

TRANSCRIPT

"The Philosophic Foundations for the Struggles ^{cf} Freedom in
the Latin American and Afro-Asian Countries" Raya Dunayevskaya 11-13-60

The first thing to be established in this first informal talk on the new book is that there is no line. There is no such thing as anybody being wrong or anybody being right. Everything is the very first time it's ~~being~~ presented and there will be many, many changes and therefore everybody should speak extremely freely. In fact, the more un-lined it is, the better it is ^{both} for the author and for the book.

The second thing is to call attention to the awkwardness of the title. For the time being, we're calling the new book "The Philosophic Foundations for the Struggles ^{cf} Freedom in the Latin American and Afro-Asian Countries." The awkwardness of the title, which ~~starts~~ ^{starts} with philosophic foundations, would give one the impression that we're putting thought above reality. In actuality, if not the opposite, it certainly is a synthesis of the two. Far from putting thought ahead of reality, it is because Motion, or Idea, or concept, or thought, and reality are not separate, and in a certain sense the entire thesis of the book, that is, the unity of thought and reality, can be summed up in the one that probably will be on the title page (just like the one on freedom was on the other title page), and that one is:

"The self-determination in which the Idea alone is, is to hear itself speak."

We all know about self-determination of nations, and it seems to be rather difficult to understand why self-determination means -- or what it means -- in relationship to Idea, but it's just another phrase for self-development. In other words, the evolution and the development of the Idea is "to hear itself speak." In other words,

13782

both what comes from it effects reality, and not only that, the reality speaks the Idea. And again, to state way ahead of time what we mean by "to speak", this book will not be finished until I have made a trip to Africa and we have heard the Africans speak, not only in books, but actually as only we can hear it and others cannot.

With this preliminary, I want to go into the three levels of newness in which this new book will be conceived. One, is totally new. In other words, Africa -- we practically didn't deal with it at all in Marxism and Freedom. And we certainly didn't ^{ever} deal with it in the context in which we will with it now, and I will quote something from it in a while.

Two, is a new in an old book, Science of Logic. I will read the specific section on Subjectivity, which will be the central focus of the book.

The three will be new on Marx's Capital, and I will begin with that. These three levels are right in front ⁽⁵⁰⁾ you -- that's why I divided the book this way. This is Hegel, and I will go into a great deal more of that. This is Marx and Lenin; and this is Nigeria which stands for both Africa and all of Latin America. These are about two dozen books which I've read already and which need to be summarized.

The reason we begin with Capital is that, considering all the time we have spent on Capital in M&F, you would practically think ~~nothing~~ else is left to be said. And yet we will ^{say} very, very different things this time. To stress that even when we say the same thing, it will have a different emphasis, I want to begin first of all with the footnote on p.54 (for people who have Kerr edition, that's p. 94...I have that French edition which I want to call attention to). It's something that was not quoted even though -- yes, Vol. 1, p. 94...--here is what it says and wherein the emphasis is going to be new:

"In the estimation of that paper" -- Marx's is referring to a paper that just reviewed his book, Critique of Political Economy -- "my view that each special mode of production and the social relations corresponding to it, in short, that the economic structure of society, is the real basis on which the juridical and political superstructure is raised, and to which definite social forms of thought correspond; that the mode of production determines the character of the social, political and intellectual life generally, all this is very true for our own times, in which material interests preponderate, but not for the Middle Ages, in which Catholicism, nor for Athens and Rome, where politics, reigned supreme. In the first place, it strikes one as an odd thing for anyone to suppose that these well-worn phrases about the Middle Ages and the ancient world are unknown to anyone else. This much, however, is clear, ^{that} the Middle Ages could not live on Catholicism, nor the ancient world on politics. On the contrary, it is the man, "the mode in which they gain a livelihood, that explains why here politics, and there Catholicism, played the chief part. For the rest, it requires but a slight acquaintance with the history of the Roman republic, for example, to be aware that its secret history is the history of its landed property. On the other hand, Don Quixote long ago paid the penalty for wrongly imagining that knight errantry was compatible with all economic forms of society."

In other words, this is something we stressed all the time, that the mode of production, the way you earn a living, determines everything else in society -- the politics, the state, the arts, your thinking -- but what we didn't stress was the ancient times. In fact, instead of stressing the ancient times, we were very busy

emphasizing the fact that Marx put the primitive accumulation of capital at the very end of the book, not centrally located or at the beginning.

[We were correct but only up to a point. It is true that Marx put the ~~primitive accumulation of capital~~ primitive accumulation of capital in other words, the way things were before capitalism at the end of the book in order to stress that it doesn't make any difference whether or not you had your first dollar bill -- or your first \$10,000 bill, for a factory...-- very honestly, some way or another, or whether you stole it, and you threw off the man from his land that belonged to him, that in either case, no matter how honest you had gotten this first dollar -- if we suppose you had gotten it honestly -- your exploitation would still be the same. In other words, if you're the one ~~who~~^{that} doesn't have it now and you have to go and work in the factory, you would be exploited.

[In order to stress that type of exploitation that capitalism gives, the way it lives off of your sweat, he never pays attention to the fact, which was easily proven, as to how un-ethically he had gotten his first dollar bill. All the stress is on that. We did quote one single phrase from the primitive accumulation of capital. I believe it was the one in your Kerr edition on p.823, in this edition p.775 [Dona Torr edition]. This ^{one} is the only one we quoted from the primitive accumulation of capital:

"The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation and enslavement and entombment in the mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black skins, signalized the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production."

