

DISCUSSION ARTICLES
FROM JAPAN

TWO CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR DISCUSSION FROM ZENSHIN

I The Present Situation of the Class Struggle
in Japan

II The Vietnam War and the World Today

AND THE ESSAY --

"Marx's Humanism Today" -- by Raya Dunayevskaya

NEWS & LETTERS PRE-CONVENTION BULLETIN No.5

August, 1966

3731

Contribution to our Discussion from JRCL-NC, ZENSHIN

THE PRESENT SITUATION OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN JAPAN

Since the conclusion of the Japan-Korea Treaty last December, the aggression of Japanese imperialism has reached a new stage both at home and overseas, in launching outer expansion and strengthening political reaction. Planned reamendment of the Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty in 1970 will inevitably occupy the essential position for future development of the class struggle in Japan, and the Japanese working class will undergo a serious trial at that time.

Japanese imperialism, defeated in World War II, experienced a grave crisis, faced as it was with a tremendous upheaval of workers' struggles in the midst of a political and economic catastrophe. It had lost its colonial territory completely and its imperialist army had been disbanded.

The elements that helped Japanese capitalism survive were the U.S. army of occupation and U.S. economic assistance, and the Japanese Communist Party, which defined the U.S. troops as a liberation army and, because they were in the leadership of the workers' movement at that time, were able to suppress the resistance of the Japanese people.

The facts are, however, not peculiar to Japan. They are, in fact, a Japanese edition of the Stalinist policy that divided the post-war world between the world imperialists headed by U.S. capitalism and the Stalinists represented by the U.S.S.R. ruling class. This occurred at the Yalta talks.

The U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. coalition turned into the cold war through the division of Germany, and was finally broken by the Chinese Revolution and the Korean War. All these facts gave the American imperialists an impetus for securing domination over the Far East.

Japanese imperialism was thus given the necessary conditions for a revival. U.S. imperialism now expected Japanese imperialism to undertake the task of being the anti-revolutionary stronghold in Asia. However, the Japanese ruling class still needed U.S. assistance. After the defeat of the workers' struggle in 1947-49, Japanese imperialism was able to reestablish itself through the Dodge Line (reduced and balanced budgeting) and by the special procurements boom caused by the Korean War.

Thus the post war development of Japanese imperialism, from the period of U.S. occupation till the conclusion of the San Francisco Peace Treaty and the U.S.A.- Japan Mutual Security Treaty of 1952, was possible only in the contemporary world in which the ruling classes of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. shared domination over the people of the whole world.

The U.S.A.- Japan Mutual Security Treaty was aimed at re-establishing Japanese imperialism as the strongest reactionary partner of U.S. imperialism in the Asian world. It is an anti-revolutionary coalition of the U.S. and Japanese ruling classes.

This treaty has given the Japanese ruling class enough military, political and economic aid to confront civil disorder. It has exempted Japanese capitalism from contributing to the military expenditures in the budget and has allowed it to accumulate capital very rapidly.

The aim of the Japanese ruling class in amending the US-Japan Mutual Security Treaty in 1960 was to raise its position in U.S.-Japan relations as well as in Asian relations. It was the result of the development of Japanese capitalism which had succeeded in restoring a financial monopoly system stronger than that of the pre-war period. And it had equipped itself with "Self-Defense-Troops" (that is, an unofficial, unauthorized army.)

Today, the U.S.-Japan Treaty is functioning as "the alliance of robbers" which allows the U.S. and Japanese imperialists to rely on each other in realizing their aggressive policy in the Far East. It is accelerated by the following elements:

First, the escalation of U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam. American imperialism, challenged by the development of both the EEC (European Economic Community) countries and Japan and afraid of losing its dominating power over the politics and economy of the world, is at present putting its full power into the Vietnamese war to secure U.S. control over Asia.

U.S. aggression in Vietnam would not be possible without the support of Japanese imperialism. The Japanese ruling class is in fact a most desirable co-thinker and co-operator of the U.S. government in carrying out a reactionary policy against the Asian people. The U.S.-Japan Treaty is nothing but a legislative pretense for it.

Second, Japanese imperialism has begun expansion through the conclusion of the Japan-Korea Treaty. Japanese capitalism has been undergoing depression. This has been caused by over production in the course of rapid development since 1955. Now the outbreak of the inner conflict in the Japanese economy cannot be avoided without establishing its own economic territory overseas through exporting surplus capital. The Japanese ruling class feels it is imperative for them to build up their own military power in order to defend their interests already gained and now being developed in South Korea, Indonesia and other Asian countries. At the same time, they feel themselves closely tied to U.S. imperialism and its destiny -- that is, that retreat and decline of U.S. imperialist power in the world will inevitably be a terrible blow to Japanese imperialism.

