

7 5 9286

SPEECHES & RESOLUTION

presented publicly to
the plenary sessions
of the

NATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD

LABOR DAY WEEKEND

1957

2596

7-5-9-7

THE AMERICAN ROOTS OF MARXISM IN THE WORLD TODAY AND OUR DEVELOPMENT

What you see before you here are the galley proofs of the book. Now that is quite an accomplishment considering that the official commission of the News and Letters Committees to have the book written and to provide for being written was only made one year ago. In fact the accomplishment is so great that it convinces me that the few of us couldn't possibly have done it unless it was a genuine reflection of the maturity of the American working class and the ripeness of the time the world over. It is this fact that is so encouraging that I feel that I want to begin my topic, The American Roots of Marxism in the World today and Our Development, and start first of all to deal with the world today.

The other day Russia announced that it has successfully tested an intercontinental missile that can cover a distance of 5,000 miles, and hit any part of the world.

With the special type of Dulles stupidity we have by now become accustomed to, the Secretary of State went into an explanation of the phrase "target area" which was supposed to allay our fears--it seems that if target area meant something as small as this room, then we would have to worry about it, but if it meant 200 miles--then, say it would not hit Washington, D.C. as the Kremlin planned but "only" Detroit.

Such "scientific" exposé may have made the Pentagon sleep comfortably--and if any of us are left to tell the tale, we'll just roar with laughter, and thank this BRINK OF WAR STRATEGIST who unhinged the Suez crisis, and was totally unprepared for the British-French-Israeli reactions which nearly catapulted us into World War III.

It is true that on that election eve Ike could appear as the man of peace. BUT SO DID RUSSIA with whom we voted. It is cheap to be against war--when it is somebody else's war. But when those two poles of world capital fall out--then the WHOLE WORLD BETTER WATCH OUT. No one knows precisely when that will be. We haven't had very many moments of peace since W.W. II ended. Whether it was an actual war like Korea or an obscure trouble spot like Oman, everyone knows that anything, anything at all can trigger off the war.

As one worker put it: "I don't know when they'll throw the H-bomb at Russia, but if they keep up all these nuclear explosions, there will be no American people left to participate in the other all-out effort."

They are all alike--these two poles of state capitalism--Russia and America--Both conspire to identify those two opposites--Marxism which is a theory of liberation--with Communism which is a theory and practice of enslavement.

Both hope thereby to avoid the wrath of the working people of their own country--for the two fundamentally opposed worlds are not Russia and America, but the workers and capitalists in each country. Here we are at the height of prosperity and in Detroit there is unemployment to the extent of 10%. The Russian worker we know is worse off yet. Whether Russia and America fight--as they will--each acts first of all against his own working class.

Preparation for war against Russia tomorrow is all-out war against the American workers, today, tomorrow, and the day after. That is why the point is not who throws or will throw the first stone, especially when that first stone will be the H bomb. The point is: are you with the people struggling for a totally new way of life or with capitalism fighting to perpetuate itself, although it has long since outlived its usefulness. At the same time, so universal is the feeling against the war that even the rulers play the game of peace and disarmament conferences. That cannot therefore be what distinguishes us from them. Private or state capitalism will spare nothing to keep itself on top and the worker at the bottom. Armed with the H-bomb and the missile, they are ready to destroy civilization itself rather than allow the new working class society to emerge.

What does distinguish us from them is not what we are against, but what we are for. To the barbarism of the war we pose the new society, but old radicals also say they are for a new society. Indeed, they would want it--IF you would give it to them on a silver platter on which all workers knoed, asking "to be led". What they all forget is that a new society is THE human endeavor, or it is nothing. It cannot be brought in behind the backs of people or over their heads or by ships carrying "original characters" to shore, as Johnson would have had us believe. In distinguishing ourselves from this "One", we will finally be able to pinpoint the NEW in our anti-war stand.

IT IS THIS: TO ACHIEVE A TRULY HUMAN LIFE, WE MUST NOT ONLY BE WITH THE WORKERS BECAUSE THEY AND ONLY THEY OPPOSE THE WAR TO THE END, BECAUSE THEY AND ONLY THEY ARE THE FUTURE SOCIETY, BUT ALSO BECAUSE WE DO NOT SHIFT TO THE SHOULDERS OF THE WORKERS WHAT IS OUR TASK, THE THEORETIC CLEARING OF THE GROUND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY ON NEW BEGINNINGS.

Original characters lay the basis for original deviations. They do not and cannot substitute for the time-tested workingclass opposition to war. Those who wish to compromise with the enemy, go through all sorts of contortions. Any weary soul who cannot resist the pressures of a corrupt society, becomes suddenly very active in consoling themselves with how badly they too "truly want" a new society.

When we broke with the old radical organizations, we saw clearly enough how those who cannot see that the road, THE ONLY ROAD, was the workingclass managing its own affairs, were always putting off workers' control until "The Day", while in the meantime, they consorted with the labor bureaucracy. What wasn't clear to us was what our own people, that is, some of us who had been with us, were doing in this conception of original characters.

Take a second look at the Johnsonites who chose the original characters of Melville as against the "old" set of characters-- the

working people--of Marx. We know their utter isolation from the working class--but now let us take a look at the self-willed impotence when it comes to taking your place in the market place of ideas. Just as a single moment's disbelief in the workers' capacity to create a new society with their own strength led the Trotskyites off the principled highway of opposition to war in words while organically hanging on to one or the other of the opposing poles of state-capitalism--the USA-USSR-- , so the Johnsonite evasion of their political responsibility of clarifying workers' politics as an integral part of theory--building led them into the Boganite variety of class-collaborationism on war.

You will recall that when Kaufman returned from Europe, she brought with her the theory that, not we in America, but the Europeans would rise to the defense of Marxism. Not that she had any European in mind who would do that, least of all Johnson, but it is a good way, they thought, of ridding oneself of one American who insisted on doing that. That thesis of Kaufman was monstrous enough as "theory", but add to that the fact that soon they were to run from the throat of war over Formosa, you will first comprehend the enormity of the theoretical evasion, because theoretical irresponsibility and political cowardice go hand in hand with class collaborationism.

You will see why I'm talking of Johnson who means nothing to us and least of all to those who were not with him, but a new element was illuminated for me in finding out what is now in our anti-war stand and what is now always in the past of history. And the past that I was looking at to find a parallel to Marxism and Freedom was Lenin's State and Revolution. That is why I want you to take a glance back to the history of World War I and see that it wasn't only the German Social Democracy who betrayed, but the left wing Menshevik, Martov, who was for the overthrow of Tsarism, was opposed to the voting of war credits, and who came back to Russia together with Lenin to supposedly be for the revolution. He wanted a new society. Now, he didn't form a new worker's state. He fell somewhere in between the road. The important thing is, if you contrast what he was doing between 1914-17 and what Lenin was doing. I'm not talking about deeds, or revolutions; you can't do anything about them. The workers either make them or they don't. I'm talking about clearing your head. Lenin sat down first of all with his Philosophical Notebook, then came an analysis of the economy, imperialism, and then came State and Revolution, on the eve of the revolution.

