

Marxism: how to face the challenge of nationalism?

—The divergence and its contemporary significance of Marx, Lenin, Luxemburg's thought on nationalism

Zhao kai-rong

(School of Philosophy, Wuhan university, Wu Han 430072, Hubei, China)

[Abstract] Marxism, liberalism, nationalism are the three major contemporary ideologies, Marxism mainly devoted itself to the polemic against liberalism and paid less theoretic attention to nationalism for a long time, usually simplified the complicated problems of nationality. However, in modern time, all kinds of complicated problems of nationality were abrupt and aggrandized, and affect the global safety and stability to a high degree; moreover, the problems of nationality embody new characteristics surpassing class relationships. This is bound to make Marxism rethink profoundly the previous orthodox national theoretic basis; therefore, the heritage of Luxemburg's thought which emphasizes problems of nationality which have a great divergence with that of Marx and Lenin is exceedingly precious.

[Key words] national autonomy; the right of nations of self-determination; national characters

[Author] Zhao kai-rong (1962-) male, Doctor, Professor, Doctoral supervisor, School of Philosophy, WuHan University, majoring in Marxism philosophy.

Bourgeoisie liberalism was regarded as the major enemy and no full attention was paid to the nationalism by Marxism for a long time. But, we come to acknowledge clearly that complicated problems of nationality are the very scourge that affect harmonious development of world and introduce more uncertain handicaps to the world development.

In the past, a deep study and discussion has not been given and could not be given by the view of materialism to these problems of nationality; therefore, we could not make out sound measures to face the challenges brought out by problems of nationality in different time.

Hitherto, Marxism has already undergone the harsh challenges of problems of nationality for four times. First, during world war one, on the issue of "protect motherland" and "protect the interest of proletariat". Marxism broke up deeply and led to the collapse of the international union, nationalism defeated Marxism. Although Lenin and left-wing Luxemburg of German Democratic Party criticized the action of Eduard Bernstein(1850-1932) and Karl Kautsky(1854-1938) who supported increasing military expenditure, they did not answer the question why so many people in the internal Marxism chose nationalism between Marxism and nationalism when they must make alternative decision. Then, during the second world war, national war broke out again as a new war form after Marx asserted that national war was an antique war(<<internal war of France>>) more than half century ago. The same as before, proletariat acted as cannon fodder of the nationalism again in this war. The third is the collapse of the Soviet Union and east European socialism camp, no longer did Marxism itself manage this crisis, and many national states appeared with complicated nationalities from the whole socialism camp as before, set back the history just as Marx says. Moreover, now many prophets asserted that this kind of tendency will continue. Some say that this is bourgeois' plot, but we don't take that for granted because the collapses appeared in the past, exist now, and they will be bound to appear in the future; and all the collapses are connected with nationalism. The recent one is the "September 11," nationalism is connected with terrorism and poses a threat to the world.

One point is very clear that nationalism is a big trouble not only to liberalism, but also Marxism.

The reason is very simple, as long as nationalism exists, whatever liberalism or Marxism is, it could not win truly. Therefore, there is no wonder that liberalism and Marxism all regarded it as an obstacle to their development.

But, what a trouble or an obstacle it is, fact is the fact, we must face it and dissolve it.

— . What is Marx's view on nationalism?

To Marx, problem of nationality is not important, or problem of nationality is not a question at all, or problem of nationality is not the question for Marxism to face and deal with at all. Therefore, he basically paid little attention to any forms of nationalism. To Marx, apart from the distinction of productive force and relations of production, there are no special problems among nations, or no special problems of nationality. There exist only different degrees of economic development among different nations; no other distinctions exist at all.

Therefore, the solution of problem of nationality is a logic duty for bourgeois to finish. "just like factory system is industry's, that is to say, labor's advanced essence, but industry capital is the finished objective form of private owned property.-----we find that only in this time can the private owned property realize its rule to human, and become a worldwide historical force as the most popular form." [1](p77) that is, "various activity areas which affect each other enlarge more and more in this process of development, the primitive, closed and conservative state of various nations are destroyed more completely due to the daily complicated mode of production, communication and thus spontaneous development of labor of division of various nations, history become a whole history to much higher degree." [2](p51) at last, Lenin basically accepted this kind of view. In the <<on the right of nations of self-determination>>, he further developed Marx's thought: "problem of nationality compared with 'worker problem', to Marx, there is no doubt that it is subjective to the worker problem."