The escalation of the aggressive war in Vietnam, as well as Chinese nuclear armament, both of which are carried out beyond the expectation or anticipation of the Japanese ruling class, exercise a grave influence over it.

These factors make the Japanese ruling class realize its reactionary role in Asia and force it to prepare for the re-establishment of an imperialist army and to strengthen their ruling system at home.

Thus far, we have analyzed the background of the imperialist aggression of the Japanese bourgeoisie, which took a new direction after the conclusion of the Japan-Korea Treaty.

The current policy of the Sato government against the Japanese people may be summarized as follows:

- 1) to reinforce the competitive power of Japanese capital through rationalization and the end of wage increases at home, and to establish a powerful influence over the other Asian countries both economically and politically, e.g. South East Asian Conference of Economic Development.
- 2) to develop the current Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty into a Japan-U.S.A. Nuclear Treaty in order to give aid to the U.S. for the Vietnamese War and to cope with the Chinese nuclear armament, and, at the same time to establish their own military power strong enough to carry out limited war as a military ally of the U.S. army through a Third Defense Plan and Secret Strategic Plan in Asia.
- 3) to launch a complete reform of the post-war system of political construction, which allowed the Japanese people a certain degree of democratic rights, and to amend the Constitution (including section 9, the Peace Article), the election system, and the penalty code in order to establish state-power on an overwhelming scale.
- 4) to embrace the ideology of imperialism and chauvinistic national unity in order to persuade the people to accept future imperialist wars abroad and a suppressive regime at home.

The planned re-amendment of the Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty in 1970 will be the culmination of the aggression of Japanese imperialism, mentioned above. The present Sato government is determined to carry out these plans until 1970 despite all the opposition of the Japanese people.

The response of the present leadership of the workers' movement, the Socialist and Communist Parties, to such a situation has deteriorated badly. It seems that the more critical the situation becomes, the less militant they are.

The main concern of the Socialist Party is to attain a majority in the parliament and to form a 'socialist' cabinet. For this reason, it is trying to make its policy more 'realistic' (e.g., to transform the existing Self-Defense Troops into some kind of Peace Corps) and has become more and more tied to the present social system. The JSP does not recognize the reactionary intentions of the Sato government and Japan's development toward imperialism.

On the other hand, the Japanese Communist Party is also rapidly turning reformistic. The JCP has a platform of 'independent, peaceful, democratic, neutral Japan; self-dependent development of the Japanese economy'. Needless to say, it is based on a two-step strategy and parliamentarianism, and is nothing but a reformist idea to find some solution to the fundamental problems of Japan without overthrowing Japanese capitalism.

In spite of its emphasis on the anti-U.S.A. struggle, such a policy as the JCP's can never bring about the overthrow of U.S. imperialism, either.

The reformistic essence of the JCP platform has been exposed in the course of the intensification of imperialistic aggression. When the JCP opposed the general strike of April 17, 1964, the excuse was "to retain the power of the Party and the people for the '1970' revolution." In May of this year, however, it was reported that a central committee member of the JCP criticised their former policy, saying that they now must expand the Party and prepare for the coming election, since the revolutionary situation is not coming. Some articles of the JCP publication have begun to refer even to the strategy of "Peaceful Transition into Socialism", which had been repeatedly attacked as the reformist view of Khrushchev and his followers.

Recently, the JCP professed a "self-dependent" line instead of its former subordination to the Chinese CP's line, as a result of the intensification of the Russian-Chinese conflict and the outburst of inner conflict in the Chinese Stalinist regime.

The "self-dependent" line of the JCP never means creative development of the movement in Japan. On the contrary, it is a very "pragmatic" response to the international crisis of Stalinism, designed to maintain the position of the party bureaucrats within and outside the JCP. Now there remains very little to distinguish the JCP from the JSP, at least in its political line, since the essence of the CP line is reformist even though expressed by the "left wing" jargon. Actually, coalition with the SP is now seriously being discussed in the CP. Moreover, the recent Peace Conference in Hiroshima, sponsored by the CP, excluded the pro-China foreign delegates in order to accept the representatives of the World Democratic Youth, which is controlled by the CP of the USSR.

The recent situation of the Japanese opposition forces may be summarized as follows:

The Democratic Socialist Party (right-wing social democrats) approaches the government party, the Liberal Democratic Party.

The Sohyo (General Council of Japan Trade Unions) turns towards the Trade Union League (directed by the right-wing social democrats).