YOU SEE, THERE IS NO IN-BETWEEN; either you believe that the working people and only they can save civilization from complete chaos and therefore prepare the theoretic ground for it, or you believe that you can continue in your intellectual sloth and leave them therefore prey to those who thirst for leadership so badly, that they'd rather be with the labor bureaucracy, and you find yourself attached to the old order. You cannot break with it until you have so ORGANIZED YOUR THOUGHT that, although an intellectual, you are with the workers to the end.

Let me stop here a moment to say that even in our break the two elements, Marxism and anti-war stand seemed separate. Even when we broke from Johnson, we saw that he was opposed to Marxism. He didn't want the book and he was opposed to war, because he ran, or rather to the anti-war stand, and we didn't connect the two as two inseparables, Marxism and anti-war stand. It is only now with Marxism and Freedom actually going to press, that the inseparability of these two become apparent as

- 4 -

ORGANIZATION OF THOUGHT. Thus, when we now say that we have not only broken with the old order and stand for a new society, but have broken with everything which FOR WHATEVER CONTORTIONIST REASON is nevertheless attached to the old order, the proof is not in our saying so. The proof is in MARXISM AND FREEDOM.

It is not only that our "goal" is to live a truly human life. It is that either our WORK helps the proletariat ACHIEVE that, or civilization as we have known it, will utterly collapse. That is precisely the NEW DIMENSION that Marxism gave to the intellectual--that if he kept his ears to the ground, if he was attuned to hear the class impulse from the proletariat, if he succeeded in catching that impulse, then he need not abdicate leadership, but can make his contribution through organizing that impulse as thought and thus becoming part of the new unity of theory and practice.

The reason we are so incorruptible is not because of any martyrdom complex, or individual courage. Not at all. It is because we are part of a class that cannot live and develop itself except through overcoming the management and labor bureaucracies pressing down upon it, so that what distinguishes us from all others, is, (1) that we are not just against the war, but for a new society, and 2) that not as a "wish", but as a class reality we help to formulate, because part of that reality is both by being part of the immediate class struggle and the historic link with the past that creates the new ground from which to take off into the future.

I think I can put it all in that one sentence. To stand for a new society, to us means to see that not alone as practice when it will come, but as theory that helps discern the movement before it comes and thus become part of the new evolving reality.

That is why, whether it is something as critical as the position on war, or whether it is how to publish the paper so that it comes out on Tuesdays, not Thursdays, every single thing we preach we practice, and practice INCLUDES THEORY, which is tested in practice. While the manner in which we put out the paper is itself a demonstration of the new society and a blow to all bureaucracy, it is incomplete if it does not include the theory which gave birth to the idea of such a paper, edited by a production worker, and written on a decentralized basis. If you look at the ORGANIZATION OF THOUGHT which gave birth to this idea, you will find it was part of the thesis that the labor bureaucracy was the specific enemy we were fighting. The Local 212 situation you will discuss tomorrow under C.D.'s report, but that struggle is only one of many fights we have been in since we have worked out the theory of state capitalism.

Briefly, the theory of state capitalism consists of 2 poles: (1) the new stage of capitalist development which has evolved from private enterprise into state monopoly, but the second is the important, because as a consequence, the unity of political and economic power meant, not less, but more oppression of the worker and that not only where state capitalism was completed, as in Russia, but even where it is only a tendency as in America. Here too the capitalist could not discipline the proletariat without the labor bureaucracy doing its work for them.

So that when we say that we are the only ones who counterpose to the barbarities of atomic war a new society, we include in this the daily struggle against the labor bureaucracy.

2600

NOW contrast to that intellectuals operating without a theory of state capitalism and hence struggle against the labor bureaucracy. Take Western Europe at the end of World War II when the workers en masse, tired of fascism and the private capitalism which brought this and its wars about, flocked to the CPs. The American State Department propaganda certainly drove them to it the faster, but what did the native--the European--intellectuals do? They were as useless as always in hammering the road out from either pole of world capital. Existentialism--by which the French intellectual movement is known--acted as a brake upon the workers development away from Communism both in 1945-47 as well as when Eastern European workers in 1953 finally revolted against Communist rule, even as the Labor Party in England acted as a brake upon the English workers' development away from the labor bureaucracy.

ONLY IN AMERICA, where the proletariat was unshackled by mass parties, only in America the labor bureaucracy has no more standing with the workers now than during the war when they were actually bound down with no-strike pledge. Only in America therefore, the workers' attitude toward Automation quite freed from the labor bureaucracy's conception of "progress", and only in America was a state-capitalist grouping able to catch the impulse from the workers and move theory forward from its political-economic context of state-capitalism to the fully philosophic concept of FREEDOM. In a word, only here could the movement from theory to practice meet the movement from practice to theory and start anew.

In that lies the only POLARIZING FORCE to counteract having to chose between one of the two poles of world capital. It is neither America nor Russia as powers, for such a choice would bring about the destruction of civilization as we have known it.

There is one answer, and only one answer. It is the American working people as a class that can save Western Civilization, and it is here to them that colonial peoples as well as the European workers are looking to. They have looked toward it with NEWS & LETTERS--our sub list, though small, covers the world. It will increase a hundred fold and deepen when the world will see that the paper didn't just happen--didn't just grow up like Topsy--but was born out of the organization of thought called MARXISM AND FREEDOM which, in turn, came not out of the head so much as out of the American workers struggles against the labor bureaucracy. When the miners in 1949-50 moved the question from one dealing with wages to one dealing with the KIND of labor, the American working class showed itself to be the true heirs to Marxist philosophy. That struggle and that question, AND NOT MERELY HISTORY, SHOWS THAT THE AMERICAN WORKING CLASS IS MARXIST TO ITS VERY BONES.

It is this fact which makes it possible to go from today's world on the brink of war to the American roots of Marxism.

II. The Birth Time of History

Now that I have reached the roots, however, I want in one respect to follow the path of Wm. Lloyd Garrison, the Abolitionist founder and editor of its greatest paper, THE LIBERATOR who stated on the masthead: "The world is my country." That is, I want to start instead with the birth-time of history, philosophically speaking, for in it we will see

not only the past but the present.