[We were showing you it really wasn't true ~~he~~^{that} got his first dollar honestly, but we left it. Now the emphasis will be the exact

opposite for the following very important reasons. First of all, the primitive accumulation of capital is the modern stage in which all of Latin America, Africa, Asia still is in. So it isn't ancient; it is what they're confronted with at this point. Just to give you two examples of that fact, which will take in both the relationship of what was then an advanced country -- Holland -- and the country that they take over in an imperialist way and exploit; and also in relationship to the U.S. and England, I will read these two passages from it. One is on p.778 (there are 40 pp. difference at the beginning, and 48 from this point on...) in the Dona Torr edition:

"A Holland which first fully developed the colonial system in 1648, stood already in the acme of its commercial greatness. It was in almost exclusive possession of the East Indian trade and ^{the} commerce between the southeast and northwest of Europe. Its fisheries, marine, manufactures, surpassed those of any other country. The total capital of the Republic was probably more important than that of all the rest of Europe put together." It's a quote from a certain book Gulich is the author and Marx then says: "Gulich forgets to add that by 1648, the people of Holland were more overworked, poorer and more brutally oppressed than those of all the rest of Europe put together." In other words, the height, being the head of the world like America is now, doesn't mean that the workers in that country are the head, only the capitalists -- that they were poorer than all the rest of Europe put together, and ~~the~~ more exploited. And of course we know that to be true in the U.S. except that, at the time Marx wrote, he is stressing that what appears to be free in the U.S. is not really free, because it comes from England. So he says the same thing is going on between England and the U.S.: "A great deal of capital which appears today in the U.S. without any certificate of birth was yesterday in England

the capitalized blood of children."

There is a much greater reason why primitive accumulation of capital will become the center force, that is, much greater even than the fact that it isn't primitive. It is present in the countries that we are dealing with. They are in one way or another reaching that stage. And it shows also the relationship between ^{both} thought and history and how, no matter how profound you may be in your interpretation, you don't really see it until a good, nice human being -- the activity of the common man -- begins to work in a certain way, in this case, in the African continent. Here is what I mean:

Number one. It is true that ~~at the~~ not only put it at the end of the volume instead of central ^{at} or the beginning, but that he did not even make it a separate part. You will recall that I call attention to the fact that Part VIII of Capital, which is the last part, which dealt with primitive accumulation of capital, in the final edition ^{which is not in the American edition but which we know about, the fourth German edition -- that was not made a separate part of Capital. It was made one chapter, or into two chapters, under the General Law of Capitalist Accumulation, which was Part VII.}

We acted as if that was demeaning it further by not giving it the status of a separate part. In actuality, it was making it a great deal more important and, for the first time, explains one thing you could never really explain before, and that is how does it happen that the section on the Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation -- the one where he says, it began in this and this manner, it moved in this and this manner, and now you're moving to the fact that ~~it~~ a-
long with the fact that one ^{big} capitalist eats up many capitalists, a-
long with the degradation of labor, you have the revolt of the workers, and the negation of the negation.

7.

[We could never quite understand why this tremendous great climax comes in what is supposed to be an unimportant part, more or less. Why did he place it there? We more or less explained it on the fact that because it was the origin, and he moves all the way from the origin to its final conclusion. It isn't true. Here is what is true and what the African revolutions are making us see for the first time:

[The fact that he made it into a chapter of Part VII, instead of a separate part, gives it the highest importance, because in Part VII -- what is Part VII? It deals with the General Law of Capitalist Accumulation. It shows you that the total result of all that he has been describing about exploitation will mean that if even all the wealth were concentrated in the hands of one single capitalist, state-capitalism, there would be no change in the worker, that the absolute law of accumulation, on the one hand, means the unemployed army. Isn't that the greatest point? Isn't that what we studied all the time as the height? Therefore, ~~it is~~ ^{if this is} made into a chapter of that part, which deals with accumulation of capital, it is not subordinate. Am I making myself understood?.... [Part VII of Capital is the height, it's the climax, it's the conclusion. He shows you that from exploitation, from the production of surplus value, you have reached the stage where on the one hand you have all this accumulation of capital, and on the other hand you have the unemployed army. That is the highest stage capitalism can reach, its collapse. And now he is saying, this primitive accumulation of capital is part of that general law of capitalist accumulation, and because it is part of that law, even ~~though~~ ^{though} I have subordinated in order to stress that the exploitation is the same and doesn't depend on this primitive accumulation, nevertheless I will now come back and show you that the historical

tendency of capitalist accumulation to its collapse and to the revolt of the workers and a new society holds true, all the way from this primitive accumulation through super capitalism and state capitalism 'til where we reach the collapse. You see how important it is and how it is impossible to see it quite in a line just out of your own head. But when workers begin to move, great masses of people like ~~that~~ they're doing in Africa, you suddenly see all sorts of things you didn't see before. [This is one of the levels of newness for this book, the new book. We will start on Capital, with the primitive accumulation of capital. That's what everyone should read now. And we will see it ~~is~~ not only ^{as} applicalbe to the reality but as integral to the law of capitalist development, growth and collapse.

[The second of the newness is -- this is going to sound like a great deal of jibberish, but please bear--later on it won't...I do not want to summarize Hegel. It is in the same chapter we said was our age, The Absolute Idea. But you know that in M&F, we went very gingerly. It was the first time we were saying this--we live in the age of the Absolute Idea. By gingerly, I meant we said the proof of it is the fact that the counter-revolution and the revolution are tied in together. Look at Stalinism and look at how every ^{body} wants the world revolution instead. But Stalinism came out of one of the greatest revolutions, proletarian revolution. [In other words, we were always pointing to the negative features: the fact that capitalism in its state form, in Russia, was the height of the counter-revolution, which it remains to this day, and that the Absolute Idea was its opposite. In other words, we left it more or less abstract. And we were always a little bit afraid of subjectivity. As we know, when ~~we~~ ^{we} want to insult some ~~body~~, ^{body}, ~~we~~ ^{we} say ~~you~~ ^{you} 're subjective. That still

holds, when subjectivity means you're judging something personally, ^{just} from your own experience and nothing else, or just from your own feelings, not even your own experience, ^{or just} the fact that you don't like somebody.

