A Lecture Delivered in Chicago, Jan. 27 - Feb. 3, 1985

DIALECTICS OF REVOLUTION AND OF WOMEN'S LIBERATION

by Raya Dunayevskaya

INTRODUCTION AND PART I:

MARX'S MARXISM; LENIN'S MARXISM

PART II:

RE-ESTABLISHING THE LINK OF CONTINUITY WITH MARX'S MARXISM AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BODY OF IDEAS OF MARXIST-HUMANISM

A. Vicissitutdes of State-Capitalism and the Birth of Marxist-Humanism: Marxism and Freedom, from 1776 Until Today

B. Return to Hegel and Our Dialectical Discoveries: Philosophy and Revolution, from Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao

C. The Marx Centenary: Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution

CONCLUSION: UNCHAINING THE DIALECTIC

DIALECTICS OF REVOLUTION AND OF WOMEN'S LIBERATION

INTRODUCTION and PART I -- Marx's Marxism; Lenin's Marxism

Let's go adventuring to some Historic Turning Points that have unchained the dialectic: in Marx's age, in Lenin's, and in our post-World War II age. (1)

Let's begin with 1843-44 when Marx broke with capitalism, having discovered a whole new continent of thought and of revolution that he called "a new Humanism."

Hegel's dialectic methodology had created a revolution in philosophy. Marx criticized it precisely because the structure of Phenomenology was everywhere interpreted as a revolution in thought only. Marx's Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic took issue with Hegel also for holding that a philosopher can know the dialectic of revolution (the French Revolution in Hegel's case) only after the revolution has taken place. Marx re-created it as a dialectic of Reality in need of transformation. He named the Subject -- the revolutionary force who could achieve this -- as the Proletariat.

Put briefly, Marx transformed Hegel's revolution in philosophy into a philosophy of revolution. This will be further developed throughout this talk. For the moment, our focus must develop Marx's first "new moment" -- i.e., discovery -- the birth of what he called "a new Humanism."

It is that which characterized Marx's whole life after his break with capitalism until the day of his death, 1843-1883. It will include two actual revolutions -- 1848 and 1871. The defeat of the 1848 revolu-

tions produced a new need for a continuing revolution, a "revolution in permanence"; and Marx concluded from 1871, which created the Paris Commune, that the bourgeois state needs to be totally destroyed and called for a non-state form of workers' rule like the Paris Commune.

A 31-year lapse followed before a single post-Marx Marxist -- Lenin -- felt compelled to have a revolutionary encounter with the Hegelian dialectic. That Historic Turning Point followed when, in the objective world, the Second International collapsed at the outbreak of World War I. The shocking betrayal by the Second International served as the compulsion to Lenin to return to Marx's origin in the Hegelian dialectic with his own study of Hegel's Science of Logic. This marked the Great Divide in post-Marx Marxism. Lenin's grappling with the Hegelian-Marxian dialectic continued through the final decade of Lenin's life, from 1914 to 1924.

What resulted from this revolutionary encounter was a reunification of philosophy with revolution. We must see what Lenin specifically singled out to help him answer the Historic task facing him, and how he reconnected with Marx's Marxism. The dialectical principle he singled out from Hegel was transformation into opposite. Everything he worked out from then on -- from Imperialism to State and Revolution -- demonstrates that.

not to tally however, Since VL never raised Q of Party but stuff thru 1902-03 State

The main focus here is on the significance of what a revolutionary concretizes to answer the challenge of a new age. In the case of Lenin it was the dialectic principle of transformation into opposite that he held to characterize both capitalism's development into imperialism and a section of the proletariat being transformed into "the aristocracy of labor."

Nearly two decades elapsed after Lenin died during which would come the actual outbreak of World War II, which caused Trotskyism to split into several different tendencies before there was the first serious grappling with the new reality that characterized the objective world. It was the outbreak of World War II which compelled me to study the three Five-Year Plans and to come to the conclusion that Russia was a state-capitalist society. The shocker to Trotsky, to which he never reconciled himself, was that outright counter-revolution came, not from the outside, from imperialism, but from the Russian Revolution itself. With the transformation of the first workers' state into a state-capitalist society it became clear that Stalin represented not just the bureaucrat, Stalin, but Stalinism, a Russian form of the new world stage in production.

