

PERSPECTIVES REPORT TO THE  
CONVENTION OF NEWS & LETTERS,  
Sept. 5, 1970

# WHAT IS THEORY?

or

"HISTORY AND ITS PROCESS"

by

*Raya Dunayevskaya*

- I - The Dualities in the Myriad Crises
- II - Recession, especially Unemployment,  
especially among Black Youth
- III - What is Theory? -- "History and its process"
- IV - Once again, "History and its Process":  
The Forces of Revolution and the Dialectic  
of Praxis

A N D

- Ⓔ Excerpts from the Convention Discussion
- Ⓕ Discussion on the Motto

Post-Convention Bulletin No. 1, October 1970

NEWS & LETTERS

415 Rainard St., Detroit, Mich.

PRICE 35¢

4431

Raya Dunayevskaya

WHAT IS THEORY?

Philosophy and Revolution vs. Totality  
of Crisis and the Bankruptcy of Thought

1. The Qualities in the Myriad Crises

That Lord of plagues, W. P. Agnew, has returned from the Nixon-ordered S. E. Asia tour where he assured the most reactionary militaristic governments, US imperialism's favorite puppets, that withdrawal of US troops notwithstanding, Nixon-Agnew will continue with the Vietnam war and its extension into Cambodia, to which the Nixon-Agnew jackals have, against the express desires and struggles of the American people, just committed the US to plush and many-bombed support.

not  
As if Lon Nol was a despicable enough ally, Agnew dared also invite that open admirer of Adolf Hitler, the S.W. Agnew counterpart, VP Ky, to view American civilization as if that weren't already on trial. If the KY invitation is put into effect -- and already there is a neo-fascistic organization -- wasn't it that demagogue Huey P. Long who said that when fascism comes to America it will be called "anti-fascism"? -- who has offered to arrange a "rally" -- I repeat if that "rally" is held, we can surely expect yet a new bloodletting!

And as if that weren't enough plagues, Agnew at once addressed a Legion convention and called for more police truncheons against "anarchism". He must mean that of the trigger-happy cops added to the National Guards and "regular" military, including the retired provocateurs: which "anarchists" added to their long list of murders of blacks the murders of two Mexican-Americans whose homes they invaded exactly in the manner of SS troops in Nazi Germany and shot in cold blood? And which anarchists just chalked up Ruben Salazar's assassination while this respected Mexican American journalist was not even marching in that massive, magnificent Chicano demonstration against the Vietnam war, but only sitting at a bar gathering a story? And compounded this "anarchist" murder by allowing no one to come to his aid as he lay in death agony from a "tear gas" bomb?

These "upholders of the law" against alleged anarchists Agnew is encouraging to use their truncheons more wildly still.

When suburbia as affluent as Royal Oak and Birmingham, Michigan, likewise break out in bloody confrontations with the cops it should be clear even to such fluent and affluent snobs as Agnew that American "civilization" is not just "on trial" but adjudged guilty by a whole new generation of Americans.

All these manifestations, we must bear in mind are but the phenomena of the totality of the crisis, whether it is the economy or the politics of American capitalism we're looking at. The "drug culture", too, is but appearance of the insanities to which US imperialism's drive for world mastery is driving the nation, especially its youth.

Unfortunately, what appears as alternative to this drive for world disorder, as if it were only US driving for world mastery, as if the world

-2-

wasn't divided into two nuclear titans -- Russia as well as the US-- Mao's China helps further to divert eyes from labor exploitation, to so-called cultural revolution; in truth China, on the one hand, and Japan, on the other hand, are looking for "their place in the sun"!

WHO, INDEED, WILL BE AROUND TO PICK UP THE PIECES, if any pieces there will remain, after a nuclear confrontation? Who is madman enough to think there will be a civilization left?

As if there weren't sufficiently burdensome dualities, we also have the jokers -- those who play with revolution and do, through mindless threats, where not actual bombings, endanger the genuine revolutionary forces.

The latest nonsense, "Dial-a-Revolutionary"-- dial it and you will hear Bernadine Dorn or Abbie Hoffman telling high school kids to get their guns!

This love of the gun, as if those who get their power out of the barrel of a gun -- the imperialists -- are any one to emulate!

The truth is that this arrogant and empty rhetoric not only diverts from both the objective situation and mass forces of revolution but also shows, when it comes to bankruptcy of thought, they are brothers under the rhetoric.

What the objective world situation shows is that there has been no peace since the end of World War II. The chief markers set up in Europe between East and West Germany, are there to point to the next war. At first they were followed by the Cold War between the erstwhile "Allies", Russia and the United States. The Berlin Blockade hardly ended when a hot war in Korea broke out. After three bloody years of wars, we had new markers set up -- this time between North and South Korea. Next came the first Indochina war which ended with the defeat of French imperialism. Russia and China then collaborated with the US and the West to force Vietnam to accept its division between North and South. This war is, by now once again so heated, so degenerate, so overwhelming that, clearly, US imperialism simply never intends to end it, as that lord of plagues, Agnew, has once again made clear. So once again, even the less benighted rulers talk out of both sides of their mouths -- talk "peace" and prepare for war.

At first sight (or perhaps I should say at stratospheric sight of capitalist diplomacy) reality would appear to have gotten off the precipice of war and moved toward peace.

The three areas of "dotente" that have been pointed to are: First, the two world super-powers' engagement in talks about strategic arms limitations. Though these are only talks and not contracts, and though Nixon used it only as a means to get the Senate to approve still one more ABM site, the SALT talks have been played up as a step "in the right direction."

Secondly, and a little more tangible, is the non-aggression pact between Moscow and Bonn. It is being played up, however, as nothing short of a "Turning Point for the whole of Europe." (LaHonde)

4433

-3-

No doubt, if your point of departure is the Khrushchev era that ended so abruptly, not only because of the conflict with China and the home economic crisis, but also for just "thinking" about flirting about just such a possible trade agreement with West Germany, then this may, indeed, look like a new ball game. Moreover, wasn't Czechoslovakia's flirtation with West Germany given as the excuse for Russia's invasion?

Clearly, Ulbricht also hasn't been overjoyed with it. After all, he wants no opening to West Germany where Brandt may be once again sowing illusions about "reunification of Germany", and to keep labor confined he must keep strengthening that WALL.

But economic crises -- like all rulers fearful that that may become their downfall--he does understand, and Russia is in a deep economic crisis. No stagnation of the economy more than parallels that in the US. Furthermore, it is beset by a low productivity of labor, and state-capitalists calling themselves Communist do know, though they never admit it, that low labor productivity is not a sign of "backwardness" but shows the exact degree of workers' resistance to state plans.

