

Responsibility for Marxist-Humanism in the Historic Mirror: A Revolutionary Critical Look

BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKA

National Chairwoman,
News and Letters Committees

Presentation to the Expanded
Resident Editorial Board of
News and Letters Committees
—December 30, 1984

Also includes:

Summation of Discussion

Abbreviated minutes of
Meeting

Published by NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES
59 E. Van Buren, Rm. 707
Chicago, IL 60605

Price: \$.75

(Ph. 663-0839)

8334

Report of Raya Dunayevskaya, National Chairwoman
of News and Letters Committees, to the Expanded
Resident Editorial Board Meeting of Dec. 30, 1984

RESPONSIBILITY FOR MARXIST-HUMANISM IN THE HISTORIC MIRROR:

A REVOLUTIONARY CRITICAL LOOK

Introduction

As against the annual year-end summation of the period since the Convention Perspectives, this REB meeting will first review what we mean by Marx's Marxism, other than as separate from Engels'. We will do so, not just for this period, but to see what it looks like in the historic mirror when, on the one hand, there is Karl Marx's "new Humanism" and, on the other hand, there is the emergence of what is called Marxist-Humanism for our epoch. We call Part I: Unchaining the Dialectic.

As Part II, we will review The Big Move to Chicago and how it affects the whole organization, relating it to the Marx centenary and with a very brief view of the new type of classes, even if limited to the Syllabus. (There will be a brief report on finances and the N&L sub drive by Mike Connolly after this report, but it is not separated from the discussion of the whole.)

Finally, Part III is called The Dialectics of Revolution and of Reason -- from Marx through the post-Marx Marxists to Marxist-Humanism OR The Continuity and Discontinuity between Absolute Method and Absolute Idea as New Beginning: the New Book and the Whole of the Archives.

Part I -- UNCHAINING THE DIALECTIC

The dialectics of revolution is our subject today, which 1) accounts for the reversal of the title of the new book to "Dialectics of Revolution and Women's Liberation"; and 2) will remain the measure of all we have done, whether that be our books or pamphlets or paper -- and, though it is implicit throughout the Archives, it will be recorded explicitly. Therefore, we will begin by asking what does the HISTORIC mirror reveal about the whole of post-Marx Marxism? And what does it show about the truly original, historic contribution of Marxist-Humanism? Naturally, we will look at the Trilogy of Revolution, but we will take up not only the books but all the pamphlets on the movement from practice from 1960 on; News & Letters; and even a brief glance at the Archives.

Philosophically, the concentration will be on Chapter 1 of Philosophy and Revolution, "Absolute Negativity as New Beginning."

Let's begin by looking at Marx, himself, from 1843 to 1883 -- in both his relationship to and the break with Hegel. Let us then look at Lenin from 1914 to 1923 and what he encountered in Hegel after a lapse of 31 years. And finally let us look at Marxist-Humanism in 1953 -- after another lapse of 30 years.

So far as I am concerned, the new moments in Marx mark not merely the last decade of his life -- though that did become the trail to the 1930s -- but begin with the very first moment in Marx, the moment of his break with capitalism, its production, its culture, its immediate contenders, from Lassalle on. From that encounter there was the birth of a new continent of thought and of revolution. There was no time for popularization; that had to be left to a collaborator, Engels, so that the founder could give his whole time to concretization of that new Universal -- his "new Humanism."

It took nothing short of World War I and an outright betrayal for any post-Marx Marxist to feel a compulsion to dig into what that unchaining of the dialectic was all about, not only as class opposition, but as Absolute Method. The period of Marx's concretizations took 40 years both of writings, climaxed by Capital; and of outright revolutions from 1848 to 1871; and of critique of the relationship of revolution to organization, his Critique of the Gotha Program. Then you look now, dig deep to the oceans below and you will find you can swim only if you never discount the constant return to Hegel. Yet, where Marx broke off in his first open critique of the Hegelian dialectic, at paragraph 384,* you can understand why Marx was compelled to break off -- because, first and foremost, he had discovered that new continent of thought inseparable from revolution. The revolutionary critique is the beginning of the Marxian dialectic.

I cannot develop this further here. That is why I have brought out for you to see (Raya here indicated the display of the full Archives collection) what it took 40 years and more to develop, in which you will find the elements that were present even before Marx's Marxism got recreated. The question we have to ask ourselves is what happened from 1883 to 1914, concentrating first on Engels from 1883 to 1895, as he was busy popularizing, sincere in thinking that, in his Origin of the Family, he was carrying out a bequest of Marx -- but actually setting the ground for revision by the Second International.