It was naturally for Marx to get this conclusion because he spent most of his life in west Europe and stayed in England, but in west Europe, especially England, as Lenin said, there was no so-called problem of nationality, or just as Lenin said, problem of nationality had already been solved, therefore, no longer did the problem of nationality exist, of course, there was no nationalism, even if nationalism existed there, it could be only the nationalism of England bourgeois. That perhaps further proved and deepened Marx's self-confidence to his thought: any problems of nationality are economic problems to the bottom at last; therefore, elimination of any problems of nationality will come true along with the elimination of class struggle.

Of course, that is not to say, Marx took it for granted that capitalism truly eliminated nations, thus liberalism defeated nationalism. No, it is not. If that were true, Marx would accept the view that present capitalism globalizes----just as some scholars suggest. But, in fact, to Marx, the globalization human undergoes now is a reluctant activity we should involve in, there must be a globalization because of history being bound to developing into world history, this globalization is historical necessity, it is inevitable and unavoidable, it is the true and sole way to solve problems of nationality. On this point, Marx would oppose steadfast any forms of history nihilism. But, meanwhile, this kind of globalization can solve problems of nationality truly, to eliminate nations truly is only to destroy multi—nationalization, is only to realize one nation's privilege.

Due to this reason, Marx never grieved at all a little at the disappearance of any sole nation, just as he never grieved at all a little at the disappearance of Romanism.

In November 29, 1847, an international meeting took place to memorize the 17th anniversary

of Poland uprising in London, Marx gave a lecture there, in that speech, Marx did not talk about how Poland should seek independence or how Poland could get independence, to a nation which had been three times divided, and still being divided and occupied by German, Austria, Russia, Marx almost not expressed polite sympathy and respect, but spoke verbally that “the old Poland has died, we by no means expect its revival.”

Today it is beyond imagination what kind of reaction Poland people will take when they hear those remarks.

But, to Marx, what is important is less national bound than eradication of this kind of bound. To Marx, if the disappearance of Poland were a progress of history, then, Poland’s disappearance was the only death of an old society; therefore, it was not to Poland a loss at all: “the death of the old society is not a loss to those who have nothing to lose in that society.” On the contrary, to the nobles of Poland, the serfdom of Poland, it was almost the very thing they asked for, because of the rule by the three big states, history of Poland progressed truly. On this point, Luxemburg born with Poland had a deep acknowledgement.

According to Marx’s thought, the key is not whether Poland was independent or in extinction, it laid in whether the independence or extinction of Poland embodies the significance of history progress or not. If Poland was laggard, if the force conquered Poland was a kind of progressive force, then, it was no significance to talk about the independence under this circumstances.

But, that is not to say Marx suggest that “the laggard should be beaten.” On the contrary, at any time Marx opposed the legitimating of the suggestion that “the laggard should be beaten.” To Poland, Marx only say, if Poland had been conquered, and the invasion force was a progress one, then, the key of the issue should not be independence, should not set back, but reestablished Poland based on destroying the progressive force.

As the same, that is not to say Marx neglect problem of nationality. It is not at all. Marx only argued that problem of nationality could not be taken and solved as simple problem of nationality, but, they could only be taken and solved by economic development. On this significance, without doubt, Lenin’s judgment was right: “his (Marx) theory is different just like heaven and earth with those of whom neglecting national movement.”[3](p437)

Then, does Marx negate completely the significance of Poland’s independence?

No .To Marx, Poland’s independence has significance only under this circumstance ----unless Poland’s independence had significance of history progress. Due to the very reason, Engels once thought that Poland’s independence had great significance to Poland; even it had great significance to whole Europe. For a period, to Engels, although Russia conquered Poland, but its civilization lagged behind that of Poland, just like north of France conquered south of France, but its civilization lagged behind that of the later.

