

MARXIST-HUMANISM, 1983:
THE SUMMATION THAT IS
A NEW BEGINNING,
SUBJECTIVELY AND
OBJECTIVELY

by RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

National Chairwoman,
News and Letters Committees

Presentation to an expanded meeting
of the Resident Editorial Board of
News and Letters Committees --
January 1, 1983

Also includes

Summation of discussion

Abbreviated minutes of meeting

Published by NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES
2832 E. GRAND BLVD. #316
DETROIT, MI 48202 (PH: 873-8969)

Price: 50¢
(Labor Donated)

7639

National Chairwoman's Report
to Meeting of Expanded REB,
News and Letters Committees
January 1, 1983

MARXIST-HUMANISM, 1983: THE SUMMATION THAT IS A
NEW BEGINNING, SUBJECTIVELY AND OBJECTIVELY

INTRODUCTION: Where and How to Begin Anew?

- I. THE FOUR NEW MOMENTS IN MARX THAT FORM THE TRAIL TO THE 1980s
- II. THE UNCHAINED DIALECTIC IN MARX, 1843-1883,
AND IN MARXIST-HUMANISM, 1953-1983
- III. WHY, THEN, ARE THERE STILL BREAKDOWNS BETWEEN
THEORY AND PRACTICE, BETWEEN PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION?
THE GLOBAL NEED FOR "3 BOOKS, NOT 1"
- IV. THE FUTURE IN THE PRESENT, in News & Letters as in all 3 books,
not 1: the Follow-through, Here and Abroad, by the Center
and in each Locality; THE NEW in the "Who We Are and What We
Stand For" Statement, Now that we have, as a Totality,
Marxism and Freedom, From 1776 Until Today; Philosophy and
Revolution: From Hegel to Sartre and From Marx to Mao;
Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of
Revolution as well as American Civilization on Trial: Black
Masses as Vanguard; Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal
and the Political-Philosophic Letters

National Chairwoman's Report
to Meeting of Expanded REB,
News & Letters Committees,
January 1, 1983

MARXIST-HUMANISM, 1983: THE SUMMATION THAT IS A
NEW BEGINNING, SUBJECTIVELY AND OBJECTIVELY

INTRODUCTION: Where and How to Begin Anew?

The reason that we begin, not objectively as usual, but subjectively, is that the "here and now" demands a deeper probing into the creative mind of Marx.

The warp and woof of the Marxian dialectic, the unchained Hegelian dialectic, the dialectic of the revolutionary transformation is, after all, true objectively and subjectively. Yet Part III of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution begins the probing of Marx before he fully broke with bourgeois society, when he worked on his doctoral thesis on the "Difference between Democritus and Epicurus." Thus began his very first critique of Hegel, in 1841, as it appeared in the Notes that were known only to himself. What did appear in the doctoral thesis itself was what pervaded those Notes, i.e. the question: How to begin anew?

The reason that question reappears here is not to emphasize how it antedated Marx's discovery of a whole new continent of thought and revolution, but rather because it reappeared in its true profundity in Marx's own greatest work, Capital (I'm referring to the definitive French edition, 1875) as well as in the very last decade of his life, in what we now call Marx's "new moments" of discovery.

Let me rephrase this. The crucial truth is that the question: How to begin anew? informed the whole of his dialectic methodology -- even after his discovery of a whole new continent of thought, even after the publication of the first edition of Capital as well as the 1875 edition, after the Paris Commune, when he took issue with Mikhailovsky who had written what turned out to be what all post-Marx Marxists likewise accented as the climax of the work, that is, the "Historic Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation" as a universal. Marx, on the other hand, held

that that summation of Western capitalist development was just that -- the particular development of capitalism -- which need not be the universal path of human development. Here we have the unique way Marx practiced summation as a new beginning.

The concept of totality as new beginning was true also on the organizational question: How to begin a new organization when it is to express a whole philosophy of revolution. Marx answered that question in his letter to Bracke, in which he enclosed what he modestly called "Marginal Notes" to the "Programme of the German Workers' Party." That was the letter in which he noted also that finally the French edition was out and he was sending it to Bracke. The fact that no post-Marx Marxists saw that inseparable relationship of organization to philosophy of revolution is the more remarkable when you consider that Marx's closest collaborator, Frederick Engels, was not only still alive but worked with Marx very closely in sending letters to the various so-called Marxist leaders as Marx tried to stop the unification of the Eisenachists and Lassalleans on the basis of the Gotha program. Beyond the peradventure of a doubt, the Critique of the Gotha Programme formulated a totally different basis for the establishment of a Marxist "Party."

It becomes necessary once again to emphasize that year, 1875, as not only the year in which both the French edition of Capital was completed and the Critique of the Gotha Programme was written. That year also predates by two years the letter Marx wrote on Mikhailovsky (but never sent), criticizing his concept of the "Historical Tendency" as a universal, insisting that it was the summation of capitalist development in Western Europe and that "the Russians" could "find a path of development for their country different from that which Western Europe pursued and still pursues" -- and that, in fact, if Russia didn't find that different path "she will lose the finest chance ever offered by history to a people and undergo all the fatal vicissitudes of the capitalist regime."

Think again about the question of how faithful Engels was to the Gotha

Programme critique, not only in the letters written when Marx was alive, but in the fact that he kept at the German Social-Democrats for a full 15 years after the first Party did not publish that criticism, and only in 1891 did get it published.

The tragic truth is that it didn't make any difference when they did publish it. It didn't become ground for the new openly Social-Democratic organization. Nor was any parallel drawn by anyone, including Frederick Engels, that there was a parallel to be drawn between organization and Marx's whole philosophy, though, clearly, definitively, this was what Marx's Critique aimed at. And just as clearly, his covering letter warned against the unification because there was to be "no bargaining about principles." Quite the contrary, he "and Engels would make clear" that they had "nothing in common with it (the Gotha Programme)."

