



疎外と革命——マルクス主義の再建

ラーヤ・ドゥナエフスカヤ 三浦正夫 対馬忠行訳 現代思潮社

3273

目次

まえがき・・・ 7
日本語版への序文・・・ 11

第一部 実践から理論へ——一七七六年から一八四八年まで・・・ 21

第一章 産業的・社会ならびに政治的・知的革命の時代・・・ 21

(一) 本と生活のなかにみられたフランス革命・・・ 21

(二) パリの大衆とフランス大革命・・・ 21

(三) 哲学者と革命——自由とヘーゲル弁証法・・・ 31

(四) ヘーゲルの絶対的なものと絶対的なものについてのわれわれの時代・・・ 31

第二章 古典経済学、労働者の蜂起、ならびに空想的社会主義者たち・・・ 41

(一) 労働者の連綿的な蜂起と古典経済学の終焉・・・ 41

(二) 空想的社会主義者とピエール・ブールドン、精神的欺瞞の一事例・・・ 55

第三章 新しいヒューマニズム

——マルクスの初期の経済学ならびに哲学に関する諸著作・・・ 61

Title : Marxism and Freedom
——from 1776 until today
Author : Raya Dunayevskaya
Originally copyrighted by Raya Dunayevskaya
Japan translation right reserved by Masao Miura
arranged through author.

A. AUTHOR'S SPECIAL INTRODUCTION TO THE JAPANESE EDITION OF
MARXISM AND FREEDOM

The plunge into freedom by the postwar youth of Japan presents a challenge to anyone who would write for such an audience. This author frankly admits that the great pleasure at this opportunity is not unmingled with trepidation. In a country where the link of continuity is so all-enveloping that even discontinuity appears to be only a form of continuity (as witness the initiation of Japan's industrialization and "modernization" in the last quarter of the 19th century via the Meiji Restoration), the present generation has made its break with the past so total that it has, literally, leaped over centuries.

Under the impact of the postwar labor struggles, the first genuine mass movement of students in Japanese history was no sooner (1948) born than it found itself challenging both capitalism and communism. By the end of the first decade of its existence, the mass protests led by the Zengakuren had inspired the growth of a New Left of many varied tendencies. In contrast to the European New Left which, despite its revulsion against Russia's crushing of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, had by now either found its way back to the Communist fold, or joined the pole of "Western" capitalism, Japan's New Left is pursuing its political differences to their philosophic foundations. Therein lies its strength, and thereby it has lit a beacon that extends far beyond its national frontiers. It has emboldened this writer to turn to this audience with a special edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM which, from its publication in 1958, had as its aim the re-establishing of Marxian philosophy in its original form, designated by Marx himself as "a thoroughgoing Naturalism or Humanism."

From the beginning of my break with Leon Trotsky over "the Russian Question" -- during the Hitler-Stalin Pact which gave the green light to the start of the Second World War -- I became interested in the economic development of Japan. The reader will find brief references to this in Chapter XIII ("Russian State Capitalism vs. Workers' Revolt") where I show that neither the rate of economic growth nor "planning", in and of themselves, are synonymous with the existence of a workers' state. On the whole, however, MARXISM AND FREEDOM -- a study of our machine age from its birth in the industrial, political and intellectual revolutions in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, to the freedom struggles of our age of Automation and the H-bomb -- deals mainly with the United States, Europe, and Russia. It was natural, therefore, that the Japanese Marxist-Humanists would ask that my subsequent and separate analysis of Mao Tse-tung be published as a new appendix for the Japanese edition. I was glad to agree to this not only because, in my return to Japan (unfortunately, only in thought), I felt at one with a tendency in the New Left which seeks once again to make Marx's overwhelming concern with living human beings the center of today's Marxism, and thus to overcome Maoism which obliterates "the subject."

At the end of the 1950's Mao's revolutionary abstractions could no longer cover up the reality of sweated, militarized, depersonalized labor in the so-called communes. By 1963 the fig-leaf of Marxist terminology can no

longer cover up the power politics in the Sino-Soviet conflict. Thereby the non-viability of state-capitalism as any "new" social order has been exposed. "Mao's Thought" can act as a polarising force only to one who begs to be intellectually raped. Thereby the revolutionary petty-bourgeois intellectual exposes that he bears the mark of our state-capitalist age, that, in and out of power, he would rather lean on some State power and State Plan than subject himself to the creativity of the proletariat and the compulsion to a unity of thought and practice which alone can release a new human dimension.

It is here that the tendencies within the Japanese New Left have broken new ground. For, in probing deeply into the philosophic foundations of socialism, they questioned, how could the Russia of the 1917 Revolution have ventured into the Pacific war between the atomic destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

History will never absolve American imperialism for this wanton, inhuman, nuclear holocaust. Neither will it forget the degeneracy of international communism as the bombs fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, August 6th and August 9th, 1945. Listen to what dares call itself L'Humanite on August 8, the day between the atomic explosions:

"The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima seems to have caused considerable destruction. American reports suggest nothing less than the disappearance from the face of the earth of a town of 300,000 inhabitants. The effect of the discovery is considerable. Nevertheless, the Vatican has been pleased to disapprove of it! May we be permitted to express our surprise, because when the Nazis had the privilege of waging total war with a total cruelty the Holy See was not equally indignant."

The Italian Communist paper, L'Unita on August 10, 1945:

"The news that an atomic bomb was dropped by the American Air Force has made an enormous impression throughout the whole world and has been received on all sides with a sense of panic and words of condemnation. This shows, it seems to us, a curious psychological perversion and a doctrinaire obedience to a form of abstract humanitarianism We do not share the sense of terror which has been expressed in certain press comments because we bear in mind the concrete use which was made of the fearful engine of destruction."