But subjectivity in the sense of, ~~a~~ philosophic sense, meaning great masses of people, or great ideas that are incorporated in you as a human being...great masses of people as a movement, we were never opposed to that subjectivity. However, as I said, we played it in a low key. We're now going to play it in a very, very high key, and therefore I want to read this part of the Absolute Idea. It's p.477 of Vol. II, Science of Logic:

"The negativity" -- that's the negation, or the form that we have just considered before -- "which has just been considered is the turning-point of the movement of the Notion." That is, the Idea. Notion and Idea are the same thing. "It is the simple point of negative self-relation, the innermost source of all activity, of living and spiritual self-movement, the dialectic soul which all truth has in it and through which it alone is truth; for the transcendence of the opposition between the Notion ^{and} Reality, and that unity which is the truth, rest upon this subjectivity alone." that's what we began with, the Idea. Rest upon this subjectivity alone. Now you'll understand more and more of it before we get through with the thing, even if it sounds jibberish now.

However, again to show that it's Africa that is making us see this and not be afraid to say it's subjectivity alone which is proof of the objectivity and which will move us forward to a new society, I will read something which to me is the same thing

as what was just said, and here it's said ^{of} all people ^{by} Sekou Toure. If you have your Africa South, it's in the April issue, "Africa's Path in History," by Abdullaye Diop. That's the Sec. of State of the Republic of Guinea. However, this is Toure he is quoting. Listen very carefully because it not only has subjectivity and Humanism that we're for, but all that we're going to go into ~~the future~~ ... ~~the future~~ science and technology.

"The future" -- this is the head ^{of the Rep. of} Guinea that's speaking, Sekou Toure -- "The future will comprise the sum total of the cultures and civilizations which are not too aware of their particular contribution, and which are not absorbed in peddling their unique values. In order to attain greater achievement, it's not too much to expect that each should join his efforts to those of others, making his intellectual means, his scientific and technical knowledge available to the world, because no people, no nation, can change and grow except with and through others. In the realm of thought, man can claim to be the brain of the world. But under concrete level of real life, where any occurrence will effect both the physical and the spiritual [?] [being,] the world is always the brain of man." It's a beautiful, dialectical thought: In the realm of thought, man can claim to be the brain of the world, but in reality, the world is always the brain of man.

"Because it is in the world that all the thinking forces can be found, the dynamic forces of development and perfectionism, ^{it} is there, too, that the fusion of energies takes place, and where the full quantity of ^{the} intellectual capacities of man can be found. So who could claim to exclude any one school of thought, and one kind of thought, or any one human family, without ^{by} so doing

13791

11

excluding himself, to some extent, from the total society of man. The right (to) exist is established by presence, concept, expression and action. Any group which is denied this fundamental human right must be counted as a loss to the sum total of humanity.

The science resulting from all human knowledge has no nationality. The ridiculous disputes about the origin of such and such a discovery do not interest us since they add nothing to the value of the discovery. It can therefore be said that African unity offers the world a new humanism essentially founded on the universal solidarity and cooperation between people, without any racial and cultural antagonism and without narrow egoism -- it's taken directly from Lenin, I'm sure -- and privilege. This is above and beyond the problem of West Africa and as far removed from the quarrels which divide the highly developed countries as are the conditions and aspirations of the African people." It's a beautiful, beautiful statement.

We have the three levels of newness. The new in Capital: we'll begin with primitive accumulation of capital and give it both its historic and ^{its} present meaning. The newness in the Science of Logic: the emphasis on subjectivity as the center and the stage which we face -- the further concretization of the Absolute Idea is that. And the newness in Africa, where they raise it, not as the worker in automated industry raises it, as labor, but as totally new humanism, and that which refuses to divide the world either on nationalities, or races, or even height of scientific development. That is, so to speak, the first part.

The second part is, to stress what is new in relationship to M&F and this book. What are the differences, what are we doing now, that is different from the principles which we established in M&F? The first: as against past revolutions...you remember we begin with the three revolutions that gave birth to this machine age and consequently to Marxism later on. 1776 in America, which comprises both the national

12
revolution and industrial revolution; 1789 in France; and the philosophical revolution in Germany. We begin with three past revolutions. As against that beginning in M&F, we will begin in the new book with the present revolutions, no later than 1956. Now let me stress that a little bit in order to show what that means.

You remember that as we were working on M&F, and working out the new Humanism for our age, the Hungarian Revolution occurred, in 1956, and we hurried up and put it in, very correctly, ^(It's) sort of incidental ^(or) a proof. Why did we need to explain it further, drag Hungary in, ⁽ⁱⁿ⁾ the the Afro-Asian pamphlet? The answer lies in the following: We acted towards new Humanism in M&F as if that was an invention of our mind. That we were very good and faithful Marxists, we found what Marx really meant and said, and we were hereby giving it to the world. All of which is true.

What 1956 Revolution showed was, yes that's true, but everybody ~~was~~ in the world ^{is} doing it. You're not so wise. These people know ~~nothing~~ nothing about you and they're doing it. But when it first happened, as we were still working on M&F, the new of the Hungarian Revolution was the Workers Councils. And it remains a new. We stressed that. But new Humanism as the guiding light and the openly acknowledged philosophy -- that we didn't know until later. So that in the African, who had made us see Humanism because they were questioning it on a different level -- they were questioning, must they go through capitalism because they must industrialize? What are they going to do, from being an underdeveloped economy, to wanting to be a socialized land when they do not have industry? And that made us go back and find out the new Humanism, and the old Humanism, wasn't

13793

something out of our head. We were very smart, but all these ~~other~~ people were much smarter than us because they were realizing it, instead of just thinking about it.

We will therefore begin with the present era of revolutions, and if we finish the book in 1961, it will culminate with the African revolutions and the Latin American. I will say very little about Latin America, even though we might in the discussion, but it will actually be a much ~~smaller~~ ^{bigger} part of the book, than it will sound here. That's the first difference, then, between Marxism and Freedom, and the new book; the difference between the past revolutions, and ~~the~~ beginning with the new revolutions.