Before, however, the dialectics of revolution could be fully unchained philosophically for our age we had to experience both the new phenomenon in 1949-50 of living masses in motion posing new questions and a serious grappling, philosophically, with the Hegelian-Marxian dialectic. This resulted in the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism. It was this philosophy which characterized those masses in motion as a movement from practice that was itself a form of theory. Since we are Marxist-Humanists, what we will examine today is that whole body of ideas -- taking up both what we call the "trilogy of revolution" and the new fourth book we will soon have off the press: Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future.

MARX'S MARXISM

Let's first examine Marx himself, from 1843 to 1883 -- in both his realtionship to, and the break from Hegel. So far as I am concerned, the "new moments" in Marx mark not merely the last decade of his life -- which became, for us, the trail to the 1980s -- 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 came the birth of a new continent of thought and of revolution.

There was no time for popularization; that had to be left to his closest collaborator, Engels, who was no Marx, so that the founder of this new continent of thought and of revolution could give his whole time to the concretization of that new Universal -- Marx's "new Humanism."

Note how painstakingly and in what interrelationships Marx's 1844 Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic shows all the new elements. Though he had already designated the proletariat as the revolutionary force, it was at that moment that he also singled out the Man/Woman relationship and pointed to the fact that it is that which discloses how alienating is the nature of this capitalist society. And though he had already separated himself from petty-bourgeois idealism, the power of negativity separated him also from Feuerbachian materialism.

The "new Humanism," in a word, was not just a matter of counterposing materialism to idealism; it was the unity of the two. By introducing practice as the very source of philosophy, Marx completely transformed the Hegelian dialectic as related only to thought and made it the dialectics of revolution. It was not only capitalism and its idealism

Marx rejected, but what he called "vulgar communism" -- which he stressed was not the goal of the overthrow of capitalism. What concretized his "new Humanism" was that the revolution must be continuous after the overthrow of capitalism.

When the real revolutions came in 1848 -- and he, himself, participated in them -- he called, after their defeat, for a "Revolution in permanence," in his 1850 Address to the Communist League.

And after the French edition of Capital, after 40 hard years of labor in economics, he projected the possibility that a revolution could occur first in a technologically backward country (what we now see as the Third World) -- ahead, that is, of the so-called advanced countries, which is what it seemed he had predicted in the "Accumulation of Capital." In a word, there is nothing that was concretely spelled out in Marx's very last decade that was not first seen in the Promethean vision which he had unfolded at the very beginning, in the breaking up of the capitalist world.

Take even the one question -- Organization -- which the so-called orthodox claim was never touched seriously by anyone, not even a Marx, until Lenin worked it out in What is to be Done in 1902-03. The truth is Marx was always an "organization man." He no sooner got to Paris and finished his Essays (which never were published in his lifetime) than he searched out workers' meetings, created his own International Communist Correspondence Committees, and then joined the League of the Just, which became the Communist League. He tried to get everyone from Feuerbach to Proudhon to join, calling on them to be as enthusiastic about the workers' voices

as he was.

What was true was that only with the 1875"Marginal Notes"we know as the Critique of the Gotha Program did he express his views directly on the "program" of a workers' party. Those "Marginal Notes" stressed the impossibility for serious revolutionaries ever to separate philosophy of revolution from the actual organization; when a principle of philosophy and revolution is not in the "program," one should never join that organization, though one could participate in individual joint action against capitalism.

Did this Critique mean anything to any of those who called themselves Marxists? Clearly, not to the whole leadership of the Second International. That historic turning point had not meant anything to any of the German leaders -- and not only not to the Lassalleans but also not to the Eisenachists, who considered themselves Marxists.

And what of the Internationaalists? It took nothing short of the outbreak of World War I to have anyone turn to the Critique. The single one who did -- Lenin -- learned a great deal on the necessary destruction of the capitalst state, as State and Revolution shows, but left the whole question of Organization completely alone.

It took our age, specifically Marxist-Humanists, before there was a serious grappling with the type of organization Marx was calling for, and a reconnection of organization with his philosophy of "revolution in permanence." We did it publically only when the transcription of Marx's Ethnological Notebooks became available and were analyzed philosophically for our age in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. It was there that we challenged all post-Marx Marxists on this question.

LENIN'S MARXISM

"The difference of the ideal from the material is also not unconditional, not excessive...