The JSP loses its militancy as left-wing social democrats.

With such a general trend toward the right-wing, the SP-CP alliance would play a very reactionary role.

The alternative has now become very clear: opposition to Japanese imperialism, or surrender to it.

Every aggression of the Japanese government against the people is not accidental, but shows the needs of a revived Japanese imperialism. One who cannot see the roots of the current policy of the Japanese ruling class will inevitably be beaten violently by the intensified attack.

Now that the entire established leadership of the workers' movement is impotent to carry out the struggle against imperialist aggression, we, the revolutionary left-wing, must assume the very heavy task of making real the workers' own struggle.

The following two points should be taken into consideration:

The SP as well as the CP has stopped referring to the coming struggle in 1970 against the re-amendment of the Japan-U.S. Mutual Security Treaty. Now

the year 1970 only means, for them, general elections which might, in their optimistic expectation, bring forth ' socialist' government.

If we let things go in the SP and CP direction, the struggles of 1970 would not be a revival of the heroic struggle of 1960. On the contrary, the more the SP-CP coalition proceeds, the more severe will the suppression by the state power be. The ruling class is now earnestly preparing for such a thing.

It is the urgent task for the revolutionary left-wing to present a clear policy for the 1970 struggle -- a policy of opposition to the re-amendment of the Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty, and of appeal to the workers and Japanese people to prepare for the struggle.

Second, it follows from this point that it is necessary to draw lessons from the 1960 struggle against the first amendment of the Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty in order to revive the power of the workers and students which was then vigorously exerted.

In fact, it was the struggle of the revolutionary left-wing that brought forth the struggle of 1960 on a scale that had never been seen in the history of the Japanese class struggle, and which saw the development of militant mass power by the workers and students.

In the development of the 1960 struggle, a harsh battle against the CP and SP was carried out in order to realize the mass militant action of the workers and students. Without such a struggle, initiated by the revolutionary left-wing, the 1960 struggle would have taken quite a different form. The struggle was based on the firm belief that the victory of the Japanese workers is impossible without criticising and overcoming the SP and CP.

For the first time in the history of the Japanese class struggle, tremendous mass action, completely independent of the CP and SP, was undertaken by ZENKAKUREN, through the leadership of the revolutionary left-wing. We were not afraid of being accused and attacked by the traditional left-wingers.

In preparing for the 1970 struggle, we have the advantage of the experiences since the 1960 struggle -- the struggle for the workers' own revolutionary party against imperialism and Stalinism, instead of the JCP and the JSP. Our present abilities, however, are quite insufficient for the task we face now.

We must point out that even among the militant left wingers who cooperate with us, there are some groups that undermine the importance of building up an independent party of workers, and hesitate to criticise the CP and SP, which are compromising with Japanese imperialism. It is therefore urgent for us to strengthen theoretical discussion among the militant left wing to overcome this tendency in the course of the struggle.

The years from now to 1970 will put us -- the revolutionary left-wing -- to a severe test.

-- JRCL-NC
ZENSHIN

3736

Contribution to our Discussion from the JRCL-NC, ZENSHIN

THE VIETNAM WAR AND THE WORLD TODAY

I

The U.S. aggression in Vietnam has entered a new and decisive stage by the bombardment of Hanoi. The battle is still going to be developed by U.S. imperialism. Complete destruction of the industrial area in North Vietnam, demolition of dams, landing (of troops) in North Vietnam, and the blockade of Haiphong harbor are planned.

Russian as well as Chinese Stalinists, on the other hand, have been deepening their degeneration. In Japan, the anti-war struggle has almost been abandoned due to the actions of the Japanese Socialist Party and the Japanese Communist Party.

In this situation some groups, even among the militant left wing in Japan, oppose open criticism of the existing leadership. They are not ashamed of their inactivity during the struggle against the anchoring of U.S. nuclear submarines in Japan last June or against the Hanoi bombings.

Here we have to clarify some point of the anti-Vietnam War struggle in order to overcome the difficult situation before us.

II

The aggressive war in Vietnam is an inevitable outburst of the inner contradiction of world imperialism long developed in the post-war system of world domination. The present crisis of imperialism is clearly expressed in the Vietnamese war. And the war is being accelerated by the imperialist world system.

The contradiction of the post-war system of world domination by imperialism has its root in the relations that gave birth to the post-war system.

