

Alger
Andy

Oct/23, 1968

Dear Colleagues:

I've made some important changes in the form of the book which I'd like to discuss with you as I'm sending the friends the new section on the Grundrisse. If you will now look at Part I, Why Hegel? Why Now? which is now complete, you will see at once the new decision. It is to have each part of Philosophy and Revolution end on the current scene. In this case, the appearance of reality is via State-Capitalism and Marxist Humanism, which I have decided belongs here instead of, as I originally conceived it, when I analyse Economic Reality and the Dialectics of Liberation. Thus Part I now contains the following: Ch. I--Hegel ---40 pages. Now that a new section on the Grundrisse had been added to Ch. II--Marx --that chapter has grown to 54 pages. Ch. 3 - Lenin --will have besides the 12 pages sent last, S-C & M-H. As you see this works out logically as well since, though that pamphlet deals with the state-capitalism of our age, it, in fact, revolved totally around Lenin's conception of the proletariat as "Subject." (I don't recall how many pages the pamphlet is, but I would guess that Part I as a whole now numbers over 125 pages and thus constitutes half of the whole book.)

As I now conceive Part II, Economic Reality and the Dialectics of Liberation, that first chapter I sent out will be very much revised and expanded as well as go back in time to the 1930's, though only briefly. For the new, really new here is that Ch. 2 would be Leon Trotsky and Mao as Theoreticians. Paradoxically as that sounds, the two do belong together since not only, chronologically, did they remain after Lenin's death, but, in fact, each was an alternative also to Stalin. It is true that LT always thought of himself as the link with Lenin and, while we have demolished that pretension, we still allowed him to appear as within the Marxist movement while Mao was excluded from it and treated, more or less, as a continuation of Stalin. It just isn't true. Of course, he didn't fight Stalin, and Trotsky died doing so. But Mao was creating something quite independent of Stalin. Jamming Trotsky against Mao means that his theory of permanent revolution will not only be dealt with theoretically, but as undergoing the test of objective reality by way of another's theory who considered himself a Marxist, and who, in any case, did answer within a movement that was not in power, with a very different theory than either Lenin or Stalin, Trotsky or the latecomer Castro. That I shouldn't have seen Trotsky and Mao as facets of a single problem appears to me now to be a "leftover" of treating Trotsky as link with Lenin though we have long denied it. It was some sort of Trotsky's hangover. In any case this brings us through WW II which was something that Lenin couldn't possibly have imagined, and ends only when from practice comes the Hungarian Revolution and from theory Marxist-Humanism and we appear.

To work all this out will take some time--a month at least, maybe more. In any case, I do not wish to bother now with Sartre who was thought of as alternative and probably will still appear so for the new French situation makes him very important still; though he is not of the Movement, neither is the New Left of the Marxist movement. What is a great deal more important, and for the moment I remain stuck, is this: How to bring in "black thought" which seems determined, if we are to judge by the loudmouths who are the nationalist leaders now. This is why I thought I would like to call a "black conference" in Detroit at the beginning of the new year. Though all of us will be present, the point is I want all white members (except me, ah!) to sit in back while the blacks plus those they invite talk up after I have presented the problem from the book's viewpoint. What do you think? Yours, Raya

14045