If it is not the case, then Poland’ independence has no significance at all. At this point, Lenin put it right, Marxism by no means talks about something generally, abstractly, wholly without combination with concrete situations.

二 . The difference between Luxemburg and Marx, Lenin

The most difference between Luxemburg and Marx is that she disagreed with Marx’s view of “negate national characters”, and clearly suggested that “protect national character”. The book << a concise history of Poland ----from the founding of state to the modern time>> written by the famous historian of Poland Stanislaw Arnold and Marian Żychowski put forward a clear account

on this point: “the social democratic party of the kingdom of Poland’s internationalism and their love to their motherland are merged together which could not be dissected. youlianmaliefsky and Luxemburg all condemned the national suppression of Poland and Russia. They opposed the crude Germanic assimilation and all kinds of damage to Poland’s characters. In 1900, Luxemburg wrote a little pamphlet entitled<<protect the national characters>>, she condemned the barbarian national suppression.”[4](p227)

Of course, we can’t get our own explanation from Marx’s remarks “negate national characters” without considering where Marx mentioned. Marx referred to the concept “negate national characters” in an international council debate on prush-austria war in 1866, in that congress, Marx assailed fiercely “the proudhon faction in Paris college students’ because they regarded “national character is absurd”. [5](p224) Marx said: “ ‘ youth France’ s delegate (not workers) put forward a kind of view that all national character and nation itself are ‘ trite prejudice’.” Therefore, nations’ distinction should be canceled, nations should be broken up. What should the nations be? “ all the nations should be broken up into small ‘community’ or ‘communiqué’, then, based on these, ‘united union’ formed, but, it is not a country.” To this end, “the history of all other countries should stop; the whole world should wait for French’s maturity to unfold a social revolution.”[5](p224)

Obviously the “negate national character” is not national nihilism, on the contrary, it oppose steadfast the national nihilism. Of course, to Marx, national nihilism still has some significance, at least, it could warn people the chauvinism. Therefore, Marx said if that kind of view that “national character is absurd” has somewhat significance, it is that “it is useful to take this tactics as an instrument to put polemics against the chauvinism”

Meanwhile, obviously the “negate national character” is not nationalism, on the contrary, it opposes steadfast the nationalism, especially opposes the chauvinism. On this point, Marx opposes steadfast any so-called excellent nations’ unification to the backward nations, of course he also opposed bourgeois’ “national country” formed by sole nation. “Negate national character” is not to negate the so—called backward nations. Lenin highly appreciates this point. Despite that Lenin agrees with kausky’s view on this question, he argues that “national country” is more regular and reasonable than “multi—nation country” formed by many nations.

Here “negate national character” refers to “big industries produce almost the same relationships among various social classes everywhere, then that destroy the various nations’ characters.” That is to destroy all the national character and lead to almost the same relationships. That is assimilation.

But, Luxemburg did not agree about this view, she argued that “socialism revolution will solve the culture problem by the spirit of freedom automatically.”[6](p84) it means to respect and protect the culture of minor nations, rather than assimilate it at all. But Lenin opposed that steadfast. To Lenin, he thought that “assimilation” was inevitable and unavoidable; the true Marxists not only feared not the “assimilation’, but made efforts to promote this kind of “assimilation”.

Since “assimilation” is unavoidable, how did Luxemburg maintain the national character she named in this kind of “assimilation”? Luxemburg’s answer was this: oppose independence; practice national autonomy. Furthermore, Luxemburg suggested that the second international should cancel the platform put forward by Lenin about right of national self-determination (the 9th line of the platform of Russia democratic worker party), and clearly asked the social democratic

party of Poland to make alterations mentioned above to the 7th line of its platform.

The so-called opposition of independence is a great corollary of her study on political and economy. Luxemburg argued that the most universal economic connection as broad as possible was required whatever capitalism or socialism was. Take Poland as an example, Luxemburg held that “Poland and Russia are transforming into an economic common community.” The economic development of Poland make it melt into Russia, moreover, “ it is a objective historical process, it does not change around one’s own will, and still not change around any party’s will”. [7](p31) therefore, independence is the degenerated national requirement or nation’s degenerated requirement, it set back the history against bourgeois’ and proletariat’s requirement. Lenin appreciated this point to some degree meanwhile doubted it a little.