The restoration of world imperialism after World War II was the result of the defeat of international proletarian revolution. This was due to the Stalinist suppression of the workers' uprising, especially in several capitalist countries such as France, Italy, Japan, etc. The world imperialist system which survived had no country other than the USA to rely upon in developing the policy of world domination. Thus the U.S. ruling class set itself in the central position of the imperialist regime. It was a semi-colonial system and the U.S. began to reign over the world as a 'despotic' dominator. Such an imperialist system is essentially unstable and requires a political-military system of suppression as part of its policy. Continuous tension between the Stalinist regime and the imperialist regime was, in fact, an indispensable element in maintaining the post-war system of world domination.

The problem is that the maintenance of world domination in political economic and military fields, in opposition to the Stalinist regime, was destined to put heavy pressure on U.S. capitalism. In this manner serious contradictions accumulated with the system.

The contradictions burst out first in the weak point of U.S. domination--the underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries.

-7-

The colonial system in its classical form could not survive in the post-war world. The defeat of the proletariat of capitalist countries and the restoration of imperialism prevented the complete destruction of the colonial system itself. A new method of dominating underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries (so-called neo-colonialism) was established. The U.S. was its main bearer, with France and Britain its subordinate force.

The U.S. domination which developed over the Asian, African and Latin American countries had a very peculiar character. It lacked the usual relationship between the imperialist and colonial countries that marked the pre-war classical system of domination. Its character is mainly military, especially in the Asian countries. In South Vietnam, South Korea and Formosa, which are the unhappy products of the division of one nation between the imperialist and Stalinist powers, the contradiction of the world domination system was culminated.

Crisis burst out in South Korea and South Vietnam. The aggressive war in Vietnam is therefore very closely connected with maintaining the post-war system of dominating the semi-colonial countries.

On the other hand, ironically enough, the more the economy of the capitalist countries develops, supported by the overwhelming power of U.S. imperialism, the more the American superiority is lost, and the more the contradictions are accumulated within the U.S. economy.

Miraculously high development of the EEC and Japanese economy can be contrasted to the stagnation of American capitalism. This has resulted in a U.S. retreat in competition for the world market.

Added to this is the fact that the tremendous expansion of the military expenditures, which the U.S. economy undertook as world dominator for the rest of the capitalist countries in order to maintain the existing system, has exercised enormous pressure upon the U.S. economy.

It is dramatically exposed in the so-called crisis of the dollar, the aggravation of the international balance of the U.S. finance in recent years. Moreover, the dollar crisis was accelerated by the outflow of American surplus capital into other capitalist countries which were superior to the U.S. in their rate of growth. The only 'solution' to the present crisis of the American economy is to regain overwhelming superiority in the level of production power by giving a stimulus to economic development. The Kennedy-Johnson administration tried to respond to such a demand of the American economy through an 'expansion' policy instead of the 'stabilizing' policy of the Eisenhower era. This policy of Kennedy-Johnson brought forth so-called prolonged prosperity & set the cycle of the U.S. economy which was going into the period of installment investment for the second time in the post-war development.

But the prosperity was accompanied with the development of a serious contradiction. In the first place, the economic development at home

gave no solution to the improvement in the balance of international payments. This, in spite of the fact that the outflow of capital was prevented to a certain degree by the expanded inner market for surplus capital. Prosperity, prolonged through several artificial measures had caused a tremendous growth in import and this counter-balanced the expanded inner market for surplus capital. Secondly, as the boom of installment investment was coming to an end, the U.S. administration became dependent on the inflationary policy.

The important thing is that the expenditure for the Vietnamese War has come to occupy the greater part of U.S. finances year by year, and has become almost indispensable for the maintenance of the American economy.

Thus the economy of the U.S. has gotten into a kind of vicious circle. In order to avoid a big recession (this would inevitably lead to a social crisis) it is bound to continue the inflationary policy and the Vietnamese War. On the other hand, the inflationary policy and the Vietnamese war cause a tremendous expansion of imports and endanger the balance of international payments. A drastic change in the international payments gives a blow to the American as well as the world economy.

More important, is that in the EEC countries, and especially in Japan, the post-war prosperity is coming to a standstill and is threatened by crisis. The Japanese economy is on the brink of bankruptcy, scarcely helped by deficit-covering bonds and American prosperity.

Thus the contradiction of the post war system of imperialist world domination is concentrated within the U.S. economy and the Vietnamese War is its inevitable product. Moreover, the Vietnamese War is now accelerating the contradiction.

In a word, the destiny of the U.S. and of world imperialism has become closely connected with the war in Vietnam, and the war has occupied the main position in the political, military and economic moves of today's world.

III

We have already mentioned the Japanese commitment in the Vietnamese War. Here we summarize it:

First, the general basis of the Japan-USA coalition is that the post-war imperialism of Japan has been unable to develop itself except through an alliance with the U.S.A.

