Dear Harry.

Now that we have gone through one of these IS Conferences, I believe that we should make sure that the next timese (of course, I meen you) should take the floor, and not only on State-Capitalism, but on the Philosophy of Marxist-Humanian. Specifically, I am referring to the International Conference they are announcing for next year. How much discussion was there on that question? Have you had any opportunity, when talking to Tony Cliff, to raise the question about inviting me to participate in the preliminary discussion for the 1970 Conference to which they are supposed to open the pages of the IS? If not, I believe that you should find some excuse scon to raise the question with themin a letter, perhaps when you check whether they are giving us an ad on the State-Capitalism and Marxist-Humanism pamphlet.

I don't know whether you know that 1970 is not only the bundredth Anniversary of Lenin's birth, but also the 200th snotversary of degel's birth, and, of course, that is the year I hope to finish Philosoph yand Revolution. It goes without saying that whether I write something for the IS or whether you must wait to attent in person their conference, Philosophy and Revolution would be the central point for both of us. Indeed, that has been the real vacuum in the Marxist movement since Lenin's death, and there is no doubt in my mind at all that this was the main reason that Trotskyism could make such headway in the IS. That is to say, he is just a Trotskyist, State-Capitalism as a, theory notwithstanding. Let me give you the following background to the theory insofar as my relations, or, more correctly lack of relations, with Tony is concerned:

- (1) In 1941, when I first developed the theory of State-Capitelism the relations with Europe were very much non-existent because of the war. Nevertheless, I am very sure that by 1943, when my study was published, it definitely did get known in Europe: I even met some workers from Turin who had told mot that the Resistance Sove cent was very much heartened by it because they had such fights with the Stalinis s. who tried to subordinate the Movement to Russia's foreign policy. Tony Cliff, as an Internationalist and Intellectual, not only knew of this bug refused categorically to acknowledge that anyons internationally could have done original work in Marxist Theory ahead of him.
- In 1947, he was still in the Trotskyist Hovement but did finally decide to make "his own study" of Russia and was coming to the canclusion that it was a State-Capitalist society. Neverthekess, he refused to vote for my resolution at the Fourth International Conference or to take any stand, until he had "his stidy" completed. That occurred the next year. And, again, despite all references to many sources that would prove his "erwittion", he made not a single reference to my study, much less acknowledge that a study before his had been done on this quention. We very non-ly came to blows when I arrived in Lordon in 1947 and found that his unalysis was so fully economist that we really did have little that we agreed on. For example, the theory of State-Capitalism in our tendency was never separated from the new forms of Workers" Revolts, in which of necessity, the spentaneity of the Masses played a crucial role. His administrative mentality mersly treated spontaneity of the workers as in it were an "Anarchist Aberation". The same divergence of views separated us on the question of Palestino as even that carly, he refused to see anything revolutionary in the actions of the Jowish Masses to rid itself of British Imperialism. And, the same wide separation provailed in our analysis or the situation in Surope which I considered pre-revolutionary, whereas he judged it as merely "mationelist."

14071

Pg. 2

(3) Finally, (inserer as Teny was concerned) he considered simself sofar apart from our teniency that when it came to international relations, he preferred ties with the burescratic collectivist teniency, (which he has, in fact, to this day with the ISC.) than with the State-Capitalist teniency.

England in 1959, their youth then (Nigel Parris) insisted on a relationship with us and we began, so to speak, to communicate through third persons. You know the situation since then and you know that this was the very first time that they sent us an invitation to their Conference. We innediately replied that we had a Marxist-Housnist group in England and that you, therefore, would be present at an observer. Had you spoken, however, you would, of course, have spoken, not ely far the Scottish Marxist-Humanists but for Mal. Does Tony, when he speaks to you, still pretend that we do not exist in the United Statest Did you, by you get the chance to write to Tony, you should state also that the more you attempt to subvert the State-Capitalist tendency, the more you are sorry that formally invited to participate in the discussion that they intend to open in the pages of the IS.

respect sizes I noticed that their ameniments speak, as usual with them, against all other Troiskyists, in this case Healyites. Are you sware that the Healyites claim to be the real theoreticians and one of their Professors wrote a whole pasphier on philosophy, hair of which was wholly devoted to an attack on me and a strought to show the great division in Lenin on dialectics?

Thanks for gotting me the Phenomenclogy. But now I want you to also get me the new translation of Magal's SCIENCE OF LOGIC, in two volumes, a new introduction by J.M. Findley. It is going to cost more money than you have cleft. (it is quoted as \$12.00 here but they have no copies). I enclose a \$10.00 have every single thing that is new on Hogel this year.

Yours,

. ауа