struggle to shake off the remnants of Hegel's idealism.

As the UOC make reference to, Engels described negation of negation in *Anti-Duhring* by discussing barley. Barley, Engels describes, begins as a seed, the seed is negated by its form as a plant, and then the plant is negated by the germination of more seeds.

This apparent motion provided by "negation of negation" is again precisely what the UOC argue justifies the existence of this law as explaining the direction of movement. But this rationale carries with it idealist kernels from Hegel. We understand, as materialists, that to consider this "new return" to provide us a guaranteed direction, we are engaging with teleology and are misunderstanding what Marx is actually describing.

Marx described ownership of property under capitalism as a "negation of negation". To Marx, the communal ownership of property under feudalism was negated when the private ownership held by artisans and guilds transitioned into the dominant private ownership of property by the bourgeoisie under capitalism. This, Marx argues, shall in turn be negated by the communal ownership of property under communism. In *Capital*, Marx writes:

*"Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated. The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation. This does not re-establish private property for the producer, but gives him individual property based on the acquisition of the capitalist era: i.e., on cooperation and the possession in common of the land and of the means of production."*⁷

To Marx, because capital constantly seeks to grow and consolidate, forcing more and more people into increasingly socialized labor, capitalist production ultimately creates the conditions for its own destruction. Marx describes how the forces of capital, dialectically entwined with the workers that utilize private property, must seek out ever-more socialized conditions. Marx describes the emergence of capitalist private property as a dialectic between private ownership and socialized labor, which shall be resolved by an apparent return to common ownership of property, by the negation private property, by the "negation of the negation."

In both the example of barley and class society, we see a cycle of development which, apparently, is propelled by negation after negation. In the quote above, Marx describes a dialectical process, the relationship between property-owners and those who utilize that property. Marx goes to great effort to describe the stages of transformation of this relationship. Most significantly, though, even if using the phrase "negation of negation", Marx argues for how this dialectic will develop and may resolve itself on the basis of forces internal to that contradiction.

Marx describes an internal contradiction, examines what compels it to develop, and argues how it will be resolved. He describes this with the language of negation of negation, but throughout his analysis, Marx does not describe the stages of property relations as monoliths to be negated, but instead understands them to be confluences of dialectical forces. The "law of nature" Marx describes is the inescapable forces internal to the phenomenon, not the "law" of negation of negation. To view aspects of a contradiction as monoliths to be negated assumes them to be one metaphysical thing, as opposed to a continuous process, constantly in motion.

Is Negation of the Negation the same as Negation-Affirmation?

One of the arguments put forward by the UOC is that Mao's conception of "negation-affirmation" never constituted a true rebuke of negation of the negation. The UOC relies on Mao's example of the negation-affirmation of predominant modes of production of society to confirm their point that Mao actually is sympathetic to the negation of the negation.

*"Slave society was the negation of primitive society, but with reference to feudal society it was, in turn, the affirmation. Feudal society constituted the negation in relation to slave society, but was at the same time the affirmation in reference to capitalist society. Capitalist society constituted the negation in relation to feudal society, but it is, in turn, the affirmation in relation to socialist society."*⁸

Here, the UOC are providing further evidence against their point. Mao uses this example to explain how negation-affirmation is part of the law of motion of the scission of opposites; it is not distinct from it. Mao describes how every stage of development contains both affirmation and negation, a quality which is clearly defined under the law of contradiction.

The UOC further argue that negation-affirmation is essentially a new conception of negation of negation, that the two principles are the same. In UOC's Defense of NOTN, they quote philosopher Nick Knight:

*"[...] Mao's rejection of the "negation of negation" was a rejection of the title, rather than the substance of this philosophical category, which sought a nomenclature more in keeping with his predilection for perceiving a unity of opposites in all things and processes."*⁹

This takeaway from Mao's contributions to Marxist philosophy by Knight and the UOC demonstrates a misunderstanding of Mao's contribution to materialist dialectics through this explanation of negation-affirmation. Within the framework of negation-affirmation, we see an understanding that as things develop from one form into another, they hold new internal contradictions. These contradictions are the character of this form, and when they resolve, the thing takes on a new form with new contradictions. As Mao describes, human society moved from slave-holding society, to feudalism, to capitalism. In each of these stages there were internal contradictions that determined its development. We can describe these trends in relation to each other; we can describe them as both the negation of the previous form and the affirmation of a new, more developed form—negation-affirmation as described by Mao—that will result from the resolution of its contradictions.

