

MARXIST HUMANIST PERSPECTIVES

1986

*The life
articulation of
life as a whole
instead of
the CP
on Pissars*

CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION: THE CHANGED WORLD Pg. 1
- II. ALIENATED LABOR AND THE PRESENT STATE OF CHAOS IN WORLD PRODUCTION Pg. 4
- III. THE ONGOING WORLD REVOLTS Pg. 9
- IV. PHILOSOPHIC AND ORGANIZATIONAL TASKS
 - A. THE SINGLE DIALECTIC IN PHILOSOPHY Pg. 12
 - B. THE SINGLE DIALECTIC IN ORGANIZATION Pg. 16

*+ Single
Year*

BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

PCST CONVENTION BULLETIN #1
NATIONAL CHAIRWOMAN'S PERSPECTIVES
REPORT TO THE CONVENTION OF NEWS
AND LETTERS COMMITTEES.
AUGUST 30, 1986

NEWS & LETTERS
59 E. VAN BUREN #707
CHICAGO, IL 60605

75¢

1035

MARKIST-HUMANIST PERSPECTIVES, 1986-87

REPORT TO CONVENTION OF NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES

by the NATIONAL CHAIRWOMAN, RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

I. INTRODUCTION: THE CHANGED WORLD

The changed world that Reagan retrogression brought to a new barbarism with his foray into the Gulf of Sidra, followed by the bombing of Tripoli and the living quarters of Kadaffi, had even his NATO Allies questioning him when his outreach declared SALT II "null and void" as he continued with his rhetoric about the "evil empire" whenever it came to any talks with Russia about disarmament. Chernobyl may have led him to think he could sweep every imperialist act under the rug, as all the Allies sang in chorus against Russia on Chernobyl. The illusion did not last long.

The present new overture to Russia about a summit meeting this year between the two super-powers likewise was bashed when Gorbachev had hardly finished his extension of the unilateral halt to testing than Reagan declared, from Santa Barbara, that he would not fall for what he called a Russian "propaganda ploy." And he continued at once with his underground nuclear explosions, disregarding Gorbachev's limited condition for the summit meeting: that the question of disarmament must be put on the table if the summit was to be "meaningful."

Of the many non-events that Reagan called "summits," the one that was an achievement was one he did not attend but manipulated. I refer to the Hassan-Peres meeting in Morocco. It was not about Africa; it was a testing of a not-so-obvious Middle East so-called summit that would include Russia.

As for imperial America, itself, what is deeply inherent in Reagan's retrogressionism -- and it is on this that he came to power in 1980 and what has been continuous throughout his reign -- is to turn world capitalism away from what was attempted by it when the Depression threatened its very rule -- i.e. the New Deal. That is not only characteristic of Reagan's two terms in office, but he is determined to incorporate it in unbreakable laws so that

it will not matter who wins office in 1988; this is the ground on which they will have to operate.

As against the kind of changed world Reagan's retrogressionism always aims at, Marxist-Humanism immediately recognized that the objective situation would not wait for us to have a bi-weekly to meet the challenge from that changed world. Indeed, News & Letters immediately introduced changes into both the Lead on Reagan's attacks on Libya and Nicaragua and the Editorial on Haiti in revolt in the April issue, and headlined them: Counter-Revolution and Revolution.

From the objective world, too, but this time very subjectively and revolutionarily, came all the new revolts -- from the Philippines to South Africa, from Haiti to South Korea, in Nicaragua -- as well as massive anti-nuclear demonstrations.

Now that Reagan has got even Congress to approve aid to the contras, his rhetoric has given forth his true aim -- the U.S. is to repeat the Vietnam War by invading Nicaragua, beginning, as with Vietnam, by sending U.S. military advisors to train the contras.

In Europe, however, the response of the anti-nuclear movement to the horror of Chernobyl has been not only outrage and protest against Russia's failure to provide information for its own people and the rest of Europe. Rather, that protest has also encompassed demonstrations against the U.S.'s nuclear plans, most especially Star Wars, and against the continuing nuclear presence in their own countries. On West German soil, especially, there has been a growing intensity of opposition to the nuclear reactors. Protestors have been mounting a continuing series of demonstrations, and the police have responded with the most vicious of attacks.

In truth, as Ronald Reagan's changed world is preparing for the unloosing of the holocaust while talking of the alleged prosperity of the U.S. and the stability of the Western world, the truth is quite different: Great Britain's Thatcher, who let Reagan use bases in Britain to fly to Libya, and who destroyed the Miners' General Strike, is now beset by daily strikes and lost bi-elections.

France refused permission to the U.S. to fly over its airspace to attack Libya. New Zealand has held firm in its protest against nuclear ships in its ports, despite being "read out" of its security treaty with the U.S. and Australia. West Germany, as we saw above, has had massive anti-nuclear demonstrations.