In a word, it wasn't only the Eisnachists and Lassalleans who knew how to misuse the fact that Karl Marx and Frederick Engels didn't make public their break with the Gotha Programme and the German Workers Party. The truth is that the German Social-Democrats, who did consider themselves "orthodox" under its leading "Marxist" theoretician, Karl Kautsky, did the very same thing later. This time the reason rested in the claim that, since they adhered to Marx's "theories," their Party was the organization of vanguard socialism. They succeeded in so twisting the very concept of vanguardism that they made "the Party" read "the vanguard Party." That was not Marx's concept, as we shall see in a moment as we turn to the third new moment in Marx on Organization. It is high time for Marxist-Humanists to concretize "Where and How to Begin Anew" for our age by looking at those "new moments" in Marx as the trail to the 1930s.

I. THE FOUR NEW MOMENTS IN MARX THAT ARE THE 1980s TRAIL

The first new moment that was not grasped by the first post-Marx Marxist generation was due not merely to the fact that Engels had omitted the paragraph from the French edition of Capital, which had been definitively edited by Marx, when Engels transferred Marx's additions to the German. Marx's point in that omitted paragraph on further industrialization (as it covered the whole nation) and, with it, the predomination of foreign over internal trade, was that/although the world market annexed "vast lands in the New World, in Asia, in Australia," that wouldn't abate the general crisis of capitalism. On the contrary. The new development in capitalism meant that the ten-year cycle he had originally cited as the crisis that regularly follows capitalism's growth would occur more often.

What wasn't grasped by a less creative mind than Marx's was that, far from the climactic "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation" signifying universality for all technological development, it characterized only Western Europe while "the Russians" could choose a different path." Post-Marx Marxists failed to grasp this because they separated economic laws from the dialectics of revolution. For Marx, on the other hand, it was just this concept of revolution which changed everything, including economic laws. He rejected the fact of Western capitalist development as a universal for all, delved into the latest anthropological studies, and then wrote to Vera Zasulich stressing the possibility for revolution to erupt in a technologically backward country "like Russia "ahead of the West." In this letter to Zasulich he had made direct reference to the "American" (he was referring to Morgan's Ancient Society) whose studies of pre-capitalist societies, Marx thought, further proved that the peasant commune form of development could lead Russia, if the historic conditions were ripe and it was working with West Europe, as well, to initiate revolution.

To make sure that none misunderstood his concept of revolution and the

prediction of revolutions in the "East" ahead of the "West", he (this time with Engels) had written a new Introduction to the Russian edition of nothing less important than his Communist Manifesto. There he publicly spelled out that prediction. That was 1882!

This was not the only new moment Marx discovered which post-Marx Marxists didn't grasp. The second new moment, again related to theory. This time it was a new interpretation of the dialectic itself in two crucial areas in the transformation of reality. Everyone knows the 1850 Address, which ended with the call for "revolution in permanence", though hardly anyone has related it to Marx's continuing concretization of the dialectic of negativity, as the dialectics of revolution. None seem to have even begun to grapple with what it meant for Marx, as he was already completing economic analysis of capitalism (and pre-capitalist societies) in the Grundrisse in 1857, to have so fully integrated the dialectic and the economics as to articulate that the socialism that would follow the bourgeois form of production signified "the absolute movement of becoming." * What an Hegelian expression to use to describe that full development of all the talents of the individual that would mark the new socialist society!

the
That/question of individual self-development and social, revolutionary, historical development would thus become one manifests itself in the Grundrisse. It is no accident that it was there where Marx stopped speaking of only three universal forms of human development -- slave, feudal and capitalist -- and included a fourth universal form: the "Asiatic mode of production." That post-Marx Marxists failed to have that as ground for working out the reality of their age and thus anticipate what we now call a whole new Third World is exactly what this age is still suffering from.

* Marx was rereading Hegel's Logic as he worked on the Grundrisse and wrote to Engels that this chance rereading was a great help to him in creating a new form for presenting his economic studies. That "new form" of integrating dialectics and economics led Marx further to reworking the first draft, Grundrisse, into the final form, Capital.

The third new moment -- that an organization -- was not only not grasped, but actually rejected. Post-Marx Marxists were always "proving" that, because Marx had not worked out a "theory" of organization, while Lassalle knew how to build a mass party, he left them no model to practice. The First International, they said, had included so many contradictory tendencies that Karl Marx was forced to "consign it to die in the U.S.". Indeed, all of them were quick to twist the whole concept of "vanguardism" as if it meant, simply and only, "the Party." Neither "Leninists" nor opponents of Lenin have been willing to acknowledge that the ground for What is to be Done? was, precisely, the ground of the German Social-Democracy. And that includes Rosa Luxemburg, despite all her great achievements on the actuality of spontaneity. While Lenin rejected any type of "half-way dialectic" on the National Question, he did not see that same type of "half-way dialectic" in himself on the question of the "vanguard party."

The whole truth is -- and that is first and foremost -- Marx never separated organization forms from his total philosophy of revolution. Indeed, as was shown when we kept stressing the year, 1875, Marx had worked out his whole theory of human development in Capital and in the organizational document, The Critique of the Gotha Programme -- because his principle, a philosophy of revolution, was the ground also of organization. In a word, it was not only the state which Marx held must be destroyed, totally unrooted. He showed that the proletarian organization likewise changed form. Thus, the First International, Marx said, "was no longer realizable in its first historical form." (Critique of the Gotha Programme)

This, history shows, was not understood by the first post-Marx Marxists. It would take nothing short of the German Social-Democracy's betrayal at the outbreak of WWI before Lenin totally broke with them, and first saw Marx's Critique of the Gotha Programme as most relevant for his day. It was then also that he spelled out most concretely how revolutionaries could not just "take over" the bourgeois state machinery. That had to be smashed to smithereens. Lenin made that revolu-

tionary message both more concrete and more comprehensive -- a true concrete Universal -- when he saw, as inseparable, Marx's theory of revolution and his theory of human development, concluding; "The whole theory of Marx is an application of the theory of development." Yet, as we know, Lenin still left the concept of the vanguard party in its old (though modified) form.