"... Our epoch is a birth-time, and a period of transition. The spirit of man has broken with the old order of things hitherto prevailing, and with the old ways of thinking, and is in the mind to let them all sink into the depths of the past and to set about its own transformation. It is indeed never at rest, but carried along the stream of progress ever onward. But it is here as in the case of the birth of a child; after a long period of nutrition in silence, the continuity of the gradual growth in size, of quantitative change, is suddenly out short by the first breath drawn - there is a break in the process, a qualitative change - and the child is born. In like manner the spirit of the time, growing slowly and quietly ripe for the new form it is to assume, disintegrates one fragment after another of the structure of its previous world. That it is tottering to its fall is indicated only by symptoms here and there. Frivolity and again ennui, which are spreading in the established order of things, the undefined foreboding of something else approaching. This gradual crumbling to pieces, which did not alter the general look and aspect of the whole, is interrupted by the sunrise, which, in a flash and at a single stroke, brings to view the form and structure of the new world. But this new world is perfectly realised just as little as the new born child--a building is not finished when its foundation is laid." (Hogol-Phon.-P.75)

American history is particularly rich in the expression of its people ever since scattered, tiny committees of correspondents began writing to each other about ways to free themselves of British rule. As even the bourgeois historian, Beard, had to admit. One day the British rulers woke up and found that the insignificant little letter writers were the engines of the revolution. The same is true of Abolitionism which led to the Civil War and the 8hr. day.

Although the Industrial Revolution began in England and the newly-born factory proletariat began at once to fight for the shortening of the working day. Although the French Revolution of 1789 to 1793 was a much more thorough one than the American Revolution of 1776. Nevertheless, when once the Civil War did away with slavery, the struggle for the 8 hour day strode forward with such 7-league boots that it had international repercussions and Marx incorporated the Baltimore Resolution directly into his greatest work, CAPITAL, which reads:

"The first and great necessity of the present, to free labor of this country from capitalist slavery, is the passing of a law by which 8 hours shall be the normal working day in all states in the American union."

Then Marx continues:----- "In place of the pompous catalogue of the 'inalienable rights of man', wrote Marx, "comes the modest Magna Charta of a of a legally limited working day which shall make clear when the time in which the worker sells is ended, and his own begins."

If you will keep in mind always that, to Marx, the simple question, when does my work day begin and when does it end, was greater than all philosophies from the Declaration of Independence to The Declaration of the Rights of Man you will have the method by which to judge your own period. For example take the CIO. The very act of SITTING DOWN and saying I will not get up until the conditions of my labor are changed, transformed not only the industrial face of conditions in America, but it set a new philosophy. The worker had something to say about these conditions of

labor. Now that period is over with. You know what happened to the labor bureaucracy. But in 1949-50 a new epoch began with the question: WHAT KIND OF LABOR? I say if you follow the method of Marx you will see that by that simple question the American workers have reunited the Absolute Idea of Hegel and Marx's new passions and new forces for the establishment of a new society.

But that is just what is so fantastically hard for people, and particularly intellectuals, to see--that the heritage of Hegelian dialectics and the Marxist world view of history has fallen to American workers who are supposed to be without even class consciousness, and who, if they follow a philosophy at all, it is that of pragmatism at its vulgarst where it means no more than "Success is that which succeeds."

To MARXISM & FREEDOM, therefore, has fallen the proof of this totally new, unbelievable but incontrovertible fact. We are so much a part of the objective movement of history that you cannot separate who we are from the who the American working class is, the roots of our dual tradition in Abolitionism and Marxism, from the present luxuriant growth: on the one hand, the elements of the new society that are everywhere present in the workers struggling against the labor bureaucracy, and, on the other hand, the theoretic foundation, the NEW GROUND FOR MARXIST HUMANISM in this native soil, and yet extending the world over even as the only alternative road to Russia or America in a war that means the destruction of civilization, is that the American workingclass is the answer to whether Western civilization will survive or not. And will indeed put an end to this pre-history of humanity.

IT IS INDEED A BIRTH TIME OF HISTORY

MARXISM & FREEDOM is both the history and the quintessence of man's struggle for freedom: (1) It breaks down the division between the struggle for freedom and the idea of freedom. (2) That is to say, in showing that philosophy is fashioned out of the activity of common man, it puts a prism, a FIRST on what the common man thinks and does, and points next to the genius who organized this thought into a system of philosophy, so that the organization of thought sums up the previous stage of man's activity. (3) When Part I of MARXISM & FREEDOM entitled From Practice to Theory, 1776-1848 ends, we see a new BIRTH OF THEORY WHICH DOES CONSCIOUSLY what Hegel did unconsciously. Strange as it may seem to use the word, unconscious, for that greatest philosopher of consciousness, it is nevertheless a fact. He had no idea he was transforming the activity of the French sans culottes into a philosophic method. And because he was unconscious of this human factor, his Absolute Idea was abstract even to himself, though it must have been very flattering to the philosopher that he would combine the human and the divine in himself.

Because, on the other hand, Marx consciously extracted his dialectic from the mass movement, his philosophy was not only a summation of the past, but an anticipation of the future. The Communist Manifesto was published on the eve of the 1848 revolution and determined the org. life of the Communist League. Nevertheless the Communist League perished with the defeats of the 1848 revolution. We got here, in the period of defeat, a still different view of the relationship of the worker and intellectual, for the attitude to the state creates a division within the unique combination of worker-intellectual type of political organization. We see a new type arise in this new organization, which was created. The type of the worker-dictator, Lassalle.

Just because Lassale was an anticipation of the worker-dictator state-capitalist type of our own era does not mean that at the TURNING POINT OF HISTORY, which his work represented, he did not carry weight among the workers--millions of workers--workers Marx did not have. And that is why it's important to see a new aspect of organization here today.

A class line isn't always that easy to see in an organization, or we would just say Marx and Engels were petty bourgeois intellectuals, but Rautler and John L. Lewis were workers! Let me give you an example closer to home. No one could compete with Shorty as to depth of layer he represents. He is a production worker who has class in his bones since he was born, and he must keep the fight up day in and day out--production line forces him to.

Yet unless he opens up new perspectives for his shopmates with the philosophic scope of the book, he will lose himself in the small coin of caucus politics. On the other hand--as I am sure will be the case--if he absorbs the book--then that will add a new dimension to him and to his struggle against the labor bureaucracy. Where he can become the polarizing force for something that really means more than an election.

I am not talking to Shorty alone or to the worker-members only. It applies much more to the intellectuals for they do not have Shorty's advantage of being an organic part of the working class destined to establish a new society. In the case of intellectuals they must work at it day in and day out, every minute of the day to get through thought what the workers get by being what they are.

And if anyone thinks thinking WHERE IT MEANS parting with your class origins is easy, history has passed them by altogether. (5) Thinking in general is hard work. It is not for nothing that Hegel called philosophy "the labor, patience, seriousness, suffering of the negative." And if ever there was a theoretic work that was the result of "the labor, patience, seriousness, suffering of the negative" it was Marx's CAPITAL, that entirely NEW ORGANIZATION OF THOUGHT upon which no new organization has been built.

That may sound like a fantastic contradiction, a complete untruth, the throwing out of the history of the Second International and hence the years 1889-1914. Nevertheless, among the new things in M&F--and this brings me to point 6 in the listing of how M&F is both the history and quintessence of man's struggle for freedom--is that history under the title ORIG. INTRODUCTION.