Finally and most crucially is Lebanon, where there has not been any halt whatsoever in the genocidal war ever since Israel's imperialist invasion, followed by Syria's equally genocidal expulsion of the PLO. The situation is so chaotic that Ronald Reagan is holding back his "evil empire" rhetoric enough to perhaps invite Russia back to try for a Middle East Conference.

Where Reagan has held back nothing is in his drive to create his Star Wars system. And he is getting support from new directions. Just look at the New York Times magazine section cover story (Aug. 26, 1986), "The Star Wars Spinoff," by Malcolm Browne. It is a vicious fairy tale of the alleged spin-offs from Star Wars, which has already gone much further than is known. Browne's apologia seeks to tie together the military, the civilian, the nuclear war and conventional war battlefields, and includes the intellectual battlefield -- the mind of the research scientist. What is at stake here is both the selling of Star Wars as the basis for "winnable wars" and demonstrating how real, how supposedly "useful" is the research that is now being undertaken.

Reagan still believes that there will be a summit. But neither side -- neither U.S. nor Russia -- is budging on what it considers "research" on the "Star Wars" program, the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). One top military analyst, the former military affairs specialist for the New York Times, Drew Middleton, who isn't against the SDI program, has nevertheless criticized the endless amounts of money for it, as if that contains the answer. He reminds them that you can destroy a country, but to occupy it, you have to be there, with infantry. The infantry is the key, not the high-tech weaponry. That is what the rulers always forget -- the masses, the people who are there.

The truth is that this is exactly what is at the root of Reagan's and Gorbachev's views -- no matter what they say about the world economy, it is in deep crisis. This is what we must turn to now as the key to the present world situation.

09011

11038

II. ALIENATED LABOR AND THE PRESENT STATE OF CHAOS IN WORLD PRODUCTION

Part II of the Draft Perspectives detailed "Capitalist Production/
Alienated Labor: This Nuclear World and its Political Crises." It is im-
portant to further emphasize this here. A leading bourgeois economist,
Peter Drucker, pronounced three so-called truths of the changed world
economy as the "uncoupling" of employment from production, of capital
investment from production, indeed the whole of industrial production
has been "uncoupled" from the economy.

What the present economists consider the changed world economy -- high
technology, unimated, robotized production -- is what bourgeois economists have
called "the post-industrial world" ever since the end of World War II. It
doesn't really matter whether those economists were referring to monopoly,
oligopoly, multinationals, or what they now refer to as the computerized
world; all are characteristic of the periods of both the post-World War I
and Post-World War II worlds.

They are characteristic of what Marx originally had singled out as the
most fundamental law of capitalist production of his day as it pursued Accu-
mulation, Accumulation, Accumulation. The concentration and centralization
of capital that characterized capitalist production, continued Marx, cannot
be changed. His greatest theoretical work -- Capital -- concludes that no
matter what it is that the capitalists do -- not even if they could extract
24 hours of living labor and if the laborer lived on air (to which Luxemburg
commented, "we might as well wait for the moon to turn to green cheese") --
capital nevertheless cannot overcome the general law of capitalist accumula-
tion, its absolute contradiction, the absolute general crisis, with its other
absolute law, the unemployed army. Capitalism will experience a decline in
the rate of profit, will collapse -- with a hefty push from those employed as
well as those unemployed living laborers.

What all the bourgeois economists choose to disregard about this high
stage of robotized production is that unpaid, surplus labor -- i.e. profit --
comes, and can only come, from living, sweated labor. Forgetting that this
automated production depends, in turn, on contract labor (the popular ex-
pression is "incubator factories"), creates the grand illusion that the multi-
nationals gain their profit, not from production, but from exchange -- an ex-
change of money. Drucker has reduced even world trade to mere exchange --
exchange of "services."

38011

11039

They further boost their illusions because they now have an objective base -- the supposed 1000 millionaires, as though that could substitute for the millions upon millions thrown into pauperization. The stock market that skyrockets from exchange does not create profits. It is nothing but exchange of different colored monies.

Not only do capitalist ideologues devise a million ways to avoid facing the unrelenting laws of capital. They are under the illusion that their great profits come from the latest machines. Unfortunately, from the moment that Vol. II of Capital was published by Engels* in 1885, some revolutionaries began arguing with the section on Accumulation of Capital. The greatest revolutionary to do so was Rosa Luxemburg. The point is that every time a truly new stage appears, the appearance becomes essence. Luxemburg was the most sensitive of all to pick up the first appearance of imperialism. But the so-called primitive accumulation -- colonialism -- that Marx took up in Vol. I was not related by Luxemburg to the new appearance of imperialism.

