

Sept 63

C O N T E N T S P A G E

THE NEED TO TRANSFORM REALITY

I - The Objective World and the Role of News & Letters Committees	p.1
II - Gaullism, the Intellectuals, and the French Miners	p.4
III - "The Atlantic Community", Nazism, Trotskyism, Vanguardism	p.9
IV - The Uniqueness of Marxism-Humanism	p.11

The National Chairman's Report to the Plenum, Aug. 31, 1963

THE NEED TO TRANSFORM REALITY

I. The Objective World, and the Role of News & Letters Committees

One thing stands out clearly in this strife-torn world of ours. It is the need to transform reality. Even the ruling class that seeks to maintain itself in power recognizes this truth.

The point of contention, nay, of life and death, is whether this is to be done from above and thus preserve the class nature of society, though that signify a retrogression, a movement backward that may entail the destruction of mankind itself.

Or whether this is to be achieved from below, with working people taking destiny into their own hands, thereby allowing a dialectical relationship of subject and object to emanate from within the historic movement forward. Such a transformation of reality would mean that the concrete totality of all the challenges that face our age bursts forth into a new human dimension, and therefore, a new social order.

Without such a transformation, the only thing that would be new in a transformation of reality would be that the old is allowed to assume yet one other disguise.

This does not, and cannot, cover up the exploitative, humanly degrading features of the existing order. On the contrary. The eloquence and/or pretty face serve only to focus attention on the feet of clay.

Thus, neither Mme. Nhu's pretty face, nor her puritanical habits can stop the obvious comparison of her to the bitch of Buchenwald. Where the latter made lamp shades from human skins — the skins of Jews —, Mme. Nhu bellows about "barbecuing", that is to say, the suicide by fire of Buddhist monks.

This inhuman expression matches the inhuman actions of the bitch of Buchenwald in her lair at the concentration camps, only the latter at least kept her vile habits in an inner circle, whereas Mme. Nhu shouts her barbarism to the skies in order to force "anti-Communists" to follow this pattern — or....

Or what? Why does the mighty power of the United States shake so when she speaks — and then, on the pretense that she does not speak for "official Viet Nam", reiterates over and over and over again that financial aid will continue to pour for that degenerate, bestial, ruling family clique?

The answer is simple. US rulers have long since given up the struggle for the minds of men, and therefore the Dragon Lady must be tolerated, if not actually welcomed into the unholy alliance pledged to perpetuate the rule of an ex-

exploitative system that has long since outlived its usefulness but still aims at world domination.

After all, words that are as intoxicatingly beautiful as the ones spoken by the ugly one who is all nose, and dreams of "French grandeur" "at the heart of the universe" challenge Kennedy's "Atlantic Alliance" outright and not only in his preserve -- France -- but everywhere in the world, including recently Latin America, or Graeco-Roman or "Latin" culture, as this man with an elephantine memory puts it.

In his self-proclaimed role of the "federator" of Europe, De Gaulle speaks softly, but, oh so condescendingly, of Europe's "daughter", that is to say, US imperial power. And De Gaulle's voice is the official, the imperious voice of pivotally-located France.

This monarchial President of the Fifth Republic has now declared 1963 to be the "decisive" year not only for the "exclusion" of Great Britain from Europe, but for reasserting the Atlantic Ocean as the barrier, the distance-setter. The Russians have an Iron Curtain, the Chinese a Great Wall, and France the deep, deep ocean to separate the United States from Europe.

De Gaulle doesn't hesitate -- this being a nuclear age which demands that the Big Powers play the death game -- to pointedly declare that "France will not be diverted by the Moscow agreements from equipping herself with the means of immeasurable destruction possessed by the other powers."

The insanity of the world's ruling classes has reached a new point of retrogression also from the one behind the Great Wall who is master at transforming the Marxist language of liberation into the Chinese call for wars, little and big and in-between ones.

Mao has added to the Stalin-Khrushchev transformations of Marx's concept of a rational, planned economy under workers' control into the State Plan over workers, and of Lenin's concept of the Party "checked by the non-Party masses" into the monolithic monstrosity of state-capitalist rule, the following emasculation: so-called People's Communes.