(3) What we did in the book in pinning down ORGANIZATION, when organization of thought is just peripheral--something you do Sundays, while daily, hourly it is not thought but organization which preoccupies you, EVEN AS IT DOES CAPITALISM ITSELF AS IT REACHES THE MONOPOLY* IMPERIALIST STAGE.

(7) Maruso's Preface is proof of what happens to the Marxist theory when the Marxist METHOD of beginning from where the workers are, building on their impulses, is passed over as something that belonged to his time, not ours. You can't divide theory from method.

Philosophy, you see, isn't anything abstract, existing either in ivory towers or outer space. The organization of thought Hegel achieved came from the common activity of man and it required some very deep digging indeed to discover its form in the development of human thought itself.

You have heard me say often--what is pivotal to Marxism & Freedom-- is that there is nothing in the mind of man--not even that of a genius-- that has not previously been in the activity of common man. You have heard it so often that it may sound like a truism, platitudeous. But published on black and white it will act not only as a polarizing force for those who want to join the movement but as a MOBILIZING FORCE FOR THOSE WHO WILL OPPOSE US EVERY INCH OF THE WAY. That is why it is so important to get clear in our heads what it is to be founders of a new movement called Marxist Humanism. I believe it will be easier to understand if we deal with it not first as it is now, but as it was in American history, in the Abolitionist movement.

The intellectual who senses the new movement on the part of the common man and joins with it, one of its forms was the Abolitionist movement in this country, which resulted in some white New England intellectuals surrounding themselves with some militant ex-slaves--WITHOUT THE RUMMELY SLAVE FOLLOWING THE NORTH STAR TO FREEDOM the Abolitionist intellectuals were ineffectual. With them they gave a new dimension to the American character and created America anew.

What distinguished an Abolitionist? There were intellectuals, like the Emersons and even Melvilles, who were "against" slavery--they were the radicals of their day BUT THEY DIDN'T STAND UP TO BE COUNTED AS DID THE ABOLITIONISTS. It was the mass movement, the Abolitionist movement that did something about it. It wasn't just any radicalism, it was the specific radicalism which tied up with the daily activity of men who wanted their freedom. The Abolitionists were founders of a movement because they did just that. But you must remember--for it will apply to us in becoming the founder of the new movement of Marxist Humanism--that, as distinguished from the literary radical like the Emersons of that day and the Existentialists of our day, the Abolitionist radical was a marked man, for if your radicalism meant you were against slavery, in a country that had slaves and slaveowners who had power, you were persecuted, slandered, stoned, and that in the non-slave-owning North; in the South it meant hanging--and the Nat Turners were hanged. It took something to stand up to that public pressure so that even though you were petty bourgeois, you were part of what today we would call Marxist Humanism AND THEY CERTAINLY WERE HUMANISTS. Not a single relationship--whether between Negro and white or man and woman--merely retained its conventional stamp. The new, human relations that were to mark the new non-slave society already marked the behavior and relations of the Abolitionists. In their movement, those relations were changed. That is what we mean that the ideal is not very far from the real.

Therein lies the PROOF of the connection between the immediate to which you reach without necessarily thinking about it, and the ultimate by which one lives and one must think about. Intellectuals may think that's what they're intellectuals for, because they think. How could they possibly have a "hostility to thought?" But only in thus overcoming "the hostility to thought" that each one of us has,

whether we know it or not, we will arrive at new perspectives.

NOW IT IS THIS WHICH PREOCCUPIED ME IN L.A., and what took 2½ weeks in L.A. you'll have to telescope in 2½ hours of discussion, so let us get down to the business of what responsibilities being part of the birth-time of history imposes on all of us. Two words can sum up those responsibilities: 1) Method, an attitude to objectivity, or to the objective world, and 2) that we considered ourselves a workshop. The proof of the pudding is in the eating and at the end something was going to come out. I wasn't going to do their thinking for them and said, you're not going to make me the philosopher, you're all going to be philosophers. You're already that, all you have to do is make yourself conscious of it. And don't show quite as much resistance. The practical conclusions, and proposals that came out of the work on L.A., will be dealt with in Inoz's report and you will then discuss them.

Let me begin with the end first, it will help in a certain sense to see the beginning. The 2½ weeks in L.A. were wound up with a public meeting. We said we're now in the market place of ideas and we're going to compete with everybody. We're not going to talk on the book, or on ourselves, but on whatever happens in the world. What happened then was the Russian Purge, but it wouldn't have mattered what happened, we would have discussed whatever was current. We would practice broaking with our tradition of keeping to ourselves by having a public meeting and distributing a leaflet at factories and colleges. One person who came to the meeting is attending the local regularly.

The reason that I began with the end is to show that we're going to face the world. We've been living an internal life all the time and by facing the world we will expand. In facing the problems of the organization the same method would hold. What is the attitude to objectivity, that is to the objective world and to what the organization is doing in that objective world?

Here I wish to limit myself, concretely to three aspects: (1) Working on the positive, rather than negative, gave the whole local a spurt forward. But even, where someone, like Boss, who had previously done the most work on the book, by her own admission, the consciousness of what she was doing by instinct, made that transition to selling as founders a new experience. (2) The letter writing for inner conviction more than for sale elicited, for the 1st time explicitly instead of only implicitly, the proletarian stamp of the organizer, i.e., and (3) THE YOUTH AS A NEW EXTENSION OF THE MOVEMENT. That may sound an exaggeration since no member was gained and nothing tangible has been added and yet THE NEW DIMENSION each feels in HIMSELF is thereby an EXTENSION as well as a DEEPENING. The very decision to study M&F has already given them confidence to take over editing of youth page and perhaps even start a new columnist. The report of the young chairman at the end of the thing, is something I think the adults can learn from: Our discipline is greater than any school discipline because 1) it is self-imposed. 2) it comes, not from edicts, but is determined rather by that organization of thought we call Marxist Humanism. They're spending their whole summer reading so that when they return to their classrooms, they will know how to handle themselves and know the true heritage of their country.

Between the school room telling you you should only think what's in the book, and the capitalists keeping you sweating on the production line and telling you you need not think at all, they'll do the thinking for you, what comes as the "hostility to thought" naturally, so to speak, is actually made into a system by Capitalism. They don't want you to think. We must do some pretty deep digging into ourselves to prepare us to meet the challenge of the world of ideas. Each of us has to go through an experience on their own, no one can do anyone else's thinking for him, no one can win their friends over for them, it has to be on their own and you yourself will gain your own dimension. AND I HOPE EVERYONE WILL SPEAK FULLY AND AT LENGTH ON HIS OWN EXPERIENCE & IN THIS THERE WILL BE NO DISTINCTION BETWEEN INTELLECTUAL AND WORKER--I want to hear at length from Morgan and Si, from Barbara and Otis, from John and Shorty, from Saul and Effie as well as Johnie-Mao and Johnny, and all those I may not even know.