Its "reformers" are trying to roll history so far back that they are now asking that one of the few labor laws protecting labor still on the Russian books -- the 1928 law that makes it obligatory for factory managers to find new employment for workers laid off -- be repealed. It is doubtful that Brezhnev would openly make so backward a step, but to try to raise productivity he has been importing whole plants to shore up the economy. From West Germany he expects to import plants of everything from chemicals to Volkswagens. (And the other day, Secretary of Defense Laird said that, though the Ford truck deal was not approved, it may be in the future! Nothing like a fat contract to warm the cockles...)

Nevertheless, the fact that Russia, on the one hand, is in an economic crisis, and that Brandt, on the other hand, assured "the West" that the Pact would not take him out of NATO for it was entered into "free of illusions" is proof enough that it is little more than a glorified commercial treaty, hardly more serious than China's deal with Canada some years back, though that was for wheat instead of steel.

The third reason for the hallelujas about "peace" is, of course, the Middle East. There the guns that were blazing across the Suez Canal are silent. There the Arab governments directly involved (if not the Palestinian commandos) are talking about negotiations, if not directly with Israel, at least via the UN.

But this, too, needs further examination. There is no doubt that Russia which has been adamant on opening the Suez Canal even if it meant still another war and the crushing of Israel is now singing a different tune. But is that fact proof of a fundamental change, either in its designs on Suez or its anti-Semitism?

If the opening of the Suez Canal is possible to achieve without a war, it would be cheaper, and for that, what was needed most was to convince US that Russia would not give up a single iota of its new Middle East sphere of influence, SAH'S 2 and 3 on the Suez Canal included.

4434

-4-

All we can be sure of at the moment is that the US has, for the time being, decided that rather than face a confrontation with Russia at a time chosen by Israel, it prefers to give in to Russia. After all, it is not the US, but Israel, who will have to pay the piper. And the US can change its position every time its imperialist interests temporarily change.

Like Khrushchev who had to tell Mao, in 1959, that this was not the time for all-out war, so Brezhnev had to tell Nasser. The response to Russia from its ally this time was affirmative. After all, it is Nasser's Egypt that is undergoing the bombing by Israel.

Nasser decided therefore to disregard both the Iraqi government (which had been talking loud, but had done no fighting whatever in the 1967 war) and the Palestinian commandos who are engaged only in harassing tactics. (Let's not forget that China is much warmer than Russia, not only to El Fatah but to the more extreme Palestinian "Popular Front".)

For its part, the US has laid down its nuclear-backed non-negotiable condition for "supporting" Israel with well paid for jets. You must be at the negotiating table.

What we have here is some moves on the chess board of "hoch-politik" that did seem unlikely a while back (and may only have been made to establish alibis for the next confrontation).

But what is of the essence is that these moves were made, not because there have been a lessening of crises, but so great a heightening of them, and not only in the Middle East, but at the home bases of the two super-powers -- that they were compelled to try for a breather in their conflicts abroad.

To see the direction of the crises, what we have to do is look at those home bases, thereby confronting the real opposition: the class struggles in each country. We look, briefly, at Russia's. The more important for us as American revolutionaries is the US.

## II. Recession, especially Unemployment, especially among the Black.

The Draft Thesis, in analyzing the present recession, pointed to three crucial factors.

One, the stagnation of the economy. For example, as against the annual rate of accumulation in 1969 of \$10 billion, the increase this year was down to near zero.

Two, the planned unemployment -- and it is chronic by now --- was accompanied by unplanned inflation, which was a real "first".

Nixon, who loves to boast of all his "firsts", does not want this "pure recession." (when inflation continues though economic activity is down, this is called "pure recession") attributed to his administration. It's not supposed to have happened, but it did. Because the United States is a world economic giant, it affects all other countries. It isn't that capitalism, private and state, aren't all characterized by inflation and

-5-

waste-destruction=production. It doesn't, however, become catastrophic except during war-time when they come up with still newer tricks, like wage and price controls, to keep the inflation in "manageable" proportions. For the country that loses the war, it's always unmanageable. Then the US comes in to save capital from revolution. But now they are in trouble, in deep trouble.

The seriousness of the present inflation is that even those people who do not have an ongoing war like Vietnam (as in Japan which is experiencing the highest rate of growth in the world and is paying the workers some of the lowest wages in industrialized nations) likewise suffer from inflation.

In a word, so decrepit is world capitalism, so impossible has it become for it to have any prolonged peace, that inflation has become, as the OECD openly puts it, "... the most pronounced and most general since the Korean war. There are almost no areas of stability and this marks a major change for the worse."

As always, the depth of the crisis manifests itself in the conditions of the workers, especially black workers. And this time it hits especially hard on the youth who can't even get jobs.

The BIS has just released statistics regarding jobs for teenagers. Among other things, they illuminate the sharp cleavage between what the average rate of unemployment is and what it is for teenagers. Thus, the average rate presently is 5.7%. For teenagers it is 15.7%. For black teenagers it jumps to 20%. This is about what the Draft Thesis estimated the averages of unemployment to be in the inner cities. Now, however, it turns out to be an understatement when what is under consideration is not the average, even when the average is limited to the inner cities.

For, when it comes to black teenagers -- and we must not forget that these are not merely grammar school kids, who will be going back to compulsory school when fall comes; these are the age group of 16 to 21 -- it jumps to no less than a shocking 30.2%. Even that does not end the bleak picture. In individual cases, such as Wichita, Kansas, the overwhelming majority of all black teenagers are unemployed; the precise figure is no less than 75%.

The stark truth is that capitalism is so decrepit by now that unemployment is a permanent feature of our most affluent times, that in the recession we are experiencing now, the unemployment situation among blacks is so chronic and massive that here the recession is a full scale depression.

Yet, the capitalists keep acting surprised that little known places like New Bedford, Massachusetts, suddenly jump on to the front page of the newspapers as they explode in ghetto uprisings.

Insofar as capitalists are concerned, however, what towers above all is the decline in the rate of profit.

The mass of profits are lush enough -- the extraction of unpaid hours of labor continues in an unbridled way in both private and



-6-

state capitalism. There is no way for capitalism to overcome the insoluble contradiction between the motive force of production, which can come only from living labor, and the method of production, which requires more and more machines.