And you must hold in mind what was happening objectively in the world with the appearance of a new stage in production and the organization of "the Party", while those who listened to the revolution unorganized workers -- as did Lenin and Luxemburg and Eleanor Marx -- held onto the political revolutionary aspect with-

* of Hegel's Philosophy of Mind

out any concern for philosophy. It took an outright betrayal by the Second International at the onset of World War I to compel Lenin to look into philosophy. Yet he let no one know that he was spending time with that mystical bourgeois philosopher, though he was by then seeing an altogether new type of newness -- the same type of revolutionary critique, movement, development in Hegel. That is what he was seeing as he studied Hegel's Science of Logic and wrote in his Philosophic Notebooks; "Who would believe that this movement and self-movement is the core of Hegelianism, of abstract and abstruse (difficult, absurd?) Hegelianism?..."

Now consider what happened after Lenin's death when the Stalinists misused Marx's revolutionary dialectical critique of Hegel's dialectic for factional purposes. This period of philosophic void -- and of total neglect of Hegel and Marx and Lenin's critique of Hegel -- lasted all the way from the early 1920s to our translation of the Philosophic Notebooks in 1949. And there was neglect again until the early 1970s when we saw the publication of the Ethnological Notebooks and of Philosophy and Revolution. The few who do recognize "new moments" in Marx and who are not Stalinists are now using them to make Marx appear as a Populist or to make the new moments appear as a total break with what Marx had stood for before that last decade. The philosophic void which is still continuing now embraces the Mathematical Notebooks of Marx, where Marx made some discoveries because he returned to Hegel and saw that nothing, absolutely nothing, could be found that was new unless it followed the Hegelian second negativity. Here is what Marx wrote:

"The whole difficulty in understanding the differential operation (as in the negation of the negation generally) lies precisely in seeing how it differs from such a simple procedure and therefore leads to real results." (Mathematical Notebooks, New Park Publications, London, 1983, p. 3)

Now look at a recent essay by the very one who discovered those Notebooks and labored to translate 600 pages -- most of which have not yet seen the light of a printed page -- and you will find that the essay turns out to be an attack on the concept of "negation of the negation" and a psychological explanation that Marx used the term "to please Engels on his birthday."

In contrast, look at what we have made of the new find, as we turn to something very concrete -- the second paragraph in the Syllabus for our classes, which states: "We aim to become practitioners of the dialectical methodology." To me, being critical means to criticize that aim, too, not because it is wrong, but because the stress has to be not only on methodology, but on the Idea itself, with full recognition that the Absolute Method is

the way to get there but is not the place itself. There is no substitute for the Idea itself, and the Idea itself for this epoch is Marxist-Humanism.

By the time philosophy became philosophy of revolution in an actual revolution, and Lenin's new theory in State and Revolution, the intellectual who didn't want to become a revolutionary and who remains to this day a great philosopher -- Lukacs -- looked at that same Hegel, but where Lenin singled out "transformation into opposite," pinpointing that as the material ground for philosophy as action, Lukacs chose totality. And by the time the new revolution got bogged down in the international field, the Frankfurt School degraded critique so they could move away from Marxism, using the term "Critical School" only in the sense of so-called open and independent "pre-Marxian Marxism."

Speaking strictly philosophically, the Hegelian Dialectic, instead of being unchained, was once again left a void until

May 12, 1953.

Part II -- THE BIG MOVE

Far from the Big Move being just a change of location, what is crucial is its relationship to what began the truly new philosophically -- the Absolute Idea in a critical new interpretation. That is, we saw Absolute Idea not only as the unity of theory and practice -- demanding as that would be and is -- but as the philosophic designation of a whole epoch, which we have designated as the movement from practice which is itself a form of theory. Indeed, in the sense which I will now develop, it is not that relationship which I will concentrate on first, but the "abstraction" for a tendency move that proves that the "where" is not, is not, a mere question of geographic location, but a most significant political-philosophic stage in the development of any tendency, beginning with the greatest of all -- Marx, 1844.

