

DIALECTICS OF REVOLUTION: AMERICAN ROOTS AND MARX'S
WORLD HUMANIST CONCEPTS

I. Introduction: Archives and Archivists

Good evening. Thank you, Dr. Mason.

This is not a mere courtesy thanks. Rather, it is the measure of how the Archives as a whole, as well as tonight's talk on the Dialectics of Revolution, are related to my Collection being at Wayne State University. We will trace the dialectics of revolution as that permeates the entire Marxist-Humanist Archives, covering a half-century of revolutionary thought and activity, from the most recent work which is still on the presses, to the various philosophic firsts that I wish to develop here with the birth of Marxist-Humanism in the United States in the 1950s. This is inherent in my choice of the Wayne State University Labor Archives, as against the Wisconsin Historical Society, to be the home of the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection.

8395

Two events in 1968 acted as a compulsion to turn the accumulation of documents covering nearly half a century over to this library. They number 7,000 pages (and by the end of 1985 will number over 10,000 pages.) Those events were: (1) the fact that De Gaulle could abort the great 1960s Movement of near-revolution, and accomplish that at its very highest point in Paris, 1968, without firing a single shot! And (2) the imperative need I felt to preserve, concretize and study the past revolutions and counter-revolutions for understanding the flow and significance of the dialectics of revolution as this affects the manner in which Marxists spell out what their historic task is to be.

The decision to choose Wayne State University, as against the Wisconsin Historical Society, was based on the fundamentally different attitudes each had toward the concept of what Archives are.

I considered, 1st, that it is not only the past but the present that is decisive, and secondly, that the one who authored the collec-

tion is the one to trace the dialectics of the particular accumulated documents. Moreover, I felt they must be made accessible not only to academicians, but to activists. The Collection was to carry my introductory note which would set its philosophic structure.

As against this, Wisconsin held that, while they would be happy to house the documents, it was their archivists who would arrange them and their archivists who would come to pick them up. To me, this was not only a question of letting me, or not letting me, speak for myself. Rather, the question was how could an archivist know what the participants in most of the events perceived the dialectics of revolution to be? In this Marxist-Humanist Collection, the dialectics of revolution range from the 1905 Russian Revolution and its ramifications in the 1906-to-1911 Revolution in Iran; ~~to~~ the November 1917 Russian Revolution and its international impact; to the beheaded 1919 German Revolution; as well as to the revolutions in our own era. And dialectics relate not just to those revolutions that were successful,

but to the many revolutions that were aborted.

Because Wisconsin was so dense on the question of the "author's role" in the very "making" of revolution -- which, of course, only the masses in motion can "make," but in that revolution, intellectuals who are with those masses in motion have a special contribution to make -- my choice of Wayne State University, as against Wisconsin, came easily. This was due not alone to the fact that the Wayne State University Labor Archives let me speak for myself, but that they had both a full appreciation of the fact that Archives were not limited to the past and would, therefore, consider additions to the Collection, as well as a recognition of the significance of Archives in general.

In that spirit, thank you, Dr. Mason.

5

II. The Excitement of Becoming Trotsky's Secretary --
and the Break with Trotskyism

I am not writing the history of the past in the future tense. I have no intention of analyzing an historic personage like Leon Trotsky only as I see him after my break from Trotskyism. I have always strongly opposed any re-writing of history. I do not deny that I certainly considered it the highest moment of my own development up to that time to have become Trotsky's Secretary and to have been a guard and translator as well.

Let me introduce you at once to the very first impression I got when I laid eyes on Trotsky in Coyoacan, Mexico in 1937-38. Let me read from my report at that time:

"With Military stride, Trotsky advanced toward me. He shook my hand firmly. I was instantly struck by his tremendous head, the like of which I had never before seen, the high forehead, the lion-like skull crowned with silver gray hair flowing back as though just touched by a breeze;

the set jaw and chin upon which the grey moustache and goatee bristle. All of this was set on enormous, sturdy shoulders. A Titan towered above me and in the conversation I felt also the force of a great intellect. 'Formidable,' I whispered to Jean Van Heijenoort, the French Secretary."