Second, maintenance of not only American but also other world imperialism and the domination over the underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries depends upon what occurs in the Vietnam War. This is also the case with Japanese imperialism.

Third, stabilization of the Asian situation by U.S. power is a necessary condition for Japanese imperialism to form its own Asian economic base. It is through formation of this base that Japan can cope with the European capitalist powers in the world market.

-9-

Thus the commitment of the Japanese ruling class to the war in Vietnam is to defend the interest of Japanese imperialism.

Fourth, the Japanese ruling class is intending to make the Japanese people accustomed to imperialist war through the opportunity presented by the Vietnamese War. The reason for the government's willing acceptance of U.S. nuclear submarines in Japanese harbors lies here. Through strengthening military cooperation with U.S. power the Japanese ruling class is trying to reinforce Japanese imperialist military power.

For American imperialism, Japanese cooperation in the Vietnamese War not only means military assistance, but also the political importance of gathering Asian reactionaries around U.S. policy.

IV

Thus far we have analyzed the imperialist character of the war in Vietnam. For total clarification of the imperialist aggression in Vietnam, we have to refer to the Stalinist role.

The criminal role of the world Stalinists, an alienated form of the international Communist movement, has been shown in the torture and massacre of the Vietnamese people by U.S. imperialism in spite of the so-called 'socialist' superiority in the world situation.

In the first place, it should be noted that the so-called 'socialist' camp has gone into serious crisis of disruption and confusion through the outburst of the inner contradiction of Stalinism itself. The ruling classes in the Stalinist countries have been thoroughly occupied in a bureaucratic attempt to overcome the crises of their respective countries (it is, of course, an inevitable product of the 'construction of socialism in one single country'). They can not even prevent the imperialist aggression.

The imperialists are taking full advantage of this situation. More than that.

Through escalating aggression deeper and deeper into North Vietnam they are trying to include so-called 'socialist' countries as targets of aggression.

If the imperialist aggression in North Vietnam is not defeated by the people of the world, then the U.S. invasion might succeed in its contention that it stopped the "aggression from the North".

The imperialist knows this very well. The Stalinists now allow the imperialist invasion into a part of their 'camps' and leave the people living there to be wounded and killed. Thus they are helping the imperialist conceal the true character of the aggressive war.

The next thing to be pointed out is that the Stalinist policy in world politics has become more and more anti-proletarian during the course of the Vietnamese War. It is well known that Moscow and Washington are connected by a 'hotline' and that the U.S.S.R. government is on its way to a coalition with U.S. imperialism.

3740

-10-

On the other hand, the Chinese government declared, in the midst of the Hanoi bombing, that the oppressed nations should fight against imperialism by themselves. It clearly shows that the Chinese Stalinists are going to let the imperialist attack the Vietnamese people in isolation. They try to justify this by employing the words of Mao Tse-tung, and by applying the policy of self-dependance.

The Chinese line has nothing to do with the fundamental principle of the international struggle of workers against war and colonialism.

The Chinese bureaucrats know only military counter-attack against imperialist aggression instead of peoples' own mass action.

Here lies the anti-proletarian essence of the Chinese line.

It should be noted very seriously that the U.S. aggressive war in Vietnam is expanding more and more, helped by the Stalinist betrayal, into a colonial war. And at the same time it is becoming a war against the Stalinist countries themselves. The point is, escalation of the war doesn't automatically lead to the growth of the anti-war movement.

In the aggravation of the situation, a clearer standpoint and attitude is required than ever toward both imperialism and Stalinism. Any other position than that of anti-Stalinism and anti-imperialism would be broken and destroyed in the midst of the conflict between imperialism and Stalinism.

Shameless surrender of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party to the imperialist aggression in Japan has its root in this point.

Let's fight for the international anti-war movement, basing ourselves on the struggle of rank and file workers.

JRCL-NC
ZENSHIN

3741

3 7 4 2

MARX'S HUMANISM TODAY

by Raya Dunayevskaya

It was during the decade of the First International (1864-74) --a decade that saw both the Civil War in America and the Paris Commune--that Marx restructured the many drafts of Capital and published the first two editions of Volume I.

