

3-2-0-4

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PERSPECTIVES

I. The State of the World Economy and Capitalist Politics

Once again production comes to the forefront, this time in the form of a near stand-still of the American economy. The Government's immense investment in nuclear arms (plus reaching for the moon) cannot hide the small's pace of the rate of growth of the productive economy, nor the private capitalists' failure to invest sufficiently to keep the economy expanding, much less to make any appreciable cut in the unemployed army which by now has become a permanent feature of the U. S. "way of life."

Automation, which is responsible for this feature, is also responsible for a decline in the rate of profit, since surplus value comes only from living labor and, relative to the sums invested in the automation machines and modernized plants, the individual capitalist continues to be dissatisfied with his rate of profit no matter how lush the mass of profits is. The capitalists are on strike and have already gotten quick depreciation write-offs plus other lures for investment. In contrast to his anger at workers' strikes, Kennedy takes the capitalists' sabotage in his stride. For him, war will "solve" this problem and thus he works to extend the "New Frontier" to the other side of the Atlantic with empty rhetoric about an "Atlantic partnership" that would astound the world with its productivity and "unity."

The history of this "united" Atlantic community, however, is filled with innumerable wars, while the present tensions in it are heightened by a dual and contradictory movement: on the one hand, the whole world is divided into two, and only two, nuclear giants, each fighting for single mastery of the world. On the other hand, [the Marshall Plan (plus Stalin's fear of and hence sabotage of the proletarian revolution) having re-established the capitalistic axis of Europe, this "new" third force of the De Gaulle-Adenauer axis can no longer be written off as a satellite of the U.S. in the manner in which Russia has made East Europe into a satellite of itself.]

At the same time, the other pole of nuclear capital is in an ever greater crisis, all the superinvestments in the Siberian virgin lands having produced virtually nought, and the labor productivity having remained but one-fourth of what it is in America. Khrushchev's belligerency on the foreign front stems directly from this crisis. The more he rattles rockets, the more what he really wants is long-term loans. Far from getting the latter from the U.S. (until the U-2 incident he did harbor such illusions), Russia now faces yet another

economic threat: re-establishment of productive, capitalistic West Europe, whose accomplishment of the centralization of capital in half of Europe has fired De Gaulle's political ambitions as well.

J.F.K. may have reason to believe that he can still keep West Europe as a junior partner, but N.K. knows it as a direct threat to Russia, and has decided to start an all-out campaign against any such consummation as the centralization of all of European capital. Even as Stalin in his day led a campaign against the Marshall Plan, Khrushchev will try to divert all European mass movements to fight the Common Market. Of course this, as part of the overall aim of world mastery, is only part, though a central part, of the struggle with the United States all over the world.

1) State Capitalism and the New De Gaulle-Adenauer Axis

De Gaulle and Adenauer are trying to do together what Hitler could not accomplish alone. The transformation of competitive capitalism into monopoly capitalism at the end of the 19th century resulted in international cartels as well as imperialist colonies. In order to consummate a redivision of the world, monopoly capitalism embarked on World War I. The war's achievement of this redivision of the world only spurred on the capitalistic need for centralization of capital within each technologically advanced country, as well as over contiguous masses of capital, for example on a European scale, in order to be able to fight for mastery of the whole world. The movement to state capitalism on a world scale was consummated in full only in Stalin's Russia and Nazi Germany.

Hitler hungered for a subordinate in Europe to help him achieve in the whole of Europe what his fascists achieved in Germany, choosing first to flirt with Great Britain (at Munich), and then with Russia (with the Hitler-Stalin Pact). Because of the antagonism to Russia, the private capitalistic world tolerated and encouraged Hitler. But when it became clear both to Russia and the private capitalistic world that Hitler's attempt at centralization of European capital was only a stepping stone to mastery of the whole world, they came together as the strangest assortment of Allies (in World War II) the world had ever seen.