"At the end of Book II of the Logic before the transition to the Notion, a definition is given: 'the Notion, the realm of Subjectivity or of Freedom':

NB Freedom = subjectivity
('or')
goal, consciousness, striving NB "

-- Lenin, Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic

Lenin did not know the 1844 Humanist Essays. What predominated in the mind of the first generation of post-Marx Marxists was Organization, and that without grappling with Marx's Critique of the Gotha Program; that was totally ignored. What was not only not ignored but actually became the Great Divide in Marxism was the dialectic, the relationship between materialism and idealism, the dialectic methodology. The only Divide acknowledged by Marxists was that between reform and revolution. Put differently, though the inseparability of revolution from organization's goal was acknowledged, philosophy remained the missing link. That is not just in general. Specifically it means reducing methodology as if it were a mere "tool." It is this which shows what the true Great Divide was: the Dialectic which Lenin alone understood although he kept his What is to be Done? where it was in 1902-03.

The very fact that the Great Divide continued within the Bolshevik movement -- in great revolutionaries like Bukharin and Rosa Luxemburg -- speaks volumes about the unacknowledged missing link of philosophy. Thus, the one who was accepted as the greatest theoretician -- Bukharin -- sharply disagreed with Lenin on his relationship to the national liberation movement, specifically the Irish Revolution. It led Lenin to use as divisive a class designation of Bukharin's position as "imperialist economism"!

Lenin did not sum up his attitude to Bukharin, directly relating it to dialectics, until his Will. There Lenin (who by then had Bukharin's Economics of the Transition Period) wrote that Bukharin's views could "only with the very greatest doubt be regarded as fully Marxian, for ...he never fully understood the dialectic."

The principle Lenin singled out in the dialectic, as we noted, was the transformation into opposite, which he related both to capitalism and to a section of the proletariat, but not to his concept of the Party-to-lead. But while he failed to submit "the Party" to the Absolute Method of the dialectic of second negativity -- that remained his untouchable "private enclave", the one that remains the noose around us all -- Lenin did unstintingly hold to the dialectic principle that the imperative to re-transform the opposite into the positive cannot be done without the creativity of a new revolutionary force. The fact that you could prove betrayal would amount to nothing unless you could point to a new force like the Irish Revolution.

It was this which led him to attack what he called Luxemburg's "half-way dialectic." Here was a revolutionary who, before anyone else, including Lenin, had called attention to the opportunism of the Second International and had pinpointed, before the actual outbreak of World War I, their opportunistic attitude to German capitalism's plunge into imperialism, and to the suffering of the colonial masses. Unfortunately, however, she saw the "root cause," not in the Second International alone, but in the defects of Marx's theory of Accumulation of Capital. This resulted in one more form of underconsumptionism. Her failure to recognise the colonial mass opposition as what Lenin called "the bacillus of proletarian revolution" saw her continue her opposition to Lenin's position

on the "National Question." That is what Lenin called the "half-way dialectic."

He, on the contrary, related the dialectic to everything he wrote from then on -- from Imperialism and State and Revolution to his Letter to the Editors of Under the Banner of Marxism about the need to study the Hegelian dialectic in Hegel's own words. His death created a philosophic void none of his co-leaders, Trotsky included, could fill. That remained the task for a new age.

PART II -- RE-ESTABLISHING THE LINK OF CONTINUITY WITH MARX'S MARXISM AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BODY OF IDEAS OF MARXIST-HUMANISM

After a decade of World Depression and the rise of fascism came the greatest shocker -- the Hitler-Stalin Pact -- that signalled the timing of World War II. It was high time to recognize the startling fact that, though November 1917 was the greatest revolution, the counter-revolution came, not from an outside imperialism, but from within. Trotsky could not, did not, face that reality, much less work out the new dialectic.

It took a whole decade of digging into what happened after the revolution had conquered power to discover how it was transformed into its opposite -- a workers state into a state-capitalist society -- through the Five Year Plans as well as the objective situation in the private capitalist world. Let's look into the two stages of that decade: first, straight state-capitalist theory; and finally the birth of Marxist-Humanism.

A. VICISSITUDES OF STATE-CAPITALISM, THE BLACK DIMENSION, AND THE BIRTH OF MARXIST-HUMANISM: MARXISM AND FREEDOM, FROM 1776 UNTIL TODAY

Marxism and Freedom is the first of the three books which Marxist-

Humanism refers to as our "trilogy of revolution." It contains two Appendices. One is the first published English translation of Marx's "Private Property and Communism" and "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" from what has come to be called Marx's 1844 Humanist Essays. The second is the first English translation of Lenin's "Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic."