* The way Engels published Vol. II was not the way Marx asked that his manuscript be published. To Marx, Vol. II was to have been what we have come to know as Vols. II and III. To Marx, Vol. III was to have been what we know as Vol. IV, i.e. Theories of Surplus Value, which Marx had called History of Theory. The point is that the whole work was outlined in Vol. I, where the final part took up Accumulation of Capital.

[Here Raya extemporaneously expanded on her text, taking up the structure of Capital, as important for both workers and intellectuals today. Marx, she said, first wrote the "History of Theory," confronting all the economists (Smith, Ricardo, etc.) who had said that "labor is the source of all value." That is what is now called "Theories of Surplus Value." That, and what is now called Vol. III of Capital, are what today's Marxist economists see as the "real economics." But the truth is that Marx put all that away and then wrote Vol. I of Capital. That was the only volume that had his full attention, all the way to publication, in 1867. But Engels first read Vol. I as it went to the printer. He asked a lot of questions of the sort that any one of us today could answer. He said that the chapter on the commodity form is so abstract that he couldn't follow it. What Marx did was to expand the section of Chapter 1 on the form -- from barter to exchange to money, and most of all, to the fetishism of commodities. He called Engels' attention to this, saying that although it is the most difficult way to start -- that is, with an ordinary commodity -- you have to see that it is all in the form itself. Therefore, the fetish of form is the beginning and end of all revolution because the beginning and end of the fetishism of commodities is in labor, living labor. That is why Chapter 1 centers on labor's dual character.

Raya then moved to the culmination of Capital, Part VII on the "Accu-

11011

11040

The Draft Perspectives rightly concluded that "the positive in the negative" was not -- was not -- that under capitalism Alienated Labor can be a human activity, much less that science is the human activity.

What we detailed in the Draft Perspectives against Ronald Reagan's fantasy about prosperity was the reality of a near-recession. It was not only Ronald Reagan who continued with his fantasy. The ideologues likewise kept hedging the facts. Recently, however, (New York Times, July 21, 1986) a bourgeois journalist, Paul Lewis, entitled his article, "World Economy Shows Weakness." There he pointed out that despite the decline of oil prices and the low rate of inflation, the three most industrialized nations -- the U.S., West Germany and Japan -- who account for 50% of the world's GNP, are showing a slowdown continuing in the second quarter with regard to production from factories and mines. Indeed, another later accounting shows that only 18% of the world's workers are in production, and another whopping 73% are in services. Furthermore, the interdependence of the world economy, and particularly the suffering of Third World nations from a collapse of raw materials prices, demonstrated that there is no "uncoupling" of any single nation from this world economic weakness.

For the U.S. in particular, the bourgeois writers are forced to headline "Unemployment Stuck, Investment Stuck", showing how far from reality is Ronald Reagan's 1981 prediction upon coming to power, that 3 million new jobs would be created for this year.

We repeat: the truth of the economy's dependence on alienated, sweated, exploited labor, a dependence that does not stop short of even death and mutilation of Capital."

Marx was afraid he would die. So he decided that all the fundamental points of Vols. II and III should be included in outline form, as indication, right in Part VII of Vol. I. It is all there. What we call imperialism, is there in embryo as colonialism. And the expression that was so important to Marx was "So-called Primitive Accumulation." But after Marx died, Engels decided that this section on "so-called primitive accumulation" was such new material that he made a separate part out of it -- "Part VIII." He divided it from the whole discussion of accumulation of capital. To this day the new translation of Capital has the nerve to keep Engels' division, and to justify it in a footnote. Luxemburg was fooled precisely on this point. She divided Marx's discussion of colonialism from the new phenomenon of imperialism, and primitive accumulation from capitalist accumulation. The point is that when a truly new stage appears, the appearance is the essence. But even one as sensitive as Luxemburg couldn't catch it when she divided it from the whole law of capitalist accumulation.]

lation, can be seen in "A Tragedy in South Georgia" (New York Times, July 20, 1966), which took place some 15 years ago but is only now reaching final court settlement. Albert Scardino reminds us that 29 died and more than 50 were injured in this disastrous industrial accident tied to munitions production of flares for the Vietnam War.

That is precisely when the militarized economy spun out of control.

One socialist economist from Sweden, Joachim Israel, does see that the whole economy started going down as far back as the Vietnam War. And that was climaxed by the 1974 general world structural economic crisis (out of which, in Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis, we had concluded, "there will be no more booms"). Unfortunately, the erudite Israel ties that state of the world economy to what he thinks is a "socialist" answer: a "socialist" Welfare State! In fact, not only is his article entitled "The Crisis of the Welfare State," but as editor of this particular issue of Praxis International (April 1986), he devotes the whole issue to that question.