World War II put an end to Hitler's ambitions. It only served to rouse De Gaulle's. De Gaulle is taking over where Hitler left off, this time making truncated Germany his subordinate. Let's not forget either

that De Gaulle's hallucinations of glory through the nuclear club include his "concept" of Europe's extension "to the Ural Mountains," i.e. into Russia. In ambition, he indeed is on a par with Khrushchev and Kennedy, especially now that he has succeeded in "solving" the Algerian war by keeping Algeria attached to France, while making sure that the OAS is more or less intact somewhere within France and Spain for any possible future use.

(De Gaulle isn't, of course, the only capitalist who has a fascistic side-kick waiting in the wings. America's fascist alliances are not limited to fascist Spain. Wherever you look--be that Korea or Guatemala; Japan or Turkey; Formosa or Argentina; not to mention on the one hand Saudi Arabia and on the other hand the Congo-- you see the reactionary, the military, the openly fascist, or the semi-fascist image. It is this precisely which Russia, which is equally counter-revolutionary as we saw in Hungary, uses throughout Europe to raise up the spectre of Nazism, as if Russia too had not found cohabitation possible, as during the Hitler-Stalin Pact. Stalin would do anything to assure that a spontaneous, truly independent proletarian power would not be able once and for all to put an end to class divisions, and have production and the state run not by yet another new bureaucracy but by the population to a man.)

2) The RCP's Goal Within the Mass Movement

The Russian Communist Party is master at narrowing one's vision to fighting on a single "immediate" issue. Ever since the end of World War II it has diverted the revolutionary impulses of the proletariat toward capitalistic goals. Stalin feared independent proletarian power more than he feared De Gaulle. The first diversion therefore was of the French CP away from the struggle for power and toward coalition with De Gaulle. Then came the Cold War and the Marshall Plan and all efforts now were concentrated against the Marshall Plan, but purely as an extension of the Russian foreign policy, purely from a negative point of view. In fact, the CP sabotaged any strike struggle, such as the famous Renault strike in 1948, and this so emasculated the CP that though it had a million members and four million voters it could put up no fight against De Gaulle's second assumption of power with the help of the OAS in 1958.

3 3 2 0 7

-4-

The same policy held in Japan where the CP opposed any move of the Japanese people against their own government since that would have "divided" the struggle from the single purpose of being anti-American.

Because De Gaulle opposed NATO (though within the framework of NATO) Khrushchev began anew his flirtation with De Gaulle, visiting him in Paris to assure him that he (Khrushchev) "understood" De Gaulle's Algerian position, and going so far as to stop the Algerian CP's all-out support to the FLN. As soon as Khrushchev lost his illusion that he could use De Gaulle for a struggle against American domination of Europe, he not only once again allowed the CP freedom of action, but himself came to the aid of the FLN, even as he hurried to recognize it as the official government before it was legally established. Above that, he has refurbished popular frontism throughout Europe, adding a good dose of anti-German chauvinism under the guise of fighting Nazism. This indeed is the cornerstone of his policy both in moving into the anti-nuclear mass movements as well as in opposing the Common Market.

Khrushchev's ambition is not limited to mobilizing the full power of Russia and its satellites. He hopes to engage also the peace movements both in Western Europe and in Japan, as well as the African national movements in an all-out struggle against the Common Market. The tragedy is that the British trade union leadership is itself involved in a struggle against the Common Market not as a capitalistic feature which should be fought by the unity of the European working class under such slogans as the Socialist United States of Europe, but on purely so-called "market considerations," constantly counter-posing the high or low standard of living in one country to the other, thereby laying themselves open for the trap set for them both by the extreme wing of the Tories and the CP.

Because of Communism's preoccupation with developing its H-bomb and missile potential, it originally left the anti-nuclear movements alone. By the time, however, the CND and the Committee of 100 in England had gotten a mass following, while Russia's high politics of negotiations were fruitless, Russia changed its foreign policy again. Not that it had given up "peaceful co-existence" with other capitalistic governments, but that both internally in each country and externally as a world platform, it turned toward taking over the peace movements. How desperate must the British CND feel, can be seen from the fact that they allowed themselves to become a captive audience to a bomb-rattling speech by Khrushchev who, the following day, told U. S. newspaper editors that he had planned to show the "Disarmament and Peace

Conference" a film of the global rocket that "can hit a fly in outer space," but that he was told "it would be misunderstood."