Some elements of Humanism were present in our development as early as 1941 in the essay on "Labor and Society," which was the very first section of my analysis of the "Nature of the Soviet Economy." That essay was rejected for publication by the Trotskyists (the Workers Party) when they accepted the strictly economic analysis of the Five Year Plans from Russian sources.

The vicissitudes of state-capitalism would show that only when the philosophic structure is fully developed can one present the theory of state-capitalism in a way that would answer the quest for universality and what Marxist-Humanism called "the movement from practice." Which is why I prefer the way my 1941 study of the nature of the Russian economy was presented in 1957, in Part V -- "The Problem of our Age -- State-Capitalism vs. Freedom." in Marxism and Freedom, from 1776 Until Today.

Marxists and non-Marxists alike have always rejected even the attempt to give a philosophic structure to concrete events. Take the question of the Black Dimension. No one could deny what new stage had been reached in the 1960s, and whether you called it a revolution or just a new stage of the struggle for civil rights, there was no denying the stormy nature of the 1960s. But the truth is that this could be seen

not only in the '60s, but beginning with the Montgomery Bus Boycott -- and not only as a new beginning but in terms of the whole philosophic structure for the following decade. Here is what I singled out from that event in Marxism and Freedom: 1. the daily meetings; 2. the way in which the Black rank and file organized their own transportation (indeed, Rev. King admitted that the whole movement started without him); 3. the fact that, whether it was the meetings or the transportation that they took into their own hands, the Boycott's greatest achievement was "its own working existence" -- the very words Marxism and Freedom had pointed to in another section as the way Marx had written of the Paris Commune.

We could take the same 35 years we have taken in our new, fourth book to show the development of the dialectics of revolution on Women's Liberation and show that development on the Black Dimension. The same is true if we take the three new pages of freedom in Marxism and Freedom on the Hungarian Revolution, where I point to the revolutionary Youth getting ever younger, as witness the 12-year old Hungarian Freedom Fighter. And of course the same would be true of Labor. That, indeed, begins in the French Revolution of 1789-93, when there was no industrial proletariat and the enragés, the sans culottes, the artisans, were the great revolutionaries who spelled out the same masses in motion.

Masses in motion have marked every Historic Turning Point. This is articulated by going beyond every national boundary. In our age it can be seen whether we are looking at the Afro-Asian Revolutions or the Latin American Revolutions, and it is reflected both in our activity and in our publications. It was seen in the very early years of News and Letters Committees in the way in which the revolution in Cuba

brought about our very first Weekly Political Letter. More recently, it is seen in the bi-lingual pamphlet on Latin America's Revolutions, in Reality and in Thought. And you will soon see it in the new book in the way the early correspondence with Silvio Frondizi attains a new significance.

The three-fold goal of Marxism and Freedom was: 1. to establish the American roots of Marxism, not where the orthodox cite it (if they cite it at all) in the General Congress of Labor at Baltimore (1866), but in the Absolitionist Movement and the slave revolts which led to the Civil War; 2. to establish the world humanist concept which Marx had, in his very first new moment, called "a new Humanism," and which became so alive in our age and led to Marxist-Humanism; and 3. to re-establish the revolutionary nature of the Hegelian dialectic as Marx re-created it and which became compulsive for Lenin at the outbreak of the First World War, gaining a still newer life in our post-World War II age.

The contemporaneity as well as specificity of the deep-rootedness of the Hegelian dialectic permeates the whole of Marxism and Freedom. Please note its dialectical structure and see that from the very first chapter ("The Age of Revolutions: Industrial, Social-Political, Intellectual") it discloses no division between the objectivity of the period and the subjectivity of revolutionary Marxism. And note as well its todayness as it ends the chapter with the section entitled "Hegel's Absolutes and Our Age of Absolutes." Let me read you the last paragraph of that chapter:

> "To declare, in our day and age, that Hegel's Absolute means nothing but the 'knowing' of the whole past of human culture is to make a mockery of the dialectical development of the world and of thought, and absolutely to bar a rational approach to Hegel. What is far worse, such sophistry is a self-paralyzing barrier against a sober theoretical approach to the world itself.
>
> "It is necessary to divest Hegelian philosophy of the dead-weight of academic tradition as well as of radical intellectual snobbery and cynicism or we will lay ourselves wide open to the putrescent smog of Communism."
>
> (Marxism and Freedom, p. 43) ------ >