Where Marx, witnessing the daring, spontaneous outburst of the Parisian masses who had shaped workers' power into a decentralized, cooperative form of action and thought called the Commune, analyzed it as the political form "at last discovered" to work out the economic liberation of the class which replaces the exploitative, centralized state of capitalism, Mao christened his centralized, regimented, state-forced labor camps "People's Communes."

And by the same token that exploitation of the Chinese masses is considered to be "socialism" -- by Mao's fiat -- imperialist wars, when it is China which is doing the invading, are now declared to be "proletarian revolutions."

Words have indeed lost all their meaning under totalitarian regimes!

Hegel knew whereof he spoke when, in analyzing just such types of erstwhile revolutionaries (in the Phenomenology of Mind), he shows, first, how "The heart-throb for the welfare of mankind passes ... into the rage of frantic self-conceit" (p. 397). Having now identified himself instead of the people with the state powers, the declamations of such an individual reveal "that the individual who professes to act for such noble ends and indulges in such fine phrases holds himself for a fine creature; a swollen enlargement which gives it- self and others a mighty size of a head; but big from inflation with emptiness." (p.399).

Hegel indeed must have met Mao!

As against the Koss, the De Gaulles, the Nrus, the Khrushchevs, the Kennedys, and others of their ilk, there are the vast majorities, the sane masses fighting to control their own destinies.

The totality of the opposition between the world of the ruled and that of the rulers is bound to explode.

The question is: what will allow the collision of the two worlds to result in a reconstruction of society on other, on human beginnings? Can the future inherent in the present evolve without a theory? And, if not, where is the theory that will converge with the practice of the millions?

Naturally, we think it is Marxist-Humanism. But we must put its analysis of what is, as well as the organizational form of what is to be done, to the test.

The task is to see that, when the collision occurs, the action truly transforms reality, instead of merely "chalking it up to experience", aborted attempts, still-births, unsuccessful revolutions and even successful ones that still did not continue into a new viable social order on a world scale.

Consider the new epoch which began with the great Russian Revolution of 1917, and resumed, but only to die an early death, with the Spanish Revolution of 1937. Or the age that began with the CIO in the United States and ended with the Resistance movements in Europe during World War II. Or the era that began with the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, dying in Russia's Europe, but coming to life on the African continents in the very same year of DeGaulle's rise to power. Far from being thrown backwards, this continued into the Africa Year, 1960, which is also the year of the great youth demonstrations in Japan. Everywhere today we see undercurrents of revolt. In the United States this assumes open forward movement in the Freedom NOW struggles of Negroes.

This, too, however, has now reached the crossroads. Isn't it imperative that, whether we begin with the Freedom NOW movement that is presently being pressured by the Kennedy Administration whose hands have been freed a bit by his nuclear co-aspirant for world power -- Nikita S. Khrushchev --, or whether we take the youth movement in distant Japan, the dialectical relationship of object and subject be not restricted to the objective world and the mass

- 4 -

force, but is inclusive also of small groupings like News & Letters Committees? Philosophically, politically, organizationally, this indeed is the nub of the matter.

All history teaches us that, for want of a unity of theory and practice, there have been altogether too many unfinished revolutions, and none more unfinished than the Civil War in the United States -- plus the hot-house kind of bureaucratization of the CIO.

Whether we use the word, organization, in the sense of Wendell Phillips who considered the gathering of a half-dozen men in one room discussing how to change reality as thereby signifying the first act of revolution; or we use the word, party, in the Marxian sense of an organization disciplined by a theory of liberation, and therefore distinguishing itself from the masses as a whole in two respects: 1) in place of only the immediate interests of the proletariat, it holds aloft their historic interests, and 2) in place of the national viewpoint, it puts forth the international one; the point is that a grouping that is the "knowing" of the mass, its historical, international and theoretical receptacle so-to-speak, must come to grips with the need to be more than "a reflection" of the world.

It is this which Lenin grasped when he viewed the outbreak of World War I and the collapse of the Second International. It led him to an entirely new concept of praxis, practice in the theory of knowledge ("in the theory of knowledge" was underlined by Lenin as he read Hegel and made this crucial generalization: "Cognition not only reflects the objective world, but creates it.") The truth that we are trying to express for this period, for our era, is this: Freedom can be achieved only if men understand their experience and will to transform reality.

This, then, is what we mean when we say that "Facing the Challenge Nationally and Internationally" must include our role and our growth. This is our preoccupation today as we set perspectives for the year.