A new historic age was needed to work out all the ramifications. A new movement from practice as a form of theory had to emerge and be recognized before a new attitude could be worked out, and that meant, far from freeing the movement from theory of its responsibilities, the movement from practice was demanding that theory, too, undergo self-development so that it could concretize for a new age Marx's revolutionary dialectical philosophy, which he had called a "new Humanism." By the time, in 1956, that the Hungarian Revolution brought Marx's philosophy onto the historic stage, we had developed that new Humanism in the U.S. By 1960, the Third World theorist Frantz Fanon had developed his liberation philosophy and called it "a new Humanism." By the 1970s Marx's Ethnological Notebooks were finally transcribed so that Marx's Marxism could be seen as a totality. It is this which Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution is rooted in when it takes a new look at Marx's 1875 Critique. The new book devotes a whole chapter to the Critique, entitling that chapter: "The Philosopher of Permanent Revolution Creates Ground for Organization." This sums up that third new moment in Karl Marx on Organization in his age and in ours.

which
The fourth new moment /opened with the Ethnological Notebooks (finally transcribed in the 1970s) reveals itself equally and even more urgently relevant to our age for Women's Liberation. It is this work which enables us to see with new eyes that Marx's 1844 concept of Man/Woman* -- far from being something that only the allegedly "utopian" young Marx had articulated -- was deepened throughout his life.

* One so-called independent Marxist, Hal Draper, dared to refer to these 1844 Essays as being no more than "the lucubrations of this new-fledged socialist."

Thus, in 1867, as he was preparing the first edition of Capital for the press, and Dr. Kugelmann had given him his Early Essays, Marx wrote to Engels: "We have nothing to be ashamed of." Marx also related these early essays to the 1867 debates around Capital, holding that "the feminist ferment" was inherent in revolutions throughout history.

From his activities in the Paris Commune, we know how Marx had laid the ground in establishing the Union des Femmes, following this through by making it a principle that the First International establish autonomous women's organizations. Finally, with his last work, the Ethnological Notebooks, he further enshrined this new attitude by showing the revolutionary presence of women throughout history, from the Iroquois women to the Irish women before British imperialism conquered Ireland.

Clearly, all four new moments, in theory and practice, in organization and spelling out "the new passions and new forces" for the reconstruction of society on new, Humanist beginnings -- first naming the proletariat as Subject; then working out the revolutionary role of the peasantry, not only/in Engels' Peasant Wars but as in the peasant communal form in the 1880s; and always singling out youth and then women as Reason as well as forces of revolution -- have laid new paths of revolution, a whole trail for the 1980s.

Surely, as Marxist-Humanists, now that we do have "three books, not one," as well as all the pamphlets on the new voices from below, world-wide as well as in the U.S.--ranging from Workers Battle Automation, Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves and Afro-Asian Revolutions to People of Kenya Speak for Themselves and Frantz Fanon, Soweto and American Black Thought -- we can now measure up to Marx's second new moment, both as a possible new path of revolution as well as the dialectics of the "absolute movement of becoming." Though this year we have worked out "Have Thumb, Will Travel" nationally, and are presently focusing on Center, the projection of Marxist-Humanism is actually crucial world-wide. Indeed, we

are planning trips abroad this Spring from England to Peru and from Mexico to Italy, and perhaps even Portugal, and, of course, France and Germany.

It is, indeed, the trail to the 1980s that we have been working out for three full decades.

II. THE UNCHAINED DIALECTIC in MARX, 1843-1883, and in MARXIST-HUMANISM, 1953-1983

It was Marx who unchained the Hegelian dialectic by demystifying the "negation of negation," designating it as a "new humanism" in 1844, and as "revolution in permanence" in 1850, while in 1857 recreating Hegel's "absolute movement of becoming" as integral to what would follow capitalism when revolutionary socialism came to full bloom. Nor did Marx stop in 1867 when he finished his greatest work, Capital, where he recreated the dialectic as "new passions and new forces". In the last decade of his life the creative nature of the mind of Marx, founder of a whole new continent of thought and of revolution, was still discovering "new moments."

These new revolutionary moments of human development became ground for organization. So integral were organizational forms and revolutionary principles that, as we have seen, he concluded that the form of the First International which he had headed was "no longer realizable in its first historical form after the fall of the Paris Commune." The point was not to "bargain about principles." Only the "all-around development of the individual" would prove that humanity reached the end of the division between mental and manual labor. Then the new society could operate on the new principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need." In a word, both the destruction of the State and the end of the division between mental and manual labor must be achieved for the principle of "the absolute movement of becoming" to become reality -- when practiced as the "all-around development of the individual." Nothing less than that could be called Communism.

When the Russian Revolution did not succeed in extending itself internationally, when world capitalism regained life and Stalin was victorious in a new form of state-capitalism, post-Marx Marxists proved incapable of following Marx's Promethean vision. This failure created a theoretic void: inability to face the new reality of the post-Marx age. Even those who did balk at any support of WWII, refusing to use the rationale of that "Left" which explained its class-collaborationism with the claim that they were not really supporting an imperialist war, but supporting anti-Nazi activities -- and Trotsky and the American Trotskvites certainly did oppose the imperialist war -- nevertheless ended by tailending Stalinism.

We who did fully break with Trotskyism and felt compelled to analyze the new reality of state-capitalism -- and the Johnson-Forest Tendency did represent a great theoretical advance in that respect -- nevertheless failed to work out what the Tendency was for instead of only what it was against. In a word, it had not reached Marxist-humanism except in the merest embryo form -- rejection of state-capitalism and looking with new eyes at labor's creativity in working out new forms of revolt. Nevertheless, were we to skip over the State-Capitalist Tendency's challenge to Trotskyism, we would leave an historic loophole on the quint-essential relationship between philosophy and revolution, between theory and practice, not to mention the search for the link to the absolutely indispensable creative mind of Marx. The historic link must be re-established if we are serious about revolution in our age. That new beginning came before establishment of organization -- News and Letters Committees, 1955.