The following day, I was introduced to the daily routine of work from 7 am to 7 pm with 1 hour off for each meal. But soon we were faced with a new tragedy -- the death under mysterious circumstances of Sergei, the only living son of Natalia and Leon Trotsky.

The GPU no doubt counted on the new tragedy to incapacitate Trotsky from fighting against the frame-up they had in store for him next -- the infamous Moscow Frame-up Trials. That they were wrong was proven by Trotsky's immediate response to the very first account of the fantastic accusations from Moscow:

"Leon Trotsky wrote an average of 2,000 words a day. He gave statements to the NANA, the UP, the

AP, Havas Agency, France, the London Daily Express, and to the Mexican newspapers. His declarations were also issued in the Russian and German languages.

"The material was dictated in Russian. While I transcribed the dictation, the other secretaries checked every date, name and place mentioned at the trials.

"Trotsky demanded meticulous, objective research. The accusers had to be turned into the accused."

All the labors could not, however, keep convinced Trotskyists from raising questions as to the nature of a Russia which staged such a frame-up of Trotsky, Bukharin and, indeed, all of those known as "the General Staff of the Revolution," with these monstrous accusations.

Trotsky's contention was that, while that did show that the workers state had "degenerated," nothing could change the allegedly overriding fact that the workers state, having arisen out of the Russian Revolution, private property having been abolished, the nationalized property "meant" that Russia remained a workers state, though "degenerate."

- Q -

P Suddenly I felt that I, who was nobody, was right to deny that -- and that Trotsky, who had been the great leader of the historic and only successful proletarian revolution, was wrong.

I'm not denying that my conclusion was so traumatic for me that I actually lost my power of speech for two days. But that only strengthened my resolve -- the need I felt to prove my conviction that what had occurred was a total transformation into opposite, that Russia had turned from a workers state into a state-capitalist society.

It took (3) years before I finished my study of the (3) Five-Year Plans from original sources, set in the context of a new world stage of capitalism. The Great Depression had collapsed private capitalism, and had led to statification. Originally, the study began with a section called "Labor and Society"; but the Workers Party, in accepting the economic study for publication, though they were bureaucratic collectivists, refused to accept "Lab^or and Society."

The analysis of the Russian economy focused on the actual conditions of labor of the Russian working

class, at the point of production, and in society as a whole. That, along with the economics of the Plans and Russia's new anti-labor legislation, demonstrated the state-capitalist nature of Russia.

I had joined with CLR James, who had also come to a state-capitalist position and had written a lengthy political Resolution for submission to the Workers Party. This State-Capitalist Tendency came to be known as the Johnson-Forest Tendency.

What I had not been aware of at the time was that the piece, "Labor and Society" -- the one rejected by the Workers Party when they accepted my economic analysis -- actually contained what would also cause, nearly a decade later, the break between Johnson and Forest, and the new creation of the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism. The philosophy that the Workers Party rejected was based on Marx's 1844 Humanist Essays, which at the time I quoted from it, I knew only as Marx's single article, "Alienated Labor."

When, in the 1950 Miners General Strike, I again used Marx's Humanist Essays -- and my own activity showed the beginning of Marxist-Humanism --

CLR James also recoiled from Marx's Humanism.

This first became clear in the final section of the 1950 Tendency document, State-Capitalism and World Revolution, written under his direction. There Humanism was dismissed as religious and/or Existentialist.

It was not until 3 years later -- May 12 and May 20, 1953 -- that I first broke through on the Absolute Idea in my letters to Grace Lee. I maintained that the Absolute Idea was not an abstraction or some sort of call for a God, but that it contained within it a movement from practice as well as from theory. This led to the founding of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S.

It is time now to turn to the founding of the Marxist-Humanist paper, News & Letters.

III. The Marxist-Humanist Newspaper, "News & Letters";
its worker-editor, Charles Denby; his autobiography,
"Indignant Heart: A Black Workers Journal" and the
pamphlets, "Workers Battle Automation" and "American
Civilization on Trial."