We will constantly be shifting from objective to subjective, and from mass organization to theoretical groupings. Let us begin at once by combining the analysis of post-war state-capitalism with the role of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals on the one hand, as against the general strike of the French miners, on the other hand.

## II. Gaullism, the Intellectuals and the French Miners

In approaching the new forms of state-capitalism, we must bear in mind the theory, in embryo, in Marx, who had predicted that if the constant increase of machinery over men is allowed to go its merry way, it will inevitably result in such concentration and centralization of capital that it would lead to single-handed control, i.e. state-capitalism. And that this ultimate concentration of capital "in the hands of a single capitalist or capitalist corporation" would change nothing fundamentally, because so long as the wage laborer is the source of value and surplus value, relations of men at the point of production

- 5 -

remain capitalistic, no matter what name they go by.

I also take it for granted that you know that this embryonic theory was made concrete in Marrism and Freedom through the analysis of the Russian economy, an actual state-capitalist society, which, though it arose after a proletarian revolution, could not escape basing its State Plan on the law of value, that is to say, paying the worker a minimum and extracting from him a maximum, once the workers had lost control over production.

It goes without saying that the State Plan either in Nazi Germany or militarist Japan had brought nothing but extreme misery for the workers. Since however, fascism was defeated in World War II, this would not be the form copied by post-war state-capitalism. One difference is what DeGaulle calls "indicative planning" -- 25 year long "indicative planning"; Another difference is its "internationalism."

Whether the Plan is only "indicative", as in France, or total, as in China, the point is that both post-war state-capitalisms begin with an "internationalist" type of nationalism.

Where Hitler took six long years to mobilize the national war machine before embarking on the path of world conquest, and only then took on "allies", De Gaulle can start his Grand Design only by the Franco-German treaty, that is to say, his "internationalism", his world ambitions, cannot start from a national basis alone.

A third difference still is the economic period in which each arose. In contrast to Nazism, which arose during the Depression and had as its mass base the declassed petty bourgeois and lumpen proletariat, De Gaulle came to power in a period of prosperity and disregarded entirely Foujad and his followers. Both, of course, are products of Big Capital but, whereas to hold onto power during a Depression and near-revolution, the Storm Trooper became the symbol, in De Gaulle's modernized, automated productive system, it is the technocratic elite.

Where Hitler, upon coming to power, had to destroy his "Left" which had taken his "anti-capitalism" a bit too seriously, De Gaulle double-crossed the Right, the very OAS and military that had brought him into power. Thereby hangs a tale of rationalization, capitulation and pulverization of the French intellectuals.

Considering De Gaulle's predilections toward fascism before World War II, his voluminous writings since, which detail his Grand Design for a third world power, his ascent to rule on the shoulders of the OAS, wouldn't one have the right to expect that the French intellectuals are "on to him?" They may be "on to him."

The tragedy is that they are also with him. This is the real, the only, the tragic difference: the genius, the evil genius of the intellectual to rationalize the new form of appearance of fascism.

The rationale for Gaullism ranges from "after all" he ended the war in Algeria, through he "modernized" industry and cut down to size the petty bourgeois, petty farmer, petty artisan that had so plagued France, to he ended French "isolationism" and we all became "Europeans."

If anti-Britain is part of this "Europeanization", well, wasn't England responsible for the burning of Joan of Arc? (After he saw a new play on Joan of Arc, Andre Maurois actually referred to the matter, not as if it were ancient history, but a present fact, saying he "understood" De Gaulle's exclusion of Great Britain from the Common Market! Needless to say he had nothing to say either of the Dauphin who was a willing "collaborator" of the British in medieval times as was Vichy France of the Nazis in World War II.)

The Social Democratic intellectuals do not fare much better than the outright Gaullists. Take the Socialist Andre Phillip. Remember that he is the famous socialist who had broken with Guy Mollet when the latter, though in power, did not move to end the war in Algeria. Don't forget either that Andre Phillip is both anti-De Gaulle and a scholar. Nevertheless, here is the nonsense he writes: "French society is passing from economic liberalism to a certain form of socialism." (sic!) (Social Research, Spring, '63)

After admiring the tremendous strides in industrialization, in modernization — automation — of the French economy, the scholar cannot, however, help seeing also that the Plan, as the society, is anything but democratic and he duly notes: "Yet within this framework a new political right is rising.... In the framework of economic and social planning, the technocratic elite is not much preoccupied with republican tradition of individual liberties, the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary."