From the very start of News and Letters Committees in 1955 we made two decisions simultaneously. At our Convention in 1956 our Constitution established News & Letters as a unique combination of workers and intellectuals, with a Black production worker, Charles Denby, as our editor and with Raya Dunayevskaya as Chairwoman of the National Editorial Board; and we assigned the National Chairwoman to set forth our own interpretation of Marxism in what became Marxism and Freedom, from 1776 Until Today. All of the new pamphlets we produced through the turbulent 1960s flowed out of the structure of Marxism and Freedom: Workers Battle Automation, The Free Speech Movement and the Negro Revolution, Notes on Women's Liberation -- all written by the new voices from below; as well as my pamphlet on the Afro-Asian Revolutions and the whole history of the United States, American Civilization on Trial, signed by the entire National Editorial Board of News & Letters. These and all the others we produced you must read for yourselves.

The whole question of the unity of Theory/Practice is seen especially clearly in the difference between Part I of Indignant Heart, written when the Johnson-Forest Tendency was still a single State-Capitalist Tendency, and Part II, written after Marxist-Humanism had been openly practiced for more than two decades and brought all those developments in Charles Denby.

In 1969 Marxist-Humanism called a Black/Red Conference, and Marxist-Humanist women also held their conference and decided to establish an autonomous organization. Not only did both conferences have many non-Marxist-Humanists present, but in the Black/Red Conference, they were the majority present. That year, 1969, was also the year we donated our Archives to Wayne State University. The unfinished 1968 Paris Revolt had finally made us realize that Marxist-Humanism, projected in the 1950s and spelled out comprehensively in 1957 in our first major theoretical work, cried out for concretizing Marxism as philosophy. Not only was 1969 not 1968; 1969 was high time to realize that theory, including state-capitalist theory, is not -- is not -- yet philosophy.

B. RETURN TO HEGEL AND OUR DIALECTICAL DISCOVERIES: PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION, FROM HEGEL TO SARTRE AND FROM MARX TO MAO

By the end of the 1960s, when the climax of all the activity had resulted only in an aborted revolution, we could no longer avoid the strictly philosophic new digging into Hegel to see what concretely related to our age. The return to all of Hegel's major works -- especially the final syllogism Hegel had added to the Philosophy of Mind -- finally resulted in our second major philosophic-theoretical work, Philosophy and Revolution. That new return and concentration on those final syllogisms was comprehensive in the way it re-examined not only Hegel and Marx and Lenin (which constituted Part I, "Why Hegel? Why Now?"), but the Alternatives that considered themselves revolutionary -- Trotsky, Mao, and one outsider-looking-in, Sartre (which constituted Part II). This time the vicissitudes of state-capitalism were not restricted to those who called themselves Communists, but included altogether new lands, new struggles, as well as a new African, Asian, Third World socialism. (Part III dealt with East Europe, Africa, and

and the New Passions and Forces.)

But it doesn't stop there. What finally summed up the new challenges, new passions, new forces -- all those new relations against the objective situation -- was the return to Hegel "in and for himself," by which I mean his major philosophic works: Phenomenology; Science of Logic; and Philosophy of Mind from the Encyclopedia.

Let's begin at the end of Chapter 1 of Philosophy and Revolution -- "Absolute Negativity as New Beginning: The Ceaseless Movement of Ideas and of History " -- where I concentrate on the three final syllogisms of Hegel's Philosophy of Mind; Para. 575, 576, 577. The very listing of the books of the Encyclopedia -- Logic, Nature, Mind -- discloses a new reality; and that is that Logic is not as important as Nature, since Nature is the middle, which is the mediation, which is of the essence. The second syllogism (Para. 576) discloses that the mediation comes from Mind itself and Logic becomes less crucial. What is Absolute is Absolute Negativity, and it is that which replaces Logic altogether. What Hegel is saying is that the movement is ceaseless and therefore he can no longer limit himself to a syllogism. The "Self-Thinking Idea" has replaced the syllogistic presentation in Para. 577.