Just as he chose the time of the Neutralist Conference mainly composed of African and Middle Eastern nations meeting in Belgrade in 1961 to unilaterally break the test ban by exploding a 58 megaton bomb, so he chose the so-called Peace Conference to boast of this global rocket "which cannot be destroyed by any anti-missile means," insultingly saying to these unilateralists that "nobody will live to see the Socialist (?) countries disarm unilaterally." In a final gesture which exposed his purpose in inspiring the conference as a platform for Russian foreign policy, he actually spent a great part of his speech neither on disarmament nor on peace, but on attacks on the Common Market, making central to everything the Berlin crisis.

So great is the preoccupation of the nuclear disarmament movements with opposing nuclear arms, that nothing else exists for them—neither the abridgment of freedom involved in erecting the East Berlin wall which keeps East Germans imprisoned in their own half-country, nor the dangerous and war-breeding chauvinism that is propagated by the Russian Communists against the West Germans. That the Communists reached this sorry end should surprise no one, but that the peace movement and some African nationalists as well as some trade unionists should come to this must give pause to all who stand for a new world.

This pause must not be used for immobilizing oneself, nor even only for clearing one's head, but must, above all, be utilized to draw organizational, serious organizational conclusions.

## II. The Year of the African Trip and the Japanese New Left

Ever since the Congo crisis and the New Manifesto of the SI CP's on the "new independent national democracies," the pull of Communist state capitalism upon the independent African Revolutions has been obvious. We had written much on the cross-roads reached by the African Revolutions and the need for the presence of the Marxist-

Humanist philosophy to help keep them on their independent path away from either pole of world capital. At the same time, it was obvious that our own philosophy needed the enrichment of this new page in world history. We considered the African trip an indispensable requisite for the new book dealing with the political maturity of the masses — "the subjectivity that has absorbed objectivity" to a degree that you could not say where theory left off and practice began. The one point we did not think we needed illumination on was the question of the role of the party. Yet, both because of the objective world situation, and the development of News and Letters Committees organizationally, the illumination on the question of the role of the party is precisely the bridge to the new stage of organizational development called "full-time organizers for Marxist-Humanism."

1) Africa and "the Party"

There are two high points in the African trip that none other had: (1) The physical presence there was not of an author but of the national chairman of an organization. This moreover was in a continent where the situation is so fluid that the philosophy and organization are judged objectively rather than on the basis of prestige and numbers; that is to say, the philosophy and physical presence can actually influence the freedom movement.

(2) In turn, their concept of an attachment to "the party", the overwhelming confidence that without an organization nothing can succeed, has shed a new light, where light was badly needed, on the whole question of the role of a party. The concept is one that is not "old politics" either as vote-getting or as "party to lead backward masses", but the type of organization such as we are, as the Abolitionists were, or as Marx's International was.

It is true we have always insisted that for a small group of intellectuals and workers to get together has strong objective and historic roots as for a mass party to arise. But, of necessity, (because of the fact that our experience is the transformation of Leninism into its opposite, Stalinism, and the need to destroy that, root and branch) we tended to underestimate the value of organization and bring to the forefront the spontaneously arisen organization even where that has not arisen.

- 7 -

The result has been that we "begged" for organizational consciousness to arise, consciousness of the need to build our organization, as if that were a departure from our way of life. And as if the building could be done without builders who feel the historic wind in their sails in a concrete enough manner to sacrifice all for it.

In Nigeria, on the other hand, it was said as naturally as one speaks of breathing that such and such an organizer decided not to marry for two years (though he had a sweet heart he would otherwise marry) because it would interfere with his organizational tour that took first place with him. At the same time a woman had decided not to bear children for two years (obviously the year she expected "the second, the real, revolution" to take place).

We have much to learn from Africa and peculiarly enough (this bears repeating) it included the one subject we consider ourselves more expert on than anyone else, i.e. the role of the party. We knew that you could not equate the "single party" or nationalist movement that fought for independence in Africa from imperialism, with the single-party-state that culminated the counter-revolution in Russia as it became transformed into a state capitalist society. Nevertheless, because we are steeped in the European tradition and because some of the worse elements of single party-ism exist in such places as Ghana, we could not see anything positive in this phenomenon on the African continent.