Lenin agreed: “under the same conditions, the conscious proletariat always holds the views that establish much bigger countries”. Lenin doubted: why the opposition of national independence is vice verse more conducive to “the conscious proletariat always holds the views that establish much bigger countries”. Took Poland as an example, Lenin argued, on the contrary, independence was more conducive to proletariat’s broader union. Lenin expounded his reason from five aspects: first, “the foreign nations basically exist along Russia’s front; second, compared with other country’s national suppression near Russia the big Russian national suppression is more cruel; third, there are same nations of these foreign nations exist in neighboring countries; forth, the neighboring capitalism is advanced than the middle area; fifth, universally affected by boundary area’s especially Asian national movement. Lenin held that their independence will more promote cohesive union of the two sides’ proletariats. Just as the independence of Norway from Sweden did [3] (p29)

What makes Lenin confused is this: no independence, how could nation rule by itself? To this, Luxemburg’s answer is this: the central and the local authorities charge their duties respectively. Luxemburg’s national autonomy is a division of right, that’s the central manages it own affaires, and the local authorities practice national autonomy according to its own nationalities; we can also protect the national characters in this way. Luxemburg expounded her view based on the example which had so many nations that Poland was the most suitable country to practice national autonomy. But, Lenin regarded it in essential a system of union of state. Lenin was vice verse prone to practice centralism.

The most difference between centralism and national autonomy is that the central government has the right to manage the local affaires in additional to charging the local authority. Lenin also realized the potential colossal scourge of bureaucracy exists in the centralism, but, Lenin gave hope to democracy and expected democracy would eradicate the damage of bureaucracy. Of course, Lenin did not realize his goal obviously from the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Despite these shortcomings, the historical facts had already approved that Lenin’s national theory had unmatched contemporary, realistic, ready political practice advantages in facing the imminent national crisis in that time. Luxemburg’s national theory is more far-reaching, general; last long theoretic significance compared with that of Lenin’s. But, this is not the very thing Luxemburg expected. She realized at early time that general national theory can meet the assignment of the national revolution period at the critical moment. Compared with that, she expected more that her theory has the form’s character, for many times she criticized Marx’s idea was utopian and unrealistic for that reason. But she can’t compare with Lenin on the very aspect.

Therefore, Luxemburg did not know how to meet the complicated national problems after the October revolution. At first, she expected of support of European proletariat in solving the national problem, but she got disappointment on this aspect because these proletariats were in deep muddy pit and no way to get themselves out of the trouble. Luxemburg said sadly: "I believe what the respectable German and French bourgeois as well as England bourgeois could do temporarily is to see Russian bleeding reasonably." And at home, Lenin also practiced his promise of the right of nations of self-determination, let fifteenth nations obtain independence at one stroke, exceedingly damaged Russian proletariats' force. Under these circumstances, Luxemburg claimed that Lenin's failure was bound to be inevitable. Even she despaired: "it goes without saying that Lenin's faction can't deal with this kind of chaos which is beyond imagination." [8](p176)

However, all the things developed in that way completely according to the predictions of Lenin's national theory: the proletariats of the nations which broke away from Russian formed a union quickly, and then national war broke out immediately, Lenin's thought that transformed the imperialism war into national war was realized completely.

Ξ . contemporary significance of contemporary time

But, after seventy years of historical examination, many problems of Lenin's national theory appeared continually; at last, in the early time of 1990's, Soviet Union's nations underwent a big collapse. Thus, Luxemburg's national theory appeared on the stage again as we rethink the experiences and lessons of Lenin's national theory. "Lenin also aimed to create the equality and the fusion of the all nationalities. Where was the fundamental theoretical difference between the two socialists?" some scholars clarity showed this point:

Lenin utilized the state for the construction of the socialism as well as for the solution of the national question. He tried to solve the problems "from top" ...It cannot solve the national question because the national question is not a result of the existence of nationalities. On the contrary state makes the national question by shifting the contradiction in side of the nation system on the national minorities. If the civil society could abolish the privilege and discrimination of the specific nationality, the national question will be able to be solved. in other words, if the real democracy could be created by citizens in the civil society, the national question will vanish. Therefore, the cooperation and the fusion of all the nationalities will be realized not in the frame work of the state but beyond the state. That was Rosa Luxemburg's "World after the abolishment of the 'Nation' State.(The establishment of the Soviet Union aimed at such direction. But it could not overcome Russian centralism and failed)" [9](p253)

The core of the question is how to treat the "national character".