And finally The Daily Worker of Great Britain on August 10, the day before Japan surrendered unconditionally:

"There was no official hint of the length of delay that the Japanese are to be allowed before the full force of Allied power -- including the atom bomb -- is loosed against them in a blow intended to be final."

In providing as empty a shelter for mind, as the fall-out shelter is for the body, Communist state-capitalism is giving full proof of the schism Marx had long ago predicted for the decomposition of the capitalistic system. This has never been truer than since World War II ended with but two victors --

the United States and Russia -- each more degenerate than the other, outdoing each other in mouthing phrases of peace while preparing the nuclear holocaust, each striving for world domination.

The polycentrism within monolithism has changed nothing fundamentally, and, to balance Khrushchev's trouble with Mao, there is Kennedy's with DeGaulle. Nor is there any need to tell the only nation that has gone through an atomic purgatory that Mao is wrong when he refers to the United States as a "paper tiger." Nor is Russia one.

The fact that the proletariat is unarmed has never stood in its way as it opened new stages of freedom in humanity's development. Surely the nuclear titans have the power to destroy civilization as we have known it. But the nuclear age is also the epoch for the struggle of men's minds. To stay the nuclear hand by winning the minds of men -- this is the road to human survival and to freedom.

To rise to the challenge of the times requires altogether new banners. Marx was the first to see this in all its breadth and depth -- as both a birth-time of history and the realization of philosophy. Because he had put the human being in the center of all his thoughts, he could unite theory and practice, idealism and materialism, and, unarmed, throw the gauntlet down to the armed bourgeoisie. When asked why he, a bourgeois intellectual had broken with his class and become a "radical", he replied that "to be a radical means to grasp something at its root. And the highest being for man is man himself." It still is.

The urgency that our epoch of necessity imparts to the Humanism of Marxism has brought Marx's struggles with vulgar materialism and vulgar communism as well as with private capitalism and reactionary idealism out of history and of theory and into the quintessential practices of the day.

Lenin did not know the Humanist Essays of Marx -- they had remained in the vaults of the Second International until after the Russian Revolution pried them open -- but he felt the compulsion to return to the philosophic foundations of Marxism in Hegel. The shock of betrayal made it manifestly impossible any longer to consider matters on a political plane alone. His break, indeed, was not only with those who betrayed, but with his own philosophic past. His Philosophic Notebooks laid new foundations for future revolutions, and permeated everything he was to write from then until his day of death, that is to say, from Imperialism and State and Revolution to his last speech to the Russian Communist Party's 9th Congress and his Will. Unfortunately, this remained a dead letter to the Marxists of the post-Lenin period. Not only was this true of those who, like Stalin, symbolized the transformation of the young workers' state into its opposite, but to those who, like Trotsky, lost his life fighting the Stalinist bureaucracy.

So total has been the void in the Marxist movement since the death of Lenin that one would think that Lenin's admonitions against the "administrative mentality" of Trotsky, as well as Nikolai Bukharin's failure to "fully

understand the dialectic" were the words of an academician in an ivory tower instead of the words of a great revolutionist on his deathbed, warning about the downfall of the first workers' state and its "return backward to capitalism" unless one began not only with the removal of the "rude and disloyal" Stalin but also with new philosophic perspectives; the shock of recognition of the Marxian dialectic in Hegel's Science of Logic which made Lenin note: "Practice in the theory of cognition. Alias: Man's cognition not only reflects the objective world, but creates it."

This is the task that confronts our age; how can the movement from theory meet the challenge of the movement from practice which strives to reconstruct society on totally new, truly human beginnings. The challenge is not to machines, but to men. The compulsion for a unity of theory and practice arises both from the impulses toward a new society and a total philosophy. It has now enveloped the whole globe. In Europe we have witnessed new tragic decades — from the 1937 Spanish Revolution which sought to combine politics with economics by at once taking over the factories, through the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, where Workers' Councils, Councils of Intellectuals, Councils of Revolutionary Youth, all sought to unite politics, economics and philosophy under a new banner of Humanism which the Communist totalitarians dared call "Revisionism." This search for a total philosophy has disclosed a new, a third world in the post-war revolutions in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. It is this new, third Afro-Asian-Latin American world, which is at the root both of the struggle for world domination between Russia and the United States as well as within the Sino-Soviet orbit and within Western colonialism and neo-colonialism. And it is this world which opens the greatest challenge to the intellectuals as well as the proletariat of the most industrialized land of this third world — Japan. A country which could, from the ruins of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, have such an astonishing industrial development that its rate of growth now challenges both Russia and the United States, and at the same time, give birth to a generation that has totally broken with its past, is a country that is sure to produce the future theoreticians of genuine Marxism — Marxist-Humanists. For what cannot be separated from this break was that it was not only a break with Japan's capitalist and militaristic past, but a refusal to submit to any established authority, whether that be the American imperialist occupying power, or established Marxism, that is to say, the existing state-capitalist societies passing themselves off as "socialist." Hence the splits in the Zengakuren. The great demonstrations in 1960 proved all this beyond the peradventure of a doubt. A theoretical development to match the practical activities of youth and labor and women, all striving for a new society, is on the order of the day. Surely the emergent theoretical development will accept no substitute for Humanism. A country that has experienced atomic energy as the A-bomb will not submit to "scientism". Revolutions do not arise in the fullness of time for the purpose of establishing a party machine; partinost (party-monolithism) is there to throttle the revolution, not to release the creativity as well as the energies of the millions. Marxism is either a theory of liberation or it is nothing. In thought and in life, it lays the basis for achieving a new human dimension, without which no new society has viability. This author feels confident that the Japanese people — workers and revolutionary intellectuals — have an important role to play in the creative drama of human liberation.

--August 6, 1963
Detroit, Mich., USA

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

3278