There is no doubt that the history of the past is on our side. There is also no doubt that the history of the present cannot be painted with the same gray brush. Nor can we be blind to the fact that the African phenomenon of "the party" is as specific to our revolutionary times as the decentralized concept of workers councils of the Hungarian Revolution. The very fact that the worst feature of single party-ism in Africa appears in Ghana where there are opposition parties shows that the evil is not in the single party-ism per se so much as it is in the limitations of speech, independent organizations of the workers, and the narrowing of their horizons to "productivity."

Originally the CFP was the break-off from an already existing national movement, and one moreover that did connive with the imperialists to maintain a so-called federal structure. The CFP won mass support precisely because of its unified stand behind "Freedom Now." This meant that the gaining of freedom was its work and the other party represented the imperialists. Recently Nkrumah was sufficiently con-

vinced that they are without any power, to release Dauqua and others from prison. Those whom he didn't release, and by now has powers to send to prison if ever again they are challenging his leadership, are the workers who are not yet organized as a party. Nkrumah's present call for "the single party" state is connected with his fear that the party, having been compelled to widen its base through absorption of the trade unions, the women's organizations and the youth, including even the pioneers, is now too broad to be truly an elite. Thereby "Nkrumahism" has been born. This is not only a question of the super-ego that is not satisfied either with "African socialism" or "Pan Africanism" as defining his specific country's philosophy. This is a question of ever sharper narrowing of the concept of "the vanguard." Nkrumahism insists that a "mass party is all well and good" but it needs "a vanguard" that has a special elite "to guide and direct it."

In a word, the evil of the single party — the concept of the elite — is what remains evil though other parties nominally exist, as they do in Ghana.

On the other hand, Toure, though he insists that the single party is an absolute not only for the gaining of freedom for imperialism, but the same national unity must remain for the reconstruction of society, insists that his single party concept is not that of an elite. It is a "people's party" because, far from comprising only 2 per cent of the population as it does in "other" countries, his is a mass party that extends to every village, and no matter how distant that is from the center, the persons in it make their own decisions. Once the general principle is accepted, the local group has all the authority to do things the way it sees fit.

The defect is that he then says: we don't discuss Marxism. We discuss whether to build a bridge or a school, where to build it, and who and how to do it. If even that were so — that all people are brought into the decision-making, the truth still remains the decision-making is on the practical level only, thereby once again re-establishing the division between mental and manual work. Everyone may be brought into a decision where to build what — but is everyone brought into the question of formulating the theory under which the reconstruction proceeds? There is many a Guinean whose concept of that which Toure calls "full Africanization" differs widely from his leader's concept for the intellectuals to continue "to lead" and the masses to continue to labor. The Guinean worker does not wish to limit his participation to the "doing." Or, rather, he wants doing to include the thinking that goes into developing the philosophy of African socialism.



Despite the negative features both in Ghana and in Guinea, but particularly in Ghana, the rest of Africa -- and that includes both the places where they are still colonies, and those where, as in Nigeria, they have gained independence, but not through revolution -- there is not a single African that does not speak with awe and reverence of the party.

He does so not because he is told to do so by his leadership nor because of the negative features in the single party state which he does oppose. He does so out of his own volition and because he believes there is absolutely no other way to achieve freedom. The party, to him, means the organization that has put an end to the fragmentation that imperialism brought.

That fragmentation is not limited just to tribal or geographic divisions, that is to say, the obvious divide and rule method of colonialism. By putting an end to fragmentation, the African means that it is impossible for an individual, any individual, be he small or great, learned or illiterate, in power or out of power, a brave revolutionary or a cowardly Uncle Tom, a chosen "genius" to be sent abroad or the leader to be imprisoned, absolutely anyone, and therefore everyone is absolutely impotent as an individual.