What is new this time is that the capitalists who have been able to attenuate this built-in contradiction with a whole bag of market manipulations -- mass production, state orders for bloated armaments, industrial holocaust on the part of the US against its best West European allies, as well as against the underdeveloped lands -- find that it just no longer works to stop the decline in the rate of profit. This is surely the first time that even an ongoing war, costing 30 billion dollars a year, couldn't do it!

Whereupon the capitalist is trying to get it out of the hide of the workers. The beginning and end of all problems of capitalism, private or state or "mixed", in its imperialist expansion and otherwise, is extracting it from the workers.

The workers' resistance to the speed-up, the forced overtime and forced under time, stiffens both on the job and off the job. (It may surprise some of the New Left youth whose isolation from the proletariat makes them think the workers are "part of the system" that at this very moment the biggest point management in auto is making is that the workers just don't seem "to care" any more, that absenteeism is so prevalent, that production lines can barely get going Mondays and Fridays.)

In all cases, the capitalist then tries for still one more machine in place of what he considers "the intractable hand of labor". Just as at the end of World War II, when the restlessness of workers led to a drop in labor productivity relative to the profits the capitalists wanted to extract and expand, and President Truman kept calling conferences on labor productivity which led to the speedy introduction of Automation; so, this time Nixon had but one answer to the general cry against inflation and the specific cry of capitalists about labor productivity, and this is to appoint still one other Commission of Study. Will they now come up with the fully automatic factory? It won't help. It won't "eliminate" the laborers. Their problems will first have begun -- if they live that long!

The crisis is now. I have limited myself to the economic aspects only because, one, this is the basis for the crisis in labor contracts, and in the relations, it should be added, between the reactionary labor bureaucracy -- Nixon's men there, not merely the hard-hats, but Moany himself -- and in the rank and file. Not only is the gulf between them unbridgeable in general, but it is even more true in relationship to the blacks. Like the whole country, there is no doubt that racism enters the labor movement. But, as we saw, at critical points, whether it was the defeat of Goldwater, or now daily conditions of labor, labor solidarity from the teamsters to the women-- does show itself. As Bob, in New York, expressed it:

At the place where I work, there wasn't a black or Puerto Rican there three years ago. The white workers are always muttering about this and even the college students who work over the summer make remarks about how easy it used to be to get work. But when it comes to on-the-job actions,

-7-

I've never heard a white not back a black against the boss. So beyond the question of race, the key thing is getting N&L views around; not because we're a "vanguard", but because of the experiences we've encapsulated, we see the forces of revolt not only as muscle, but as creative forces, too.

Two: The political crisis, Nixon's wars abroad and at home, are all too obvious. The Draft Thesis and the special 12page N&L dealt with these in one respect. The point here is:

Who are the forces who will bring down capitalism? And how will they do it? Why has capitalism, which has long since outlived its usefulness, had the proverbial 9 lives of a cat? Isn't it because revolutionary moments were too often lost. It becomes crucial to look at not only desires for revolution, but at that which Marx called "history and its process"; at the underlying theories which either succeed in preparing revolutionaries to meet the objective and spontaneous challenges of the time or help them lose those moments.

### III. What is Theory? "History and its process"

Theories galore are being offered by rootless intellectuals to the youth so actively visible, not only on the anti-Vietnam war front, but also in more organic ways to reshape the world they did not make and which is rotting.

Unfortunately, this being the age of state-capitalism, papal imperialist wars and overwhelming might, those who reject the proletariat as revolutionary force are looking for shortcuts to revolution. The most perverted forms of all, we must repeat, are mindless terrorism and bombings.

The obverse side of this, but organic to the rejection of the proletariat, the embrace of shortcuts to revolution, as well as the headlong plunge to "instant theory" are both for those who keep looking at the world as if it consisted of countryside, whereas, in fact, as Latin America shows, the most spectacular events happened in cities -- not only in Western Europe (Paris, 1968) but in the Third World itself.

If theory were a mere question of reading books or being world travellers, invited world travellers, it should be added, by existing state powers, "progressive" though they be, then, of course, there would be no need to follow the movement from below, from practice. The last thing our self-styled theoreticians think about is listening to workers, to the masses. And, though they talk much about Marx, they have not the slightest conception, or even feeling for what Marx meant by "history and its process", or how praxis, not books, led to the dialectic working out of a philosophy of revolution.

Take so simple a question as the Machine. (The other question we will be discussing is the concept of revolution. But let us begin with the machine here, not only because that is where Herbert Marcuse's departure from Marxism begins. It is also where our modern age began, and so did Marxism. It is still where the capitalist crisis, on the



-8-

one hand, and the impasse of the New Left, on the other hand, are at

The Machine. Marx wrote a magnificent analysis of the Machine in Grundrisse: Being a dialectician as well as a revolutionary, the subject of machinery was never dealt with apart from its opposite, the laborer.

The strife between workman and machine is there, but, as worked out in this first draft, the concentration was on the logic of technology's development from a complex tool to a full automaton, at which point the worker might stand outside of the production process. The year was 1858, Marx decided not to publish this section. Then in 1859 he published Critique of Political Economy, i.e. 2 chapters of the Grundrisse.

This is not the place to go into the whole of the Grundrisse. (It will be dealt with in full in the new book, Philosophy and Revolution) Here we must limit ourselves only to what Herbert Marcuse quotes about being "outside of" production process. Not only does it not mean anything that Herbert Marcuse attributes to it, but what is of the essence is that Marx's decision not to publish was not because it was "wrong". It was not concrete enough. The changes he introduced reveal the dialectic method in full; that is not only as concerns technology but as it develops out of "history and its process", so it is a question of method. It concerns theory, not only theory as such, but the idea of theory, Marx's most original contribution since it is

out of praxis that this idea of theory, his philosophy of liberation as a philosophy of human activity, flows.

Marx states that if one studied the history of inventions, he would be able to see how inseparable from it is the revolt of the workers. The worker resists the mindless substitute for every move of his hand -- the machine.

To counter the workers' resistance to the new forms of exploitation, the capitalist, or rather his scientist, keeps inventing every new way of getting rid of the laborers' "intractable hand".

This strife between worker and machine, worker and capital, Marx, as I showed, called "history and its process." The key word is process. That is to say, the concrete process of this strife discloses what the workers are doing, the multitude ways they are fighting capitalism at the point of production, and the questions they are posing on every facet from the length of the working day, the kind of labor men should do, the relationship of labor to life.

Marx, in deciding to rewrite, begins posing questions to Engels who was inside the factory even though not as a worker: what is it that the workers did who were displaced by machinery? Not as unemployed, but what new jobs do they get? What is labor like? What is the new machine? He decided to take a course in Machinery himself, but, most of all, to keep his eyes glued on the relationship of machine and labor, those inseparable, the contradictions, the revolts, their spontaneity.