When I jammed up this conclusion of Hegel's in my first chapter of Philosophy and Revolution with what I worked out when I summed up the final Chapter 9 on what flowed from the movement from practice (what I called "new passions and new forces"), here is how I expressed it:

> "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.

> "Ours is the age that can meet the challenge of the times when we work out so new a relationship of theory to practice that the proof of the unity is in the Subject's own self-development. Philosophy and revolution will first then liberate the innate talents of men and women who will become whole. Whether or not we recognize that this is the task history has 'assigned' to our epoch, it is a task that remains to be done."
>
> Philosophy and Revolution, p.292

C. THE MARX CENTENARY: ROSA LUXEMBURG, WOMEN'S LIBERATION, AND MARX'S PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION

The Marx Centenary created the opportunity for us, when we also had a third major philosophic work, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution(which completed what we call the "trilogy of revolution "), to stress how total the uprooting of the system must be. It is not only that can there be no "private enclaves" that are free from the dialectics of revolution -- that which Hegel called "second negativity" and that we consider the Absolute Method, the road to the Absolute Idea. It is that the crucial thing for us, now that we had the Ethnological Notebooks, was more than just singling out the Man/Woman relationship, because we could see that the critique of all post-Marx Marxists begins with Frederick Engels. This last work of Marx disclosed Marx's multilinear view of all of human history vs. Engels' unilateral view.

It is that which prompted us to create the category of post-Marx Marxism and it was precisely when we dealt with other revolutionaries like Rosa Luxemburg that it became necessary to focus on Marx's concept of revolution-in-permanence.

All these new points of departure led to the new study where I re-examine Marx's Marxism as a totality. I cannot here go into that, which was central to the third book. I will have to limit myself simply to quoting the last paragraph of the work:

"What is needed is a new unifying principle, on Marx's ground of humanism, that truly alters both human thought and human experience. Marx's Ethnological Notebooks are a historic happening that proves, one hundred years after he wrote them, that Marx's legacy is no mere heirloom, but a live body of ideas and perspectives that is in need of concretization. Every moment of Marx's development, as well as the totality of his works, spells out the need for 'revolution in permanence.' This is the absolute challenge to our age."

Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, p. 195

CONCLUSION : UNCHAINING THE DIALECTIC

The title for my lecture today has reversed the title of our new fourth book into "The Dialectics of Revolution and Women's Liberation," not just as something needed for this lecture, but as what is the actual focus of the whole "trilogy of revolution" as well as this latest philosophic work. Indeed, the Introduction to it -- which is really always also the Conclusion -- is called Introduction and Overview. It is that which I will try to summarize here as the unchaining of the dialectic for the post-World War II period, whether that is expressed in activities or books; in pamphlets or News & Letters; or as it is implicit throughout the Archives, as well.

It is this which reveals that, no matter what specific revolutionary force turns out to be the main one in any ongoing revolution, no one can know before time who it will be. Nothing proves this more sharply than Women's Liberation, because it has been an unrecognized and degraded force rather than a force that is simultaneously Reason. It is this which has made women question:"What happens after?"

In the main, Women's Liberationists refuse to accept anything which shows that "a man" decides. In actuality, what they are thereby rejecting is the dialectics of revolution. It is this burning question of our age

which led me to subtitle this final section of my lecture:

UNCHAINING THE DIALECTIC:

First, let us look at the unchaining of the dialectic for our age by Marxist-Humanists. Our original contributions to Marx's Marxism can be seen in our first book, Marxism and Freedom, as the structure of the whole -- the Movement from Practice. It is seen in our second work, Philosophy and Revolution, as the working out of the Absolute Idea for our age -- Absolute Idea as New Beginning. In the third work, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, it is seen as the challenge to all post-Marx Marxists.

Secondly, let's see how Marx explained his return to the Hegelian dialectic in the very last decade: "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..." This is from the manuscripts for Volume II of Capital that Marx left, and that Engels left out.

Now let's look at the strucutre of our fourth book, still on the press, Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future. What became obvious to me was that the four parts of this book turned out to be actual moments of revolution. Thus Part I -- "Women, Labor and the Black Dimension" -- totally also includes Youth, as the four forces of revolution. I insisted in my Introduction that I was not presenting my writings chronologically because I wanted each topic to reflect, even if only implicit ly, the totality of my views. Even that aspect does

not tell the whole story about the relationship of the forces of revolution to the Reason of any revolution -- i.e. how each one of the forces "reaches for the future." This was most clearly shown not only by the forces that actually made the revolution in Russia, but by those in Persia where the women had gone beyond even what they did in Russia, itself, by establishing a new form of organization, the women's anjumen (soviet). Today we spell this out as committee-form in place of "party to lead."