If anyone has not begun before, they must begin here and now, and expand from then on until we have founded a new movement by extending our organization into a fully Marxist Humanist one, and yet not one of us smug as "the elite", "the chosen few". IT IS TIME INSTEAD TO STOP BEING POLITICAL BABIES. I take that back. That is an old type of statement--the leadership used it to denote the membership still had some "facts of life" to learn--as if the facts of life were a set formula that those on top know and could deliver for the asking, except they'd always hold a few back, so at the next convention, you would again be told to stop being political babies, and again you were given a few chosen anecdotes, clothed in historic garments, to learn.

No, that's not what I mean. I mean let's stop being PHILOSOPHIC INNOCENTS, and I mean ALL of us. Until we do, it is not the proletariat we have to blame for not joining us in greater numbers. It is ourselves we have to blame for not giving them the something total they are looking for to join. And that holds for the intellectual as well. people do not join what is implicitly the now, but what is explicitly so. A view of our own development will show us that.

III. OUR DEVELOPMENT: Philosophic Innocence & New Humanist Proletarian Maturity

Somewhere in the PHENOMENOLOGY (p.770) where Hegel speaks of the Garden of Eden and the eating of the apple, he uses the expression that it may be called "innocence", but it is "not good"; at least religion presents Man as if "it happened once as an event, with no necessity about it--and was driven from the state of innocence from Paradise--and from nature offering its bounties without man's toil."

Now, as you know, never again, if then, except for the favored rich, has man got food, whether to eat or to think, except by his sweat of the production line, but I do have something I can tell you about the sweat of thought, especially when it is not empty fancy, but the organization of thought, which must have as its point of departure and point of return proletarian thinking and doing, as well as the general development of thought. And I would like to give you here, at least a brief idea of what went into so simple a question as deciding to publish NEWS & LETTERS.

(I) The story begins in 1941 when the theory of state capitalism

was elaborated. From 1941 to 1949-50 you could call the development of that political tendency as a development from theory to practice. Not that the theory wasn't tested in practice all along, but, on the whole, it was built on a) figures -- development of Russian economy and politics, b) past theory--Marx's concept of capitalism's development and the revolt of the workers, and c) it was all within the radical movement itself. That can even be shown by what our attitude was to the labor bureaucracy. We were already against the labor bureaucracy. Nevertheless the policy during that period was, since Routhier did come from the workers' ranks and since he was once a worker, maybe he could be given a push to the left. We were working in caucuses, trying to push him to the left. All you did was push yourself far away from anything.

(2) Now, as you often heard, 1949-50 begins a new epoch, for with automation in the form of the continuous miner and the miners' strike, something TOTALLY NEW APPEARS: the movement from practice to theory. It isn't that it was just a strike. It is that the most left wing of all the left wing leaders (because if anyone in the trade union movement you swore by, it was Lewis, he always went on no contract, no work) when he said go back to work, the miners said NO. That is a very high stage in development, because it is not only a new stage in the fight against the labor bureaucracy, it says "I, the miner have something to say about this and I have a thought about it". "I say this damn continuous miner not only throws me out of work, and those towns are all becoming ghost towns, but what kind am I doing? What is a human being? What kind of labor does he perform anyway? I'd like to know a couple of things on that." So it wasn't merely a class struggle and a very exciting strike that lasted 9 months. It was that they themselves had a new theory. They didn't call it a theory, but it was there, so you could have the movement from practice to theory. Now you can say in a certain sense you couldn't have development before you have developed. Not that there wasn't always that movement in life, in history, but no theoretician was fully conscious of it. a) Even the founder of Modern humanism, Marx, who broke with the bourgeois concept of theory, and reconstructed his major theoretical work on that movement from practice, nevertheless made a separation between theory and practice. It could not have been otherwise until the proletariat itself matured philosophically. b) The proof of that is that the 32 years after Marx's death, when the proletariat was readying for the greatest revolution in history--overthrow of Tsarism--and Lenin came to philosophy, he saw the essence of the dialectic in the unity of opposites, the transformation of one into the other, and not the A.I. or new society.

SO THAT IT IS NOT ONLY THAT WHAT TO LENIN'S WORKS WAS IMPLICIT
**PHILOSOPHIC FOUNDATIONS-- MUST BECOME TO US EXPLICIT. It is far more than that. What must become explicit to us is not contradiction, but the A.I.

2) The second period of our development covers 1950-1955. The new impulses from automation takes a long time to get organized. The break from totalitarianism signalled by the June 17, 1955 revolt in East Germany seems easier to comprehend. But, as we know from the necessity to break with Johnson, we had first to break from this totalitarian, who resisted the return back to theory on these new grounds, as we have found from our own experience and hence for a unification of theory and practice, including our being tested by the outside world where we were found wanting.

3) Now the 3rd period, the actual birth of News & Letters Committees or Marxist Humanism as the new theory, 1955-57 has compelled us to shed our philosophic innocence in the face of the workers demand for a total approach, but we have just begun. He who thinks otherwise will never build an organization, which cannot be built seriously without first of all being based on organization of thought that is both new and continued from Marx's day.

Let me deal with organization of thought first negatively, that is to say, from the bourgeois point of view. Thought is something reserved for the elite and, if you do not bow before it, like before the cross in the church, you nevertheless end by endowing MAN MADE INSTITUTIONS with ETHEREAL, UNCHANGEABLE LAWS OF THEIR OWN, taking them out of their historic, human determinateness, and thus make a FETISH of it.

The most common and vice-like fetish is what Marx called the fetishism of commodities. Not only is the whole capitalist world a world of commodities, but everything can be bought, including the human being. That the capitalist buys only his capacity to labor, not the laborer himself, has never had any except a juridical meaning to him. That is true not only of the capitalist himself and his intellectual hirelings, but even when bourgeois political economy was a SCIENCE, and discovered that labor was indeed the source of all value, the classical political economist did not go beyond "source" to subject, the human gravedigger of his exploitative system. In a word, classical political economists remained a prisoner of the fetishism of commodities. THAT IS WHY MARX OPPOSED NOT ONLY THE CAPITALISTS AS A CLASS AND THEIR IDEOLOGY AS RATIONALIZATION FOR THEIR EXPLOITATION OF THE WORKING CLASS BUT INSISTED THAT ALL HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS UP UNTIL THEN WAS A FALSE CONSCIOUSNESS. Only he who had nothing to gain from this exploitative system could gain a TRUE consciousness and that is why the WORKER could see clearly. Not because he was a hero but because, needing to throw all exploitation from his back, he straightened up as man, ended the pre-history of humanity because in his straightening up his head too was raised and he became conscious of all around him as a historic, that is, passing phenomenon. Gaining a mind of his own MEANT AN ENTIRELY NEW, UNPRECEDENTED ORGANIZATION OF THOUGHT, and this organization of thought was elaborated by Marx in the Communist Manifesto, which determined the organizational life of the Communist League.

WITHOUT SUCH AN ORGANIZATION OF THOUGHT organizations are nothing but factional groupings to be manipulated by unscrupulous politicians, big and small, includes, as I told L.A.--everything from the sublime to the ridiculous "3 friends" who were so far from getting any impulse from Angela Terrano's column as to single that one out for attack.