The decision, made simultaneously at the very first convention of News and Letters Committees, was to have a Black production worker as editor of its paper, and to assign the National Chairwoman, Raya Dunayevskaya, to complete the first major philosophic -- and not only economic-political -- work, Marxism and Freedom, on which she had been working for several years.

The concept of having theory and practice together dictated our refusal to put theoretical articles only in a theoretical journal. Our point was that the intellectual should not only read, but write, for a workers' newspaper like News & Letters; that is, that intellectuals would talk to a working class audience which has a great deal to contribute to the intellectual (1) the intellectual knows how to listen to the new voices from below. The goal became the new principle of combining workers and

intellectuals -- neither of whom would be stopped by a McCarthy retrogression. That was the ground for our Marxist-Humanist newspaper, News & Letters, when it was established in 1955.

Now listen to Charles Denby's last letter to me just a few months before his death in 1983 -- the Marx Centenary year:

"We finally have in our hands the whole 'trilogy of revolution' -- that is, Marxism and Freedom, Philosophy and Revolution, and Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

Anyone can see and read what Marxist-Humanism has represented since our first Constitutional Convention... Now we can say to everyone, 'Here is Marx's philosophy of liberation and we know that it is the path to freedom'."

My "In Memoriam" on Charles Denby begins: "In 1948 when I first met Denby he had already become a leader of wildcats, a 'politico'... Listening to him telling of his life in the South as he said goodbye to it and came North made me feel I was witness to an individual's life that was

a universal, and that touched one personally." This, in fact, is what was worked out as integral to his autobiography, Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal.

In 1950, when we were all still in the SWP, although we were a separate Tendency, I was involved in the Miners' General Strike in West Virginia. It was Denby's UAW Local 212, along with John Zupan in Local 600, who sponsored the famous caravan of food and supplies to the miners on strike.

That strike achieved a truly historic "first" both in the Strike itself, and in what was happening simultaneously philosophically. The greatness of the miners strike over Automation before the word was even invented was this: What had begun in 1949 as a union-authorized strike turned into a strike against the union leadership. Instead of asking for higher wages, the miners raised altogether new questions dealing with their conditions of work, and questions of the work itself. What they asked was: "What kind of labor should man do?" "Why should there be such a gulf between thinking and doing?"

74

The pamphlet we recently published -- The 1949-50 Miners General Strike and the Birth of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S. -- tells, first, the in-person story of the miners' participation, by a miner who is himself a Marxist-Humanist. The pamphlet then includes the story of my activity. And in an Appendix there are 35 Letters exchanged between myself and the two other leaders of the Johnson-Forest Tendency, CLR James and Grace Lee Boggs, which show that in that period I was not only translating and commenting on Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, but also, in the end, actually telling some of the strike events. All of this makes clear that the question of cognition and actuality -- like the gulf between thinking and doing, touches on the relationship of philosophy to revolution.

This is at the root of the separation of Johnson and Forest in what ~~was~~ ^{had been} a united Johnson-Forest Tendency. We can now see how that was already present in the 1949-50 Miners General Strike and in my activity in that strike. The strike had actually manifested the new form of activity that we were later to call "a movement from practice that is itself a form of theory."

Charles Denby's whole new development began, he thought, when CLR James took himself out of the Organization of the Johnson-Forest Tendency during the McCarthy attack on it, and Denby chose the ideas that became Marxist-Humanism rather than James' ideas.

Issue Number One of News & Letters came out in honor of the East German revolt. 1955 was also the year that the Montgomery Bus Boycott erupted and signalled the birth of the Black Revolution. My life and Denby's truly became one -- that of Marxist-Humanism.

Part One of his autobiography was written before Denby's own development as an editor. In Part TWO of Indignant Heart: A Black Workers' Journal he sums up the events of a full quarter century of the existence of Marxist-Humanism which had meant such a new stage in his own life.

In 1961 he was not only the editor but the author of a pamphlet called Workers Battle Automation where we hear the voices not only of workers from many industries, but also of young ^{woman} a doctor, and a computer-technician.

Denby's favorite quotation from Hegel's Phenomenology of Mind was this: "Enlightenment upsets the household arrangement, which spirit carries out in the house of faith, by bringing in the goods and furnishings belonging to the world of Here and Now." It is this which, to Denby, proved the "practicality" of the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism, which met the needs of the working-class. In 1969 this was climaxed with the holding of a Black/Red Conference to which Denby presented the Welcome.