Capital sets forth a new concept of theory, a new dialectical relationship between theory and practice, and a shift of emphasis from the idea of history as the history of theory to the idea of history as the history of production. It signifies Marx's "return" to his own philosophic humanism after more than a decade of concentration on economics and empiric studies of the class struggles of his day. Not surprisingly, this return is on a more concrete level, which, rather than diminishing Marx's original humanist concepts, deepens them. This is obvious in the section "The Working Day," which Marx first decided to write in 1866 under the impact of the mass movement for the shortening of the working day following the conclusion of the Civil War in the United States. It is obvious in the original categories he created for his economic analysis and the creative practice of the Hegelian dialectic. Humanism gives Marx's magnum opus its force and direction. Yet most Western scholars of Marxism are content either to leave the relationship between the now-famous Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844² and Capital implicit, or to make the continuity explicit only insofar as the ethical foundations of Marxism are concerned.³ This, it seems to me, leaves the door wide open for those who wish to transform Marx's humanism, both as philosophy and as historic fact, into an abstract which would cover up concrete economic exploitation, actual lack of political freedom, and the need to abolish the conditions preventing "realization" of Marx's philosophy, i.e., the reunification of mental and manual abilities in the individual himself, the "all-rounded" individual who is the body and soul of Marx's humanism.

The 1844 Manuscripts didn't just "pave the way" for "scientific socialism." Humanism wasn't just a stage Marx "passed through" on his voyage of discovery to "scientific economics" or "real revolutionary politics." Humanist philosophy is the very foundation of the integral unity of Marx's theory, which cannot be fragmented into "economics," "politics," "sociology," much less identified with the Stalinist monolithic creation, held onto so firmly by both Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung.

Of all the editions of Capital, from its first publication in 1867 until the last before Marx died in 1883, the French edition (1872-75) alone contained the changes that had, as Marx put it in the Afterword, "scientific value independent of the original." The revolutionary action of the Parisian masses in "storming the heavens"⁴

and taking destiny into their own hands clarified for Marx the two most fundamental theoretical problems: the accumulation of capital, and the fetishism of commodities. Just as his analysis of the struggles to shorten the working day became pivotal to the structure of Capital, so these additions became crucial for its spirit, i.e., for the future inherent in the present. The changes were of two kinds. One was tantamount to a prediction of what we today call state capitalism--the ultimate development of the law of concentration and centralization of capital "in the hands of one single capitalist, or those of one single corporation."⁵ The second was the illimination of the fetishism of commodities ipherent in the value-form as emanating from "the form itself."⁶ Marx concluded that only freely associated labor can abrogate the law of value; only "freely associated men"⁷ can strip the fetishism from commodities.

At this moment in history, when established state powers claim "to practice" or to base themselves on Marxism, it is essential to re-establish what Marx himself meant by practice. It was freedom. The notion of freedom, always Marx's point of departure and of return, is concretized through a most painstaking and original analysis of the "inexorable laws" of capitalist development. This discloses how the proletariat, as "substance" (or mere object of an exploitative society) becomes "subject," i.e., revolts against the conditions of alienated labor, thereby achieving "the negation of the negation," or self-emancipation. In a word, Capital is the culmination of the twenty-five years of labor that began when Marx, in 1843, first broke with bourgeois society and melded what he considered its highest achievements in thought--English political economy, French revolutionary doctrine, Hegelian philosophy--into a theory of liberation, a new philosophy of human activity which he called "a thoroughgoing Naturalism or Humanism."

The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 transformed Marx's humanism from an academic debate to a question of life and death. Interest in it intensified the following year when the "Hundred Flowers" blossomed briefly in Chiga before the totalitarian state caused them to wither abruptly. From 1958 to 1961 the African revolutions gave proof of a new, third world whose underlying philosophy, again, was humanism.

The Cold War and McCarthyism helped keep the United States isolated from the West European rediscovery of Marx's 1844 Humanist Essays in the mid-1940s and early 1950s. Now, however, Americans have an opportunity to make up in comprehensiveness of discussion what was lost in the belated start.¹⁰ The Freedom Now movement of the Negroes, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the 1962 missile crisis over Cuba, which made real the nuclear threat, have helped rekindle the debate. In his own way, the scholar too must grapple with the inner identity of the Marxian economic, political, sociological, scientific and philosophic categories. It was the late, non-Marxist, anti-Hegelian economist, Joseph Schumpeter, who pinpointed Marx's genius as "the idea of theory," the transformation of "historic narrative into historic raisonné."¹¹

Elsewhere¹² I have made a detailed analysis of all four volumes of Capital and their relationship to the 1844 Manuscripts. Here space considerations limit me to the two basic theories--the Marxian analysis of value and the fetishism of commodities--which are, in reality, the single, decisive, unified theory of alienation, or historical materialism, dialectically understood.