The second is the difference on the national question and the Negro question. First, let me say two things on the new in Africa and the new to us as method. We have often stressed -- some of you may be new and ~~may~~ not know it -- that because we base ourselves on the self-activity of the masses, and know that that has always been the reconstructive force in history; that because of that method, and because of that confidence, and because of that identity of ourselves and our ideas with the great masses of people, the self-activity of the masses, we can find, even historically so to speak as scholars, things that nobody finds who is a scholar and is nothing ~~like~~ but a scholar. And as proof we show it in the American Revolution, Civil War, the part that the Negro played, both in stimulating the Civil War.. But one of the things that came in our development of the Negro Question that did not enter in the book, even though it entered in some of our writings, and now we want to make the Negro Question a very, very big part of the book, was to show that the Populist movement, which followed after Reconstruction failed through the conniving of the northern bourgeoisie and the plantocracy, and where the Black laws already existed, and that therefore nobody had

expected any movement of the Negroes at all, and it's not recorded anywhere. But because our method of thinking, our philosophy, was based on that, we looked far enough so that suddenly we found in one little footnote in Commons' History of Labor that the Populist movement of the Negroes, right in the center of the south at the height of the Black laws, and all that goes with it, were the greatest organization the Negro had seen... half a million or three-quarters of a million people, strong enough to elect congressmen, representatives, senators, and challenge even on the national scale.

The African revolutions are making people see the same thing in Africa, not only that they have a history, which other people didn't, but certain parts of those people who even knew that it's impossible for people to exist and not to have had a history, don't realize what revolt meant. For example, one of the popular, not only misconceptions, but truisms in a certain sense, that West Africa is fortunate enough not to have too great a white population, ^{or} practically no white population, ^(s) because of the tse-tse fly, a certain fly with disease, the white man couldn't stand it so he didn't cultivate West Africa. That is, he took it over and exploited it, but on the whole he didn't live there like he lived in East Africa, North Africa, and therefore became the counter-revolution and made it harder for you to gain your freedom.

Now comes a book -- I haven't yet gotten it but I know what it's all about -- by Dr. K. Onwuka Dike, in which he proves that the reason the white man was so late in capturing Nigeria was not the tse-tse fly, but 400 years -- 400 years! -- of African revolt. The chiefs wouldn't let them get in. It took that long to pacify and destroy them, with all the modern weapons that they had, and Africa did not.

The National Question as it was placed in M&F was to show that,

for example, the Irish Revolution -- and it would apply to the Negro Question in America -- was a stimulus to bringing on the actual proletarian revolution. The Irish Revolution came first, 1916, and then 1917 came the Russian Revolution. In our country it would be better, because the Negroes aren't in another country but right in this country; they were a vanguard force. What is new for this book, is that the National Question, because of the race, because now the particular national involved is a Black race, and the Black race is a world race, that we're going to have the world aspects of the National Question.

Not only is that new, but we will therefore be able to involve and bring up to date all of our great work on the Negro Question. And nobody's done as great a work as us, even if it was in a different period. I just want to show one aspect when we saw it at a different stage, some aspects of it. Some of you who are old may remember from that time, but you know, Gervey movement in 1919 (even I was too young to know too much about it..) was the movement that asked for, a Back to Africa movement, and it got 6 million American Negroes to be members of it. We said, it's quite fantastic. The American Negro is American. If he is joining a Back to Africa movement, it's not because he sees Africa as his country. He doesn't know the language; he doesn't know its history; he was brought here against his will many, many hundreds of years ago. America's his country; America's his language; America is where he wants to remain. Why then does he join this Back to Africa movement? We said it shows the frustrations of the American Negro ever to really get full and complete democracy and freedom in this country. We stressed the fact that he was American, and also that ^{it} was a race question.

As against all the "talented tenth," the Negro intellectuals, who felt that this was a shame, and showed supposedly how backward

the American Negro is, that he goes for such a faker as Garvey. I want you to know that I have found some things that we will just throw down DuBois' throat, because even I didn't know Du Bois was that bad. You know W.E.B. DuBois was one of the greatest of American Negroes insofar as history is concerned. That is, he wrote the great thing, Black Reconstruction. The last few years he's suddenly become a Stalinist, in his old age -- he's in the '30s. He invented the (idea) also that each nation has a "talented tenth." That's where the expression comes from. And this talented tenth would be the one to liberate the nations, not the masses who really reconstruct society, but you just have to bow to your great, big leaders. We knew that that was wrong. We fought him.

But ~~what~~ we didn't know is that so -- at least I didn't know... until I found the resolution in which he had sent to the State Dept. and all that -- that so bitter was his denunciation and feeling against Garvey, that he had actually addressed a demand to the U.S. State Dept. that this man be expelled from this country. Now that's what you call a stool pigeon in a big way... In 1922. And he was then, after that, supposed to be the father of Pan-Africanism but again, demanded a talented tenth ~~we, the~~ a talented tenth would show you -- actually all that he was asking was that people should ~~begin to~~ study Africa or something. And again on this business. So that his new administrative mentality with the Stalinists is nothing new. But as I said, I did not know that he was so bad that it was not only a theory of the talented tenth, but he actually appealed to the State Dept., like any stool pigeon, expel this man from this land.

As contrasted to that, I find that Nigeria--incidentally, this is a very beautiful book even though it's just a bourgeois writing it, and a white man at that--because it's the only one of a lot of books

that are now coming off the press, that at least doesn't just pay attention to figures, or tell you how backward the Africans are supposed to be, or how the economy has to be, but to people. It takes up the nationalist movement in Africa. [I find out, therefore, ^{that} we thought we were so advanced in 1943, ^{when} we rioted in this ~~country~~ and wanted freedom, that the Africans in Nigeria -- and I'm sure happened throughout Africa too -- had a general strike in which they demanded their freedom, complete freedom. They said, Churchill and Roosevelt's ^{...} Atlantic Charter, ^(they felt) that's wonderful, the self-determination of people, they want their self-determination of people. That's what provoked the remark of Churchill, that he didn't come to preside at the head of ^{the} British empire in order to see its dissolution: ~~that~~ that they meant the freedom only for Europe, and not that.

[The wonderful part was that in addition to this general strike that they had in 1945, and demanded their freedom, it wasn't for Nigeria as a country. It was for West Africa, minimum, and perhaps all of Africa. In other words, before they even felt as nationalists, they felt as an African power. ^(and) ^{the} a continent connected with Negroes in America, therefore, a world.