On the American scene, the whole N.E.P. spelled out the Black Dimension so concretely that it ranged over the entire history of the United States. We called it American Civilization on Trial. It expresses not only the needs of the year 1963, when it was first published, or even 1970 when Denby appended his "Black Caucasians in the Unions." Rather, it reaches back to the beginnings of the Black Dimension in the U.S. (as well as forward to the 1980s.

In 1983 we ~~published~~ ^{voted for} a new 4th edition, and Denby asked that my Introduction include the

new paragraph on the Black Dimension I had added to the Rosa Luxemburg book. We had singled out what characterized Marxist-Humanism from the start -- the two-way road between the United States and South Africa. That is to say, the Black Dimension represents the kind of nationalism that is inseparable from internationalism, which in our age is the focal point for both nation^{al} revolutions and the needed world revolution.

Today's newspapers carry news of still another massacre by the apartheid regime against the majority Black population. What happened 25 years ago today, in Sharpeville, became a category that was deepened in 1976 in Soweto, and took to the world stage again today.

All of these voices we have recorded as the events happened. Indeed, in the 1960s, when Sharpeville became that dimension of African, American, and world revolution, I was in Ghana and aligned with Sobukwe, who was arrested and sent to prison with Mandela.

And now it is high time to turn to our Trilogy of Revolution and concretely unchain the dialectics of revolution.

IV. The Trilogy of Revolution -- Marxism and Freedom; Philosophy and Revolution; Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. The Unchaining of the Dialectics of Revolution; American Roots and Marx's World Humanist Concepts.

What is significant to us here, in Marx's transformation of Hegel's revolution in philosophy into Marx's philosophy of revolution, is how it was extended in his last decade. It led us to call the 1830s a "Trail to the 1980s." Marx deepened and concretized what he had originally called a "New Humanism" throughout his life. After 40 years of labor in the field of economics, which culminated in the 1872-75 French edition of Capital, in the same decade in which he wrote his Ethnological Notebooks, Marx hewed out a new moment. It is seen in his critique of the Russian Populist Mikhailovsky; in Marx's draft letters to the Russian revolutionary Marxist, Vera Zasulich; and in nothing less important than the Introduction to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto -- where he predicted that revolution could begin first in the backward "East" rather than in the technologically advanced West. He singled out Russia as that "East." That was 1881! No wonder we call this the "trail to the 1980s."

Strictly philosophically, our first unchaining of the dialectic began with my breakthrough in the May 12th and 20th, 1953 Letters on Hegel's Absolute Idea. ^{AS THE SWI} We have recently traced the breakthrough in its embryo appearance in the three preceding years: 1950-53. It is true that the breakthrough in the 1953 Letters showed that within the Absolute Idea itself is contained the movement from practice as well as from theory.

But the 1950 strike was the real appearance. It is therefore imperative to combine what Hegel called "the Self-Thinking Idea" with what was present in the spontaneous movements of the Miners' General Strike, that which we later called the "Self-Bringing Forth of Freedom." It should not here be necessary to explain the obvious, but such explanation is "required" against the vulgar materialists to assure them that, of course we know it is not the Idea that thinks: it is people who think. What must be added, however, is that the dialectic logic of the Idea moves in the direction of what was implicit in the movement from practice.

By the mid-1950s, the category I had worked out as the movement from practice provided the structure for my major philosophic work -- Marxism and Freedom, from 1776 Until Today. That was the first of what we now call the "trilogy of revolution." It illuminated the fact that the movement from practice was itself a form of theory.

It is this concept of philosophy as being rooted in the movement from practice which creates a challenge for theoreticians to work out a new stage of cognition.

Marxism and Freedom

Concretized the American roots of Marxism -- from Abolitionism to the then ongoing Montgomery Bus Boycott which opened the Black Revolution. In that work, the world Humanist concepts were also spelled out, not alone in the United States, but in the very first mass revolts from under Communist totalitarianism in East Europe -- East Germany, 1953; Poland, 1955; Hungary, 1956.