Marx's discovery that "it is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence that determines their consciousness"¹³ was no departure from either his own theory of alienated labor or the theory of alienation as the central core of the Hegelian dialectic. But Marx's precise analysis of the actual labor process under capitalism is more concrete, alive, shattering--and, of course, revolutionary--than any stage of alienation in Hegel's Phenomenology of Mind. In true Hegelian fashion Marx focuses on creativity, but, unlike Hegel, he bases it on the actual process of production. There, facing not just an idea but a human being who has ideas, Marx develops his earlier concept of the worker's "quest for universality."¹⁴ The "new passions and new forces" he now sees are born not only to overthrow the old order, but to construct a new one, "a society in which the full and free development of every individual is the ruling principle."¹⁵

So organically related are the economic, political, and philosophic concepts in Capital that when, in 1943,¹⁶ the Russian theoreticians first openly broke with the Marxian analysis of value, they had to deny the dialectic structure of Capital and ask that, in "teaching" it, Chapter I be omitted. It does not speak highly of "Western" philosophy that it never saw the philosophic implications in this economic debate, and therefore also failed to discern the reason why the theoretical magazine of Soviet Marxism (Under the Banner of Marxism), which had carried on the tradition of Marx's dialectic philosophy, ceased its publication. Thereafter, without further ado or any reference to any previous interpretation of Marxian economics, the revision of the Marxian analysis of value became the standard Communist analysis. The wholeness of Marxian theory has always been the bete noire of established Marxism. It took the collapse of the Second International and a break with his own philosophic past to make Lenin, at the end of 1914, fully grasp the organic connection of Marxian economics with Hegelian philosophy. And from then on he became uncompromising in his criticism of all Marxists, himself included. In one of his "aphorisms" he wrote, "It is impossible fully to grasp Marx's Capital, and especially the first chapter, if you have not studied and understood the whole of Hegel's Logic. Consequently, none of the Marxists for the past half century has understood Marx!"

There is no more remarkable piece of analysis in the annals of political economy--and no more Hegelian kind of writing in Marx's "early Hegelian period"--than the final section of Chapter I of Capital, entitled "The Fetishism of Commodities." There philosophy and economics are connected with history as integrally as content

and form are welded together in a great work of literature. By the time Marx introduced further changes into the French edition, after the Paris Commune, those fifteen pages were as tightly drawn as the strings of a violin. We must remember that Marx considered the greatest achievement of the Commune to be "its own working existence." The totality of the reorganization of society by the Communards gave Marx a new insight into the whole question of the form of value, not only as it was historically determined, but also as it conditioned bourgeois thought in turn. Under capitalistic conditions of production, philosophy had been reduced to an ideology, i.e., false consciousness. The categories of thought proper to capitalistic production were uncritically accepted by all, including even Adam Smith and David Ricardo, the authors of the epoch-making discovery that labor was the source of all value. This is why, despite their discovery, they could not dissolve the fetishism of commodities. Classical political economy, concludes Marx, met its historic barrier here.

The commodity form of the products of labor became a fetish because of the perverse relationship of subject to object--of living labor to dead capital. Relations between men appear as the relation between things because in our alienated society that is all "they really are."¹⁷ Dead capital is the master of living labor. The fetishism of commodities is the opiate that, to use a Hegelian expression, passes itself off as "the very natura of the mind"¹⁸ to all except the proletariat who daily suffer from the domination of dead labor, the stranglehold of the machine. Therefore, concludes Marx, no one can strip the fetishism from the commodities except freely associated labor. Obviously the Russian theoreticians, in 1943, were determined that no one should.

The necessary ideology to cover up the exploitation of the laborer did not change its essence when it changed its form from the private to the state capitalism that calls itself Communism. Nor has the ideological rift between China and Russia undermined the exploitative relationship in either land. Were Marx to return to earth, he would have no difficulty whatever in recognizing in its new form--the State Plan and its fetishism--the state capitalist development he predicted as the ultimate effect of the inexorable laws of capitalist development. Our generation should understand better than any previous generation that it is not a question of nationalized vs. private property. It is a question of freedom. Wherever and whenever freedom was limited, Marx struck out against the barrier, in practice and in theory. Thus, when classical political economists spoke of "free labor," by which they meant wage labor, Marx wrote caustically: "For them there was history, but history is no more."