Other significant aspects of the counter-revolution which is polluting the air of the Left flowed out of Reagan's meeting with Savimbi -- the one I took up at the first Workshop/Class. Indeed, one of the latest of the counter-revolutions I did not develop in the Draft Perspectives is that one involving Savimbi and South Africa and the CIA, although in February, at the first Workshop/Class, I first pointed to the red carpet Reagan rolled out for Savimbi, at the very moment of the quiet coup in Lesotho.

Presently (Aug. 10, 1986), Savimbi is building camouflaged treetop platforms in Angola, from which to fire U.S. Stinger missiles at Russian-built fighters and bombers, hundreds of miles to the northwest, at Huando and Lubango, where Angolan pilots are being trained by Russian and Cuban advisors. It may become the last clash in Africa's hottest bush war.*

Not by any means to be skipped over is the fact that Savimbi's supply lines and support bases are in Zaire. These are under the supervision of the CIA. (Remember that the U.S., with the UN, in Zaire, made sure that Zaire

* See Washington Post section of Manchester Guardian, Aug. 10, 1986, for article by David Ottaway and Patrick Tyler.

remained in the West's camp -- for which they murdered Patrice Lumumba.) When Angola gained its independence, the Gulf Oil interests remained with the new regime. Since Reagan has come to power, he has been busy pouring money to Savimbi. He has not only put pressure on Gulf Oil to withdraw, but is at the same time opening other possibilities for them to keep getting their oil profits while Savimbi gains his own piece of territory out of which to operate. The point is the whole emphasis is now on supporting Savimbi, which means South Africa. The pipe dream that Savimbi can win a part of Angolan territory for the U.S. does show that CIA stations exist in Kinshasa, Zaire, Pretoria, South Africa, and indeed are active throughout Southern Africa. That is the reason Reagan does not budge from his opposition to sanctions against apartheid South Africa.

The masses of South Africa are moving on their own despite the undeclared civil war by the savage, barbaric, apartheid, white rulers and their daily slaughter of Blacks. It is high time to turn to the creative, revolutionary, courageous, genuine, freedom fighters in their ongoing revolutions in South Africa, in Haiti, in the Philippines and in Latin America, without forgetting the endless "little" strikes in the U.S., the intense anti-nuke demonstrations, especially in West Europe, after Chernobyl, that were directed not only against Russia but against the U.S. as well.

(Lou Turner will develop the "Philosophy of the Black Dimension" in full. What I want to call attention to is the fact that the Black Dimension has been key to our existence from the very start, as we made it clear that not only are we having a Black production worker as editor, but that it was not a question of any one person alone representing the Black Dimension. By 1969 we not only were preparing the biggest leap philosophically by presenting Philosophy and Revolution to a specially-called Black/Red Conference; so many non-members were present that we were actually the minority.

You will find a reprint of the bulletin we issued on that Conference in your packet. Also there will be the reprint of what came after Philosophy and Revolution, the speech on Absolute Idea as New Beginning that I gave to the Hegel Society of America.)

8 22011

11043

III. THE ONGOING WORLD REVOLTS

All of the great ongoing revolts in South Africa, in the Philippines, in Haiti, in South Korea, demand more than just being hailed. The dialectic of their development discloses new forms and new forces as well as the need for tracing the development, knowing from history that in the first stage of revolt, one is still not fully aware of the full might of the counter-revolution -- aware, that is, that those who had the power yesterday have ways to hit back. The new revolutionaries are really fighting under the whip of the counter-revolution at all times.

The greatest of the full revolutions is, of course, 1917. Remember that the betrayal of the Second International had no sooner happened in 1914 as World War I broke out than revolutionaries, Lenin especially, called for turning the imperialist war into a civil war. But it took three years before we had the revolution, and the first stage was not November, but February -- i.e. Kerensky.

When, at the beginning of the 1980s, we entitled the Marxist-Humanist Perspectives Thesis "Tomorrow is Now," we were pointing to the new structural economic crisis, the U.S.'s counter-revolutionary war in Vietnam, the urgency of Marxist-Humanism to delve into the whole body of ideas of Marx's Marxism as a totality. That was the trail to our age, and it became imperative, at one and the same time, to ask the question "what happens after" and also to trace the development of new forms of revolution and its relation to philosophy or the lack of philosophy, of relations of worker and intellectual, of spontaneity and organization; in a word, to single out the new forces of revolt that became crucial at a specific period.

We want, for example, to turn to what we seem to take too much for granted -- the Youth in the ongoing present revolutions. Turn to Haiti and see what was new as distinct from trying to overthrow the Duvalier dictatorship from its strongest center, Port-au-Prince. The Haitian youth tell us now that in actuality, in the Gonaives region, students had organized for some time into small groups before the downfall of Duvalier to work against the regime. Another youth complained that "the leaders do not see the importance of the role of youth in the socio-economic and

political development of the country...our youth, therefore, are abandoned to their own devices." The youth do not stop either with critique or with being outside of the center; they are now in Port-au-Prince and throughout the country, and are reaching out internationally and to us.