In the 1960s we began recording the new voices of a new generation of revolutionaries, and in 1968 had to face the aborted near-revolution in France, which made imperative our return ^{to Hegel} on an altogether new level. What was needed was a working out of the Hegelian dialectic, this time "in and for itself," as well as how it was grappled with by Marx and Lenin. This resulted in the second unchaining of the Hegelian dialectic ^{for our age} as the dialectics of revolution. We examined, as well, the Alternatives: Trotsky, Mao and "the outsider looking in," Sartre.

1973 saw the publication of Philosophy and Revolution: from Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao. I there extended the concretization of Absolute Idea not just as a totality -- the unity of theory and practice -- but as the development of Absolute Idea as New Beginning.

The 1st chapter of Philosophy and Revolution was entitled "Absolute Negativity as New Beginning: The Ceaseless Movement of Ideas and of History." Here I argued that seeing Absolute Idea as a unity of theory and practice, as totality, is where the task first begins. Absolute Idea as New Beginning challenges all

generations to concretely work out such a new beginning for their own age.

The book moves to the different objective situations on the vicissitudes of state-capitalism in East Europe and Africa.

We there encounter the development of theory in Frantz Fanon, who, in The Wretched of the Earth, likewise called his philosophy "a New Humanism."

The 1970s also saw the emergence of a new revolutionary force: Women's Liberation, which had grown from an Idea whose time had come, to become a Movement. Its uniqueness expressed itself in their refusal to put off for "the day after the revolution" the questions they demanded answers to. The so-called Marxists at first would not even bother to listen to the women who proclaimed that "male chauvinism" was by no means restricted to capitalism. ^(society) It not only appeared before capitalism, but is present right now and has re-appeared after the revolution. It must be faced here and now. The women insisted that the Left must face the male

chauvinism within that movement, and must recognize the need to grapple with this question before, during, in, and after the revolution.

It became the impulse for the third major philosophic work, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, which completed what we call the "trilogy of revolution." Here is how I there summarize today's Women's Liberationists' demands:

"Don't tell us about discrimination everywhere else; and don't tell us it comes only from class oppression; look at yourselves. You will have to understand that our bodies belong to us and to no one else -- and that includes lovers, husbands, and yes, fathers.

"Our bodies have heads, and they too belong to us and us alone. And while we are reclaiming our bodies and our heads, ~~we will also reclaim the night.~~ No one except ourselves, as women, will get our freedom for us. For that we need full autonomy."

For me, it became necessary here to also focus on one of the inadequacies of the Women's Liberation Movement; its disregard of Rosa Luxemburg. Indeed, this was a stimulus for my new work, though my scope

was by no means limited to unearthing Luxemburg's heretofore unknown feminist dimension.

When I began my study, it was to be just on Luxemburg -- and the intended climax was to have been the year, 1910. This was the year when her flash of genius, in grappling with the new phenomenon of Imperialism, resulted in her break with Karl Kautsky, the leader of the German Social Democracy. This was some 4 years before the outbreak of World War I and the Second International's betrayal. It was 4 years before any male Marxist, Lenin included, saw the coming betrayal.

And yet, suddenly, even this seemed to me to be inadequate, because Luxemburg remained a member of the German Social Democracy as if her break with Kautsky was "personal."

Clearly, her methodology of analyzing imperialism and her critique of Marx's Accumulation of Capital, had to be characterized as a half-way dialectic. That is to say, though she was an unflinching fighter against imperialism and the Social Democracy's opportunism she nevertheless refused to consider "nationalism" as Subject, as a new revolutionary force.

I felt the need for a decisive philosophic grappling, which I worked out as Part III of the so-called Luxemburg book: "Karl Marx: from Critic of Hegel to Author of Capital and Theorist of Revolution in Permanence."

As against ^{Luxemburg's} ~~Marx's~~ half-way dialectic, Marx's multilinearism of human development, of paths to revolution, as they related to so-called backward countries, to Women's Liberation, and to nationalist opposition -- all made me question not only Luxemburg but all post-Marx Marxists, beginning with Frederick Engels, whose unilinearism permeated the whole German Social Democracy. Post-Marx Marxism, to me, became a perjorative.