Today we have traced back the organization which meant serious preparation for 1917, which illuminated what it is the Johnsons were running to escape. But having finally accomplished the writing of the book, and gained our philosophic wings, does not mean we have finished the task, not even though it took us 16 years to reach here. We must now become so practiced in philosophic analysis of the actual, that it is second nature to us. Letter writing is one way, but it is the path only if it gains us an extra dimension in all things.

First and foremost it will determine our organizational life. Saul will deal with this and you will have your chance to discuss then the concrete. Here I am dealing, not with the particular, but with the general, although with Marxists the general too is not abstract, but concrete. For example, take the ABSOLUTE IDEA, not merely in its result as a synonym for the new society, but as a process: 1st objectively for thought too is objective--that is to say, the attitude to objectivity itself becomes part of that objective historical development. That idealist Hegel was so solidly based on the actual world that even his "world spirit" becomes actual. Thus he says: (Phen., p129) "It is the nature of truth to force its way to recognition when the time comes and it only appears when the time has come." The time is now. Truth has forced its way up and it will be heard. That is where the sales of the book comes in. You will recall from the Logic that he always insisted that, "The Idea is not so impotent as merely to have a right or an obligation to exist without actually existing."

HOW TO ACHIEVE THAT WITH MARXIST HUMANISM IS THE QUESTION

We have two advantages: 1) Ours is real, not only in thought, but in the outside world for we live in an age of absolutes, where the counter-revolution is in the innards of the revolution, "and no ghost need come from the grave to tell us that", since not only every child can understand the Hungarian Revolution; every Hungarian child participated in it and suffered the blows of the Russian bloodletting. 2) Ours is native. Marxist Humanism originated in the period of the Civil War, but it has come of age now in the period of Automation, where its very form took shape. But, we must be under no illusions--neither because founders of a new movement sounds so poetic that we forget the trials and tribulations that the capitalists, labor bureaucracy, and old radicals will throw ours away and as often as possible try to hit below the belt. Nor because we felt that since it came from the workers, we can shift to them the responsibility that belongs with us. Not being an elite doesn't lessen that responsibility. It heightens it. Although we are not an elite and we are not out "to lead" the masses, we do have a serious role to perform that no one else is doing, although now that it is done, everyone will challenge. The intellectual sloth that has accumulated these decades since Lenin's death has created a quagmire that will have a pulling effect on us too if at any moment we relax our vigilance and the confidence in our now point of departure. For it cannot be too often repeated that Marxism is not what Marx wrote in 1843 or 1883, but what it is today. What 1843-1883 created were the theory and the method. We must unite theory, method and practice, so the workers can actualize it and make it real, or there will be no new society.

We repeat: how to actualize Marxist Humanism is the question. We can say simply by selling MARXISM & FREEDOM. That is true, but it is not the whole truth. THE FOLLOW-THROUGH IS THE WHOLE TRUTH AND IT IS A CONTINUOUS PROCESS. It begins before you have sold, continues when you have sold, remains to be done after you have sold and until the person has joined us. Between the "after" and the "until" they join us, we become a part of the marketplace of ideas which is more like a battlefield where no powers less than the American and U.S.S.R. Administrations, Routhers' Labor Bureaucracy or John L. Lewis' Labor Bureaucracy, marshal all their command in an attempt to destroy us.

That man Hegel, never ceases to amaze me. He sat in that ivory Prussian tower, thinking and rethinking the movement of thought - its history-- and yet Practice to him is of the essence, and that even when he reaches the pinnacle of his system, the Absolute Idea and when he says that RECALL, remembrance of things past is the pathway to the Absolute Idea, he adds; "RECOGNITION PUTS ITSELF FORWARD AS SIMPLE KNOWLEDGE OF DUTY IN CONTRAST TO THE DISTINCTION AND DIRECTION THAT LIE IN ACTION." AS OPPOSED TO THE RIGID REALITY CONFRONTING ACTION, ACTION ITSELF OVERCOMES THE OPPOSITION BETWEEN REALITY AND THOUGHT --breaks down the division between the two--and what results? " Truth... has also the shape, the CHARACTER OF CERTAINTY." That is to say, that is how you gain INNER CONVICTION.

It is thus not just a question that you learn by doing. You gain a new dimension, in doing and a new adherent and that is what is important. You gain it, says Hegel, not so much from knowledge as such as from the activity. In exposing yourself to the outside world, you have thereby transformed innocence or inherent nature into "explicitness of Substance into Subject," SO THAT WHEN the cycle of philosophy returns to itself, we see that it has reached its beginning ONLY AT THE END.

Translated into our terms, it is as a living human being (" Subject" to Hegel) that you supercede the distinction between thought and reality. It is as living human being that you have shed the hostility to thought, your philosophic innocence and blind belief and thereby released the previous empty Absolute from the abyss and let it unfold its own existence ANEW--as a unity of the Theoretical and Practical Idea. "This process of releasing itself from the form of itself," says Hegel, "is the highest freedom and security of its knowledge of itself."

NOW THEN RELEASE IS A MOST CREATIVE ACT OF LIFE ITSELF, AND ESPECIALLY SO, THE LIVES OF THE WORKING PEOPLE, oppressed in the shop, depressed by the blaring of the labor bureaucrats and political leaders in and out of the shop, withdrawing into himself by the overwhelming pressures of a world he produced, but in which he is nothing but a cog in a machine, and he is told in a million subtle and not so subtle ways that thinking is not for him. Therefore, what is stirring in his mind not only you do not see - he himself isn't aware of it. There is no release and it is for this reason that we began, not with the book, but with the paper. THAT MUST CONTINUE. But everyone in this room knows that it will continue and expand only AS MARXISM & FREEDOM has become second nature to us AND THEREFORE WIN FOR US A MUCH WIDER BASE IN MEMBERS, IN SUBS, AND IN MONEY. That is how the whole organization will learn how to fly. It has just gained its philosophic wings, but it is not yet practised.

The practice of the paper carried us to the book and the practice of the book will carry us to an expanded paper because by then we will have founded a new movement which will give the paper a wider, as well as more solid organization.

As you know, we are not out "to lead". We say that while the old radical organizations that thirsted for leadership, were out to capture the workers and teach them the "great principle of the party," we hope the workers will capture us. But the truth is, the workers haven't rushed to do that either and for AS SOLID AND SUBSTANTIAL REASONS AS WE AREN'T RUNNING TO LEAD THEM.

That is to say--each of us is part of the objective movement - the MOVEMENT TOWARD A NEW UNITY OF THEORY AND PRACTICE. That was begun in the method of the paper and in the way MARXISM & FREEDOM was written. But it has just begun. The test whether MARXISM & FREEDOM is "just" a book or the real foundation for a new movement is yet to come. It will take at least a year before we can even say where we stand in replacing the principle of the party to lead with a new unity of theory and practice.