[The ~~second~~ difference, then, is on the national question. And the third difference is on automation. God knows, we have a lot on automation in MAF. We certainly knew that that was the center of development ever since 1950. ^{that} That was the new mode of production. We followed it up with the latest great piece of work, WDA, and nevertheless this will be new, and I'll tell you why.

[We did not consider it from the point of view which will head insofar as the newness of the advanced countries are concerned, and the backward, of what I call discontinuous development.

[For example, you will recall that in the chapter on Russia, I do not go further than 1940 insofar as the economy is concerned. I analyze the three Five Year Plans at the ^{beginning of the} outbreak of the war. And I specify that I do that very deliberately in order to show that there were no unusual features like war to contend with, ^{that} All the capitalist laws that were operating in all the other capitalist ^(countries) were operating with a vengeance ^{where} the state control ^(of) production. Therefore when I go into any part since 1940, it was purely in the ideological field. I show that they have revised Capital, the teaching of Capital; I show that they revised, in 1955, the teaching of philosophy. I show that the jet plane didn't really, wouldn't really, raise the standard of living of the Russian workers.

[Then as it was ^(not only) going to press -- it was already the second one, I don't know, ^(it) ^(probably) cost us \$50 extra to put in that little last paragraph when the Sputnik went up, in which we stressed that the Sputnik does not change anything, that launching satellites in outer space does not solve the problems of this earth.

[That's true, and it's good, but it's not good enough for ^{four} new book. Therefore, in the third difference between MEF and the new book becomes the big third part of my last point, which will ^{have} discontinuous development, mainly in the economy, and all of the new ⁽ⁱⁿ⁾ Science of Logic. Let me go ~~into~~ a little bit ^{into} what I mean, and why it is so important.

[We have reached a stage ever since the smash up of the atom, that it is not just the world market which sets the stage for all that and shows that the law of development ^{is} true in reverse ^{that} is, not only the advanced countries shows the backward country the road of its own development, but the backward country shows the advanced. But when we said it at that time, we limited ourselves to politics, didn't we? We said you cannot have state-capitalism without having ^(the) Mussolinis

and Stalins and so forth. We will do something very, very different now.
Because you have had a situation where there is practically no difference
between science, abstract science, and technology, its actual appli-
cation. There used to be maybe 20 or 30 years. ~~They~~ ^{People} would just leave
you alone, if you were a scientist, you weren't interesting ~~to~~ ^{of} them.
For example, Einstein discovered the theory of relativity in 1905.
It was 1943 before we smashed the atom to prove ~~there was~~ ^{that really} such a theory.
You have 40-year lapse. In certain parts, in relationship to industry,
you ~~are~~ ^{had} less. But minimum, there would be a decade. As a matter of
fact, all of Marx's theories . . . on defining the rate of profit
is built on when it takes you to retool your industry and to build...

Now we have sometimes no difference, and between two and three
years. For example, what was new was that since science united with
the military to break the atom, so they could win the war, science
then united with industry to bring the glories and agonies of automation.

Russia had a certain development from 1928 to 1940, which followed almost
to the point ^{and} except they could do it much faster because they had the
State Plan ^{and} exactly what was happening in the private capitalist coun-
tries. Then you had a war, 1940-45, everything is smashed. 1945-50
takes them to just regain their breath ^{and} be where they were before the
war broke out. The great change is 1950. (Every time I touch anything
that's the year 1950...sticks at me) The great change is 1950.

Because of the automation meant not only in industry but being
able ^{of} leap ahead of even the most advanced country: Sputnik No. 1.
They're not just catching up; we haven't caught up to them yet, so
far as thrust is concerned. We may have some very, very high-faluting
things going up there; we have a lot more than they have. But we have
not yet caught up with the thrust.

What does that mean, outside of what is evident, and that is that war is staring us in the face? It means that by this discontinuous development, just certain of the essentials -- they don't have to have as many cars as we have, or television sets, or better living -- but just by having steel, machine tools, and Sputniks, and above all, H-bombs, they can challenge the greatest power, can't they?

This is the negative aspect of it. It first came to be when Stalin was still alive. The bureaucracy began to see that there was a chance really, of all these times they said catch up, that they could, and perhaps even give a little ^{bit} to the workers who had ^{suffered} so much and had lost 20 million people ^{during} the war. in Russia ^[and pause?] ...to catch your breath. Stalin didn't want to catch his breath. He felt that the H-bomb ^{never mind what would follow from it and automation, was sufficient of a deterrent so they could maneuver ^{in a} war, Korea, especially if someone else is going to fight his wars, which in this case were the Koreans and the Chinese.}

It was not only the most unpopular war in this country -- the Korean War -- it was in Russia too. As soon as that man died, they hurried up and finished ^{with} that war. Why did they? Because they could go back to production. I think the best way to show the positive aspects of this discontinuous development is how wonderful it would be for the under-developed economies. They don't need 100 years or 50 years to catch up with ^{US} These things that are used for explosions so that you can irrigate lands and make canals where there are mountains, and make something else where there's something else (I hope that John will expand some of it) -- but I want to expand some of it, and to give you one book to read, which is a very bad book, but it's worthwhile if you know where to look for it: Fritz Sternberg's new book, I think: it's called Military and Industrial

Revolution of our Era... If you'll just skip all of the nonsense he has you will find at least one half of one chapter, which shows you the following in the development of contrasts between the second industrial revolution, ^{since} automation or since the A- bomb, whichever way you want to use, and the first industrial revolution.

He shows that you began with light industry. Even if you had wanted to begin with heavy industry, you didn't have it yet. There was 50 years difference between ^{we} textile factories ~~had~~ having railways. There was 50 years difference between having railways and having machine tools. There was 50 years difference between having some of the agriculture. ^{For example,} we have always used the fact that it's capitalism's mission, so to speak, to have also introduced mechanization in agriculture, not only in industry. But it was so slow in doing it, that by that time the proletariat has shown itself as an independent force, and the result was that the bourgeoisie decided in each case they would rather connive with the old landlords than go and take a chance of losing all their power with the working class, who didn't want to have any kind of class society.