Engels' unilinearism was glaringly revealed in the very first work he wrote after the death of Marx -- Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. Engels claimed it was a "bequest" of Marx, but it expressed anything but Marx's view either on the Man/Woman relationship or on the relationship between advanced and backward societies. Nor was there similarity between Engels' view of primitive communism and Marx's.

We cannot go into this here, but I hope you will ask me questions about it.

For that matter, I cannot here go into the fact that I had also discovered a new Hegel, who, instead of closing his thought off in a "system" and retreating with the Owl of Minerva, had at least left the doors open for future philosophers.

But, again, please be sure to ask me more about that "discovery" as expressed in his final 3 Syllogisms.

For a moment, let us now turn away from all these philosophic-socio logical-political-economic developments, to a story from my personal life. The incident I'm diverting to, happened when I was 13 years old and had been but a single year in the United States. I was leading a strike against the school principal. Her name I still remember -- Tobin. And she exacted corporal punishment for so little an infraction as coming five minutes late. Also, she forced all to memorize Shylock's speech, where he demands his pound of flesh. (I am telling this story with hindsight of course, but my memory was refreshed by the Chicago Tribune story of that day, which had carried a sensational article and picture of the strike.)

I am doing so to illustrate the difference between an idea in embryo and in full development; between process and result, as well as the whole question of a child's perception, when great revolutions occur and for how long these impressions last.

The story took place in 1924 in the Cregier public school in a Chicago ghetto. I credited my supposed bravery to the Russian Revolution of November, 1917, which had burst upon the scene 6 years previously and

had left an indelible impression on me of great doings, like equality and comradeship. I was an illiterate child then, living in the Ukraine, who had refused, 2 years ^{before} 1917, to engage in khabar (bribery) in order to be among the 1 percent of Jews who gained the "privilege" of being able to sit in the back of the school room.

The United States, after just one year living in its ghettos, reminded me of a pogrom atmosphere.

I was threatened with deportation which had no effect on me, but it sure scared my Dad. In any case, there I was, already marked as a "trouble maker."

Now look at an altogether different historic period, to a different life, ~~and there, too, we will see what a child's perception is, when born during great turning points in history.~~

When I returned back to the U.S. from being with Trotsky in exile in 1938, the one who made a great impression on me was the famous French syndicalist, Alfred Rosmer. In 1919, he had switched to communism.

STET

and then in 1937-38, had become head of the International Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky. He was returning to France via New York and I thought I would show off its beauties by taking him on a ferry ride to Staten Island.

As we reached Staten Island, Rosmer said: "Oh, yes, I know, I was born here." Naturally, I thought he was pulling my leg, but no, he was serious and proceeded to prove it by telling me the story of his early life. It turned out that his parents were Paris Communards from 1871, who, after its defeat, escaped to the United States. His mother was pregnant and gave birth to him on Staten Island. He simply was never interested in claiming American citizenship.

France and the Paris Commune never left his memory, not because he was there, but because of all the stories he heard from his parents.

This only released in my mind still another remembrance ^{of}

^{with}
Eugene V. Debs, was making his very last appearance at Ashland Auditorium in Chicago. It was 1925. He was so eloquent a speaker that he made you feel the presence of any person he mentioned in his life.

He was very proud of the fact that he had known the great Abolitionist, Wendell Phillips. It was Wendell Phillips who, after the Civil War, made a transition from Abolitionism to Socialism. It is he who had said: "Scratch a New Yorker and you'll find a Communard."

Two points are involved in this remembrance of things past: One is that, embedded in embryo of the past, is the presence of the next step, whether or not one is fully conscious of it. Two is that presence of the future inherent in the "here and now" characterizes also the first instinctual reaction which is philosophically called "first negation." What makes you move to the second negation creates a new humus for future development.

Marx's magnificent, original, historic unchaining of the dialectic was the creation of such a new humus. This unchaining began, of course, with his refusal to consider that Hegel's Notion was related only to thought.