We must admit that Lenin's worry about the "national character" is reasonable. To Lenin, nothing is more harmful than "autonomy of national culture", "divide school according to students' nationalities", due to their rich exquisiteness, they are more harmful nationalism. Divide school, live and have a life according to nationalities and so on, that is necessary to lead to the estrangement and closure of the nations, all these measures which seems to respect the "national characters" are necessary to the national discrimination and national inequality. Now, this point is approved universally. Therefore, Lenin fiercely criticized Luxemburg's thought that "practice autonomy" according to nationalities.

To this, Lenin's method is actually "assimilation", "to negate national characters", to negate the narrow national characters of various nations by advanced culture, especially Marxism culture.

According to Lenin's view, any nations could be divided into two nations, advanced nations and backward nations; therefore, a necessary logic thread is that replaces continually the backward national character of the nation by the advanced national characters. But, obviously the national problem was simplified in that way.

Many aspects of national culture could not be generalized by such words as "advancement" and "backwardness", in many occasions, national culture is a kind of living method. Just like Chinese cooking and west cooking, just like west suit and chi-pao, just like pavilion, tower, building, and pavilion on terrace. Make an assumption, if not to keep "national characters", how do human being have such a rich and colorful life? Make an assumption, if not to maintain national characters, let national characters be assimilated randomly, "negate national characters" freely, is not mankind's life dull and boring? This is not the major reason, most important of all, provided that without so rich and colorful national characters, perhaps human being had already eradicated in an enormous catastrophic time. Modern complexity study proves that the life continues due to its diversity. That becomes the common sense even on forest and greening. provided that there is one kind of trees, once the disease of trees break out and the worms which endanger the trees appear, the whole forest will disappear quickly, but, if there are many kinds of plants, whatever disease break out, a great deal of trees will survive. Human's prevention of virus is just like that too. Any destructive virus did not eradicate human being truly just because of different human species and nations. As the same, to maintain national character and enrich national diversity is the absolute guarantee to keep sustainable development of human society.

Lenin's national theory is necessary that leads to the extinction of "national character" of the various nations of Soviet Union. In 1931, the famous scholar Oswald Spengler(1880-1936) once asserted: "the achievements obtained in the recent fifteen years of soviet rule is that it revive the political, military and economical organizations, only replace it with a new name." [10](P312-313)

But, Spengler is wrong, even in that way, at least there is still one kind of national character, which is a big Russia national character. But, in fact, even this kind of national character of Soviet Union faded, at last, there is no bright Russian literature, arts and culture, only colorless literature, arts and culture of Russia exist. But, as an excellent culture which forms during the several thousands of years and affects the whole world, how could it be eradicated completely in the short scores of years? Chinese are all the same, a series of movement, such as New Culture movement, Four Checks, The great Culture Revolution, had it truly eradicated Chinese national character? No, it is impossible.

The important reason which caused this kind of phenomenon is that almost Marxists (Luxemburg included) explain problems of nationality from economical aspect. Therefore, their attention paid to economy is much more than their attention paid to national study. Luxemburg's attention paid to economy is so exceedingly high that she needed relax her regurgitation caused by "had to engulf a great deal of political economy works" through "reading ancient classical works".[8](p131)

We must admit that this direction is right; moreover, this kind of method could explain and expound the problems of nationality truly. But, this is a basis; a necessary condition of national liberation, a prerequisite is dispensary by no means. Now some scholars put forward that many nations just exist in Africa can't be analyzed by class, the history of these nations is regarded as the pure race and national clan history. We deeply doubt about this view, this kind of phenomenon

is only possible in primitive community group.