Indeed, the youth are of the essence and of a very conscious form not only in Haiti. Take what is happening in South Korea. Even the bourgeois journalists (see New York Times, June 17, 1986) have featured the fact of a new kind of radical, who simultaneously delves into serious study of Marx and outright revolutionary actions not only against that regime, but against U.S. imperialism itself. That is exactly what reveals even more the whip of counter-revolution -- which began way back in the 1950s South Korean movement, when tens of thousands of U.S. troops were stationed along the 38th parallel.

To emphasize the continuing whip of counter-revolution, Schultz was there at the very moment when one of the great demonstrations of youth was ongoing, and turned his back on it.

Every division into two, from the end of World War II, marked the possible starting place for the next war, even though that means the nuclear holocaust itself -- i.e. two Germanies, two Vietnams, two Koreas, two Cambodias; the Pacific is full of them, and Gorbachev isn't letting America be the only nuclear power there. (Russia is everywhere from Southeast Asia to Vladivostok, and making overtures to China as well as silent ones to Japan.)

The Youth in South Africa -- indeed, many are young children -- are not only the most heroic, but are involved in every facet of the revolt and well aware of tendencies. So much so, that one group expressed it in a very specific way when they told us that they understood why we call ourselves not just Marxist, but Marxist-Humanist.

The greatest upsurge, of course, was in the Philippines. That "people's revolution" was especially dramatic when the nuns put flowers in the army's guns aimed against the people's uprising. The youth there reached to us as we reached to them; the whole youth page in the May issue of News & Letters was devoted to the youth's struggles in the Philippines, and clearly, they

are interested in ideas as well as actions. How many tendencies are there now, fighting without a philosophy of revolution? And without a rigorous tracing of the historic past as well as the present of those using the term Marxist-Leninism?

With Ronald Reagan's latest call for the overthrow of the regime in Nicaragua, we surely need to intensify our activities against Reagan and the Congress that just voted for \$100 million more in aid for the contras. The Latin American revolts, indeed, were among the first of the new movements from practice in 1952 and have never stopped. Whether it was making a revolution in Cuba or whether the U.S. supposedly did stop a revolution in El Salvador --- and this time it was Carter who started that counter-revolution, ahead of Reagan --- the point is that the revolts have never stopped, as the May 1 demonstrations showed.

The labor upsurges all through Central America have touched every nation there in the last year, from El Salvador to Guatemala, and including Honduras, where Reagan is now sending GI's to train the contras. And yet, the unfinished nature of all these struggles under the whip of U.S. imperialism, has never been more evident -- especially in Nicaragua, where the ongoing war with the contras is putting a severe strain on that revolution's development.

The revolts are significant even when they do not border on revolution -- as on May 1 which, at one and the same time, saw demonstrations against Duarte in El Salvador, and tremendous new actions in Chile and even in Guatemala and Paraguay. East Europe, too, has not at all ^{been} quiet, as witness the fact that, despite the "destruction" of Solidarnosc, it seems alive and kicking; the rulers have again declared amnesty for some of the most active, long after the supposed destruction of Solidarnosc.

What seems of less significance are the actions right here inside the U.S. -- whether that be the Hormel strike or "just" the May Day Haymarket celebrations in Chicago. The truth is, however, that what we've been correctly saying ever since the 1980 Perspectives Thesis is that "Tomorrow is Now."

That this permeates the whole decade of the 1980s is shown not only in

the fact that we reached out to revolutionaries overseas, but that they reached out to us from major revolutions-in-the-making like Haiti, the Philippines, and South Africa. At the same time, we established new relations with striking workers here in the U.S., especially those at Hormel and Ottumwa. It wasn't only our participation in their actions that brought us these new relations, but the fact of their participation in events other than their own immediate strike struggles. They solidarized with other strikers where we were present.

Thus, at the May 1, 100th anniversary of the very birth of the struggle for the 8-hour day -- the Haymarket Martyrs -- here in Chicago, striking workers from Minnesota and Iowa were present. That commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Haymarket was both a national event and an international one -- with visitors from Germany, Sweden, Canada, Poland and Japan. They were present, and so were News and Letters Committees.