How something can be both "socialist" and fascist Phillips doesn't tell us, and thereby hangs another tale, for the administrative mentality of the intellectual in the age of state-capitalism is, literally, magnetized by the State Plan!

Truth to tell, the French intellectual, even when anti-bourgeois, was never anti-France, surely not as much anti-France as anti-Great Britain, as anti-USA, as anti-everything except anti-France. This stands out nowhere more shockingly than in the elation over De Gaulle's "independence" from the United States, even though that means building a "bit" of a nuclear deterrent of France's very own!

No less shameful than the role of the Gaullist and/or the socialist intellectuals are the ones who felt the pull of so-called Communism — Russia and/or China orbit.

Take the existentialists. They whitewashed Communism not alone during the Resistance when all anti-Nazis naturally collaborated, but afterwards when total commitment, for intellectuals, should have meant sufficient "labor, patience and suffering of the negative" to have come up with a comprehensive theory.

- 7 -

Instead, just as their use of the dialectic was always more riddled with dramatic shock than objective contradiction, so their alleged Marxism was riddled through with Stalinism. Stripped of all the verbiage, Existentialism is, after all, but another name for pragmatism, plus shock. That the shock was not so all-shocking as the dramatists would make it appear, that, in fact, it was but a variant, a refinement if you wish, for a form nevertheless of "success is that which succeeds", is proven nowhere more clearly than in holding onto one pole of world capital, while seeming to let go of the other. I say seeming because the total commitment to the Resistance evoked by fascism was easy.

What Daniel Bell for once correctly calls the "moral simplicities of the Resistance" (How Leader, August 19, '63) was made doubly easy by not having to take either theoretical or organizational responsibility for leading the struggle. The "total commitment" can then be an "against" to the point of "Hausea", but not for to a new society. It is so much easier to let "the Party lead". This is the only existing "Marxism" said Sartre.

We tarried so long over the disarray among French intellectuals -- Existentialists, Socialists, Gaullists -- because, where it isn't sheer opportunism or outright capitalistic ambition as well as mentality, the logic of empiricism that holds them in its grip characterizes also those on the Left who, at one time, were close to us, like Socialisme ou Barbarie. This group is against both Washington and Moscow, and did say they saw a future society in the spontaneous actions of the masses.

They failed, it is true, to accept the theory of state-capitalism, Marxist-Humanism, much less see the publication of Marxism and Freedom as an overriding necessity. They claimed they wanted to work seriously to create an organizational form with an underlying philosophy for those spontaneous masses. Yet even the whip of the counter-revolution -- De Gaulle's coming to power -- couldn't shake them loose from the empiric approach to the dialectics of theory, whose central function is the transformation of reality.

Lenin's decriing that Bukharin didn't "fully understand the dialectic" was not a scholastic point -- Cardan can talk voluminously on dialectic in a scholastic way. The point is this: does the dialectic discipline the revolutionary intellectual to accept theoretical responsibility for proletarian revolution and afterwards reconstruction of society. To "admire" spontaneity and talk of dialectics -- but keep away from the unity of the two leads inescapably to "The Plan". Thus Nikolai Bukharin could be "left" of Lenin in 1919, but in 1920 to 21 be with Trotsky in the trades union, and author of "The Economics of the Transition Period," which prompted Lenin's remarks.

In the case of Cardan, everything from the embrace of the ILP and the peace movement seemed preferable to "Leninism" -- a sort of assurance "to get rich quick", that is to say, finally to have "a mass movement." The only result, however, has been a movement away from both Marxism and the "masses."

3286



As against this pulverization of the French intellectual opposition to De Gaulle, the proletariat acted. Where neither "the other 5" in the Common Market dared move against De Gaulle, and Kennedy likewise held his tongue, the French miners brought De Gaulle down to size.

The French miners acted in the face of threats to force them into the armed forces, and they won this time. For this the press "admired" them.

Watch, however, what this same press does when De Gaulle, after his capitulation to the miners, moves fast in his controlled parliament and quickly enacts legislation against flash strikes. The class solidarity with De Gaulle shows at once -- even in the United States which is certainly having its own troubles with him.

