

Sept. 30, 1985

Dear Dave,

I agree with you -- that professor from Chicago, David C. is a OK guy, especially since he is talking about combat rather than adjust, not to mention the abstractions of what that Iowa guy dares call "organizational dialectics and social construction."

And your Abstract is on the whole very good, but I would like to make some suggestions:

1) instead of going back all the way to the 1920s and near committing (?) the 1930s, I would suggest you leave out the 20s and start with the 30s. That is crucial because, a) then we have not just factory closings, but Plan and not only from Russia but throughout the world, whether it is Japan or the U.S. New Deal. b) you thus have Plan and technology and not just a relationship of the movement of capital from one city to another where there is cheaper labor. Above all it will be easy, as Marxist-Humanist to connect that with the 50s and prove long, long before ever anyone thought of automation because Oil, my dear friend, first went automated and monopolized and yet had active labor struggle resistence right in the union. Do please read Oil and Labor by John in the Archives pages 1297-1331. It spreads over three issues of 4th International and while John wrote it and thought of it that way after he met us, it was not as Marxist-Humanist, but as state-capitalist. Furthermore, when I was working in 1940 on Plan and state-capitalism and trying to prove it was not just Russia but a world phenomenon, I brought ~~xxx~~ out how even a feudal regime like Japan could and did industrialize and that at a faster rate than Russia because of militarization and State Plan. You will see that in the Nature of Russia articles. Indeed, that whole group of statistics on what happened on the eve of World War II with all the plans, is still relevant, no matter how many ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ refinements of the statistics have taken place since.

(By the way one thing that John ~~and~~ another comrade Lyman did in the 30s before they met us was have all those illusions that social architects, which they were, in urban planning would create all those magnificent low-coast housing for the masses. One day you should get to talk to him about it.)

2) Thus when you go to the 50s you can have Plan, state, technology (and don't forget Marx said if you really want to know the dialectics and history of technology you have to know the history of labor every time there has been an eruption of labor against, that is, when a new machine was devised to take labor's place.) ~~and~~ you are right to concentrate on General Strike pamphlet.

Finally, when you come to today and the factory shutdowns, I think the combative spirit must ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ not be made in the same breath that you talk about new forms of organization, because, that if for a Marxist-Humanism not for the efficiency that they are lacking for. The way you can and it is to say whether a capitalist thinks he can solve these problems by moving to the South where labor is unorganized or only one more machine, the whole point it it never varies from the subject of labor productivity. That is were all the value and surplus value comes from. And not from the latest machines which end up by throwing yet more workers on the unemployment line to where the capitalist thinks ~~that it is not his business, but it is the state, and the capitalists are so scared of revolution, that they introduce the powder yards, RAY~~

16667