Marx climaxed his break with bourgeois society by moving from Germany to Paris and to Brussels and to England. In each case, it meant a new philosophic development: 1) the 1844 Essays; 2) the 1848 German-French Revolutions; 3) the relocation of industrial England for the completion of Marx's greatest work, Capital, for which I would give two locations -- for the German edition, London 1867; for the French edition, Paris 1872-75 because that edition followed where the Paris Commune burst forth spontaneously as the greatest living proof for Marx, who was its dialectical recorder and summarizer. It was great also in its internationalism. (Indeed, Marx's International was itself a historic spontaneous event from the masses, simultaneously with Marx's presence as a member of an organization, as recorder, as living historian and writer of all its manifestos.)

Each historic period, not accidentally, signifies a where and a who -- for, by not being just a geographic location but a philosophic break, it is personified. Each signifies, as you can see from the dates, a when; and, most important of all, a what. And that what is not only Absolute Methodology, as crucial as dialectic method is, but knowing that the Absolute Method is as great and all-pervasive as it is because of only one thing: THE IDEA -- which for our period is Marxist-Humanism. So, you see, those four little "s" for writing N&L stories are not a technical matter.

We want to consider here, however, not just our own Big Move, but the whole revolutionary human development from Marx and Lenin, as it took place on U.S. soil. That means to look at the move, for example, in the 1920s of the Communist Party from Chicago back to "New York and the CCNY boys." The revolutionary Midwest included everything from "Bloody Kansas" to Chicago's Hay-

market. We can see how politics was very much personalized. The move back to New York was a real break with the proletarian, revolutionary history in the U.S. -- whether that be abolitionism as John Brown defined it in Kansas, or what Cannon represented there, or the relationship to the industrial revolutionary proletariat as seen both with the IWW and Foster as representative of the 1919 steel strike.

That happened when we finally decided to break with Trotskyism once and for all -- not leaving it as just a political thesis, but making it a new relationship between forces of revolution? Our choice of a location of possible revolutionary happenings included the re-examination of what revolutionary journalism is all about. You already know how we stuck pins in a map to mark all the many different industrial locations: Chicago; Pittsburgh-West Virginia (steel and coal were considered one); Detroit as the "new" CIO; anywhere but New York, which stood for dilletantist intellectualism. Detroit won out because it answered the concrete question of a revolutionary proletarian force ready to undertake responsibility for such a paper. (At that time the editor was not the Black production worker, though Indignant Heart had already been produced, but the white skilled proletarian; it was only after the break-up of the Johnson-Forest Tendency that the editorship became white and Black.)

In the 1960s Detroit remained alive -- especially in 1963 with American Civilization on Trial, through to 1969 and the Black/Red Conference and our Women's Liberation Conference. That year brought also a challenge from the so-called intellectual youth, Richard, who was answered in our 1969-bulletin on "The Newness of Our Philosophic-Theoretic Contribution" when he refused to recognize that 1969 was not 1963 and revealed a total misconception of Marxist-Humanism itself, as if the Left personified by Marcuse was the same type of interpretation of the Hegelian dialectic as Marxist-Humanism. It was then for the first time that it became clear to me that it was long past the time when we could live on the 1953 Letters on the Absolute Idea without concretizing what is in Hegel himself, which none had done before, not even Marx -- historic concretization, that is to say, concretization not just of the historic period of either Hegel or Marx or Lenin but of our post-World War II period.

With the publication of Philosophy and Revolution, especially Chapter 1, in 1973, two seemingly opposite goals suddenly emerged. One concerned the re-establishment of Marxist-Humanism in New York, the cultural center of the U.S., and the need for us to spread beyond the confines of a tendency. The other concerned a return to Chicago as the "origin" of labor and Black, and focus for women and youth, and by no means only as origin since high-tech has now shifted the center away from what was the CIO and the UAW: Detroit. I first broached the question of establishing a new local in Chicago to Donby in 1976, and Ron and Terry volunteered for the

task.

The next step as the 1970s were coming to an end, with the Marx centenary on the horizon and Denby a very sick man, involved two decisions: 1) the expansion of N&L from an 8-pager to a 12-pager, with Eugene coming to the Center to become Managing Editor; and 2) the Black dimension, in the person naturally of Denby, needing not to carry the whole responsibility for his column, and thus asking Lou to come to the Center to take responsibility for some of them after Denby had completed Part II of Indignant Heart.

The whole concept of the 1980s as the trail to which the 1930s had pointed was involved in Denby's very last correspondence after we completed Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution and as we were working on the amended Constitution. The whole stress of the new on black Dimension, which we had been working out in every publication since our birth, was seen in the paragraph I had added during the centenary tour, which Denby repeated in the very last column he wrote and which we included in the In Memoriam issue, December 1983.