No one can ever predict when and how revolutions will break out but how does one prepare himself to be there? (theoretically)

The genius of Marx starts now (in Capital) telling the historic narrative and out of it emerges historic reason. Because, to begin with, it was immanent in the actions of man, in workers' self activity.

So, as he tells the story of Machinery in 1867, as against 1858, narrative and reason become one, and as historical materialist he launches into an attack not only on capitalists but on those he calls "abstract materialists", the scientists, before whom our age bows so, and not only for not "knowing" the economic laws of capitalism, but for having missed entirely "history and its process."

Now then 100 years pass. The automaton Marx predicted has come to life, even the word is hardly different from the one he used. The new word is Automation. It is overpowering. The workers react one way -- general strikes, wildcats, revolts. The scientists, the labor bureaucrats as well as management help defeat the workers in first round. Out comes now the academic Marxist, the one who in 1941 could write Reason and Revolution, but by 1960 is overcome by the new technology because he is so isolated from the modern proletariat, that he now decides that the proper characterization of our age is one-dimensional society and so he names his worker, One Dimensional Man.

As against Marx, who never looked at machines without looking at the absolute opposite, the men who operate and fight them, Herbert Marcuse sees not contradiction, but "integration", thereby killing at one and the same time, the Hegelian dialectic and the Marxist concept of class struggles.

One Dimension Man does succeed in proving one thing -- the one-dimensionality of Herbert Marcuse's thought. It can't get out of its confines during the four years between its publication, 1964, and Paris, 1968, although the anti-Vietnam war movement so intensified the US after Johnson's wanton bombing of North Vietnam that a veritable new generation of revolutionaries were developed, and, by 1968, the student alliance with workers, 10 million of them on strike, nearly topples DeGaulle.

Instead, -- though he is given credit for that with which he had nothing to do -- he moves, inexorably, from departing from Marx's analysis of machinery, to throwing overboard nothing short of Marx's concept of revolution itself: "the Marxian concept of a revolution (that phrase is underlined by him, rd) carried by the majority of the exploited masses, culminating in the 'seizure of power' and in the setting up of a proletarian dictatorship which initiated socialization, is 'overtaken' by the historical development...." (and that last phrase is likewise underlined by Herbert Marcuse. Now Left Review, #56, 7-8, 1969).

And, though he once again says this is not a revision of Marxism but an Aufhebung (transcendence) of a historical condition, he cannot resist hitting out against Marx's concept: "one aspect, however, seems to be incompatible with this interpretation. There is, in Marx, a strain that may be called a rationalistic, even positivistic prejudice ... (about) 'highest stage of human development'"

-10-

There is no point here to go into Marcuse's intellectualistic, vanguardist disposal of the proletariat as any revolutionary force, his "objective" alternative -- the hybrid of the Third World revolutionaries headed by Cuba and China, who will co-exist "more or less peacefully" with Russia. One can see its egotistic subjectivism better when we look at what alternative Marcuse proposes insofar as the task of revolutionary intellectuals is concerned. This reduces itself to a return to cultural enlightenment -- "Radical Enlightenment."

Or, as the more original and talented turner of phrases, Jean-Paul Sartre puts it in these days of continued enthusiasm for "Cultural" Revolutions: "Culture is the 'Practice' which elucidates itself in defining what it is doing."

Culture is hardly the "practice" (with or without quotation marks) which was the stuff out of which Marx created Historical Materialism.

Where the "historicist" Marcuse throw overboard Marx's concept of revolution, Sartre tells the youth to reject history: "What benefit can you get" (writes Sartre despite his proclaimed conversion to Marxism which was supposed to have led his "acceptance" of history and his writing of the Critique de la Raison Dialectique) "from learning something about the Punic Wars or the Crusades?"

Well, I'm not sure that I'm an expert on either the Punic Wars or the Crusades, but I know Sartre has an awful lot to learn from the history of Maoism, a philosophy that he has criticized even as he had previously criticized Russian Communism. And as he "follow-travelled" with the Russian Communists throughout the post-war period, so now he follows Mao, or at least holds up Mao's Cultural Revolution, including the manner in which it manifests itself in France where he is presently "acting editor" of their paper.

It isn't that Sartre doesn't know that history any more than he hadn't known the history of Russian Communism at the time Existentialism follow-travelled with it, Moscow Frame-up Trials and forced labor camps, notwithstanding.

It is that knowledge bereft of "History and its Process", i.e., the class struggles, hardly helps one grasp reality.

It seems impossible for petty bourgeois intellectuals, even when they are revolutionaries, to hear the silent voices fighting for freedom, though the slightest sound of empty rhetoric of the Leader they easily hear, and stand ready to whitewash outright counter-revolution.

Every one here, including those who have read the Hunan Manifesto which we have published in abbreviated form, should get Peking and the New Left: At Home and Abroad. Disregard its author, Klaus Mollenhert who has the characteristic intellectual arrogance toward the proletariat. The point is he reproduces the Hunan Manifesto in full, and you can also see the Maoists who have been denying there is such a movement of opposition to Mao in China itself "answering" the attacks on them. By now they have moved as you have all read in the

Press (See especially New York Times Magazine, 8/22/70, "Mao makes the Trials run on Time" by Richard Hughes) and so you know that the attacks aren't just "ideological", or even dunce caps, or beatings as during the height of the misnamed Cultural Revolution, but outright public executions.

O.K., even if not to the voices from below, shouldn't theoreticians at least know how to listen to the theory of the Cultural Revolution, the beautiful sounding one of "Uninterrupted Revolution". That has never been separated, in Mao's mind, from "protracted war", a favorite of his. And now he has extended it, not only to gaining peace from capitalism, but to extend it till after the establishment of so-called "socialism."

The excuse is that, as Mao phrases it "In the realm of politics and ideology a very long period of time is needed to decide who will win in the struggle between socialism and capitalism."