Once Marx discovered a new continent of thought and of revolution, the task he assigned to himself was that of uniting Philosophy and Reality. The proof of that unity came from uncovering the hidden Subject --

the driving forces of the revolutions-to-be -- the Proletariat -- and at the same time focus on Man/Woman, as alienated and alienating, which must be totally uprooted as the way to fully human relationships.

¶ Marx had rejected Feuerbachian abstract materialism, not alone because it failed to see the social relationship instead of stopping at individual relationship. He opposed Feuerbach as well, for rejecting the revolutionary Hegelian principle of "negation of the negation," a principle Marx cited again even in his technical Mathematical Manuscripts of 1881-82.

¶ Instead, his concept of revolution-in-permanence contended that only after the historic transcendence by the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, would there first begin the development of a new human society and a new Man/Woman relationship.

(in his last decade, writing)
Now listen to Marx on his relationship to Hegel -- which he left with his papers for Engels for Volume II of Capital, but which Engels left out:

P "My relationship with Hegel is very simple. I am a disciple of Hegel, and the presumptuous chatter of the epigones who think they have buried this great thinker appear frankly ridiculous to me. Nevertheless, I have taken the liberty of adopting ... a critical attitude, disencumbering his dialectic of its mysticism and thus putting it through a profound change..."

Between Marx and our age only Lenin seriously returned to Marx's roots in Hegel. But while Lenin commented profoundly and brilliantly on the whole of Science of Logic -- including the Doctrine of the Notion, where he embraced and concretized Hegel's principle that "Cognition not only reflects the world, but creates it," -- he nevertheless concretized only the single dialectical principle of transformation into opposite; of every unit containing its opposite within itself. He spelled that out concretely not alone as the expose of the 2nd International's betrayal, or naming the new stage of capitalism as imperialism, but because he made a category of its opposite -- the national revolutions. Specifically, it was the Irish Easter Rebellion of 1916, which Lenin considered the "bacillus" for proletarian revolution.

Unfortunately, other questions, especially the one on Organization, Lenin left untouched within the Vanguardist confines of his 1902-03, What is to be Done?

Our age has focused on the dialectics of revolution as the determinant. Nothing, including Organization, the Party, can find any escape route from that determinant. Even the Absolute Method itself is but the road to the Absolute Idea, Absolute Mind. When the Self-Thinking Idea comes with the Self-Bringing Forth of Freedom, we will have actual total freedom.

Though I have but a few moments before concluding, I do wish to give you at least a brief view of my new book that will soon be off the press: Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future.

The first thing I noticed in re-reading that 35 year compilation of articles -- with a focus on a single revolutionary force as Reason, Women's Liberation -- is that the Dialectics of Revolution is characteristic of all the (4) forces we singled out in the United States -- Labor, Black, Youth, as well as Women. (All are moments of revolution, and nobody can know before the event itself who will be the one in the concrete, particular revolution.

This determined my 1985 Introduction and Overview to the new book, which culminated in what we call the "Trail to the 1980s". The range of revolutions covered in the text characterizes the Archives as a whole, which tonight I'm bringing up to date by turning over the works of 1981-1985. It is also the distinctive mark of the activities of News and Letters Committees.

This is true not just as a summation, but rather as a new beginning. Just as Marx's concept of "revolution in permanence" made it clear that the revolution does not end with the overthrow of the old but must continue ⁱⁿ the new, so you begin to feel this presence of the future in the present. This is the time when every man, woman and child feels this newness precisely because it is now rooted in such new beginning.

In conclusion I would like to read two quotations, one from Philosophy and Revolution and one from Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution.

Here is how I ended Philosophy and Revolution:

"The reality is stifling. The transformation of reality has a dialectic all its own. It demands a unity of the struggles for freedom with a philosophy of liberation. Only then does the elemental revolt release new sensibilities, new passions and new forces -- a whole new human dimension."

And here is how I am ending my new, 4th book:

"With Marx's first founding of his new continent of thought and of revolution, he wrote: 'To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie'. The truth of this statement has never been more immediate and urgent than in our nuclear world, over which hangs the threat to the very survival of civilization as we have known it."

-- Raya Dunayevskaya, March 18 - March 21, 1985