Before the establishment of the Committees we had, when still a part of the State-Capitalist Tendency, broken through philosophically on the Absolute Idea. That happened in 1953. It is this, just this, catching of the new in our age that laid the ground for seeing the link of continuity with Marx. It becomes necessary to stay a little longer on those two years, 1953 to 1955, to work out, in full, our own contributions, not just as against Trotskyism but also against Johnsonism.

Here, again, we need to return to what Hegel called "The Three Attitudes to Objectivity." Actually, it is four attitudes, but the fourth, the Dialectic, being the whole, is not given a number since it occupies all the works of Hegel, and is Hegel and Marx. It is the "attitude" that is most relevant here. It is the relationship of subjectivity to objectivity when that subjectivity is not mere Ego, but the historic-philosophic subjectivity which, in place of stopping at first negation or mere reaction, goes on to second negation -- i.e., absolute negativity which alone reveals totality by developing it as a new beginning. That new beginning relates all the four new moments in Marx to the question of philosophy of revolution as ground of organization.

Let's catch our breath right here because the "new Humanism" for our age must not be "taken for granted." It is the recreation of Marx's new Humanism at a time when.

But this "when" means both a "before" and "after", that is to say, it is the "when" that is our age. It signifies the stage of human development which was brought onto the historic stage of today by actual revolutions in East Europe, in the Middle East, in Africa, in the West; and in multi-colors of Black, Yellow and Brown and Red; with a whole new generation of Youth and of Women's Liberationists -- as well as by a movement from theory that, though not from the same origins or as total as ours was nevertheless as philosophic as Frantz Fanon's Wretched of the Earth. Far from being taken for granted, our "new humanism" must be so fully internalized as to become a second negativity type of "instinct" -- that is, reappear at all historic turning points spontaneously.

This being so, we have to take a deeper look at our break from Johnsonism and see that far from taking it for granted it happened "by no accident whatever." The break was not only because we were the opposite of the Johnsonism to which CLRJ tried to reduce the JFT, but because the Marxist-Humanism we became is so new that the Great Divide in Marxism that Lenin represents in history became a point for further theoretic departure. Note that I say this, not in the sense of

a single issue as I did when I considered how wrong is Lenin's concept of the vanguard party for our age. This time the point of reference is to philosophy itself, which Lenin did finally see as "dialectic proper" but nevertheless stopped his Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic half a paragraph short of the end of the Absolute Idea. It is on that point that I first took issue with his Abstract in the Philosophic Notebooks. It is true that I explained my "daring" as being necessitated by the objective situation which followed his death, so that whereas he saw Stalinism only in embryo, we had to suffer through a whole quarter-century of it. But that had not stopped me from refusing to remain only on the "political" scene. Instead I went on my own to Philosophy of Mind, and afterward discovered that I had also gone past where Marx broke off in his "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic."

Marx, unlike Lenin, had, naturally, not dismissed the rest as inconsequential. The totality of the Hegelian dialectic "in and for itself" had not only been fully inwardized, but Marx had recreated it in the fact that by then he had discovered a whole new continent of thought and of revolution which has remained the ground for Marxists, and will continue to be our ground until we have finally and totally uprooted capitalism.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that our age had to return to Hegel in order to work out that which Marx had not "translated." What had not become concrete for the other age had become imperative and urgent for ours. For our age, however, that philosophical mediation became alive as forces of revolution as Reason rather than needing any further abstract development as that middle which first creates from itself a whole. I'm referring not to the general question of absolute negativity, which Marx had fully worked out as revolution in permanence, but to the specifics of the final three Syllogisms that Hegel himself had worked out only the year before his death. Even more specifically I'm limiting myself to the final paragraph (#577) of Hegel's Philosophy of Mind, which states "it is the nature of

the fact, the Notion, which causes the movement and development. Yet this same movement is equally the action of cognition." We worked this out after we rejected Lenin's stopping on the Absolute Idea before that final paragraph of the Science of Logic, which warned the readers that the "Absolute" has not finished its journey which must still be tested in the Philosophy of Nature and Philosophy of Mind. It was when we turned to the latter that we broke through on the Absolute Idea not only as both not being in the stratosphere and signifying a new unity of theory and practice, but also as disregarding the Party and instead facing the new society. By seeing the new unity as a new relationship -- which demanded that the new beginning must rest in the movement from practice that is itself a form of theory, so that theory must first then work out how to reach the heights of philosophy and depth of actual revolution -- we succeeded not only in the breakthrough on the Hegelian Absolute, but in reconnecting with Marx's "revolution in permanence."

This meeting of the spontaneous outburst of the masses and hearing the voices from below as one form of theory occurred six weeks before the actual revolt in East Germany on June 17, 1953 -- the first ever from under totalitarian Communism which found its voice once the incubus of Stalinism was removed from its head by Stalin's death. First, let's review briefly what happened in the movement from practice and how the breakthrough on the Absolute Idea helped free us from Johnsonism.

III. WHY, THEN, ARE THERE STILL BREAKDOWNS BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE, BETWEEN PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION? THE GLOBAL NEED FOR "THREE BOOKS, NOT ONE"

The historically new in our age which it became imperative to generalize was that movement from practice which is itself a form of theory, which had emerged in the 1950s but which Johnson still saw as only "proving" state-capitalism. It was that imperative which transformed what had been "Nazism and State-Capitalism" into Marxism and Freedom. What we didn't acknowledge in full even though we

had practiced it was that Marxism and Freedom not only brought out the American roots, brought out Marx's Humanism internationally, and structured the whole work as a movement from practice, be it from the year 1776 to 1789, or Marx's 1843, or ourselves in the 1950s -- but also developed new points of theoretic departures for our age.