But he shows ^(that) regardless of that fact, certain parts couldn't have been introduced, in other words, irrigation and some of the things we know in relation ^{to} using atomic energy for building dams and so forth. He actually puts, at one point, the difference as much as 200 years. The backlog of technological development in all fields -- light industry, heavy industry, nuclear energy, automation -- that a country coming on the scene now is 200 years in advance ^(of a country.) He doesn't use that expression. He just says that technology is 200 years in advance of that, but it's actually 200 years in advance for the ~~of~~ country. He therefore says that the difference between town and country, as it will be developed in Africa and Asia and Latin America, will be entirely different than

either what Europe or America knows. I must say, he doesn't know what he's saying, but it's a tremendous thing to say.

Why did Marx at one time talk ^{about} rural idiocy? By the time the proletariat got developed and began its class struggles in the cities, and had all the sophistication and the cohesiveness of being so many thousands in a single factory, the farm workers were very much dispersed, and each one had a tiny little plot of land. You didn't have that cohesiveness. We knew it couldn't have been quite the revolutionary force ^{before, says} the beginning of the 20th century, or at least the last ^{part} of the 19th century.

If it is possible, not merely to build up factories and have your industries, but to build up agriculture and ^{haven't} [having] this wide division between, whether its rural idiocy or rural roads and city roads, you can see that the whole world's history would be different. He admits that it would be different, ^{at least} than America or Western Europe.

In this discontinuous development, we just hint at it a little bit in the Afro-Asian pamphlet; we say it on two levels. One, is that a people mature enough to die for its freedom and get its freedom, is mature enough to reconstruct its own society, have destiny in its own hands. We also show that atomic energy could build up the country more if therefore there would be a development between advanced countries and the other countries. ^[lower?]

The national question opens an entirely new field here, too, which again we took up for the first time in the Afro-Asian pamphlet, but very briefly. I want to stress only one thing of that for this period, in which I'll ⁱⁿ go much more in the actual book but not today. That is the third element of what is new, that is, Lenin, Vol. X, or anywhere you can get a hold of the Theses at the Second Congress, the one which said that for ^{our} narrow egoism, we would have to give it up

if it would be possible to overthrow world capitalism through the underdeveloped countries. Here is what I want to stress, which I merely began in the Afro-Asian Revolution:

[The fight between the Narodniki -- the Populists -- and Lenin, which centered around whether capitalism -- the mir, the commune form of the village, the village could skip capitalism. Lenin fought them very hard and showed that they couldn't and finally won the day. Now in 1920 he turns around, exactly around, and he says, we are completely mistaken about the world. The overwhelming majority of the population of the world are living in Asia and in Africa, and this is underdeveloped countries and it's ridiculous to think that they would have to wait for us. They may be able to overthrow capitalism [for that end.] A lot of journalists and other fancy psychologists are trying to say, he only said it because the European revolution was dead.

[It's true the West European revolution was dead. Germany had not made its revolution, ^{the} Western European countries did not come to the aid of Russia, and he turned East. It's one of these truths that mean absolutely nothing. It just also happened to coincide with something. Therefore, we must review for just a brief moment what was meant by whether or not you could skip capitalism, first for Marx, second for Lenin, and thirdly for us.

[Now, on Marx. You know, the Populists in Russia were the ones that translated Marx's Capital. They considered that they have the real heirs; they wanted to play on that. They wrote him a letter, and the first Marxists had also written him a letter -- Zasluich -- in which they said, You seem to say in your Capital which we just translated that this form of development, this horrible capitalism, that you're describing, we're all doomed to live through it before

we can go to a socialist society. We don't think so. ^{I think that} We have a village commune, ^{that} ~~that we~~ ~~could~~ ~~skip~~ it. Marx generally wrote pretty easily. He wrote that letter over 3 times, and he sent only one aspect of it, and two or three ^{different} versions ~~not~~ not sent. It became quite a fight.

[What did he say? He said, what I have described is true. It was so in Western Europe. It doesn't seem likely that somebody could skip it. But it would be fantastic for me to say ^{that} it can't be skipped because human beings are still the great force in history, and if they can't skip a stage, they can certainly shorten the birth pangs, or what was later known as telescoping.

[The Narodniks ^{therefore} said, this is our ticket ^{to} you all ^{have} follow us instead of the proletariat, ~~that's~~ ~~have~~ the peasantry as the motive force, and not the proletariat as the motive force, for ^{the} new society. [After Marx's death, Lenin came on the scene, and the Narodniki presented their credentials of being the Marxists, and he said, you go to hell. I'm the Marxist, and I don't agree. But he didn't say what he's accused of saying. He did not say we couldn't skip that stage. He said we aren't skipping that stage. He said, what are you giving me a lot of abstractions? Maybe we could, but just look at the actual society. The great big work was, The Development of Capitalism in Russia. He proved in fact, in sociology, in class struggle, and in actual economics that capitalism was there. So he said, I don't want to discuss abstractly whether you can -- we're not. He was not saying ^{that} you couldn't. He said we aren't, and therefore let's be just as Marxist as Marx was in Western Europe.

[In 1920 when he said it, it isn't true that he had no background ^{that's supposed to be} and ~~was~~ the exact opposite of what he had been saying up until ^{the moment} when the West European revolution lost. But even Lenin didn't know it all,

because, you know, when he was speaking about the East, he was [having] China of Sun Yatsen, and a few little countries in the East like Egypt had a little tiny Communist Party. All ~~the~~ ^{this} great tremendous movement that we see in Africa, it was nowhere in his thought. We not only have to consider a new factor in life and a new factor in thought, but the actual reality. that confronts us both in thought and in life.

[To view it, therefore, ~~the~~ ^{there is} this business about a people ~~is~~ ^{is} mature enough to have its revolution, is mature enough to keep destiny in its own hands -- against the background of discontinuous economic development, we must once again return to Hegel.