If any one, however, thinks that either that is only "ideological", or has ended now that "Mao's Thought" is the only dominant thought in China, and is backed up by execution, then please listen to the very latest reprint of that revolutionary-sounding rhetoric, Uninterrupted Revolution, as interpreted by Chao Yang, who, we are informed, is "of a unity of the People's Liberation Army, Logistic Department." The Theoretical article is entitled: "Conscientiously Study Chairman Mao's Theory of Continuing the Revolution under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat." (Peking Review, 1/30/70)

This is aimed to prove "the genius of Mao", not merely as against the "Russian Revisionists" and "the monster Liu Shao-chi", or the "so-called Left" but in comparison to none other than Karl Marx and Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

The proof of this is stated in the climactic final paragraph:

"Owing to the limitations of his time, however, Karl Marx only showed the direction (of the permanent revolution, rd) ... V.I. Lenin saw the danger of capitalist restoration, but he died soon afterwards ... under the new historic tradition, Chairman Mao for the first time developed the theory and practice of the international Communist movement."

to  
And what does all this theory and practice add up? The truth is that despite the revolutionary-sounding rhetoric of uninterrupted revolution, retrogressionism oozes from its every pore, military "protracted war"; regarding the proletariat, "glorious production teams"; regarding thought, though guided by the Thought of "the One", the helmsman of State, "Mao Tse-tung", the ideological warfare will not be won soon.

"Decades won't do it. A century or several centuries are needed."

We have tarried so long on Herbert Marcuse and Jean-Paul Sartre,

not because they merit it, but because, as philosophers experienced in manipulating the dialectic, (not Marx's and not even their own but Mao's or whatever is the latest craze), they do carry a thought through to the end. Thereby they cast an illumination on all petty-bourgeois revolutionary thinking. Acknowledged or otherwise, it is there where much of the New Left is entrapped. It is to them we turn.

#### IV. Once again "History and its Process" -- The Forces of Revolution, and the Dialectic of Praxis.

We must take a second look at the new forces of revolution. This time in strict relationship to the actual, objective situation.

As Marxist-Humanists, we participate in all mass activities, but we must also project the philosophy, Marxism, which is itself a power precisely because it is a philosophy of human activity, emerges out of it, reunites with it, moves toward actual proletarian, social revolutions that operate not just on the surface, cultural or otherwise, but at the production roots.

First, then, let us look at the history of such revolutions. I do not mean to go as far back as the greatest proletarian revolution, the Russian Revolution, 1917, which soured nevertheless, or start with the CIO, as it emerged to transform the industrial face of the US only in order to end up <sup>with</sup> the reactionary hardhat, Meany, or even the outright Spanish Revolution in 1937. These did occur in the 20th century and do prove how insane are all the intellectual pretensions about "19th Century Marxism" needing to be brought up to 20th century.

I will, nevertheless, limit myself only to the 1950's, in a word the not too distant history even though the new generation of revolutionaries did not come on the historic scene until 1960. They must not, however, forget that the youth then were called the "beat" generation, something we never accepted. Instead, we designated it as a revolutionary force, insisting that the objective pull, as well as the idealism of youth, would coalesce to reshape a world they did not make.

The point I'm trying to make is that the 1950's were not just what the capitalists and the intellectuals record -- the Korean War, McCarthyism, the mis-named Congress of Cultural Freedom, culminating in the "theory", that passed under the title of "The End of Ideology."

No, the 1950's for the proletariat, and it is they who did not capitulate as the intellectuals did to McCarthyism, established nothing short of a new epoch in struggle and in thought.

In the United States, the epoch began with the general miners' strike which defied first the state and then their own trade union leadership, and finally, raised basic philosophic questions about the kind of labor people must perform, questions that were far above not only the Hooks, Bells, and the Congress of Cultural Freedom, but also the independent Marxists, the Trotskyists, who, though they "supported" the miners, were totally incapable of hearing these new voices; they had, in Stalinist fashion, rejected Marx's Humanist Essays.

By the time Automation reached the auto industry, the workers wildcatted against both management and the trade union bureaucracy. In Europe, specifically East Germany, at the very moment the Western intellectuals were saying that East European workers were brainwashed, and, in any case, it was impossible to revolt from under Communist totalitarianism, the East German revolt occurred on June 17, 1953. The Rebels in East Europe continued despite the Russian might until it reached a climax in an actual revolution in Hungary, 1956.

Nor did Marx's Humanism, in its historic present, remain only in Eastern Europe. It became a banner also for the African Revolutions which were to reshape the whole continent and give rise to a whole new world. The Third World was against both Capitalism and Communism; even Castro first called himself a Humanist. All these happened in the 1950's, and these great movements from practice, as everyone here knows, were precisely the foundations for Marxism and Freedom. We dared the intellectuals to meet the challenge from practice and thus end the theoretic void that has pervaded the Marxist movement since Lenin's death. But only the workers heard us.

Now then, though the world had started before 1960, let us look at the generation of new revolutionaries. First of all, even as revolutionaries, they weren't born "out of thought", out of phenomenological categories that allegedly correctly grasped reality.

No, the reality they grabbed was Black, and it is the Black Movement that both brought them into the civil rights movement and became the catalyst for activity on their own behalf when they returned North. In a word, the first period of development, 1960-1964 was from Mississippi to Berkeley, from civil rights to the Free Speech Movement, from doing something "for others" to the recognition that they themselves were alienated, imprisoned in "knowledge factories", the educational institutions that are supposed to train them to be "leaders" and meanwhile makes handsome money in working hand in glove with the state, the military establishment. The shock of recognition was via reality and Marx's theory of alienation, and its correlative, the philosophy of Humanism.

The second turning point in the development of this generation came in 1965 when Johnson bombed North Vietnam, thereby giving birth to the opposite -- the teach-ins against the Vietnam war and with it, the birth of an anti-Vietnam war movement.

There was a negative aspect, however, insofar as the focal point of the American Revolution is concerned. The white students failed to deepen their relationship to the blacks. They began to look at the latter as a subordinate force in the American Revolution. It was then that the gap between talk of revolution and narrowness of relations with the Black revolutionaries widened to such an extent that the new black leadership, a la Stokely Carmichael, included them in the designation of "whites" (especially when they were addressing white audiences) whom the blacks had to fight.

Another, and more primary, diversion from the movement was



supplied by the Sino-Soviet conflict, which for its own imperialist, chauvinist purposes cemented the division between blacks and whites.

Nothing, however, could stop the black mass movement from developing its momentum. The racism which has characterized this country from its birth, allows no respite. The ghetto uprising in 1967, were completely spontaneous, completely leaderless, overwhelmingly potent. It is this which brought back all the elitist leaders, white and black, each trying to take credit for what the masses had done entirely on their own. None more so than the latest creation, the Black Panthers. They, in turn, won back the whites, making them ecstatic about eating crow and bowing to the vanguardism of the Black Panthers.

As you see, abstract as the title may have sounded, it was related concretely, both to the objective situation and the forces of revolution. Now these must be further concretized in their direct relationship to our Perspectives for 1970-1971. These related, not only to youth, but most of all to Proletarianization, inseparable from black masses. And we must not forget a still newer revolutionary force - women.