It must be stressed also that this identification of fragmentation with the individual, though it no doubt has some origin in communal living, as a tribe, is of this era and not of the past, is directly related to the gaining of freedom, the type of freedom that is more than nominal; that is to say, not just political independence, but economic strength. This is not something out of books -- neither books by his native leaders, nor those from behind the Iron Curtain extolling the monolithic state. This is out of his own experience in the actual struggles for freedom as well as in the imperative need to industrialize his land and to unify with the rest of Africa so that Africa becomes an important world phenomenon. Neither is it due to the fact that he is unaware that in this Pan-Africanism there are such opposites as the emperor of Ethiopia and the president of Guinea. He still feels that only he, as a collective organization, a black collective organization, can do away with feudal kingdoms.

How long, he asks, has the imperialist not only tolerated the Lion of Judah without industrializing? What if the major businesses in Senegal or Nigeria are still owned by the white French or the white British and will continue to be so if it is Whitehall or Quai d'Orsay that is setting the line? "But if we get Senghor and Azikiwe to sit at the

tables of our unified Africa ...." And to the question: What about the other imperialists, Russia and China? the answer is: they haven't gotten here yet, and if we're unified they never will. Why do you think the white only uses us, and we can't use him?

No need in a Resolution for our organization to waste time exposing all the errors in this type of thinking, either their discounting of the threat of Russian Communism because it isn't physically in Africa, or in the naivete of the idea of "using." Our point here is limited only to finding the point of unity between our concept and theirs on the question of the role of the party. That point of unity is the concept that the revolution in Africa is by no means completed, and the second revolution will never come unless the Africans never again allow their fragmentation, unless the Africans continue with mass organization.

It is this which the Africans swear by, not at the party. It is this which infuses Negritude with a philosophy of Freedom Now. It is this which makes them reverse the Marxist principle that no society can be free unless the individual is free. To the African, no individual can be free unless society is. There may seem to be no contradiction in this, and indeed it is only a different formulation of the same thought. But the African persists in his own formulation because to him it is not only that society cannot be free, but that it cannot even exist unless it is organized, has its party which would thus give it the strength to challenge neo-colonialism though it still isn't armed and imperialism is. Thus they have fastened on to the indissoluble link between freedom and organization. It is this which we have to gain for our present development, not as a generalization, but as the concrete growth of our organization.

We have, in our horror at the Stalinist counter-revolution, as well as the Trotskyist concept of the party to lead, gone to the other extreme of very nearly dismissing party organization. As if the degeneration of the vanguard party compells the rejection of party organization. Or, to put it another way, as if there were no difference between the spontaneous mass organization that arises in revolutionary times, and that small grouping which persists (through quiet times as well as turbulent days) to maintain not only the historic link with the proletariat's glorious tradition, but to keep it ever afire through daily activity as well as through fundamental reformulations of theory to meet the challenge of the times. As if the unity of the movement from theory to practice with that from practice to theory could be achieved "unconsciously." If we leave Africa for a moment and

view the new Japanese left, we will get yet another illumination as to the needs of our own development at this stage.

## 2) Japan's Objective Development and the New Lefts

Japan seems to be the forgotten country—except when something like mass anti-nuclear demonstrations bring it to the forefront, and then only for the span that it occupies the headlines and not as a focus for a re-examination of the fundamentals both of the objective development and the subjective development of the various tendencies and parties. Yet it is the latter that relates directly to our own development.

Japan was the one Oriental country that began its industrialization at the turn of the century and which had in 1905 defeated Imperial Russia, thus indirectly helping to bring on the Russian Revolution. Again, in the 1930's, when the liberals and New Dealers and other lefts all looked with awe at Soviet Russian state capitalism industrializing at a phenomenal rate, Japan was exceeding it. Finally, in the post-World War II world, when victorious American imperialism, fearing proletarian revolution, propped up the defeated Emperor of Japan and his semi-feudal, semi-industrial, fully military regime—no one looked toward Japan to start the great mass movements not only against nuclear war but against capitalism and for a truly new human order.

Moreover, in this period of struggle they had to contend not only against the American occupiers and their own reactionary capitalistic rulers, but also against the Communists. The latter, who during the war supported America's dropping of the A-bomb, and then supported the American occupation, turned to the other extreme as the Cold War developed, and became so anti-American that they sabotaged the class struggles developing within Japan.