What Mao really provides is a more correct understanding of what it means materially for something to be destroyed or transformed, that is to say "negated". We can use this framework to describe barley more correctly than Engels.

Approaching this question from the conception of negation-affirmation, we understand that the seed is not a thing unto itself, but instead is a confluence of forces. The seed contains within it the genetic code which, under the correct external conditions, will allow it to transform into a plant. It may never become a plant if it does not meet the right conditions. That is to say, the seed contains within itself means of transformation, both in affirmation of the barley plant (given the right conditions), and the negation of the seed itself. The barley plant, in turn, because of the affirmative forces within the seed, contains affirmative forces for the production of new seeds under the right conditions. We understand that the seed merely contains the potential to become a plant, and is not compelled to become anything. And yet still, we understand that the seed, the plant, and new seeds are not so much individual things, but a continuous process of development. The important distinction here is that, under this paradigm, we understand that motion is provided by forces internal to the process we are examining, and not by metaphysical concepts like "negation".

It can be said plainly that negation-affirmation is not simply a reframing of negation of negation by Mao. Instead, it marks a qualitative shift within Marxist philosophy. Negation-affirmation takes the underlying concepts within these analyses described by "negation of negation" and brings us forward by prioritizing the force of contradiction within all things. It marks a materialist step forward in the field of dialectics, leads us away from teleological errors, and can provide us with a more concrete understanding of dialectical processes.

Political errors following from the treatment of the NOTN as a 'general law.'

"The idea of determinism, which postulates that human acts are necessitated and rejects the absurd tale about free will, in no way destroys man's reason or conscience, or appraisal of his actions. Quite the contrary, only the determinist

view makes a strict and correct appraisal possible instead of attributing everything you please to free will. Similarly, the idea of historical necessity does not in the least undermine the role of the individual in history: all history is made up of the actions of individuals, who are undoubtedly active figures. The real question that arises in appraising the social activity of an individual is: what conditions ensure the success of his actions, what guarantee is there that these actions will not remain an isolated act lost in a welter of contrary acts?" — Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are"

Questions around determinism, historical necessity, and inevitability define the political stakes of the debate around negation of the negation. What is responsible for the direction of dialectical movement? Will capitalism inevitably transform into socialism? What is the role of individuals in enacting this transformation?

The UOC traces the debate over monism vs. triplism to the days of the RCP, based on Bob Avakian's conception of dialectics. Both the CCIUMU and the UOC engage in a rhetorical debate that sidesteps the philosophical relevance and political consequence of upholding negation of the negation by making claims that their point is correct because the RCP/Avakian aligns with the opposite position. To reject an argument simply because one person agrees with it is a weak basis for an argument. It is undialectical and anti-Marxist to conflate the person with the idea. Just because Avakian is known for an arch-revisionist turn in the ICM does not mean he as an individual is incapable of supporting some correct ideas (especially when they're actually Mao's!). Rather than analyzing the character of the man behind it, we can analyze the content of his words in response to Engels' example of barley in *Anti-Durhing*, as quoted by the UOC:

*"This, to me, is a smell of predetermination and the notion of the immutable essence of things. Mao opposed this kind of thinking when he pointed out that heredity and mutation are a unity of opposites. Engels himself says several sentences later that it is not possible to "grow good barley" without knowing how to do it—which is true, but who says that growing barley is the "characteristic" of barley and the proper way of negating it, and that grinding it is not? (Apparently) man and nature have hitherto done more of the former than the latter with the barley grain, but is this something that cannot be changed? Or could the barley grain not be changed in another way? Finally, when Engels insists: "The first negation must therefore be of such a nature as to make the second possible... This will depend on the special character of each concrete case", he includes a metaphysical element in his explanation of the dialectic. He adds "in grinding a grain of barley, in crushing an insect, I undoubtedly perform the first act, but I make the second impossible". The second, as if there were an obligatory, necessary, "characteristic", predetermined "second act". Here we see how the concept of the "negation of the negation" enters into antagonism with the true fundamental law of dialectical materialism, the unity of opposites (contradiction)."*¹⁰

From this quote, we can divide one into two. First, Avakian slightly misunderstands Engels by ascribing a determinism to his example of dialectics. The UOC do later quote Engels in clarifying:

*"In characterising the process as the negation of the negation, Marx does not at all think that this proves that the process is historically necessary. On the contrary: after having proved historically that the process has indeed been realised in part and that it must be realised in part, he characterises it in addition as a process which is realised according to a certain dialectical law. That is all."*¹¹

However in mischaracterizing Engels, Avakian inadvertently highlights the possibility of misinterpretation and muddying of the nature of dialectics with his critique. It is this concept of a predetermined path for the development of a (metaphysical) thing—as opposed to a continuous process developing through interpenetration of opposites—that the negation of the negation leaves open to take up this interpretation and thus obfuscate the universality of struggle over the temporality of unity. To claim that the determining factor of the quality of dialectical progression (the direction of movement) is not the scission of opposites, but rather a predetermined, metaphysical path of negation of the negation, leads to serious political errors in determinism and a stageist view of development. It assumes a seed becomes barley which produces seeds, which ignores the internal struggle of opposites within concrete external conditions that change the seed or plant and allow them to grow.