For News and Letters Committees, Marxism and Freedom did become ground both for creating a forum for all the new voices from below -- be it in Workers Battle Automation, Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves, or the Free Speech Movement pamphlet. At the same time, we practiced the concretization of theory, be it in the Afro-Asian pamphlet or American Civilization on Trial. But not all, even in our Committees, were fully aware that these mass pamphlets that flowed from us during the turbulent 1960s were not products of the movement from below, that they could come only from so great a philosophic breakthrough as was represented, first in the Letters on the Absolute Idea, and then followed through in Marxism and Freedom, which covered a period of 200 years.

Every time a new historic Turning Point is reached objectively but not worked out subjectively, the impulse is to separate on some "simple, concrete" turn in the road to take. The integrality of Theory/Practice gets pulled asunder. The details of the "simple" get so fragmented that what appears as "skipping over" the generalization, the theory, is in fact a turn backward. Which is why Hegel made the third Attitude to Objectivity not the dialectic, which is never in a straight line in any case, but retrogression. Whether that is called Jacobi or a return to the old, the point is that retrogressionism, counter-revolution from within revolution, is what follows. It is why we totally reject this, not only as counter-revolution, but even as tailending.

After Fanon's death there was no such affinity of ideas as we had hoped would result in Philosophy and Revolution being a collective work. All that was

revealed in the trips to West Europe, to Africa, to Hong Kong and to Japan; was that not a single independent Marxist theoretician was ready to collaborate on a work that would challenge post-Marx Marxism.

There can be no successful revolution without having labored at the theoretic preparation for revolution. We refused, however, to stop theory short of philosophy. Which is precisely why, instead of giving in to a temptation to start Philosophy and Revolution with Chapter 9, the work begins with "Why Hegel? Why Now?", which goes through Marx and Lenin after grappling with Hegel "in and for himself" -- with eyes of today. In that way we reached beyond anything done by any other Marxist. It is this, just this, which, at one and the same time, led us to discover an affinity of ideas with the greatest Third World theorist, Frantz Fanon, and theoretical collaboration with East European revolutionaries.

Philosophy and Revolution, nevertheless, was worked out by us alone; while the independent Japanese Marxists continued to operate on the level only of state-capitalism, we were enabled -- after 1968, in the 1970s when Marx's Ethno-logical Notebooks were finally published -- to see there his "new moments" and thus catch the historic continuity with Marx's Marxism. This prepared the ground for Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution by critically looking at revolutionary Marxists at the highest/turning points -- Lenin in the Russian Revolution and Luxemburg in the German Revolution of 1919 -- as well as the new in our own age, including the newest revolutionary forces as Reason, Women's Liberation, not only as Idea whose time has come but as it has itself become a Movement.

Our slogan this year -- "three books, not one" -- demands that we look at Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution not just as a recapitulation of what it meant in the respective historic period, but as that which makes them and the new work a single totality. One of the critical new points in Marxist-

Humanism reached with the new book reiterates the point that our theoretic contributions for the past three decades not only parallel the 30-year movement from practice but anticipate the future in the present. It is seen also in the manner in which we reject the party-to-lead concept. We do not stop at rejecting the party-to-lead and accepting the committee-form for a new relationship of theory to practice. It is true that this means we go beyond Luxemburg also, who did raise the quintessential point of socialist democracy after the conquest of power but who still adhered to the Party.

But what is totally new is that we place philosophy of revolution and not just committee form as ground for organization. In a word, we do not stop, as she did, with full appreciation of the genius of the masses in action. Rather, we deepen that with such a philosophic penetration of that action of the masses that we call their attitude not just force but Reason, and Reason means the totality and new unification with the movement from theory.

The fact is that many of us experienced the "pull" -- objective and subjective -- for underlining the little pronoun, "its", whenever we spoke of the new relationship of theory to practice, beginning with its new Reason -- that is, the form of Reason we attributed to practice. Thereby, we left out the over-riding significance of the new meaning of practice as a form of theory, which the movement from theory had attributed to it. A revolutionary philosopher-organizer is no philosopher-king. And anyone who fights on that ground contributes to the breakdown between theory and practice all over again. Which is exactly why this time we accompanied the words "individual responsibility" with the phrase "for the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism".

Take this Summation as new beginning. It is the objective situation that compelled the Center to recognize its responsibility for so many people needed there rather than in the various localities. It doesn't mean, either nationally or

internationally, that there will no longer be "Have Thumb, Will Travel" adventures. It does mean that each one must look at him or herself in the historic mirror of Marxist-Humanism rather than reducing it all to the "lowest common denominator." There is no "lowest common denominator" when each looks in the historic mirror, because what is immediate in activity and what is universal and historic is the future in the present. It is that which we must draw out in full, precisely at this urgent nuclear moment when civilization itself is threatened with extinction, while the idiocies of the capitalist ideologues are reflected in Time Magazine's choice of a robot as their annual "Man of the Year."

We are proposing that we do not wait a year just because, technically, this September is scheduled as a Plenum year. Instead the REB proposed -- and it is the only motion we are proposing -- that we transform the September 1983 Labor Day gathering into a Constitutional Convention.

IV. THE FUTURE IN THE PRESENT, IN NEWS & LETTERS AS IN "THREE BOOKS, NOT ONE":

THE FOLLOW-THROUGH, HERE AND ABROAD, BY THE CENTER AND EACH LOCALETY; THE NEW IN THE "Who We Are and What We Stand For" Statement, NOW THAT WE HAVE,

AS A TOTALITY, "3 books, not 1"-- which means Marxism and Freedom, Philosophy and Revolution and Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, as well as all the pamphlets that flowed from them in the concrete: American Civilization on Trial, Frantz Fanon and American Black Thought, Workers Battle Automation, Afro-Asian Revolutions and Part II of Indignant Heart.