Despite all these obstacles the new Japanese left arose and refuses to remain the orphan that is left outside (outside of the world context). In contrast to the many little sects in Great Britain (and some in America) who are now flocking into the peace movements as if peace could be gained without overcoming the class structure of society which causes wars, the nuclear disarmament movements in Japan are first now experiencing serious divisions, the kind of fundamental division that leads to a new unity on new beginnings. In contrast to the European and American splits that seem to think that all they need to do is

-12-

repeat "the party is the vanguard" (and of course deem their little clique to be "the vanguard") without meeting the challenge of the times on any fundamental question, from the class nature of the Russian state to the new problems of war and peace presented by the H-bomb, the varied lefts in Japan are finding their way to the Humanism of Marxism. At the same time, in contrast to Pan-Africanism which wishes to stay out of East and West, the new Japanese lefts are acting as true world citizens and taking on both opponents. They do so without losing appreciation of the need for a party organization.

Previously we dealt with two such groupings. In the Political Letter on Japan's New Left of Intellectuals and Workers--Possibilities of New International Relations (March 5, 1962), we wrote: "The one weakness in these two remarkable articles (from the Japanese left) ... is that obviously this New Left has not yet moved its opposition to Communism onto a class basis by recognizing that present-day Communism is state capitalism." During the African trip, we also discovered that a new grouping has arisen which accepts the designation of Russia as state capitalist, and hence of the world economy as the same. The group publishes a monthly organ called "The Vanguard" and is undertaking presently the translation of MARKISM AND FREEDOM.

Without moving from an analysis of the change from monopoly capitalism to state capitalism, one cannot really see the global struggle of state capitalism for mastery of the world and therefore one cannot see either the new type of class revolts, and therefore the need also for new regroupments of those who maintain the historic continuity of Marxism into an actuality, the realization of Marxist-Humanism for our epoch.

If we now consider this against the background of the development of our own organization, we will see how the specifics of our present development compel that the philosophy, and the organization that corresponds to it, concretize themselves in what we now call "full-time organizers for Marxist-Humanism."

-13-

III. Need for Full-Time Organizers for Marxist-Humanism

The method is therefore both soul and substance, and nothing is either conceived or known in its truth except insofar as it is completely subject to method...

Hegel

The whole movement of history is, therefore, on the one hand, its actual act of creation--the act by which its empirical being was born; on the other hand, for its thinking consciousness, it is the realized and recognized process of development...

Marx

Heretofore we have satisfied ourselves with contrasting the maturity of the masses, which even in such under-developed economies as make up the African continent, were able to open a new page in the history of freedom, to the theoretic void in the established Marxist movement. For the clearing of one's head as well as for listening to the masses whose actions are the source of all theory, that was the indispensable first step without which we could never have moved forward. After 7 years of theoretical development and practical activity, ranging from strike struggle to the freedom rides, and from European to African and world relations, this will no longer suffice. Even as it was necessary to break down dialectic method not only as theory but as the actuality of the reconstruction of society by the population to a man, so it now becomes necessary to develop the concept of organization not merely as something "acted upon" but as something capable of influencing the course of history, even though the masses are the only ones that can do the actual reconstruction.

Everything, from the standstill of the economy to the drive toward war, from the cross roads reached by the African Revolutions to the inadequacy of the movement for civil rights in the United States, as well as Russian Communism's new popular frontism, demands it. Precisely because the organizational development cannot be kept in a separate compartment from theoretical development, it is necessary now to test organizational growth. The very fact that the past decade has seen the birth of such varied forms of organization as the Hungarian

3216

Workers Councils and the African socialist parties, the schisms in the Japanese anti-nuclear movement and the search for Marxist regroupment in Europe as well as in the United States and Latin America, means we have to turn with as much seriousness to organizational questions as to that of the theory of state capitalism fructified by Marxist-Humanism. We must remember that Lenin's break with the Second International was not limited to the latter's betrayal but extended itself to the dialectic of the party itself and a totally new formulation of the relationship of idealism to materialism. So long as one conceived of the crisis of capitalism as leading "automatically" to the social revolution, one could discuss difference in the party structure as if it were a difference based on whether one lived under bourgeois democracy or under Tsarism. Once, however, one put the subjective factor, the proletariat "to a man," as the only force capable of reconstructing society, then the question of how the socialist idea, the socialist movement would develop meant such a respect for Hegel's idealism as to see in it the very method of the birth of the new society.