Thus, the New York Times, in extensive excerpts from his July 29th speech, quoting him at length, nearly a full page's length, did not see fit to print a single sentence of his attacks on labor struggles. In a separate, smaller article on the conference, we get exactly three of De Gaulle's phrases, but at least we find out finally that the General said that the notion of class struggle "fades away", and therefore all workers must "collaborate" with the State.

The truth there is that the General took time out to demand that "the professional classes", first of all, enter into class collaboration, and this be followed by labor. If no one else knows it, De Gaulle does at least know that unless he succeeds in establishing a corporate state, sucking the trade unions into it, his glory dreams go up in smoke, if even he can bamboozle the Big Two for "a special role." It has been his aim ever since he got into power, and he is moving full steam toward that end now.

While it is true that the miners won, it is even more true that they cannot, either alone or with the rest of the proletariat in full revolution, succeed not only in the overthrow of the regime, but in the full reconstruction of society unless a unity of theory and practice has been achieved in the process.

Theory, of course, is gray. Life, of course, is ever green. But unless a certain method -- the revolutionary dialectic -- the full theory of Marxist-Humanism -- has trained one to elicit the tomorrow in the today, one is likely once again to settle for the yesterday!

The restlessness of French labor, the courage shown by the miners, the flash strikes that continue, the upsurge is sure to put a great urgency upon the need to publish Marxism and Freedom in France. (Dic: has a man-sized job cut out for him here.)

As we have shown in the Resolution, the whole non-Communist Left has been gripped in the most terrible of all logics, the logic of empiricism, bouncing from side to side, affirming "theories", dropping them and building ever "new" ones based on the limitless possibilities presented to one whose point of departure is not the objective law of capitalist development in strict relationship to the revolt of the masses. Limitless possibilities, that is, to say, turning away from the one right class answer to 1000 wrong petty bourgeois answers.

The resulting undisciplined verbiage and shifting generalizations based on the headlines of the moment and the inner fights in the "communist world", whether "in opposition" to it or otherwise, is a sickness that has too long sapped the Left. At no time has it had more tragic results than presently on Sino-Soviet conflict, as we shall see in a moment.

### III. "The Atlantic Community", Facism, Trotskyism, Vanguardism

We did not mean totally to bypass our home-grown capitalism though it is still of the private enterprise variety plus, however, a whopping \$100 billion Federal budget, 30% of which is for war purposes.

But surely there has never been a shorter dream for any Big Power than the 1962 dream of an Atlantic Community which was to have been opened by the "unprecedented, historic" Trade Agreement Act, and the Reality of 1963. The reason for De Gaulle calling this year decisive is that he means to unite the 6 against the United States before trade talks officially begin in the Spring of 1964. Instead of a "united Europe" tied to the USA, JFK finds that De Gaulle has engineered a new division of Europe which will, he hopes, exclude the United States as he has already excluded Great Britain from the Common Market.

If this doesn't effectively end both JFK's "Atlantic Community" and multi-farcical in place of multi-force nuclear deterrent, it will be only because Germany still appreciates the United States' nuclear arm. But Nikita Khrushchev has long since let JFK know that any nuclear arms to Germany will be sufficient cause for World War III -- and JFK knows NK means it even as NK knew JFK meant it when missiles were discovered in Cuba.

Germany once again becomes the key to Europe. Without the Franco-German axis, De Gaulle cannot succeed.

Germany once again becomes the key to the world -- without her the United States cannot hope for "leadership" of Europe, and therefore of the "Atlantic Community."

Germany remains the key because this is where the two nuclear giants will decide whether to plunge into a nuclear holocaust.

But Germany herself is divided and the industrial might of West Germany is challenged daily. Enter the Sino-Soviet Conflict.

The shockingly new within the fully state-capitalist orbit calling itself "socialist" emanates from the depths the Sino-Soviet conflict has reached which makes it imperative that we pose this question: Can there be war between state-capitalist regimes calling themselves Communist?

This was, of course, implicit in the fact that we proved them to be capitalist regimes, and wars, as Clausewitz long ago saw, are only "extension of politics by other means."

The distance between the implicit and the explicit can, however, be of many generations' duration. Or it may never come to be. It certainly isn't in the immediate future.

As we show in the lead article for News & Letters for August-Sept. it would be most unlikely now. Russia has finally made her attacks in the open, not in order to declare war on China, but rather to re-establish her leadership of the Communist orbit.