As we wind up this section on the Big Move, we are looking at it not only as something past, but as an indication of our Perspectives for the year 1985. It shows why, instead of dealing with all six classes, I want to single out why even totality does not answer the question. It answers it only when the Absolute Idea (or any totality) becomes a New Beginning. The new beginning can start with the first lecture, How to Begin New, if we do not leave out the truly New, our unique contribution to uncovering the still Missing Link -- Philosophy. Seeing the concrete Universal as that still missing link, the Political-Philosophic Letters do not mean "politicalization" only, but the philosophic grounding of the politicalization. (Here Raya referred especially to the very first Weekly Political Letter of April, 1961, on the Preliminary Statement on the Crisis over Cuba, the Bay of Pigs.)

That, in turn, shows why I single out the second lecture on Black Consciousness. That element was certainly throughout history, and was recognized by revolutionaries -- and yet it was seen concretely as fully philosophic only in 1957 because it was only then that we, and we alone, singled out the Montgomery Bus Boycott not only as a new stage, but as where the Black activity was in daily session and bore comparison with the Paris Commune.

It is out of this that we were able, even before Chapter 1 of Philosophy and Revolution in 1973, to raise the question of what Subjectivity means philosophically, in that 1964 edition of Marxism and Freedom with its new concluding section on "Two Kinds of Subjectivity." We have finally seen that theory and philosophy are not the same. It is philosophically that "two kinds of subjectivity" becomes ground for that plunge into paths untrodden even by Marx and Lenin.

The Big Move now has to venture into expanding philosophic futures by relieving Eugene of local organizers in Chicago to work with me on new organizational aspects of philosophy! This releases Olga for two days in the Van Buren office. And underlines the need for Lou to assume co-organizership responsibilities in the Chicago local, where the Black dimension is so important, but Lou's work will by no means be limited to Black dimension. Rather, all the concrete decisions are part of working out that philosophic phrase we now use: revolution-in-permanence as ground for organization.

Finally, we arrive at Part III -- but there, too, process is quintessential to understand why I do not start with what I thought I would -- the four parts of the new book, giving us much of the actual contents of the whole. Instead, the Introduction/Overview, when taken page by page, reveals and concentrates on the whole because the whole now is not just the Absolute Method, but the Absolute Idea itself and its concretization as Marxist-Humanism and as News and Letters Committees.

Second in the process is seeing the missing philosophic humus of the Political-Philosophic Letters as more than politicalization.

Thirdly, the consequence of jamming up totality in a single stage like the PPLs would now become the path to how to begin anew -- and show that as our unique contribution once 1973 summarized all the new passions and forces.

Part III -- THE DIALECTICS OF REVOLUTION AND OF REASON -- from
Marx through the post-Marx Marxists to Marxist-Humanism
OR

The Continuity and Discontinuity between Absolute Method
and Absolute Idea as New Beginnings: The New Book and
the Whole Archives.

The dialectics of revolution are manifested in the new book whose title has been reversed for the class-lecture to "The Dialectics of Revolution and Women's Liberation." From the Introduction/Overview of the new book, here is what was manifested:

The four parts of the new book, as expressed in the Introduction and Overview are actually the various stages of the dialectics of revolution. It is that alone which explains the essence of why, for that final lecture, we insisted on turning around the title of the book, beginning not with women's liberation but with the dialectics of revolution.

Take each page separately. Begin with the very first paragraph of the very first part and see that the very first sentence states that what is new is the epoch. Women's Liberation is one manifestation. Rather than WL, what characterizes the epoch is the movement from practice that is itself a form of theory. That same paragraph on the first page challenges all philosophers not just to come up to what the masses in motion discovered but to work out the new stage of cognition philosophically. It is only the second paragraph that names the new unique feature of this epoch's Women's Liberation Movement. In a word, first comes the newness of the epoch, second comes the newness of today's WL in naming male chauvinism as the culprit. When the view is extended not alone in time but in the whole of human development we find once again that we can move nowhere without Marx and his discovery of a new continent of thought and revolution. From then on, you could never separate thought from revolution. And you could not reach a new stage of cognition without a revolution.

Put briefly, Women's Liberation is the first dialectic of revolution when it is relation -- when it comes out of -- the new epoch itself, which we declared philosophically to be a movement from practice that is itself a form of theory, and absolutely inseparable from revolution. It is those three elements -- the epoch, the philosophy, and a new force of revolution -- which we and we alone named when we saw WL not only as Force but as Reason.