Indeed, that international solidarity is true not only of labor, but reaches out to all forces of revolution, as was seen this year in the continuing exchange of views between Japanese anti-nuclear activists and American youth. The Marxist-Humanist contribution to that two-way road of dialogue within the anti-nuclear movement spans more than two decades, going all the way back to our relations with the left wing of Zengakuren, who helped to translate Marxism and Freedom in the early 1960s and arranged a national tour for us, which included a speech at Hiroshima on Dec. 7 (8), 1965. It is that kind of new relations, national and international, that Reagan's counter-revolution seeks to suppress, whether it be in Nicaragua or apartheid South Africa.

IV. PHILOSOPHIC AND ORGANIZATIONAL TASKS

A. The Single Dialectic in Philosophy

In your convention packet you will also find two new things that you may think are old, since one is a reprint of what you saw serialized in News & Letters -- "Retrospective and Perspective"; the other one you haven't seen in print, but you've seen it on videotape as the sixth of the Workshop/Classes.

34811

11047

In fact, they are both very new, not just because the Retrospective/Perspective includes as well the new Introduction to Vol. 12 of the Archives -- which has a view of the early past as well as the latest additions of 1985-86 -- but because the early history brings us back to the ramifications of the Russian Revolution on the U.S. That sheds an illumination on the dialectical relationship of the Universal to the Particular as well as of Essence to Form. These are integral to what is at issue objectively as well as subjectively, both to the body of ideas of Marxist-Humanism and to this year's concrete proposal to transform News & Letters into a bi-weekly.

Marx's "new Humanism" is a totality that marks a new beginning that will first determine the end, leaving all doors open for the new that will appear after. 1844 revealed his discovery of a new continent of thought and revolution. It also disclosed Marx's attitude to the movement from practice that was itself a form of theory. In this Marx rooted his "new Humanism." This was obvious from the fact that he held that the burning of the property deeds by the Silesian weavers was itself so high a stage of development that it towered above the Great French Revolution. Which is why he called his philosophy a "new Humanism."

He did so in the same essay -- "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" -- which is part of what we now call the Humanist Essays, and in which Marx broke not only with Hegelian idealism but with the mechanical materialism of Feuerbach. Marx, instead, credited the Hegelian dialectic with developing the active side of thought, and calling for a still newer unity of material and ideal which would break with both private property and vulgar communism. It was that transcendence which would first spell out this humanism, "beginning from itself," and which remained throughout his life -- 1844-83.

And what was the key to all this? Labor. How could Hegel have possibly been "called upon" in this? Let's take still another look at the dialectic. We are back at its key, the negation of the negation. We are back at the self-production of Man/Woman (something, I might add, that Engels never fully grasped.)

This is the dialectic which Marx never departed from in considering

Hegel's Dialectic as the "source of all dialectics." This, even after he had discovered a whole new continent of thought and of revolution. And even after he had worked out the fundamental economic laws of capitalism and was sending his colleagues his Critique of the Gotha Program at the same time that he was finishing his editing of the last parts of the French edition of Capital. Neither the Gotha Program nor the French edition of Capital were focused on, in the 1930s. The focus was the Depression and the Russian Revolution.

Those of us who had gone through Trotskyism certainly suffered before we finally broke with Trotsky. Stuck in the fact of the nationalization of production coming out of the Russian Revolution, Trotsky held that particular to be a veritable universal; held that it was the Essence that in no way revolutionaries could disregard or depart from; held that, even when the false foreign policy form led to war, we could not fail to defend the workers' state "though degenerate." It was then that we finally broke.

Or take the opposite case -- Flekhanov, who was known as the "father of Russian Marxism." When a particular form like soviets became the Russian Revolution he refused to recognize it. In a word, he betrayed. What I am trying to say is that Form is not just the Form to which Essence is counterposed. There are historic moments when Form is Essence. Just as the Universal must particularize itself, so must Essence appear.

Revolutionaries recognized that Flekhanov had betrayed. Trotsky remained a great revolutionary and even entitled his study of Stalin's Russia, The Revolution Betrayed. Nevertheless, he failed to recognize Stalin as an alien class, as not just a bureaucrat but as the latest form of capitalism -- state-capitalism.

Let's examine again 1933 -- the year Hitler came to power. Why did it take all the way to 1938 before the establishment of the Fourth International? And even then, Trotsky still called for the defense of Russia as a workers' state "though degenerate." The Trotskyists were certainly right in all their tactics against Hitler when he came to power. We certainly met the challenge from the objective situation when The Militant was transformed into a three-times-a-week paper, charging only pennies. Trotsky warned

84011

11049

A. The Single Syllogism in Generalization

Because it is essential not to let go of the dialectic in the body of ideas and in the concrete scrupulousness for a single year, it becomes necessary to return to a final look at the Dialectic in Hegel. What may have sounded very abstract when I sent around the page of "Random Thoughts," on the relationship of the first to the last work of Hegel, is what is relevant here. I stressed the fact that all of the ideas that it took a quarter of a century for Hegel to work out were already present, even if only implicitly, in the Phenomenology of Mind.