We are no elite and have no blueprints. Not only is the new movement first to be founded next year, but one thing we know for sure is that even then it will not be hardened or set in its ways, because to us Marxist Humanism is a continuous and ceaseless movement where theory and practice are constantly changing places. The forever beating heart of Marxism in the DAILY LIVES OF THE WORKING PEOPLE will first then, we hope, have also a forever growing body of people.

It is then and only then, when NEWS & LETTERS too will have a foundation that will make it an easy transition to go to a bi-weekly and even perhaps a weekly, but by then, each of us will have gained that new dimension, which will make us 10 feet tall and ready to challenge the rulers of this century in the struggle for the mind of man.

In the year between now and our next convention, we have a lot of work to do to make the organization grow through spreading of MARXISM & FREEDOM. We will do this by living as active lives philosophically as we do in the class struggle. There is no doubt that TOGETHER those two activities will move the organization forward and earn us the title of being founders, for by then MARXISM & FREEDOM will become the POLARIZING FORCE for the new movement, Marxist Humanism. Is it too much to ask that we double our membership by then?

HUMANISM AND MONEY

Every time the organization called for money the membership has always rallied and given it. But now we are at the point where we have to catch up with the times so to speak. The ruling class has always seen fit to spread their philosophy in millions of ways, to have it seep into our very thinking without us even realizing it. Today they work at it more feverishly than ever before. Today they are fighting for their very life. Today Marxist Humanist is what we stand on and what we are going to bring to the world.

When the working class began fighting class domination they were starving and penniless, but every ruling class down through history has held the wealth in the palms of their hands. The working class had only its mass strength, and pennies. Their coming together to work in a factory and finding others with the same problems to fight soon showed the way to gather those pennies. It was through their pennies that they established working class unions, demanded public education, and broke away some of the intellectuals who seeing this, said they would rather be with them.

We now have the ideas the paper was built on, developed into a book, a book of ideas, thoughts and working class philosophy and life.

This is one reason why the opposition will be so hot. Because deep within the book is the truth that although many workers don't know philosophical terms they have from years of working in the factories a philosophy in their bones. A philosophy that is totally against those people that think they are the chosen ones to stand behind, on top, and all over the production workers telling them how to work, how to eat, live, and how to think.

They figure it will be better for them if they can keep the workers fighting among themselves, to have them gather their pennies and buy houses and T.V. sets.

What they forget is that no matter how many T.V. sets they buy the working man returns to that factory and the cycle starts all over again and each time it starts it gets a little higher and closer to home. And if they are laid off, they are once again penniless.

Years back when the people in power saw those pennies gathering together they established a penny newspaper in this country. Now the Johnsonites played this up quite a bit. They judged the paper we had then, Correspondence, against Johnson and decided the pennies that come from our small organization would go to the paper and the rest to Johnson. The bourgeoisie got rich on their penny papers, we got poorer and poorer. Mariners, Renegades and Castaways cost between 8 to 10 thousand dollars, and that's no lie, and it was a complete loss. Just think how many issues of News and Letters that

would pay for.

Johnson did the bourgeoisie a favor. We were so secretive about our ideas and Marx, that that organization was just a clearing house for souls dissatisfied with society. We were each others' psychiatrist. We didn't have to go out into the world with our ideas, we had each other. I say this not to dwell on the past but to show how differently we began with our paper and how different the future is ahead, once the book is published. Not just that it has to be different, but the publication itself makes it so, even if some don't want it, they can't stop it.

When we began with News and Letters we began the exact opposite of Johnson. We established a \$5,000 fund for the paper first. We thought that would take care of the publication of the paper for a year. We weren't exactly right. That fund carried us up to May and from there on the money that came in for the book supported the paper, but at that point too we had to go from a bi-weekly to a monthly, otherwise we wouldn't have any money left for the book.

We voted for a monthly not choosing the one against the other, the book against the paper, but because we realized that although the paper was built on the ideas that come together in Marxism and Freedom, and that the book in its turn was developed from the paper and is a continuation of the paper. That Marxism and Freedom is not finished because it is between two covers, but is living and breathing and has given life to the paper.

Since the convention, we have raised through regular contributions to keep the office going and to have one paid staff, through the special fund of \$5,000 for the paper, and at least \$1,000 that the book has given to the paper, over \$13,000. Now when someone feels what we are trying to do and can put it into a few words, it's picked up and spread around and each one of us has to find what it means to ourselves. I'm talking of what John said at the RMB, that we have to find out the difference "between selling the book as merchants or as founders." And with this idea of going out to be founders, the RMB proposes that we be responsible for 1,500 copies of the book, 500 being the responsibility of the center and 1,000 copies left for the three locals. Now we also propose that each member be responsible for 25 copies to buy, to either sell or give away. Olga has another proposal that she will talk on, that each of us be responsible to try and sell another 25 copies, making it 50 for each.

Now whether it's 25 or 50, each of us will be in the world of ideas. It will be as if we are seeing ourselves growing up before us, as we did yesterday and this morning, saying here is what you have made of the world and here is what the workers have been fighting for and here is our book.

"Humanism" is not an abstraction of philosophy but a value judgement which decides how much anything is worth to you. We will

say here is your world in which you judge everything by its worth and cost. The workers you judge by how much time he spends laboring.

The IWB local that I belong to for some 3-4 months now, put out a leaflet recently which talked about some studies made at a university. The first thing you see on it is, "If you had a million?" It goes on to say that four out of five employed American men would want to keep on working if they inherit a million dollars. It also compares middle-class jobs to working-class jobs, saying the middle-class job is more satisfying. "The type of work performed by middle-class employees offers satisfaction because it is concerned more with symbols and meanings than physical labor. In contrast, working-class jobs are more concerned with physical activity: handling tools, operating machines, lifting, carrying etc. For this reason, life without working is more often seen as life without anything to do by members of this class." It goes on to give some statistics, then, "This suggests that work is an important element in the emotional economy of many individuals, anchoring them to society, the researchers indicate."

The union makes no comment on this so I assume they agree. But this is their judgement. They at least see that work is essential to living, they say that working people are dissatisfied with their work but they don't say that work should not be the way it is today, no they say being a labor bureaucrat, professional, insurance salesman, personnel manager, or whatever middle-class jobs are, is better and more rewarding work than what the working man who creates the wealth these people live off of does.

Their judgement is the money, the prestige. We ask what kind of labor is man to do? A socialist society poses not the measure of things in labor time but in leisure time for the laborer, where the production worker establishes his condition of work. We deal with automation and what it does to the human being, not glory in the progress of the machine. No capitalist, American or Russian, nor labor bureaucrat can say what we say in the paper and in the book. We do not learn from them but from the people who work or don't work because of these machines. It is they that were listened to in 1950 in the mines, that enabled the development of the automation chapter in the book.