I deliberately left the fourth force of revolution -- Women's Liberation -- for the last. First, you're all going to have a special session on it and I will be a most rapt listener. I would like, however, to make one contribution in the field where you, like the SDS before you, are facing a new diversion, only this time more from Trotskyism than from Maoism.

I am confident that precisely because you arose from the Left, and were able to spot male chauvinism, not only as a class phenomenon, but as elitism within the movement, Trotskyism will not succeed in fragmenting you. It was, after all, the Women's Liberation, alone, that dared challenge the Black Panthers' offrontism and opportunism in forming a united front with the Communist Party and letting Aphokor take away from the women the time allotted to them.

Trotskyism has shown often enough its Left Stalinist nature, both with its worship of the state plan, and the vanguard party to lead, as well as its rejection of the Humanism of Marxism. Tragic, indeed, would it be if a force for liberation such as yours would consider the substitution of state property for private property, as if it equalled "the new society."

It is on the woman question itself that they show where elitism and opportunism leads to. For here they are, not only white-washing the Arab countries in general, as if they were all revolutionaries, as against Israel, but above all, in doing nothing whatever to expose the status of women in lands where they still are covered with veils, and in the home, the man remains "lord and master."

Naturally, here, they have more subtle ways by which to hide their specific elitism. It is simply not creating a form which will release the innate talents of women. The "stifling" of voices that will not follow "the line" is one way. The narrowing of vision is the more persuasive way.

-15-

May I then ask you to discuss at your session why there is a distance on your part from Marx's Humanism, the philosophy so essential not only to women's liberation, but to the movement as a whole which has suffered a full half century of theoretic void. In one respect, Hegel has shown, in the Phenomenology, how that is true of any new theory since it fears losing its uniqueness, its individualism, by any direct confrontation in the battle of ideas with that which is steeped in "facts".

Marx, on the other hand, shows that individualism is attained only through history. The first was the communal form and when it was lost, it was not as vulgar Marxists try to portray it as the loss of paradise. (Whether or not there ever was a matriarchal society, one thing was clear to Marx -- that even in the communal state, the elements of slavery were there. This is seen in the labor of women and children, and the domination over that labor that is so much the mark of class society that he related primitive communism, tribalism, to so-called "Oriental despotism," to the commune as State.)

Through this, however, comes the development of the individual. You learned to be an individual through this struggle. You found your talents, your self-development. It was not first you were an individual, then the state took something away. First, you were a collective man and woman, for you could not otherwise fight the natural elements. Then you became an individual. It's all a question of becoming -- and it is this which you need not fear. Far from losing your talents, you will develop them. All of philosophy is nothing but the elicitation, the making explicit what is implicit, inherent, natural, but not yet fully conscious.

You, too, therefore, have something to learn from a reconsideration of the disintegration of the SDS.

Precisely because they didn't comprehend the objective base for black masses as vanguard, indeed, didn't bother to ask the black masses whether they accepted the Black Panthers as their vanguard, the farcical situation was created whereby at the last SDS Convention, all, Black Panthers included, Progressive Labor Maoists and "Independent" Maoists kept waving the little red book.

This is the inexorable result of slothful intellectuals' desire for "instant theory". There is nothing instant about theory. It takes labor, hard labor, what Hegel described as "the seriousness, the labor, patience, the suffering of the negative."

As with capitalism, where the seal of bankruptcy on its civilization is the bankruptcy of its thought, so is it with our rootless intellectuals tainted by as pervasive an administrative mentality as that of the capitalist managers and labor bureaucrats. This is the mark of our state-capitalist age. They dare to cite revolution as reason for vitiating the philosophy of freedom.

One of the ironies of history is that the moment of disintegration came just when it had reached its highest point of development, both as the first mass movement of youth and when it had become a world phenomenon.

-16-

The period of the Columbia University Strike, Spring, 1968, was the period when on a world scale the highest point was reached in Paris, a totally new form of functioning -- student-worker alliance which helped bring about a general strike of 10 million that nearly toppled DeGaulle.

The pressing reason for having gone over this history was to try to find why the "independent" part of the old Left, having had the vicarious great experience of a near revolution, are, as we have shown, back at their old tricks of trying to disorient still another generation of revolutionary youth.

The tragedy is that all this seems very nearly unbeknown to the youth again, as with Jean-Paul Sartre's rejection of history, not because they don't know the "facts", the personalities, the ideologies, but because they themselves are so isolated from the proletariat, from that movement from practice, that theory has the look of words, and praxis the look, not of mass self-activity, but mindless terror.

Remember that Marx's original insight into the dialectic of praxis, of living men as makers of history, did away with both the abstractions and obfuscation, both of the old philosophic and historic "categories." That is to say, he saw not only that it is the deeds of men, common men and women, laboring human beings, rebelling against what is that shapes history, but that philosophy, Reason itself, comes out of these activities. Or, as Merleau Ponty expressed it, "Marx discovered the historic rationality immanent in the life of man." Philosophy is in history, in the activity of men and women, in praxis. That is what history is. That is how theory originates. It is then unity and only unity that can establish truly new beginnings for humanity's self-development.

That is the foundation for our Perspectives this year.

Hence Proletarianization as the central point. (You will discuss that during Organizational report, not here, nevertheless it should be stated that the concretization we have made of it is to assign Mike to full-time work in that field, while both proletarianization and black, woman and youth, will be evident in the suggestion to Detroit for new co-organizers of Anne and Ray.)

(American Civilization on Trial)  
Hence reissuance of ACOT, not merely as history--though there is no such true history of black in America as this which was first issued on the 100th Anniversary of so-called Emancipation Proclamation -- but as foundation for our work this year.

Hence, Women's Liberation pamphlet, which is but the barest beginning of a new force of revolution, thus must still develop, grow.

Hence High School Prison Notes: 8:3 -- not because we are turning away from college youth; they still are the backbone of the important anti-Vietnam war movement; they hold new openings to ground-breaking theoretical work such as we are attempting with Philosophy and Revolution which we will have two chances this year to project to philosophic conferences. No, it is because, the revolution is so deep that it does start at this young age.