The significance of Eugene's report, making one month pivotal to the whole philosophic-organizational-N&L tasks since the Convention, resides in the objective need to show that our theoretical contributions are by no means simply a parallel to the movement from practice. Just as the N&L analysis of the Andropov phenomenon pointed to that truth, so is it true of each of the three books and the pamphlets that succeeded each other. In each decade, the book moved beyond the "au courant" -- that is to say, it anticipated the future in the present, once

the movement from practice emerged as a form of theory itself. Thus, the new in Marxism and Freedom was not just state-capitalism but Marxist-Humanism. In a word, it delved further into what was new and developed it theoretically to the point of philosophy. It is high time for us to project that, just that. Until we do so, the elitists will have it over us by sticking to the Party towering over philosophy because supposedly action is not within philosophy's province but is the Party's province which thereby entitles one to "leadership" over the masses.

Now that we have the Ethnological Notebooks of Marx and see Marx as a totality, our activities as well as writings prove themselves over three decades as the basis for our challenge to all post-Marx Marxists. Because we caught the link of historic continuity with Marx's Marxism while participating in the events of 30 years which marked our age's turning point in history, "three books, not one" does not mean merely longevity. Rather, any new adherents coming to Marxist-Humanism only now are likewise on that ground floor of Marx's Marxism which is challenging all post-Marx Marxists. That is seen in the very method by which we singled out three categories of non-NER members to be invited to this Expanded REB, as well as in the new proposals we made for additions to the NEB. We have, first, the strengthening of the proletarian character of N&L by the cooptation of Felix Martin to full NEB membership, even as the Black dimension was strengthened by the move of Lou Turner to the Center this year. At the same time, we invited both those who have lived through all the "three books, not one" such as Peter Mallory and Bess, as well as more Youth than ever. Indeed, we have coopted one of them, Russell.

It also explains why, just when we declared the Center and not the locals to be the point of concentration now, we are proposing the international trips. We may include in those international trips the "trip" in April to the Conference of Iranian revolutionaries. Ever since my "being" in Iran theoretically beginning in 1978, Iran and the new book have been a journey of discovery and re-

discovery of the ramifications of 1905 in the East. First, we found a deeper development of the Russian Revolution itself when it came to the organization of the women's anjumen. It was this that enabled us to greet the IWD demonstration in Iran as both an attempt to open a second chapter to the revolution in Iran, and to be so international an event that we could unite in a single paragraph / America's working women, Germany's Luxemburg and Zetkin, and China's Ding Ling with Iran, 1979. That was not abstract rhetoric. We also showed the threat of the counter-revolution and kept analyzing that as the present ongoing reality without arresting the continuity of the revolution-that-was.

Finally, we must take an historic look at News & Letters, both because its proletarian character will be strengthened with Felix Martin's being here for the next month, and because so totally different is our attitude to "technique" -- as is seen in the very name we have assigned to the Philosophic-Technical Committee -- that we have invited Mary-Joan today, even as we have strengthened the Black dimension by bringing Lou to the Center, and having Diane both as REB sitter-in and as new Chairwoman of the Detroit WL-N&L Committee.

One of the unusual features of N&L is that it has serialized most of our pamphlets before they became pamphlets. Our one and only NEB Statement -- American Civilization on Trial, is the one that will require a new edition in 1983, the Marx centenary year. This is its 20th year. Its very subtitle -- Black Masses as Vanguard -- shows its international as well as national character. Because it sums up two decades, theoretically and practically -- and "practically" includes the Black Revolution in the U.S., the Black Revolutions on the African continent, in the West Indies, and the bacillus not only for the revolutions in Latin America but the whole Third World so that even so old a civilization as China and so technologically advanced a land as Japan (which the "West" is suddenly including in the super-powers) as well as such new revolutions as Portugal, on the one hand, and Iran, on the other -- all suddenly find an affinity to it.

As against the way the attitude of Correspondence to theory was shown in deepening the division between theory and practice -- not only continuing the attacks on the "Beria analysis" that appeared in the first issue for many a further issue, but also, in the end, trying to split Correspondence Committees themselves between worker/ intellectual/ Black -- News & Letters deepened that unique unity of worker and intellectual by having as editors Charles Denby as well as JZ. That great forward step notwithstanding, we found that N&L, too, until after Marxism and Freedom was finally published, often manifested ambivalence on that unity of Theory/Practice. It is important, therefore, in studying how N&L itself developed with each new theoretical work/both in the paper and in the self-development of the members and the growth of the organization. The new book, with its challenge to post-Marx Marxists, will give a still newer, deeper and more historic character to this development.

With this in mind, and fully aware of the fact that we are all being tested in this centenary year -- specifically from today to Labor Day -- we propose that the Plenum this year be transformed into a Constitutional Convention. Indeed, we have tried to anticipate the addition to the Constitution that will be made there, by proposing that, with the next issue of N&L we have a new, expanded Statement on "Who We Are and What We Stand For."

(The new paragraph on all "three books, not one" to be added to the Statement, beginning with January/ February issue of News & Letters, is attached.)

SUMMARY BY RAYA FOLLOWING DISCUSSION AT EXPANDED REB, JAN. 1, 1983

Both because it is necessary to be brief and because the only two points I am concentrating on -- Peter Mallory's suggestion that, instead of the hieroglyphic "3 books, not 1," we use the expression "Trilogy of Revolution"; and Lou Turner's question about the relationship of Black Dimension to Marx's "new moments"-- need all the time available so we can at once begin practicing them, I shall not comment on the discussion otherwise.

The reason that Mallory's "Trilogy of Revolution" so impressed me was not simply because we are all tired of the hieroglyphic "3 books, not 1," but because we can begin practicing dialectic methodology right here and now by relating that, or rather concretizing it, both to all three works and to News & Letters. Thus, N&L can include a Reader's View on it at once, prominently, which would present the expression to all our readers.