Yesterday the chairman talked of the meeting with the LA youth and of how she was able to give them what is not taught in the schools. They can go back to school and not have to accept what they pass off for history and current events, not only not accept, but challenge, for they will have at their finger tips a method of thought that can cut through the hog-wash and brain washing that they get, day in and day out. At the REB the chairman reported that when Louise wrote to one of the "Three Friends" out there, she wrote, "You're trying to be a part time Marxist and Marxism is not a part time job." That statement along with John's, "Selling the book as founders not as merchants," sets, I think, our task right in the fist of our hand.

The other day watching T.V. I was startled to see Howard Fast, who has been a Communist for many years but has broken with them after the Hungarian Revolution. He was on Dave Garroway's show. He is supposed to be an intellectual, a writer, and I felt the way Olga felt yesterday with the professors.

He said that you can't be a Communist without holding a party card. He was asked why it has taken him so long to reach the conclusion that thousands of other Americans came to. He resented the statement and I can understand why in a sense, but he didn't go on to say one word about workers and their experiences in the shop with the Communists and their maneuvering, or the Negro people's experience with the Communists and their maneuvering. He just answered in a very superior manner that he has grappled with questions the American public knows little or nothing about.

To me, and what I have gotten from the book, organization and paper, he is still a Communist at heart and in the mind. What greater questions than, production, what kind of labor is man to do, war, prejudices, freedom, can be dealt with? The American worker, white and Negro faces them every day in the shop. We pose these questions in the book and we will have to make a value judgement of what it is worth to us.

Olga has worked out some estimated monthly expenses for me. I'm sorry that I can't give exact figures on what was spent, the books are open for anyone to see of course, but I've been on this job for 3 months and haven't really got hold of it yet.

Estimated expenses for a monthly paper	Estimated monthly income from regular contributions from locals
Printing & engraving--- 300	La----- 160
Rent----- 60	W. Va.-- 1gh. 50
Utilities----- 30	Detroit----- 170
Salary----- 200	Total--- 380
Postage----- 20	
Total----- 610	

Sometimes it's higher or lower, that's sort of an average. Total monthly income is 380, that leaves us with a monthly deficit of 230, plus a back bill to the printer of 1700 that has to be worked off. Now here is where the paper and the book depending on each other show itself very concretely. For one year of printing the paper including the back debt, we need above our regular contributions, 3460.

Now each member buying 25 books at 5 apiece, we would get 12 on each book and get 1,250. To make possible the publication of the paper for a year we have to sell every one of the 1,500 copies proposed that we be responsible for.

5.

Now I think after yesterday we all realize that once this book of ideas is out in the world of ideas, each of us has to be able to answer for it. There will be no purges of people, no factions etc., that we can hide behind to keep from facing this world of ours.

We can have funds like in the past, and everyone make a pledge, each of us being responsible for 25 copies is sort of that, but that is not the answer anymore to our financial problems. How much what we stand for is worth will be shown by how much we go out with our ideas, fight, argue, sell, and found an organization based on Marxist-Humanism. We will have a little less than a year to show our judgement of this organization. Not everyone will be able to do the same work, not everyone will gain the confidence right away, but each of us has to accept the fact that in this world of Automation, H. Bombs, and Earth Satelites, we can not allow either side to make the judgement that this is the age of absolute war or absolute unemployment. For with the book and the new organization we will show that we are not alone the competitors of the capitalists and the labor bureaucracy, but of everyone who claims the name of Marxism.

2617

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD, SEPT. 1, 1957

Selling the book as founders, and not as merchants, places not only a very high, but a very new responsibility upon every one of us. For each to consider himself, and carry himself, as a true founder of the new movement, Humanism, means not only that we will of necessity have to stop depending on others - the leader - to do our thinking for us, find the answers for us, and compete for us in the world of ideas with other groupings and opposing forces, of which there will be plenty. It means something far more important as well; the actual building of our organization.

The beginning was made a year ago in July, when we gained for the first time a sense of organization and adopted our Constitution. But it was only the merest beginning. With the new basis the book creates, it cannot be mere wishful thinking, but an actual goal for us, to expect that when we meet again next July, we will have at least doubled our membership. Marxism and Freedom creates the basis for this perspective, but the rest is up to us, for it is people who make the movement. A body of ideas requires living and thinking human beings to give it reality.

Agreement on this as a perspective is not enough, however. A perspective cannot be left as an abstraction, but must be made concrete for each one of us.

Therefore, as a very minimum responsibility and opportunity for each of us to become true founders, this plenum resolves:

- 1- That the organization be responsible for the sale of 1600 books, of which the center assumes responsibility for 500, and the locals responsibility for 1000.
- 2- That each one of us set himself the goal of selling 50 copies, but hold himself responsible for 25, whether sold or not.
- 3- That the money for these copies be in the office within six months after publication of the book, but that that does not mean waiting for such time either to begin selling, or to first send in the money. Money should be sent weekly, if not daily; that is to say, just as soon as copies are sold. The advance orders already sold indicate the possibilities open to us immediately.
- 4- That "selling as founders and not as merchants" covers every conceivable variety of activity. First and foremost is the continuation of the letter-writing which has already begun, as an integral part of our lives and our own development. Writing cannot be limited to friends alone, but must reach out both to enemies, as well. Our reading of the press can attain a new aspect, if it is read with the idea of constantly being alert to every opportunity to write to the editor, to contributors, to reviewers, and all other personalities. Likewise, each of us must be involved in the promotional and publicising of the book from all aspects, whether that be an alertness to grasp or create opportunities for lectures by the author, tours paid for by the outside wherever possible, or TV and radio appearances. These opportunities, as well, should not be limited to only those areas where we have locals in existence, but reach to any corner of the world where the opportunity is presented.

5- That the involvement of each one of us is the prime necessity because no one will build this movement for us. No one will give us the free publicity a Djilas is given. It must be recognized, instead, that many will try to prevent our growth. We few alone are responsible for our growth and our life. It is the essential reason why we cannot remain a few.

The high level that has been reached for the present outward move and which the book makes possible, establishes no guarantees of success. We are certain to face many difficult situations, some of which may appear to be even defeats. This should not surprise us. But this must follow - if our heads are clear and our perspectives based on the solid foundations presented in the book, these temporary defeats will be turned to eventual victory.

6- That "selling the book as founders", means also establishing the paper on a much higher basis. Every sale of the book can mean two subs for the paper. The inseparability of the book and the paper will be seen in the development of the paper, not only as the daily expression of what the book itself contains, but as the continual expansion and enrichment of its contents, and this particularly in the increasing struggle against the labor bureaucracy. It is in that very real sense that the book will not be finished when it is between two covers, but will first begin to live.

7- Finally, that within six months, the IER be authorized to meet and sum up our collective experiences, to see what faces us next. For, although the perspectives we set ourselves in actuality cover the entire year ahead, a six month's summing up is made necessary because "selling" is not a 1:1 relationship with the book alone, nor even a 1:3 relationship involving the book, the paper, and the organization, but an indefinitely expanding and limitless relationship in which its far-reaching results cannot be even predicted, or adequately imagined.