And China is too weak for such a war. What she wants is to split that Communist orbit where she need not meet Russia alone.

THE CRUCIAL POINT, HOWEVER, IS THAT THE POSSIBILITY OF WAR BETWEEN RUSSIA AND CHINA IS NOT EXCLUDED. THUS, THE NON-VIABILITY OF STATE-CAPITALISM AS ANY "NEW" SOCIAL ORDER MOVES FROM THE THEORETICAL TO THE PRACTICAL, THE VISIBLE STAGE.

Not that it is visible to the Left, from Trotskyists to Communists who are turning against Khrushchev, but not against state power, not toward the spontaneous masses. And, oh, all the myriad, exciting lines the Chinese propound:

1) To all underdeveloped countries, they say: we can do it faster than the Russians and without technology; just mobilize your masses like we did in the "Communes."

2) Then to Africa and Asia, they add racism: we need no whites and Russians are also white.

3) To Latin America and Japan, they speak not only bravely as anti-Yankee but also successful guerrilla fighters who "proved" that you need not have either the proletariat or the majority; in guerrilla bands you can last for years as small groups and still win.

4) Finally, to the Trotskyists, to the Communist Parties of the West, the Chinese act as the most orthodox of all "Marxist-Leninists" who know so well the Leninist thesis of inevitability of war, that they can even add "and permanent revolution." This, moreover, gives an outlet against the existing leaderships, whether Togliatti, Thores, Gus Hall -- anywhere so long as it is not challenged in China -- so that the underdog can become leader.

So attractive is all this to those who have so long been outside of any Communist leadership, like the Trotskyists, that they forget their own heritage of Trotsky being specifically against Mao, specifically against the thesis of encircling, outflanking towns instead of having the city proletariat the spearhead of revolution.

Our Resolution has reiterated a fundamental truth. It is a sad commentary on our times, and exposes how totally lacking in any confidence in the self-activity of the masses are today's claimants to the title, "Marxist-Leninist". Their militancy gains momentum only where there is a state power to back it up. It is the mark of our state-capitalist age that our "revolutionary" petty-bourgeois

cannot act without the State Plan, and fear the self-mobilized proletariat as much as do the powers that be.

At the same time, however, the American Trotskyists certainly do oppose American capitalism, and certainly are fired up with the belief that they are the "vanguard". Therefore a more concrete example, especially one on the Negro Question, is needed to illuminate the whole question, and to begin to see why they do not see the visible non-viable state-capitalism in China.

Because, in Trotskyist minds, vanguard was pre-empted by "The Party", which would use Marxism as "a guide" to place itself in power, they gagged at our use of the word, vanguard, to describe the role of the Negro in United States history.

One of the specific concomitants of having anticipated the vanguard role of the Negroes involved fighting them on the concept that the Negro "couldn't get to first base" without white labor, and white labor could get nowhere without the party.

Thus, to preserve a "vanguard" role for the party, question marks were placed both over the role of white labor and the Negro.

Despite the Trotskyist present flirtations with the Muslims, the Negro as a National Question was not an easy one for them to grasp, much less accept as the catalyst that would bring the proletariat as a whole onto the historic stage. Their present flirtations are only one more manifestation of empiricism: bouncing from side to side, jumping to extremes and backing down so hard you fall flat on your face -- part of not having a Marxist-Humanist theory.

But what then, asked the Trotskyists in horror, becomes of the role of "the Party"? It was impossible to make them understand that its historic right to existence can assert itself only if and only BY finding the human, the specific human body that will, by the logic of events, be in forefront, and with them realize the forward movement of humanity.

Theory is knowledge of the whole, and the whole means, not only something negative -- the comprehension of the class forces against you -- but something positive -- there can be no new society if it is brought in behind one's back. The working people construct it or it does not exist. And people means the minority as well as the majority, the population, as Lenin put it, "to a man". To concretize this for our age is the task we now face.

IV. The Uniqueness of Marxist-Humanism

"Lower and Deeper"

All of philosophy consists in making explicit what is only implicit in the objective movement of history. An objective view of historical development of necessity reveals the subjective, the human force which will be the one to realize the forward movement of humanity. In the case of the United States it was the Negro.