[Let me first warn you, before we return to Hegel, that I will do some very vulgar things right after ~~I~~ ^{I'm going to} haul out Engels for having done some vulgar things, but it's unavoidable. Here is what I mean by vulgar things. Every one tries to simplify or popularize -- it's rather difficult to understand, this Hegel -- and in a certain sense, they are not wrong, especially if they correctly state that this is our age. I am doing what is necessary for our age. I am not giving you a comprehensive view of Hegel. He didn't quite say that. For example, he wrote a work in which he said that three fundamental laws of the Hegelian dialectic are: the transformation of quantity into quality; two, the unity of opposites; and three, the negation of the negation.

[For a long time, there was one thing that was very unclear to me. The first law is the transformation of quantity into quality. Therefore quantity is supposed to mean nothing, and we always said, 60,000 workers in one factory really means new, so I ~~could~~ ^{could} not understand why he disregards quantity. All I could understand was, evidently it's a new quality when they're 60,000, which is true and not true at the same time. Here is what I mean by vulgarity:

In order for him to say that, which was applicable to his age and was very, very important, it really meant not so much transformation of quantity into quality, but transformation of quantity into a new quality called Essence, in other words, production relations. That's what he was interested in giving you, that it ~~was~~^{was} not the market, it was production relations, right? But then when I started studying Hegel, I realized that little Hegel has an entire book before he ever reaches quality, and that the first category is not, is not, quantity, but quality. That looks ^{very} upside down, ^{therefore} so let me explain it.

He begins by first of all showing ~~that~~ you cannot take anything abstractly. There is no such thing as ^(an) abstract being and an abstract nothing. You're starting with something very definite, a concrete something, whether it's a human being or an inanimate object or nature. A concrete determinate quality, right? That's the very first thing you meet. It's a process of becoming. He begins by denying right off the bat ~~that~~ either being or nothing, and shows the fusion of the two is becoming. In this process of becoming, you begin with a quality, some definite quality, that you're going to overcome, to negate, to get to a higher stage. So the first category is not quantity, but quality.

Not only that. You go through an awful lot of categories when you reach from quality to quantity to measure. In measure -- and we're still all in the first book, the Doctrine of Being, and it's still all just quality, the measure is you jump into Essence. Let me explain that further. First of all, let's get it by degrees. There are three books in the Science of Logic: ^(three parts) the Doctrine of Being, which in political terms is equivalent to the market; the marketplace, where you buy commodities, where you buy labor power, where everything seems to be equal. Then you get to Vol. II, the Doctrine of Essence, and you find

out nothing is equal because all these things that you bought were dead and ^{the object} therefore no change in value, right? Only one ^{thing} ^{was} living in all the millions of commodities ~~that~~ you bought as a capitalist and that was the worker, and out of him you got all the surplus value out, yes? What is equivalent in political economy, Marxist political economy, to the mode of production, the factory, where Marx stays all the rest of the time, is equivalent to the essence, Doctrine of Essence, in Hegel.

Then he moves from the Doctrine of Essence to the Doctrine of the Notion ^{that's the Idea in your thought} and would appear that there is only thought. But it isn't. I'll ^{come} back to that in a minute. All I'm now trying to stress is that by beginning with the law of the transformation of quantity into quality, he skipped the entire Vol. I of Hegel. Now if you want to skip it, that's fine. If it doesn't apply to your period, that's fine. If you don't think it applies to your period, just say so. But you can't therefore popularize and ~~just say~~ ^{it's} so and another age suddenly looks in and finds that even in the Doctrine of Being, there are some tremendous things.

For example, Lenin made his first great leaps before he got to Essence, in Measure. You have one human being, yes? Let's get it down to a quality. Then you have many human beings. Let's get it down to a class, the workers, right? Then you have so many, they become a measure of something, that's your class, yes? You have 60,000 workers in this age in one single factory. That new thing becomes the essence, becomes an entirely new quality. But look how hard you had to work and how many ^{you had} historic periods ~~before~~ ^{before} you ~~came~~ ^{came} ~~to~~ ^{to} this production relation. Not only that; in each single thing you have the universal forms. We know, for example, that the fetishism of commodities is actually not just commodities in the market, but a certain view of

the development of all of society.

[Stalin took these three laws -- transformation of quality into quantity, unity of opposites, and negation of the negation -- and this is what he did. Unity of opposites, he said, ^{is a} only applies to capitalist society, where you have capital and labor; that's your opposites.

In our society, since we don't ^(really have) contradictory opposites, you have just criticism and self-criticism. It's a classless society. The negation of the negation he rightly saw as meaning the abolition of his own society, ^{and} so he didn't like it and ^{sort of} disregarded it. He said it was...

[A lot of the modern scientists who are all beginning ^{to} study Marx are all saying that supposedly since Khrushchev, we have gotten to the stage where once again negation of the negation is in its truthful place. And they prove it by showing ^{that} in the present Dialectical Materialism that are published, negation of the negation is mentioned very prominently, and the very same article, which I used to ^{prove} that they are abolishing, that they are fighting against humanism and negation of the negation, they used to show that it is. So let me explain.

[There was a man by the name of Karpushin. In 1955, he said, that the negation of the negation was very idealistic, it was very mystical, and there is no point to it. But in order to discuss it, you have to reconstitute it. During Stalin's time, they forgot all about the Essays-- the Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic, and the new Humanism Essays, so in the other editions, they weren't published. Before he could attack it, he had to have it before him, so he says, let's republish them. That's what they took as a recognition of the fact that they recognize.

[Why did they have to republish them? Not only because he ~~couldn't~~ ^{couldn't} attack ^{ed} them, something a lot more important. For ^{science}, they had to have negation of the negation. So long as it did not mean subjectivity, so long as negation of the negation ~~could~~ be handled not as society

overcoming another society, or as the human being having all of objectivity in him, the new dimension, the new society ; in order to get from the relativity theory, the theory that all things are relative, ^{the} the various fields are not absolute, and that the unbreakable limit is not just an atom. The atom in turn is full of energy; you break that up, and you find yourself a new little hydrogen bomb, yes? So in order to get to the science, and to see the new stage, unified field theory, see the relationship between electromagnetic field and the other fields, the relationship between matter and energy, in order to get to the H-bomb, to get to the Sputniks, to get to all the things ^{they} they are getting, they needed the negation of the negation, ^{But} and they got very far with it. ^{It} was precisely why they struck out against Hegel, because Hegel, you cannot say, that it applies only to Nature. It's ^{man} ~~is~~ that it the proof of all this, nobody else but man. His subjectivity becomes that important to ~~the~~ us.