We want to be clear that this debate is not semantic, but has material implications for world revolution. Our engagement in this ideological struggle is not to wax philosophical about what constitutes a "law", but rather to demonstrate the political consequences of the practical application of concrete (incorrect) ideas. To further clarify the contention between determinism, possibility, and inevitability within dialectical development, we quote from Comrade Ajith of the Communist Party of India (Maoist). In his polemic *Against Avakianism* he highlights a kernel of correctness in Avakian's ideas:

*"The possibility of humanity becoming extinct through the same contradictions that make communism possible is real. Capital's endless drive for self-expansion that lies at the root of these contradictions could very well lead to an environmental catastrophe making human life impossible. So too could something like a huge comet crashing on earth. Thus there is no hidebound certainty that humanity will achieve communism. But do these possibilities eliminate inevitability altogether from historical development? No they don't. The resolution of social contradictions contains inevitability. For example, a socialist (or new democratic) revolution is inevitable for the resolution of the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. And, if humanity continues to exist, the basic contradictions of imperialism will inevitably continue to sharpen and give rise to rebellions, communist parties and revolutions led by them."*¹²

As Ajith masterfully illustrates, it is the resolution of contradictions which contains inevitability, in contrast to a mechanically determined path en route to that resolution. He

explains the nature of contradiction and inevitability dialectically—while there is no guarantee that humanity will achieve communism (either due to the contradictions of capital itself or contradictions of nature that may become primary over social contradictions like the case of a comet), the conditions of the resolution of the proletariat-bourgeoisie contradiction, should they be achieved, are guided by the development of the aspects internal to that contradiction. Not only is historical development not a perfect line of cause and effect, but nor is it a perfect spiral with each turn moving forward without winding detours and setbacks. Both the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, and development of socialism until communism itself, will be replete with class struggle, and each development characterized as negation-affirmation. Even after the resolution of class society, the new era of humanity under communism will be teeming with new contradictions and struggle. As Mao points out in *On Contradiction*, the conditions of resolution of each contradiction will have a particular character. As dialectical materialists, we must analyze these conditions to understand what intervention can promote such a resolution rather than its disastrous alternatives.

The sum of all heretofore class struggle has led to the scientific theory that if the contradictions of class society are to resolve, they will be resolved through the intervention of a communist party. It is an inevitability as part of the development of class struggle, but it is not predetermined that the contradiction of class society will resolve. From the Paris Commune through modern revisionism, the development of class contradictions also includes failed attempts at socialism that are only able to be proven incorrect through experimentation and struggle. Part of this inevitability includes the development of revolutionary theory through the Marxist theory of knowledge, which claims that the unity of opposites of cognition (theory) and action (practice) constitute knowledge. However, this inevitability does not determine that this process will happen in a linear direction without setbacks and retreats, including within the domain of revolutionary theory and ideology. In fact, the law of contradiction necessitates that one divides into two, and that there will be setbacks and incorrect ideas put forth as social contradictions develop.

The UOC notes in *Defense of NOTN* that the temporary defeat of the proletariat in Russia and China was an unforeseen event that led to the conviction that “the social movement has no specific direction” and in turn the rejection of the NOTN, which the UOC calls an “abandonment of revolutionary positions on philosophical grounds.” They argue that the International Communist Movement came to the belief that motion, matter and society are directionless as a result of this unforeseen defeat, and even go on to connect the current dispersed state of the ICM with these prevailing ideas. By counterpoising motionlessness with a metaphysical determinism (negation of the negation), the UOC obfuscates the actual motive force of history and what contributes to spiral development: struggle. Only through the lens of scission can we cut through this “directionlessness” and correctly locate the causes for capitalist restoration in Russia and China in insufficiently checked revisionism and an inability to fully recognize and combat the resurgent bourgeoisie in emerging socialist

society. Only through social practice can anti-revisionist methods of political strategy and leadership be creatively applied and new truths discovered. As part of the internal development of capitalism, history will bear out a correct answer ("monism" or "triplism") to guide the transition to socialism, outside of human will. The current stakes of the debate are thus: has historical practice already given us an answer on the correctness of the negation of the negation? The answer is a resounding yes.