Such a methodology guided Marx's actions. Instead of despairing when the British tradeunionists left the First International at the time of the Paris Commune, Marx further concretized his concept of the revolutionary role of the proletariat with the new view of going "lower and deeper" into the class -- the unskilled rather than the skilled; the newly-arrived in the city rather than the bourgeoisified ones; the oppressed minorities -- the Jews, the Irish, the East Indians -- rather than the upper rungs who gain from capitalist-imperialist exploitation.

It is not an easy concept to grasp. It wasn't when Marx first said it. It wasn't for nearly a half-century thereafter. It took World War I and the collapse of established Marxism in the Second International before Lenin "found" and fully understood that expression, "lower and deeper," and then only with the help of the Hegelian dialectic and its concept of development through contradiction, via the route of the unity of opposites, of self-development.

Once Lenin understood it, then and only then did he fully understand the empiric facts. Then and only then could Lenin build on that foundation the theory of the aristocracy of labor as being integral to monopoly capitalism. This on the one hand. On the other hand, came the driving necessity to destroy the state structure, root and branch, and with the new form of organization, of the self-mobilized masses -- the Soviets -- have the party aim to end division between mental and manual labor.

#### No Vanguard Role is "Fixed"

It is this, just this, that led Lenin to write: "Cognition not only reflects the world but creates it." The party, as the "knowing" of the proletariat, would prove itself by aligning with these masses. It wasn't that the party "guided them"; it was they who pushed the party forward, and it is they who found a need for "this knowing." When the separation of party and mass, and knowing and action re-entered the scene with the conquest of State power, the party and the revolution were both doomed.

Let's go back to the vanguard role of the Negro. Vanguard is not yet the whole. The Negroes do need the collaboration of the white workers, and not only because the latter are the majority while the American Negroes are a minority, but mainly because the proletariat, too, is a vanguard and at the very point around which all else in society revolves -- at the point of production. No vanguard role is ever "fixed for all time." Only with the vanguard party's transformation into opposite -- the monolithic party of Stalin, Khrushchev, Mao -- did such a concept arise. It became "fixed" along with totalitarian power.

This, precisely, is why with our very first unique theoretic contribution -- analysis of Russia as state-capitalist totalitarianism -- we insisted at one and the same time, on the concept of new forms of workers' revolts. And we pointed to the class nature of Stalinism rather than only its bureaucratization as the root cause of monolithism in "the party".

This, precisely, is why, once we made explicit all that was implicit in the theory of state-capitalism and workers' revolt and returned to philosophy we achieved the full circle — Marx's original Humanism rather than yet one other form of vanguardism.

Relationship of Philosophy and Practice

"Cognition not only reflects the world, but creates it." To work this out fully, from every vantage point, including those we cannot even see, is the task of this generation.

That the youth not only here, but throughout the world, and especially so in Japan, precisely in the country where you cannot possibly accuse the youth of inactivity, keep probing for the philosophic foundations discloses yet another distinction between our organization and the party in the old vanguardist sense.

It is this: when a fundamental fact of man's existence eludes him, when he cannot penetrate through the objective and yet does not wish to turn to external forces to explain it away — be they gods, fetishisms, or vanguard party-ists — he digs deep down to find the meaning of his actions.

This is the pivotal significance of philosophy. It is neither a mythology, nor metaphysics, nor an illusion. As Herzen saw it over 100 years ago, "Dialectic is the algebra of revolution." And Merleau-Ponty added 100 years later, "Philosophy is the algebra of history."

In a word, the search for philosophy, the attempts to work out this "algebra of history and of revolution" is the act of realizing it. The young Marx may have sounded idealistic when he said that it was not enough for theory to tend to reality; reality must also tend to theory. But he meant something very practical: the proletariat taking hold of philosophy.

This is why I entitled this report "Transformation of Reality." This is not only the lifeblood of theory, of methodology, of the dialectic, it is life itself.

It is the life of the proletariat rebelling against his conditions of labor and life, and overthrowing these conditions which degrade him.

It is the life of the youth rebelling against a world they did not make but are willing to reconstruct on new beginnings.

It is the life of the minorities, and in America this minority is the Negro, but it is every oppressed minority anywhere from the Jews to the American Indians, from the Germans or the Poles or Hungarians in the Russian Empire to the non-Han minorities in the Chinese.