But, an obvious question is that different national cultures emerges based on the same geological environment and the same economic base, such as Chinese various scholars and one hundred of academic factions in ancient china. (Actually there were more than one hundred academic factions). The reason is very simple, after all, national culture is created by human, and moreover, what is more important is that it is not only created by economical principles. Just this kind of thing itself clearly embodies that there are shortcomings in explaining national culture by economy. So, philosopher Bertrand Russell(1872-1970) with England agreed about this principle of Marx to some degree, but he also argued that this principle is not suitable in national culture area.

A realistic case which is also haunting Marxism national concept is the middle east countries which produce petrol, these nations' economical income is enormous high, many people of these nations are educated in Europe and America, a lot of people are masters in English. But, their national characters are not closing to the west; on the contrary, their national characters are more bright and vivid. This can't be explained in economical development, it could only be explained by their national characters. As Lenin says, human will embarrass themselves and make unacceptable actions when they face interests; vice verse, class can't do it when national problems appear. That is major reason why Marxism class principle never goes through and advances hardly when it meets national principle. After all, class is changing, but national characters—such as posture and facial features, language, culture, common psychology is difficult to change in short time. as the same things happened in Taiwan now, which is representative, it is acknowledged universally that Democratic Progress Party has broken the Taiwan's economy and is still damaging it, but the principle of the origin Taiwanese still is: “not enough to feed, but we still elect Chen Shui –bian”.

In fact, it is not strange, national character is the national distinction; economical distinction is only one kind of these. Some scholars' views are right: “human always divide themselves into different groups, moreover, distinction goes along with discrimination and hatred. But, this kind of distinction could lead to violence only in the exceptional situations.”[11](p186)

Distinction leads to struggle, economical distinction leads to class struggle, therefore, class struggle is only a kind of distinction struggle, this kind of distinction stops, there are still other distinctions and other distinctions struggle, that is the very national distinction and the very national struggle. The fact goes like this, it is not correct of the saying that whole human history is the history of class struggle, it is still not correct of the saying that whole human history since class appeared is the history of class struggle. On this point, although Mao tse-tong's theory of “three-world division” inflicts a far-reaching impact on national liberation movement, its major structure focuses on economical development.

Like this, the development of human history perhaps has many ways, west Europe way is the only one kind of these, but different nations can probably go their different ways according to their own national characters. By giving up to Vera Ivanovna Zaslucic(1849-1919) on this point, the old Marx acknowledged that Russia could probably go on a different road compared with that of west Europe. And in the years of his later time, he put down the finished <<capital>> volume 2 and 3 without publication, focused on the east nations' history fully. He wrote a great deal of things which is similar with chronicles. Whoever has read those books would feel that Marx only cared particulars, even he wrote down the each particular of the things which look like trivial and dull.

Perhaps just the very particulars, therefore, the very national characters caused Marx's attention and decided the big change of Marx's historical concept in his later years.

The change probably is this: national ideology's role should be filed out based on the economic base. That is the economical development decides the general direction of society (those five social formations or three social formations, the economical development of each nation must go in that direction), but national ideology decides the special road of national development (that is the reason why there is so few realistic social development meets the social development as Marx prescribed by taking west Europe as an example). But, on this point, Luxemburg did not discover it due to her deep obsession to the economical base, on the contrary, Karl Liebknecht (1871-1919) of the left-wing as Luxemburg was in realized it.

He (Liebknecht) opposed taking economic base as the base of generalization of social relations and put it out of the general social relations.he argued that "economic factors" in Marx's system was narrow and not correct; "superstructure of ideology" was not fully prescribed, even we can say that this prescription is not correct. The relation between ideology and "economic relations" is expounded incorrectly. [12] (p363)

This kind of view is very valuable. In a series of articles we have already pointed out that Marxism's frustration against nationalism is not mainly in economic problems, but mainly in ideological aspects. Actually any true and pure problems of nationality are mainly ideological ones. The dissolution of Soviet Union and east European socialist countries were caused by ideology. That Marxism ideology had not gone deeply into the national ideology of the various nations in Soviet Union and east European countries is the major reason. If we must say there is somewhat national character in their Marxism ideology, that's more or less marks were stamped by "the proletariat culture" which is "not special thought"[13](p129). Compared with what mentioned above, China does a successful job in this aspect, an important piece of experience is to combine Marxism with Chinese concrete realities, to "have protected Chinese national characters". On this aspect, without doubt Luxemburg's requirement of "protect national characters" rather than "negate national characters" in solving problems of nationality warns us greatly.