4446

-17-

The work will be hard for we face a violent, degenerate enemy out to turn the clock of history back. And to do it with neo-fascistic methods, be it My Lai or Jackson, Mississippi, be it Cambodia or Kent, Ohio, be it the so-called "spheres of influence" in the Middle East or in Berlin. Whether war breaks out in Southeast Asia or in the Middle East or some new place (Let's not forget that Nixon's emissary in Latin America, Rockefeller had, likewise, returned with a new passion for the militarist, reactionary regimes there) the point is that the real super-power confrontation between the US and Russia is in the offing. And, as against the New Left's pretensions about a "Third World" instead of a proletarian revolution, this confrontation of the nuclear powers cannot occur IF we at home recognize that this is the decisive front and do not let it break out. The enemy is at home but the confrontation does not begin and end on the campus, but in production, in the black ghettos, with the youth, provided they are not hankering for short cuts but look for new ways of relations with the proletariat.

There is but one way to counter both capitalism and a mindless Left terrorism, and that is to make sure that the activity never be separated from the thought for only in the unity of philosophy and revolution can we finally uproot the old, root and branch, and set the new, not on the course to being soured, but having it emerge, here and now, as that new way of human relations which Marx called "absolute movement of becoming": "the full development of human control over the forces of nature ... the absolute elaboration of his (individual's) creative dispositions without any preconditions other than antecedent historical evolution... where he

does not seek to remain something formed by the past but is in the absolute movement of becoming." (Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations, pp. 85-86)

It is in this "becoming" that the forces of revolution, the praxis of revolution, and its philosophy coalesce to uproot, once and for all, the old and create the new as Humanism, beginning from itself, from the human relationship. The time to start is now.

\*\*\*\*\*

Raya Dunayevskaya

Detroit, Michigan  
September 5, 1970

4447

## "A PERSON IS A PERSON BECAUSE OF OTHERS"

— Eric

Today the need for a total philosophy has never been greater. That need is reflected not only in what Harold Cruse called, "the crisis of the Negro intellectual". It is a crisis of American society which has become total, total in the sense that all classes in society feel the intensity of the crisis, feel the need for a new beginning, feel the need to unfurl a new banner of Humanism. My experiences in the student movements revealed that need, to overcome alienation, the opposition that first posed itself in myself. I had to establish for myself that students don't have a monopoly on ideas. I had accepted the gospel from my working parents that they graduated from the college of hard knocks. And I had listened patiently to my economics teachers and other professors who gave me a song and dance number about how relevant capitalism was to the working man. But none of that preaching hit home the way the article by a black hospital worker in the Women's Liberation pamphlet did. Then I realized that "thinking and doing" was not an abstract cliché, but the concrete means of working for freedom. I realized that the black proletariat understands the struggle of objective and subjective forces in society better than do all the petit bourgeois.

At a time when blacks are trying, according to the lyrics of a contemporary jazz song, to "Make it real compared to what" or "tell it like it is," at a time when the crisis of humanity is showing profoundly, the fragmentation of society has rarely been greater. Look at the New Left, and the blacks. They came up to us and said: "Hey, brother, you've come along at the right time. Give us your help in fighting (for or against) the war, and we'll see that you get help afterwards." And we said: "Hey, we kinda disagree." And as a rebuttal, we pointed out to them the contrast between Kent State and Jackson State. We referred them to the Forties, when the American blacks tore up their Communist Party cards rather than abandon their fight for democracy until fascism was defeated. We pointed out to them Nixon's Moynihan Report and his alter-ego Agnew, which have attempted to set a timetable for freedom. We pointed out that racism, recognized by DuBois 70 years ago as the problem of the Twentieth Century, is still a fact of life in the auto shops, the businesses, and the campuses of America. We're trying to make it real compared to what. We're trying to show that freedom does not come by separating your thinking and doing by a timetable or international globetrotting.

Despite the wealth of literature ranging from Nkrumah to Castro, the poverty or depth of their theoretic gap still remains. If the vanguard role of oppressed people has put white labor to the test, then black revolutionaries have also made revolutionaries out of whites. For all their enthusiasm for the Black Panthers and their new rage for black culture, the inability of the New Left to

listen to the voices of the black masses, has made them miss the boat. All of them except Marxist-Humanists have sought substitutes or shortcuts to revolution via elitism of Mao or Stalin or whoever.

To accept that kind of vanguardism would be to deny the very vitality of our day and time which flows from the continuity of freedom fighting through 400 years. For us, our Pan-African heritage or exchange of ideas is very real. That heritage has always been a dual movement. Though Afro-Americans did not make the African revolutions, it is important to note that just when the Africans decided that they weren't going to be black Europeans, the Afro-Americans decided that they weren't going to be Negro-American anymore. After the excitement had died down, after most of black Africa had become independent, after a few years of Afro culture, it has become apparent that we are not satisfied with black culture or African philosophy; we are looking for a total philosophy. The need for such a philosophy in the black community was recently expressed by the black counterpart to Life magazine, Ebony, which devoted its entire August issue to a discussion of the question, Which Way Now, Black America? Though dedicated to dialogue on particular alternatives and tactics for freedom, the issue demonstrated once again the urgency of the historic struggle to re-establish human relations from the grass roots up. On the African side of the coin, the Africans are finding it necessary to link up their past with their time. One of the more dramatic episodes in academic thought is being written by African scholars who are bringing to light a literature and philosophy of humanism that astonishes this Western ethnocentric world of ours.

The Bantu people of South Africa believe that the worthiness of a person can only come in harmonious unity with other persons. They say: Motho ke motho ka batho, which means literally: a person is a person because of others. It is amazing to see how this African proverb unites and concretizes Marxist-Humanist principles of social relationships, history and universalism in the simplest terms possible, and long before the dialectical principles were established by Hegel, humanized by Marx, and related to the revolutions of today. Every time we travel down a different road of human thought or experience, we find the same spontaneous growth and urge to reach out, a growth blossoming in our time and signaling the approach of a new world.



## ON ECONOMIC REALITIES

—John

I would like to expand a bit on the field of economic categories since I feel that the impetus of the economic causation of political events is sometimes lost on the youth today, who see only the concrete effects of the economic crisis, unemployment, racism, war, discrimination and oppression, and fight against the symptoms without clearly understanding the common underlying economic causation of these events.

Nixon stated even before his election that his goal would be to "cool off the economy" even though it meant a rising rate of unemployment. He began quite consciously by decreasing the amount of money in circulation until he had driven the prime interest rates up to 8%. With money hard to find, plant expansion was cut back, orders for new equipment cancelled, payrolls cut 5 to 10%, and the stock market took a nosedive. Over \$500 billion has been lost in the market during the past year. Hundreds of companies, who pledged stock as a basis for loans to buy smaller companies, found their deflated stock insufficient collateral for their loans and are being forced to sell their assets to meet their loans. Every conglomerate in the country is in deep trouble. The Penn Central is bankrupt.