The more serious attitude of appreciation is to show exactly how we can all concretize that slogan. Here is what I did at once, as I listened: I asked myself how could the slogan, as dialectic of revolution, be shown to exist in all three works. Take, first, Marxism and Freedom, and ask yourself what new was manifested there in what we call the movement from practice for our age. Didn't the East Berlin workers, when they demolished the statue of Stalin, actually express not only courage and opposition to state-capitalism but do it in so new a form, right from under totalitarianism, that "Bread and Freedom" gained a new excitement as a form of theory? And wasn't it true that our other new "page of freedom" -- the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which we raised to the same level as the Hungarian Revolution, for which we were sharply criticized -- disclosed how Marx's theory of revolution anticipates the future in the present, whereas no others could see the Black Revolution until five years later, when the youth revolution in the South was born?

By contrast, the theory of state-capitalism, without the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism, in CLRJ's hands, led to the hollowness of Facing Reality -- which faced the new reality so little that they dared to say that, because Emmett Till's murder so arcused the Black com-

munity, it was correct for Correspondence not to pay attention to the Hungarian Revolution. Though they hurried to reprint State-Capitalism and World Revolution (with a whole series of names who had nothing to do with its conception or writing) the new was demoted to a single "new" paragraph on its cover claiming that it proved they were right all along.

The dialectics of revolution embedded in the expression, "trilogy of revolution", shows our historic-theoretic contributions to Marxism expressed in a still newer form in Philosophy and Revolution. There it begins, not with the movement from practice, but with the movement from theory, starting with Hegel's main works "in and for themselves" so that we can see why Marx had been rooted in the Hegelian dialectic -- both as a revolution in thought which preoccupied Hegel, and as a point of departure for the Marxian dialectic and his theory of actual revolution. Permit me to skip from that Part I, "Why Hegel? Why Now?", to the final Part, on our age. Didn't that part not just record what was happening in practice but show a new dimension also in the Black revolt, since it was not only activity, but Frantz Fanon's concept of dialectic and his calling his philosophy of liberation "a new Humanism" that brought about an affinity between us? The newness in the Black dimension was ours alone when it came to the question of Women's Liberation, which wasn't one of Fanon's preoccupations in the early 1960s, whereas we, in the early 1970s, could quote that magnificent Black Women's Liberationist who criticized the Cuban revolution and demanded to know her role after revolution, asking whether she would then get a broom shoved into her hands just as under this racist, sexist society?

Finally, when it comes to the third work, -- when we can look at Marx's works as a totality now that Marx's Ethnological Notebooks have been transcribed -- the "trilogy of revolution" is made alive, with Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, in actual revolutions and new forces of revolution as Reason in Women's Liberation as well as in Youth, and in the totally new concept of revolution as Marx's ground^{so} for organization. In a word, dialectics of revolution could be/com-

prehensively presented in philosophy, in politics and in organization as against the elitist "vanguard party-to-lead" that we could issue a challenge to all post-Marx Marxists.

"Trilogy of revolution" can likewise sound, if not like a hieroglyphic, like a cliché if we don't at the same time make sure not to limit our concretization to the books but to carry it through in N&L as paper and News and Letters Committees as organization, as we establish new relations with readers of N&L and even those who have never heard of us before. Which is why I was so impressed with Lou's question: "What I really want to know more about is what is the relationship between what we have said on Black dimension and what we're now saying on Marx's 'new moments'."

A "moment," speaking in terms of Hegelian-Marxian dialectics, is not a moment in time unless it is an historic moment, a new stage in history, a new factor of development, a new stage in the self-determination of Ideas and in the self-development of the Individual reaching Universality. Or, to put it differently, moment is time only when and if we define time as Marx did -- as "space for human development." A new moment, therefore, is one that emerges after a lengthy period of "labor, patience, seriousness and suffering" of the negative. In the case of Marx, these new moments appeared in the last decade of his life, when all others were just recording how ill he was and treating him as very nearly dead. In truth, ^{he was looking anew at} everything from what was called "Asiatic mode of production" to the climax of his greatest theoretical work, Capital, -- Accumulation of Capital -- which he suddenly said was not a Universal and that, on the contrary, revolution could occur in technologically backward countries like Russia ahead of the technologically advanced West. At the same time, there was a return to his very first Man/woman concept as the most fundamental in creating a new society.

Nowhere can those new moments be expressed more eloquently and succinctly than on the Black dimension. And nowhere can we more clearly see the difference between the Marxian dialectic and the half-way dialectic in Rosa Luxemburg, ^{who} certainly did feel for the Black dimension and saw the horrors of imperialism

as it tried to destroy that great force during the carving up of Africa. She also saw the illumination the events cast not only against imperialism but against the pusillanimity of the Social-Democracy. This led her to fight their opportunism and break with it. And yet, and yet, and yet -- it was only as suffering Black that she saw this dimension, rather than as the Subject of revolution and Subject of humanity's development.

Now look at the great revolutionary dialectician and founder of us all -- Marx -- to see his concept, activity and new moment on Black dimension -- and, it must be added, this is most necessary for us at this moment, 1983, when we have a 20th anniversary of American Civilization on Trial, for which we need a new introduction and reprint.

As against post-Marx Marxists, where the carving up of Africa meant only "primitive accumulation of capital" and suffering, Marx, in the new moment of working on his Ethnological Notebooks, and specifically in summarizing Lubbock's work, tells how Lubbock writes of how "backward" are the aborigines of Australia since they don't even believe in one God -- whereupon Marx refers to the supposedly backward aborigine as "the intelligent black", whose opposition was on so high a level as to question the British imperialist idolatry of Queen Victoria.

Or take Marx's very closest collaborator, Engels, who was so preoccupied with the greater generals the South had against the inferior generals of the North in the U.S. Civil War that he feared the North would lose. Marx assured him that the North would win, not only because it was more industrialized, but because ^{once} the "pettifogging lawyer" (he was referring to Lincoln who was trying to run the war as a "unifier" of North and South instead of realizing it was a civil war, a revolutionary war for freedom) recognized how decisive it would be to have a Black regiment, and what an effect that would have on the Southern white nerves, there would be no question about whose generals were "superior." For Marx, the inclusion of Black regiments in this revolutionary war would assure the North its victory.