Another way to express it is that methodology consists in 1) the most complete expression of theory, 2) the result of the complex interaction of social base, theoretical analysis and practical activity, and 3) the struggle with rival forces. Maturation means the transformation from effect into cause, and this is inseparable from the activity--practical and theoretical--of those who develop it. This maturation is not only of the masses but of the small grouping of workers and intellectuals in the historic tradition of Marxism. With this in mind, let us turn to the various stages of development of our own organization.

It is necessary, first, to draw some conclusions regarding the distinction between eliciting from workers and generalizing on that basis, as against projecting our ideas and organizing on that basis.

In both cases it is true that the initiative has come from us. That is to say, even during the period of so-called "full fountain pens" to take down all the workers had to say, we never said that our task stopped there. Rather we emphasized it first began there. But the very rich thoughts as well as class instincts that came from listening were such heady wine to old radicals who had heretofore only followed "the line", that we put ourselves very much in the background.

Therefore it is necessary to re-establish the fact that the initiative has always come from ourselves.

-15-

1) It was so in 1950 when the great general miners' strike inspired our looking into the Humanist Essays of Marx; while the actual publication of them, and the linking of them to the questions the miners posed, of the type of labor, was our own doing.

2) It was so in 1955 when we began publication of News & Letters, and from the Communist attack on the Humanist Essays we anticipated "another" East European Revolution like the East German revolt of 1953. The Hungarian revolution broke out in 1956.

3) It was so in 1958 when we published MARXISM AND FREEDOM, a restatement of Marxism for our day, which was not limited to the establishment of its American roots, but its world connections which re-established the Humanism of Marxism for our era.

4) It was so in 1959 with our extension of a Marxist-Humanist analysis to the problems of the Afro-Asian Revolutions.

5) And finally it was so in 1960-62 as we moved into the field of such practical activities as the Freedom Rides, and the Workers Battle Automation pamphlet. The consummation would be to recognize that the concrete and universal now demands the recognition of the need for, and the realization of the task of establishing, full-time organizers for Marxist-Humanism.

It is time we moved from self-development of individual members to their testing in the development of organization.

We often used "full-time" when we meant consciousness of organization. Now, however, by "full-time" we mean not just to think but to act. Full-time not just to act either on the immediate field or in other organizations, but for Marxist-Humanism.

Time is short because of threat of war and threat of Stalinism destroying altogether both the proletarian and peace movements.

None like us have the theoretical foundation and day to day activity in class struggle and civil rights fields. Yet News & Letters has often been a weapon in the class struggle without becoming an organizer for News & Letters Committees. Widespread as our literature distribution has been, especially Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves, it has not become a Marxist-Humanist organizer. To build the organization we must have organization builders. To do a proper job these organizers must have no other job but that of organizers for Marxist-Humanism.

Unfortunately, these full-time organizers at this point must be unpaid not because being unpaid is a principle with us, but we have no money. Nevertheless, at this juncture, it is as well that we do have to leave the test in this manner because we have long since passed the stage of "merely" clearing one's head or even just publishing Marxism and Freedom, News & Letters, etc. etc. But now we must physically show ourselves as an organization.

We have begun some changes already, such as in separating the functions of the REB as a political-organizational body from the sub-committee on editing News & Letters. Not only those who will be able to function full time for the organization, but all members, will need to redefine their role in the building of Marxist-Humanism.

The failure of Johnsonism was not so much its clique-ism, although there was too much of that, but it was the emasculation of the purpose of organization. To now reunite purpose and conditions of existence, and not separate these from activity, means to make our contribution to ending the division between object and subject. The workers will build what they will build. We must define our purpose in relationship to the masses, not only in times of revolution, but in the quiescent days of maintaining the historic link with the past and the anticipation of the future.

None but the convention itself can spell out further the full meaning of what we see as the need for full-time organizers for Marxist-Humanism even as they alone, from life itself, will first be able to tell us the next time we meet what has been accomplished and what to do next. It is a stage in our development that will test us all.

July 1962

Ray