Part II -- "Revolutionaries All" -- again shows the activists, the actual participants in revolutions. Whether or not they were conscious of actually being the history-makers, they were exactly that. And that section has the footnote which returns us to Marxism and Freedom, choosing the section that describes the milkmaids initiating the Paris Commune of 1871.

Part III -- "Sexism, Politics and Revolution -- Japan, Portugal, Poland, China, Latin America, the United States -- Is there an Organizational Answer?" -- clearly illustrates both the positive internationalism and the very negative sexism in each country, whether East or West. Yet what the Introduction and Overview made clear was that the forces of revolution had to show their actual presence before the concretization of the dialectics of revolution would manifest itself.

Put differently, what the very first sentence of the first paragraph of the first page of the Introduction establishes is that first there must be a definition that is a concretization of the specific nature of your epoch. We had designated that as the movement from practice that is itself a form of theory, and we had arrived at that conclusion from the encounter

with the Absolute Idea as being not just a unity of practice and theory, but a very new relationship of practice to theory. It is this which determined the whole structure of our very first major theoretical work, Marxism and Freedom. Only after this specific epoch and its historic content was grasped do we speak, in the second paragraph of the Introduction and Overview, about the uniqueness of one of the forces of revolution -- Women's Liberation.

We now come to Part IV on "The Trail to the 1980s" -- which is naturally the one that is key to any concretization of the present period. Our task is two-fold: we have to catch the link of continuity with Marx's Marxism and then make our own original contributions, which only the epoch in question can work out for itself. Marx opened the gates for us. Look at the way he treated his relationship to Hegel after he discovered his own New Continent of Thought and yet felt it important to return to the Hegelian dialectic. That was not to deny anthing new. On the contrary -- and contrary especially to all those who try to use the final decade of Marx's life to turn him into no more than a populist -- the full 40 years of Marx's work, which saw the critic of the Hegelian dialectic become the philosopher of revolution and the author of Capital, prove that he continued his own very original development throughout his life, including the final decade, and that the new moments were no break with his very first new discovery.

Follow the dialectics of the development of Women as the new revolutionary force and Reason. Concretization, when it expresses a Universal that becomes Concrete, shows what Absolute Idea is as New Beginning. All the emphasis on "New Beginnings" pinpoints the task of an age. Absolute Idea is total, but it cannot be total as a quantitative measure. That is where the new in any epoch requires the living presence of that revolutionary

force and not just a Promethean vision. That is not because Promethean vision and Reaching for the Future doesn't help the next generation to see its task. Quite the contrary. That is when discontinuity is not a re-vision of, but a continuation with, the original New Moment when there are all sorts of new voices and listening to them is quintessential.

It is only after the new world stage of practice is recognized that we get to that new revolutionary force of Women's Liberation, which has named the culprit -- male chauvinism -- as characterizing the revolutionary movement itself. That is to say, it is not only characteristic of capitalism, and not only of this epoch, but has existed throughout history. The point is not to stop there. But in order not to stop there, you have to recognize it as a force that is Reason and not just force -- and that means a total uprooting of this society, and the creation of totally new human relations. Which is why Marx was not exclusively a feminist but a "new Humanist." The fact that feminism is part of Humanism and not the other way around does not mean the Women's Liberation becomes subordinate. It means only that philosophy will not again be separated from revolution, or Reason separated from force. Even Absolute Method becomes only "road to" Absolute Idea, Absolute Mind.

Let me end, then, with the final paragraph from the Introduction and Overview of our new, fourth book:

> "The Absolute Method allows for no 'private enclaves' -- i.e., exceptions to the principle of Marx's Dialectics, whether on the theoretical or the organizational questions. As Marx insisted from the very beginning, nothing can be a private enclave: neither any part of life, nor organization, nor even science. In his Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, he proclaimed that: 'To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie.'"

(And now that we have both the Ethnological Notebooks and the Mathematical Manuscripts from

Michelle - we won't show her R.D. Cooke into the part re. Women's Liberation. She'll see it herself. Perhaps Rueda'll write after all? ...