That leads at once to another inseparable -- a second determination of the dialectic -- the Black Dimension. That second moment, which, of course, had a presence chronologically from Marx's day, was discovered by us alone as the American roots of Marxism in-

separable from Abolitionism. It was this which for the first time, in 1957 in Marxism and Freedom, finally enabled us to name Marx's new Humanism as Marxist-Humanism in the United States, and, indeed, to first name our goal: recognition that along with the establishment of the American roots goes the world concept of Humanism as specifically marking our age.

You see why it is so difficult to pinpoint the dialectic of revolution, single it out, concretize it, until you have both worked out the logic of the Self-Thinking Idea and had new revolutionary forces who wished to take responsibility for it. Clearly, as the 1949-50 Philosophic Correspondence show, the elements were there even before I worked out that logic to be the movement from practice in the May 1953 Letters three years later. It was that movement from practice which first burst forth six weeks later, on June 17, 1953. So it is both thought and revolutionary forces which finally unite responsibility of both workers and the revolutionary intellectuals (and not by just listing four instead of one force, though that is an improvement, but by working out the unity of the two).

Now take page 2 of the manuscript and you find that what we have there is the birth of a whole new world, the Third World, coming from the national liberation movements. And now you have to ask yourself why I said this collection of 35 years of writings is not presented chronologically. Clearly, I wanted each part to be a totality, but even that is not the answer, because we can get there only when totality is a new beginning and that new beginning is in philosophy. That is why even Absolute Method is now stressed as only the "road to" the Absolute Idea. And the Idea is Marxist-Humanism.

Then we named all the forces, the youth especially was a designation that was not limited by class. This reaching for the future was the Promethean vision that Marx bequeathed to us. That bequest is a demand not just for measuring up to history, but for concretizing Absolute Idea for one's own age. You cannot step over historic barriers even with a Promethean vision. Marx had stopped in his Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic at paragraph 384 in Philosophy of Mind because it was his age that made a concretization of the Hegelian dialectic, and the discovery of a whole new continent of thought and revolution was the task history assigned to him. It is Absolute Mind as action, as transformation of reality.

Now take page 3 of the manuscript and see that "somehow" both Black dimension and the old radicals suddenly come together in embryo as the problems of the World War II period. And, of all things, these pages are from an organization document. How absolutely necessary it is to uproot all the old so that Reason as the new consciousness and the revolutionary force as the new con-

sciousness comprise the second dialectic of revolution. It is only then -- pages 4 and 5 -- that I first quote the newness of Women's Liberation in our own epoch by quoting from Rosa Luxemburg Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. All of this, these two moments of the dialectics of revolution, is in Part I of the new book, entitled "Women, Labor and the Black Dimension." Yet even that, even naming more than one force of revolution, and even not following the chronological order does not really cover reason and revolution, the very heart of the Marxian dialectic.

Part II -- "Revolutionaries All" -- begins on page 6 and has us turn from our epoch to the first Russian Revolution in 1905-1907, which already involves the Third World even though there was no such designation then. It is out of that, too, that "L as Reason as well as Revolutionary Force" is born out in what is new, the 20th century revolutions, when that third dialectic of revolution -- masses in motion -- transforms reality and extends East into Persia. Page 7 quotes and summarizes those new forces as they appear in Chapter 9 of Philosophy and Revolution.

I was asked by Erica at the first class how it was that the class was asked to read Chapter 9 for that lecture without first reading Chapter 1, when I had always insisted that one could not separate them. The answer is that by now the audience for these classes is supposed to know Chapter 1 of P&R from 1973 -- indeed, know it as it was anticipated philosophically in 1964 when the new chapter on Mao's China added to M&F focused on "Two Kinds of Subjectivity". If we still don't know that, we have a lot of catching up to do. The fourth dialectic, thus, is the return to Hegel -- and it is no accident that it is here that we quote Gramsci's statement on dialectics as "Knowledge and therefore action."

Part III -- "Sexism, Politics and Revolution -- Japan, Portugal, Poland, China, Latin America, the U.S. -- Is There an Organizational Answer?" -- begins on page 8. I deliberately don't answer the question there because the person really asking the question is not I, but Sheila Rowbotham -- and she thinks it is a question against all Marxists, and that Organizing Idea is all women, when in truth she is only expressing Lenin's 1902 conception: "Without an organization..." The fifth dialectic, on the contrary, is that without revolution-in-permanence as ground for organization, it doesn't make any difference. Whether you have an organization or not, you will fail.