It is true that Hegel himself didn't fully grasp that when it first poured out of him spontaneously. Post-Hegelians are still busy talking about its chaotic structure. When something bursts forth from a genius and has no strictly logical form, is hardly more than instinct, everyone, including the genius, is ready to attribute it to the chaotic state of youth. But, in fact, this is where instinct is not just instinct.

Long before he was able to articulate it to his own satisfaction, the essence of the final three syllogisms was in the Phenomenology. What spelling out the structure in the Encyclopedia in syllogistic form -- Logic-Nature-Mind -- showed was that the Philosophy of Nature was the middle, the Mediation. That is to say, Nature, not Logic, is the true first. It took Hegelians more than a century to discover that Logic was "replaced," and what Poggeler said in 1961 is still new and unacceptable to Hegelians. Paragraphs 575, 576, 577 further reveal that a new unity is needed between Nature (Action, Practice) and Cognition. That unity, far from ending it, is a new beginning. The point is that the unity, or totality, is either a new beginning or it is no more than a quantitative summation.

The second syllogism, however, is not the final, not the second negation. With the second syllogism, Hegel still felt that his body of ideas needed to be worked out in full. That is what the third paragraph -- #577 -- is about. It is the second negation, and Hegel's "Eternity" leaves plenty of doors open. Marx's greatest transformation of Hegel's "Eternity" is "revolution in perma-

06011

11051



sense." You can't just repeat it as a phrase, as "socialism." That is what first begins a revolutionary's task, as it must be concretized for our age.

The unity, or totality, is either a new beginning which determines the end, or it contains the greatest contradiction all over again, as Hegel showed in the very first paragraph of the Absolute Idea. There he referred to Absolute Idea itself as containing the greatest contradiction.

In a word, when Hegel concluded Chapter 2 of Section 3, "The Idea," which showed the unity of action and cognition, he said "this is the Absolute Idea" (which made Lenin so very happy despite the fact that Hegel was showing that it is only the threshold of the new Idea, and as everyone knows, from the threshold you can either go forward or fall backward.) As you may know, that's when I began my fight with Lenin, in 1954, when he said that the final paragraph of the Science of Logic could be thrown out -- but at that time I forgave him on the ground that he hadn't lived through Stalinism.

Now we turn to perspectives for Marxist-Humanism in the 1980s and specifically for this year, 1986-87 -- still not letting go of the dialectic in the body of ideas.

This year's perspective of a bi-weekly will, of course, have its own report this very day, and will deal with it substantially and in detail. Here what is necessary is to consider the Marxist-Humanist Body of Ideas beginning with the birth of the 1980s.

1980 was a crucial year for the decade organizationally, philosophically, journalistically, as the third of what we call the "trilogy of revolution" -- Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution -- was nearing completion. (The 8 chapters then projected were listed in the new pamphlet on 25 Years of Marxist-Humanism we wrote that year.)

Journalistically, we were preparing for it with a proposal to transform the 8-page News & Letters into a 12-pager which would regularly feature Essay-Articles. Eugene had been brought to the Center to be responsible for that. The year before we had already issued three 12-pagers, one of which repro-

83011

11052

duced the chapter we, at that time, had thought would be the first chapter of the new book: "Relationship of Philosophy and Revolution to Yeats's Liberation: Marx's and Engels' Studies Contrasted." By the time the book was actually finished, that chapter had become the final one, the key chapter that projected the concept of post-Marx Marxists as a category.

It was in the late 1970s, too, when Charles Donby and I had finished the Introduction to the Frantz Fanon pamphlet, that we had brought Lou Turner to the Center to get to know the proletarian city of Detroit and our Black worker-editor in a working relationship.

We were determined to have Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution off the press in 1982 so we could have it in hand for the 1983 Marx Centenary tour, and project the new category of post-Marx Marxism to the new doors we were trying to open in the Black dimension and Women's Liberation. As it turned out, that tour actually returned us to where the whole body of ideas known as Marxist-Humanism began, at the time of the Miners' General Strike of 1949-50.

Post-Marx Marxism as a pejorative made translucent how crucial was that missing link -- philosophy, not only for revolutionaries who had not returned to Marx's roots in the Hegelian dialectic, but even for a great revolutionary like Lenin who had, and without whose ground, in the philosophy of revolution, we couldn't have developed the Absolute Idea. Yet Lenin had not grounded himself in that missing link, philosophy, when it came to organization, "the Party." This produced the other new chapter for Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, Chapter 11 -- "The Philosopher of Permanent Revolution Creates Ground for Organization."