Nixon cooled it off, cut down the demand for goods and increased the unemployment to almost 10% (9.1% in Detroit).

Behind all these unpleasant facts lies the proletariat, the American working class. It is they who produce all the wealth of the nation. With 10% fewer workers on the job, 10% less goods are produced, and perhaps 15% less profit. Kenneth Galbraith has a tendency to blame Nixon's inept economists. But Galbraith's economics are as bad as Nixon's. Inflation begins when the capitalists raise the price of their goods to make greater profits, and the workers do not receive raises to compensate for the increased prices they have to pay for goods.

Karl Marx has very carefully outlined the process of the accumulation of capital through the exploitation of labor. Those who ignore it, do so at their own peril.

The so-called "Left" today, be they Maoists, Trotskyists or "New Left", ignore the role of labor as the essential ingredient of the class struggle. Recently I read an article by the Trotskyist Roberts in the Militant, ostensibly supporting the idea that autos should be made in the U.S. and not in foreign countries. Every American capitalist automaker could sign the article and agree with its sentiments. The present line of the U.A.W. in its contract talks reflects the same sentiments. What in the world does such a line have to do with conducting a class struggle within the U.S. and expressing international solidarity with workers abroad suffering

under problems of even greater exploitation?

Unfortunately, the basic understanding of Marxist economics seems to have become lost in the morass of the broad general field of immediate "action issues."

The failure of the so-called "New Left" to involve labor in their struggle is based on the idea that workers have become more conservative. The truth is that the New Leftists have ignored the real grievances of labor and gone off on their own "revolutionary programs" without the support of rank and file workers.

Unless the revolutionary youth establish a solid working agreement with the factory workers who control production in the U.S., then we are talking about two separate groups working to different ends.

Our aim is quite different from the Maoists, Trotskyists and "New Left." We seek to work with, crystalize and expound the ideas of the working class as the motive force of history. We can do so only by being sensitive to their innermost thoughts and feelings, helping them to express them in N & L, and by becoming the force to support their efforts to build a new society, not seeking means of getting them to support the latest crackpot demands of Mao Tse-tung.

ON OUR MOTTO

"...DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN POWER, WHICH IS ITS  
OWN END, THE TRUE REALM OF FREEDOM..."

Sept. 30, 1970

Dear Friends:

Above you have the quotation from Marx which I propose be the specifically Marxist-Humanist masthead of NEWS & LETTERS. First, because it is Marx's own words. Secondly, because it is from Marx's Capital, Vol. III, p. 954, and therefore can, under no circumstances, be disregarded as belonging "only" to the "young Marx." Thirdly, of equal if not greater importance, it brings it up to our day's concern with "power", but most uniquely makes it "human power."

Everyone should read the above quotation now in the complete sentence, which is: "Beyond it /realm of necessity/ begins that development of human power, which is its own end, the true realm of freedom, which, however, can flourish only upon that realm of necessity as its basis. The shortening of the working day is its fundamental premise." We, however, could have it either as above, or even shorter as "development of human power, which is its own end."

The crucial point is that Marx, having finally worked out his greatest theoretical work and come toward its end, was summarizing what it is that he had been writing for some 2,000 pages which would show the reader the movement of humanity from primitive times, "Just as the savage must wrestle with nature, in order to satisfy his wants, in order to maintain his life and reproduce it, so civilized man has to do it, and he must do it in all forms of society and under all possible modes of production." This then is followed with expansion of what it is that still comprises "the realm of necessity" so long as we are in class society: "it always remains a realm of necessity." Thereupon follows what would be the realm of freedom, which is what NEWS & LETTERS would stand for, has been founded upon, will strive to realize.

This is what I was trying to say when I hinted that, though "The leap to freedom is from necessity" is great and we once ran it as masthead, it wasn't Marx's own words, not exactly; for in that little word, "is," that worker (O.D.) added to make clear what we are talking about, and want, the clarification happened to disregard decades of debates on whether it "will", of necessity, "automatically", by "party structure" or what not, really be it. I'm sorry I'm so late with producing what Marx himself said, but when I was presented with the urgency to change the masthead I was working out the Perspectives, and simply had no chance to look up the full sentence which I prefer both because it is Marx speaking for himself and because it is most relevant for our day. This happens to be the very first day I had a few free moments. I dare say I'm not late, since there are a few other proposals made at the convention that are still to be run before the entire membership votes.

Yours, Raya

4452

## MORE ON THE NOTIO ...

Dear Raya:

...I like the masthead selection because it transcends what is. But really I'm not sure it makes sense extracted as it is. The realm of necessity has to be contrasted to it. I'm beginning to think I don't like sloganizing unless there's an asterisk with an explaining paragraph.

My Volume III, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow 1957, ends at page 886. Is page 954 the Kerr edition? So I have not as yet found the relevant pages...

John, New York (Oct. 4, 1970)

Dear John:

... The Moscow translation of Capital that you have is, hard to believe though that may be, even worse than the standard underconsumptionist variety that the Kerr edition has been. Thus, the quotation I suggested for masthead has "power" translated as "energy" on the supposed ground that so long as both are "human" it is the same? In any case, the quotation from Kerr edition, p. 954 appears in Moscow edition on p. 820. If, however, the whole page (the chapter is the one entitled "The Trinitarian Formula" in the final part of Vol. III) is read, there is no mistaking the meaning, the pivotal difference between realm of necessity and that of freedom.

It happens to involve more than half a century of debate, beginning with the Second International (Plekhanov-Kautsky type of neo-Kantian philosophy parading as Hegelian) claiming that it is sufficient to "recognize" necessity "to arrive at" freedom. Then there are revolutionaries insisting there must be a "leap" from necessity to freedom, but not specifying who or how the revolutionary leap will be achieved. After which the return both to Hegel and to genuine Marxism with post-1914 Lenin gives us the emphasis back to human power as in the new universal "to a man."

Interestingly enough, Lucio Colletti, who has broken with the Communist Party in Italy, and does not find he can agree with the Maoism of those who broke with him, and thus belongs nowhere (I, unfortunately, do not know enough Italian to have gathered whether he is anywhere near our position, but we will carry out correspondence on that later) -- in his paper at the Telos Conference brought in the question as characteristic of the Second International's "recognition" of necessity as freedom instead of revolution toward it.

You may remember many years back when I tried to explain the complexities of the question, and Denby "resolved" it all by proposing we simply use "is", as in the masthead we just produced. I, however, feel we must let Marx speak for himself.

Raya (Oct. 15, 1970)