That is what you learn on page 9, and you learn it by seeing Marx in 1844 is the only one who then posed "feminism" in a way that meant something as the Man/Woman relationship when you have revolution-in-permanence as individual development as

well as universal development and not just as theory. And that means a new humanity, a new human stage, a new human person, everything. Since you cannot answer it that way yet, and since all the ramifications of the Marxian dialectic have not manifested themselves yet, pages 10 and 11 remind you what the half-way dialectic means, even if you are as great as Rosa Luxemburg, even if we are talking about the unfinished Latin American Revolutions, even if it is the unfinished Portuguese apartidarismo. It means you have not grasped what you think you know very well -- the whole question of objectivity as unseparated from second negativity.

It is Part IV, "The Trail to the 1980s", which begins on page 12, where we meet the sixth and final dialectic -- the need for a total uprooting, including that of the family.

Now watch the process: how Marx comes to it when he becomes an "economist", and how it is reflected in this part. Page 13 deals with the Grundrisse and Women, and it is there where Marx became the Marxian type of economist by returning to Hegel and restating the super-Hegelian expression: "Absolute movement of becoming."

Page 14 therefore stresses all over again that unless critique means the critique of all post-Marx Marxists you haven't understood the New with which Marx infused critique and which led to his Ethnological Notebooks. It is only on page 15 that we have new forms of cognition so that by page 16 I come to the measure of everything: the concrete Universal and the prediction of revolution first in a backward land.

Page 17 points to the Marx centenary as demanding of us not just a grasping of his "notes" (i.e. the Ethnological Notebooks), but an asking of ourselves: What new points did Marxist-Humanism achieve for this epoch? How fares the concrete Universal philosophically? What have the new live forces challenged us on that Marxist-Humanism has more than come up to by making an historic mark which would outline a new path to revolution?

On page 18 watch the sudden venture into literature because the philosopher Sartre, though an outsider looking in, pinpointed "metaphysics" (i.e. the Absolute) not as some sort of abstraction, but the most concrete demand for "commitment" on the part of the revolutionary intellectual. That was his demand at the end of World War II, which led existentialism to flirt with Marxism.

Then note that what I chose from Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks now is not "transformation into opposite" or even "self-movement," but a sudden praise of Hegel for having the chapter on "Life" in so abstract a work as the Science of Logic -- and not at the beginning, but in the final section on dialectics at the point when

contradiction in personal life is experienced as pain. That is not for sob-story purposes, but in order to let his comrades know what is the significance of transition and how you must watch process.

Page 19 looks at the Critique of the Gotha Program and "Absolute Idea as New Beginning" with all the emphasis on New Beginning. That is what pinpointing means. Absolute Idea is total, but it cannot be total as a quantitative measure. That is where the New of the epoch does require presence and not just Promethean vision. That is not because Promethean vision and reaching for the future doesn't help the next generation see its task. Quite the contrary. That is when discontinuity is not a revision of but a continuation with the original New moment when there were all sorts of new voices and listening to them was quintessential.

Without all the new forces which we recorded -- from the miners' wives in the Miners General Strike to the Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves and the Free Speech Movement; from Workers Battle Automation to Working Women for Freedom and all that we have in News & Letters regularly -- there could not have been a Chapter 1 of P&R and the grappling with those paragraphs in Hegel which Marx knew but didn't bother to spell out for us once he discovered a New Continent of Thought and of Revolution. There wouldn't have been Marxist-Humanism in the United States as the challenge to post-Marx Marxism that RLVLKM presents in the continuing form of revolution-in-permanence as ground for organization.

Finally, on page 20, we see the multilinear Marx vs. Engels' unilinear view of all human development.

It is now December 30, 1984. The critique extends to ourselves, for that missing link -- philosophy, dialectical philosophy -- was not fully grasped at the Convention. The third part of the Perspectives was quite a bit rewritten after Convention to stress that Absolute Method was the essence of "not by practice alone." Today I declare that Absolute Method, though it is the goal from which no private enclave can escape, is still only "the road to" the Absolute Idea or Mind. That is still the only answer which transcends method -- or expresses it, if you wish. And that needs concretization. That concretization is the name of the Absolute Idea for our age: Marxist-Humanism, further pinpointed as News and Letters Committees in the U.S., but by no means limited to the U.S. It is a world concept, a world concretization. And it is that historic look at it, and the looking at ourselves, that will assure revolution-in-permanence to be.

#