Without the key importance of that missing link, philosophy, we couldn't have fully spelled out the full body of ideas in the succeeding year, especially the section we called "Not By Practice Alone" in our 1984-85 Perspectives. The following year, we were again stressing "organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanism."

As the Draft Perspectives for this year puts it:

11053

11053

"Self-discipline is not the absence of discipline; it is the absence of an order to be disciplined. Self-discipline is born out of the Idea of Freedom as Absolute and History as not only past, but history-in-the-making which Marx saw as the actualization of freedom, its struggle throughout human development. The long, hard road to revolution cannot be achieved if History is skipped over; history-in-the-making, as well as in the past, is inseparable from the self in self-determination of the Idea of Freedom."

This year the objective situation needed some practicing dialecticians. To become practicing dialecticians we felt it necessary to devote a whole year to testing ourselves in a new way by holding a new type of Workshop/Classes. We introduced there the need for the reporters to each of the sessions, no matter what the topic, to bring in a 2-pager for News & Letters. We considered this one way to "concretize" the road to a bi-weekly. Several of these 2-pagers were printed in News & Letters; others, which were not as timely, nevertheless did give the writers the experience of responding to the challenge from the objective situation.

The other road to the bi-weekly was the activity of the organization, trips especially. Indeed, the latest trip to India by Kevin and Neda was so important that we will hear from them today and tomorrow both as it relates to our body of ideas and to our Perspectives for a bi-weekly, and in general faster responses to world events.

The need to organizationally concretize philosophy anew each year naturally is given new urgency now that Ronald Reagan's "Changed World" has made counter-revolution so tower over the seething discontent of the masses in the world that the very thought of revolution seems impossible. All the more reason to begin now; at one and the same time, preparations for a bi-weekly News & Letters and concentrated work on the book. Eugene will be giving you the full report on the paper. Here I want to tell you that I have introduced some changes into the title for the book. It is now Dialectics of Organization and Philosophy: The Party and Forms of Organization Born out of Spontaneity.

Philosophy is so very crucial to everything -- not only the book, but here at this Convention. Which is why all reports this year, whether on Fi-

nances or on Archives, the Paper or the Black dimension, begin with the words "philosophy of." By organization being kept inseparable from philosophy, we see that there is no way for dialectics to be in two different places, one for organization and the other for philosophy. There is a single dialectic of objective/subjective.

It is not ended in that relationship. That is where the task first begins. That is the Absolute Method. No other method will do. This is why Hegel, once he criticized the empiric and critical method as one -- the second attitude to objectivity -- proved that if any philosopher tried not to go to the Absolute Method, the dialectic, he would retrogress into the third attitude to objectivity. And that is why Marx never departed from Hegel's dialectic of thought, even in his discovery of a new continent of thought and of revolution. That is what remains the ground of Marxist-Humanism.

✓ Crucial for the book-to-be is collectivity. It is too often that we have related to collectivity as if it were only a question with the "outside," that is to say, the masses who are naturally key. But what is often passed over is that the whole responsibility is not one single person, but all of us. When I said, in the Preface to Marxism and Freedom, that I considered the workers, especially the miners whom I had interviewed, to be my co-authors, I didn't mean that they were the only ones. I stressed the fact that no writer writes out of his own head. It has never been truer than for this book, which is the first ever in which organization and philosophy are inseparable.

Each decade is seen in our organization, in all those 30 years we keep talking about, of the movement from practice to theory and from theory to practice. In this specific case, those members we have from the decade of the 1950s, who either think they are too old to be as active as they should be, or too wise, become critical for this new book, precisely because they are the ones who experienced the need to break from C.L.R. James to become Marxist-Humanists.

All of our activities in the mass movement, be they in labor struggles or in the Black or Women's Liberation Movement, or Youth, or anti-nuke, or in our international relations, be they in Latin America or Haiti, in South

11054

11055

Africa or the Philippines, in East or West Europe, become inseparable from our major theoretical works. Indeed, that was characteristic of us from the first, as both the Hungarian Revolution and the Black Revolution became inseparable from Marxism and Freedom.

The same was true in the further development of philosophy and the new passions and new forces of the 1960s that became Philosophy and Revolution. In the 1980s we decided that a balance sheet was needed about all the great revolutionaries like Lenin, Luxemburg, Trotsky -- which not only became Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, but saw a new category created on "post-Marx Marxism, beginning with Engels."

Finally, as the Draft Perspectives shows in its Introduction, it is both our body of ideas and our concrete perspectives for a bi-weekly this year which is called upon by the objective situation to meet the challenge of this changed world that Reagan is retrogressively driving for, with his latest repeated threats to Libya and the ever-growing poverty in the U.S., where one-third of the nation is what Roosevelt said it was in 1933 -- "ill-clad, ill-fed, and ill-housed," and now homeless.

Tomorrow is today.