And transformation of reality requires that we recognize our special role in all actions we undertake — be they in the Freedom NOW movement, or in the trade unions (both against the labor bureaucrats and those like the TULC who

- 14 -

would compromise with them) or in youth organizations, or functioning on our own, be that the theoretical and/or practical fields. Let's see how these relate this very moment to the March on Washington as the culmination of all the Negro struggles since the Birmingham events in May. What has transformed it from a March on Washington for "Jobs and Freedom", to one for "redress of grievances"?

First came a pause in the USSR-USA cold war (whether you wish to consider it from the point of view of realigning their different orbits, or, more important, the intensifying of the class struggle at home). Our resolution centered around it, warned of the dangers of the Negro leadership stopping far short of the full aspirations of the Negro masses, criticized white labor for its passivity in this, and we at once went to press with a second edition of American Civilization on Trial where this is also spelled out by asking people to join News & Letters Committees to continue in the full tradition of Abolitionism and Marxist-Humanism.

Olga will deal with it further in her report, and you have all seen the Preface to the new edition for yourselves. The point is to use this weapon in the civil rights struggle both as your proud credential, and as a membership invitation for others.

Just as a foundation, even a solid one, is not yet the whole house, so a comprehensive theory which we alone have in Marxist-Humanism is not yet the organization, the people who alone can put it into effect, while the process of so doing will act toward their own self-development.

The uniqueness of Marxist-Humanism, lies also in this: that despite all theoretic contributions and singleness of purpose in achieving total freedom, it asks to be "taken over" by the masses, to be subjected to the daily and long-range tests, so long only as the unity of theory and practice, worker and intellectual, technologically backward and technologically advanced economies, all merge in order never to stop short of "the ultimate": the new society, the new human dimension, the incorporation within the individual of all of his mental and manual talents.

I have dealt a little more extensively with philosophy in this Report than usually, because I wanted to give you an indication of the points to be developed in the new paperback MARXISM AND FREEDOM, with which Saul will deal tomorrow.

If you consider, not only the year since the last plenum, but the six years since publication of MARXISM AND FREEDOM in hard cover, you will grasp at once how crowded the years, and how imperative the theory. The book came out just as Sputnik No. 1 circled the globe, McCarthyism was reaching its tail end, and Little Rock was chasing Sputnik for the world's attention.

As the Italian edition and reviews indicate, the conspiracy of silence that then surrounded the book, both from the bourgeoisie and the radicals, cannot now be maintained by either.

3293

For one thing, we have had a new world born with the African Revolutions in 1960 — and we had something to say on that not alone in the pamphlet on the Afro-Asian Revolutions, but with our presence in West Africa, which means we are known, not isolated.

Not only that, the Ghanaian letter in News & Letters shows that we are the only outlet for revolutionary opposition in Africa.

For another, there was the Cuban Revolution, which too soon was diverted into the Russian orbit, but, again, our analysis stood up — and now there will be a Spanish edition of MARKISM AND FREEDOM. In contrast to the whip of the counter-revolution in France in 1958, where we did not succeed in getting M & F known, we have now also co-thinkers in Japan who are bringing out an edition this very fall. And they will be the only ones who will have, as an Appendix, also our special on Mao Tse-tung, brought up to date — no little matter, for none can match us here, either.

Above all, we have concretized its main thesis for the right-here-and-now on the key question of the Negro role in American history, and a 5000 copy edition became exhausted in three months, while a new edition of American Civilization on Trial is already in your hands — again no little matter; again we have no match here.

1963 is the decisive year, subjectively, and objectively, not because De Gaulle declared it to be so in his fight for European domination, but because, after the 1962 confrontation at the brink of nuclear war, the bourgeoisie needs the pause.

And we can use it for clarification, for establishment of international relations, for organizational growth.

It is now up to us AS AN ORGANIZATION, which neither lays claim to "vanguardism", nor has illusions of substituting itself for the mass, to see that our uniqueness is made known, our isolation ended, our coalescence with the mass movement a fact which will help in the creation of a truly new society on truly new beginnings. That is why I wish to end on the note sounded in our Resolution:

Organizational consciousness begins with the realization that none of these analyses, whether in book or pamphlet forms, in newspaper, or Political Letter forms, are "for themselves." It is conceit to think so. No one can build an organization when they underestimate the reason of the masses to grasp our philosophy organizationally.

--- RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

\* \* \*