Now try another tact to show you on this question of the relationship of Hegel's books. The four books that Hegel himself wrote -- in other words, not the ~~lectures~~ -- is the Phenomenology of Mind, the Science of Logic, the Encyclopedia -- each of these have several books, but I'm coming to that -- and the Philosophy of Right. The Philosophy of Right is ^{where} he approves, so to speak, the Prussian state. It's the political statement. However, I deny that that is the height to which all of these works are moving, because even in the Hegelian system of idealism, the state which he's trying to approve when he can't unite and the people don't unite of themselves, and he's trying to bring in the state all over again to unite, that is not the height of his system. The height ~~state~~ is the Absolute Idea. In other words, it takes a subordinate part. Not only that takes a subordinate part, religion takes a subordinate part. It doesn't

mean God; God comes before the Absolute Idea.

In a word, what I am trying to say is ~~not~~ I am opposed not only to the idealists, and not only to the Marxists who pervert, but to any Marxist Hegelian who says that Absolute Idea is important only insofar as it means method, the dynamic, dialectical method, the development through contradiction. I deny that absolutely.

The Absolute Idea is not only method. And we don't have to throw it out when we throw out Hegel's political conclusions. The Absolute Idea are the objective and subjective means by which a new society is born. Why? How did Hegel happen to get that far?

We saw in Book One he was dealing with Being, yes? Incidentally, all of the Phenomenology is considered just an Introduction to this. Let's consider it in forms of consciousness ^{first} I think it will be easier for us. I'll summarize the whole Phenomenology of Mind in 6 stages and I'll make it really only 2. Each one will be 3. The first 3 are: consciousness, self-consciousness, reason. Here is what they mean. You are become aware of something, an object outside of yourself, or the world. You suddenly become aware that you and the world, or you and this thing, is not one and the same thing. You are conscious of objects. Then you move to self-consciousness. You are conscious of yourself. The minute you are conscious of yourself, you have reached a higher stage, because it means your relations with other men. That's where he has the great thing about Lordship and Bondage, right ~~there~~ ^{away are} you ^{are} ^{ing} reach a class society.

Then you reach what to him is Reason, the third stage in this first part I'm talking about, which is capitalism, in other words, the revolution. has finally eliminated feudalism and established the suppositions of a free society. Somehow things don't look very good there do they? That's your first part of the three. Now watch the

second part of the three. [The second three is: spirit, religion, Absolute Idea. That's your 6 stages of self-consciousness. In the Spirit he finds what we would say, what happens after, yes? The state has already been established, you had your revolution, you now have your state. The man is very unhappy -- the alienated spirit. All these things we quoted against Mao Tse-tung and the "haughty vassal" and feeling himself identification with state power making ^{you} unhappy nevertheless.

← You go through what Marx said in his Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic, whole stages which Hegel didn't criticize, but there is your essence of criticism of the state. [You move away from the state into what you think is an abstraction and what will give you happiness -- religion, including the arts. He considers the various arts as one of the forms of religion, whether it's great tragedy or great comedy, or music or any one of the arts. Maybe some people are happy in it, but he is not. He's showing that the superstructure, even for those that it favors, once the spirit is such, once the what happens after is such, he is unhappy with it. That is why he moves from spirit, from religion and the arts, to the Absolute Idea. [He moves to a stage where he will unite theory and practice, the subject and the object, the divine and the human knowledge, by a ^{dimension of the} new human being who will have all of this. By trying (or) make the man whom he did understand -- even if he understood him only as a philosopher -- as the height of ^{the} development to reach the new society. The new dimension was it. He never varied from it, ^{not} even when he became the state philosopher. The Absolute Idea was always separate and apart from the others and nothing would let you forget it, because what was Absolute Knowledge over here, became Absolute Idea over here, and became Philosophy of Mind.

What else does he do in the Science of Logic? He had already explained ~~to~~ on the various stages of self-consciousness, ^{here} where you have already moved all the way from primitive society to ancient Greece to the French Revolution, to Prussian state and the ^{Lutheran} Reformation. He now sees that he had ~~never~~ taken any of these fields separately. He took up the totality of reality as he saw it, which we would call superstructure—the sciences, the arts, the state, all of the things that confronted you in what he called objective mind. He wants to relate all of these, in forms in which they would apply, whether you're talking about nature, whether you're ~~talking~~ talking about science, whether you're talking about the human being. So that the notional categories in the Science of Logic must be abstract. He couldn't possibly have had them concrete. I'm sorry I have to be so idealistic, but they couldn't have applied to all of these things. ^[?] He was distilling 5000 years of the human spirit, in itself as a human being, as humanity, in the sciences, in nature, in the objective world, and saying, ^{where} is all this going to lead to? He tried to say, ^[leads?] this is what it means. This is what we call the pull of the future on the present, or what he called the World Spirit. He was moving in that society.

Far from negating the negation being anything abstract, or needing to stand...on its feet, ^{so that} we know it means the society as a whole, ~~the~~ new society, we are moving to the fact of subjectivity, more or less, exactly as Hegel moved, ^(only) in 1960, and as Marxists, not Hegelians.

When we understand that -- incidentally, the Phenomenology of Mind, ^{is} all these lectures ~~are~~ actually concretizations of what he did. In other words, the Phil of History, and the History of Phil, and the Aesthetics--History of Fine Arts, and the Hist. of Religion -- every one is taken up in a series of lectures proving what he's already stated

in here, developing further from history, and that's when we get all these things about freedom, and showing that freedom has always been the central feature and the ?

If we are able to develop this subjectivity without being afraid that we'll be called subjective, we will finally have understood the modern age as it is in the underdeveloped economies who can, because of the maturity of the age, not only ask for freedom, and not only ask what happens after, but wanting to make that what happens after to be this totally new dimension of society. And we cannot really know it until we have visited Africa.