If we say that Lenin's practice of national independence policy actually obtained the great stage achievement, then, Luxemburg's remarks that opposed the national independence has realistic significance now. Not a long time ago, national movement just like wave over wave became a big obstacle to imperialism colonialist expansion. However, at the same time, imperialism also used national independence to counter back proletariat camp; at last, many nations broke away from it. That further makes international national problems increase without declining and create new problems of nationality, especially leaves many problems of nationality which could not be solved easily. Israeli question in the middle east, India and Pakistan question in south Asia, Taiwan question in China, North Korea and South Korea question in east Asia and so on, and any of these questions would involve in world safety and stability. To meet this challenge, only Luxemburg's principle could be used: only could Czech and Hungary actually protect their national characters when they are annexed into Austria, and independence only makes them go deep into the trouble.

Now it is the time to seek universal unification and oppose independence. Now some scholars have paid attention to the following:

it could be said like this that it is more suitable to the reality and also more suitable to the imminent requirement of international family if we not to emphasize that each country is

independent to any other countries and acknowledge frankly that each country depends on all other countries and altogether exist cohesively in the big international family or in a world government. [14](p134)

This kind of unification could be economic, military or ideological form. All kinds of forms could be allowed, European Union is the most representative form. Whatever the unification form is, the general principle is to “protect national characters” rather than “negate national characters” as could as possible. By comparison, the solution of problems of nationality just like American invasion to Iraq is still “negate national characters” or chauvinism. According to Marx’s thought toward Poland question, American invasion to Iraq is that America helps Iraq eradicated its own old world and sweep the obstacles for the proletariat to truly “negate national characters”, therefore, America is the stage ally to the proletariat and proletariat should support its action. However, as long as we observe the question by the view of true national complexity and not the view of social evolution based on economy, then, we must admit that American action does not solve problems of nationality at all and create new problems of nationality, just as it goes all out to frustrate the unification of Mainland of China and Taiwan, which creates new problems of nationality rather than solve problems of nationality.

1. Marx, Engels: *Collected works*, volume42. [M].Peking: People publishing house, 1979.
2. Marx, Engels: *Collected works*, volume3. [M].Peking: People publishing house, 1960.
3. Lenin: *Collected works of Lenin*, volume 20[M] Peking: People publishing house, 1959
4. (Poland) Stanislaw Arnold and Marian Żychowski: *A concise history—from the founding of state to the modern time*, [M].Peking: Commercial publishing house, 1974.
5. Marx, Engels: *Collected works*, volume31. [M].Peking: People publishing house, 1972.
6. (America) Sidney Hook: *Marx and Marxists*, [M].Shanghai: Shanghai people publishing house, 1965.
7. (СССР) Р.Я.Евзеров, И.С.Яжборовская: *Роза люксембург*,[M],Peking publishing house,1983.
8. (Germany) Rosa Luxemburg: *on the literature*, [M].Peking: People literature publishing house, 1983.
9. [Japan] Ito Narihiko: *Nation and State in the Thought of Rosa Luxemburg*, [J]. International Conference on Rosa Luxemburg’s Thought and its Contemporary Value, Wuhan,2006.
10. (England) J.F. C.Fuller: *The decisive battles of the western world*, volume 3, [M].Guilin: Publishing house of Guangxi normal university, 2004.
11. (America) Joseph S Nye JR: *understanding international conflicts: an introduction to theory and history*, [M].Shanghai: Shanghai people publishing house, 2005.
12. (СССР) Б.А.Чагин: *ИЗ истории борьбы против философского ревизионизм в германской социал-демократии*, [M].Peking: Sanlian publishing house, 1964.
13. Bai sihong: *Selected data of proletariat culture*, [M].Peking: china social science publishing house, 1983.
14. People publishing house: *Imperialism remarks concerning present stage of imperialism*, [M].Peking: People publishing house, 1964.