The defeat of socialism in Russia and China highlights the dangers of the negation of the negation as a law of dialectics. The 1936 declaration that the bourgeoisie had been defeated and class struggle was therefore over in the USSR represents a metaphysical negation of capitalism into socialism. Here, we can imagine the ways in which an elevation of NOTN to a law of dialectics provides a justification to downplay the internal contradictions in all things in favor of declaring a victory of dialectics in the negation of capitalism and class struggle. In contrast to the UOC's claim of a "motionless" ICM that rejects the "direction" provided by the of negation of the negation, Mao's advanced understanding of dialectics regarding class struggle continuing under socialism is a recognition that it is the internal contradictions of the state and its ideological apparatuses that allow for the spontaneous reemergence of the bourgeoisie within the party. Thus, the shift in direction of the development of class struggle under socialism to the primarily ideological realm is understood through the law of scission. With regard to the ultimate reversal to the capitalist road in China, the apparent "negation of the negation" in this instance (semi-feudal, semi-colonial China negated by socialism, negated by capitalism) is at best an incomplete approximation that implies causality, and at worst a metaphysical explanation that obfuscates what is actually the winding, torturous (yet in the last instance historically inevitable) path resulting from the struggle of opposites within the proletariat-bourgeoisie contradiction in Chinese society.

Mao's conception of negation-affirmation is a necessary intervention into the remnants of Hegelian idealism within Marxist dialectics. It places scission in its proper place as both the engine and steering wheel of dialectical movement, itself representative of a negation-affirmation of Engels' three laws and the revisionism they engender. The motion of the contradictions of class society, including the transition to socialism, has been and will continue to be replete with advances and retreats, victories and defeats. In each particularity, Mao teaches us that the factors responsible for the direction of the motion are internal to the sides of the contradiction and the principal contradictions by which it is subsumed. In the contradiction between the proletariat and bourgeoisie, communists and the Marxist theory of knowledge represent a concrete aspect of this interpenetration of opposites. Part of our duty as anti-revisionists is to creatively apply the lessons of past historical sequences so that we do not repeat the same mistakes of those coming before us who had to learn through original experimentation. As discussed, historical experience has taught us the incorrectness and the political consequence of the line of thought stemming from the concept of the negation of the negation.

Though we deny voluntarist fantasies of accelerating revolution beyond what our current conditions allow, we do not wish for these mistakes to be repeated, as time is of the essence before environmental collapse precludes the resolution of class society into communism all together. While the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism could all be derived again because they are discoverable with dialectical materialism, starting from the pinnacle of advancement (by upholding and continuing to advance anti-revisionism including a rejection of negation of the negation)—as opposed to starting from square one—could be the difference between socialism or barbarism, survival or extinction. It is only by understanding the world through dialectical materialism that the workers and oppressed peoples of the world will be able to finally negate capitalism and affirm a world free from exploitation.

CCIMU and UOC documents referenced above and our abbreviations thereof:

CCIMU: Proposal regarding the balance of the International Communist Movement and of its current General Political Line → CCIMU Proposal

UOC: 'On the Proposal on the Balance of the International Communist Movement and its current General Political Line For a Unified Maoist International Conference' →UOC Proposal Response

CCIMU: In Defence of Maoism → CCIMU In Defence of Maoism

UOC: In Defense of the Negation of Negation as One of the General Laws of Dialectics →UOC Defense of NOTN

- 1 CCIMU, 'Proposal.'
- 2 CCIMU, 'In Defense of Maoism.'
- 3 Lenin, 'On the question of dialectics.' 1915.
- 4 Mao, 'On Contradiction.' 1937.
- 5 Lenin, 'Karl Marx.' 1914.
- 6 op cit.
- 7 Marx, *Capital*, v.1 ch. 32
- 8 Mao, 'Talk on questions of philosophy.' 1964.
- 9 Nick Knight, 'Mao Zedong on Dialectical Materialism: Writings on philosophy.'
- 10 Bob Avakian, 'More on the question of dialectics.' *Revolutionary Worker* #95, March 1981.
- 11 Engels, *Anti-Dühring. La subversión de la ciencia por el señor Eugen Dühring*. México: Editorial Grijalbo, 1968, p. 124. [NB – this is the specific translation into Spanish used by UOC]
- 12 Ajith, *Against Avakianism*. 2017.