After the Civil War Marx reconstructed Capital into its 1867 form, turning to labor as well and including directly in his

greatest theoretical work: "Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded." In fact, this time Marx succeeded in getting the first National Labor Union to practice that as it was initiating the new stage of fighting for the shortening of the working day.

To sum up Marx on the Black dimension, whether it was the question of the Abolitionists he was collaborating with and considering as the real bacilli for civil war before it had even erupted, writing that a new world epoch had begun with John Brown's attack on Harper's Ferry and establishing the First International of working men and women in England, France and Poland to work for the end of slavery; or whether it was the Civil War itself during which he advised Lincoln what a single Black regiment would mean in a war for freedom; or whether it was Capital itself, both theoretically and practically in the organization of labor unions; or whether it was his new look at pre-capitalist societies and seeing the possibility of revolution occurring there first, as well as the visit to Algiers where he admired the Moors, and not only as a question of "Asiatic mode of production" but the whole question of human development -- it is the totality of Marx's Marxism which we have grappled with in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, as the "new passions and new forces" for the reconstruction of society on totally new, truly human beginnings.

I had meant to develop also the question of the difference between phenomenology and philosophy, but all I can say, and all too briefly, is that it is important to remember that phenomenology is not just appearance, it is the philosophy of appearance. Don't dismiss all phenomena. Some may be no more than pure show, but others -- and that is what Hegel deals with in the Phenomenology of Mind -- are the appearance of essence. For, as he puts it: "Essence must appear." It is true that from philosophy of appearance (where the Absolute appears as Absolute Knowledge, which is also, however, inseparable from history) we need to go to that of Essence (or what Hegel refers to as "Science of Logic" where Absolute is now Absolute Idea, the unity of theory and practice). But that, too, does not complete the process of the journey of discovery. We

still must go to "pure" philosophy -- Philosophy of Mind. Nevertheless, the start of the journey is Phenomenology and is not only the most creative but really contains, in embryo, all three works.

But I cannot develop this further here. We must stop here and go to the proposal to be submitted to the membership that we transform the Plenum into a Constitutional Convention so that we can record where we have reached with Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution directly in the Constitution, as we are now recording it in a preliminary way in our Who We Are statement.

* * *

June, 1983

The national tour on the Marx centenary

THEORY / PRACTICE

by Raya Dunayevskaya

author of *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*

I have just returned from a three-month long national tour on the Marx centenary and the publication of my new work, *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*. The most exciting aspect of the discussions around both the centenary and my book revolved around my focus on the last decade of Marx's life as he discovered "New Moments" in human development of what today we call the Third World. Where so-called "orthodox" Marxists spoke of the last decade of Marx's life as a "slow death," the "New Moments" Marx uncovered in the last decade became the centerpiece in the final Part of my work, which I have entitled "Karl Marx — from Critic of Hegel to Author of Capital and Theorist of 'Revolution in Permanence'."

Naturally, the "New Moments" in Marx's revolutionary philosophic-historic concepts were both an extension of and a return to Marx's very first break (1843-44) with both capitalism and what he called "vulgar communism." Then, too, Marx's Promethean vision of truly human relations which suffered no division between mental and manual labor had him integrate, into his new proletarian focus on class struggle, the Man/Woman relationship as a most revealing relationship of Alienation in this exploitative, sexist, racist, capitalistic society. In his final writings — after completing his greatest theoretical work, *Capital*, and as he turned to what was then a "new science," anthropology — he kept working at and concretizing his multilinear view of human development and its continuing struggles for freedom.

Whether that meant introducing fundamental changes in *Capital* itself, as he prepared its 1872-75 French edition, both on concentration and centralization of capital and in making the final section on "So-called Primitive Accumulation of Capital" integral to Part VII; or whether it was his commentary on Morgan's *Ancient Society* and the Iroquois women that we find in Marx's *Ethnological Notebooks* of 1880-82; or whether it was a new view of the primitive agricultural commune in an industrialized world as he expressed it in letters to Vera Zasulich and in commentary on Mikhailovsky's critique of his "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation" — Marx's point, as he projected the startling possibility of a revolution coming first in backward lands like Russia ahead of the technologically advanced West, was that there was more than one path to revolution.

It was this, just this, that proved to have the most intense interest for today's audiences.



Raya Dunayevskaya on tour at the University of Michigan where she spoke on "New Moments in Marx's Last Decade" and on "Marx and the Black World."

AFRO-AMERICAN AND THIRD WORLD AUDIENCES

Take, for example, those talks that were sponsored by Afro-American Studies programs. The interest of these audiences in "Marx and the Black World" was not limited to Marx's 1867 expression in *Capital* that "Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded," but extended to my quotation from the 1881 *Ethnological Notebooks*, where Marx calls the Australian aborigine "the intelligent black." What some in the audience responded was: "Yes, but how, in today's world, where the Black World is truly global — and none have done more to reshape it than the African revolutions — can we escape being drawn back to capitalism, keep the revolutions from souring, and show that we, the Blacks in the U.S., are not narrowly nationalistic after all?"

Furthermore, both the Black intellectuals and the Black activists wanted to discuss also the origins of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S. I first broke with Trotsky over the Hitler-Stalin Pact, when Trotsky continued to call for the defense of Russia as a "workers' state, though degenerate," and, under the name of Freddie Forest, began my development of the theory of state-capitalism. This led, in 1941, to my association with C.L.R. James, author of *Black Jacobins*, who, under the name of J.R. Johnson, had arrived at the same position. The state-capitalist tendency thus became known as the Johnson-Forest Tendency. But where, to me, the theory of state-capitalism was but a step to the development of the philosophy of Marx-