It should be obvious that Marx's primary theory of value, or "abstract," "value-producing" labor, is a theory of alienated labor. In the humanist essays Marx explained why he analyzed economic facts "in conceptual terms as alienated labor...How does it happen, we may ask, that man alienates his labor? How is this alienation founded in the nature

of human development? We have already done much to solve the problem insofar as we have transformed the question concerning the origin of private property into a question about the relation between alienated labor and the process of development of mankind. For in speaking of private property one believes oneself to be dealing with something external to mankind. But in speaking of labor one deals directly with mankind itself. This new formulation of the problem already contains its solution."¹⁹

By the time he completed Capital, however, Marx felt the need to create economic categories to analyze the alien character of labor under capitalism both as an activity in the factory and as a commodity in the market where "alone rule Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham."²⁰

Marx created special economic categories not only to expound his theory of value and surplus-value, but also to show how degraded human relations were at the point of production itself. By splitting the category of labor into labor as activity and labor power as a commodity--as if the laborer could indeed disjoint his hands from his body and have them retain their function--Marx was able to show that, since labor power cannot be so disembodied, it is the laborer himself who enters the factory. And in the factory, continues Marx, the laborer's ability becomes a mere appendage to a machine and his concrete labor is reduced to a mass of congealed, abstract labor.

Now there is, of course, no such creature as an "abstract laborer"; one is a miner or a tailor or a steelworker or a baker. Nevertheless, the perverse nature of capitalist production is such that man is not master of the machine; the machine is master of the man. By the instrumentality of the machine, which "expresses" itself in the ticking of a factory clock, a man's skill becomes unimportant so long as he produces a given quantity of products in a given time. Labor time is the handmaiden of the machine which accomplishes the fantastic transformation of all concrete labors into one abstract mass.

Marx considered his analysis of concrete and abstract labor his original contribution to political economy, "the pivot on which a clear comprehension of political economy turns."²¹ In the process of his analysis of the capitalist's "werewolf hunger for surplus labor" as "a live monster that is fruitful and multiplies,"²² Marx creates two other new categories: constant capital (machines) and variable capital (wage labor). All labor, paid or unpaid, he insists, is forced labor. And this labor is so alien an activity that it has itself become a form of capital.

The precision, as well as originality, of this description of alienated labor is not, of course, merely a category of the "deductive Hegelian dialectic." It is a category of the dialectic empiricism of Marx re-creating an altogether new level of truth. Only politically motivated, self-induced blindness can, when reading Marx's pages upon pages on the labor process under capitalism, conclude either that the mature Marx departed from his theory of alienated labor, or that

alienated labor is a "leftover" from Marx's "left Hegelian days" before he worked his way out of "Hegelian gibberish" into "scientific materialism." At the same time, because Marx's economic categories have so incontrovertible a class character, it is impossible to denude them of their class content. Although some of today's near-Marxists loudly proclaim the "neutralization" of these categories, they apply them to capitalism and to capitalism only. Because the Marxian law of value is the supreme manifestation of capitalism, not even Stalin--at least not for very nearly two decades after he already had total power, the State Plan, and the monolithic party--dared admit its operation in Russia since he claimed the land was "socialist." It was only in the midst of a world war that the Russian theoreticians openly broke with the Marxian concept; in practice, of course, the ruling bureaucracy had long since followed an exploitative course.

In 1947 Andrei Zhdanov dramatically (or at least loudly) demanded that "the philosophical workers" replace the Hegelian dialectic with "a new dialectical law": criticism and self-criticism. By 1955 the critique of Marxian concepts concerned his humanism. V.A. Karpushin wrote in "Marx's Working Out of the Materialist Dialectics in the Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts in the Year 1844": "Marx was the first philosopher who went beyond the confines of philosophy and from the point of view of practical life and practical needs of the proletariat analyzed the basic question of philosophy as a truly scientific method of revolutionary change and knowledge of the actual world."²³

The Russian Communists were not, however, about to favor "revolutionary change" where revolutionary change meant their downfall. Therefore, when the Hungarian Revolution tried the following year to transform reality by realizing philosophy, that is to say, by making freedom from Russian Communism a reality, the debate ended in machine-gun fire. Thus the violation of the logos of Marxian theory was followed by the destruction of liberty itself.

Soon after, the Russian theoreticians unleashed an unbridled, vitriolic attack on all opponents of established Communism, whom they gratuitously labeled "revisionists." Unfortunately, too many Western scholars accepted the term and referred to the ruling Communists as the "dogmatists" despite such wild gyrations and "flexibility" as, on the eve of World War II, the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the united front between Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek, and, more recently, the rift between Russia and China. At the same time, the single grain of truth in the duality of Lenin's philosophic legacy -- between the vulgarly materialistic Materialism and Empirio-Criticism and the creative dialectics of his Philosophic Notebooks -- has provided a field day for the innate anti-Leninism of "the West". Elsewhere²⁴ I have analyzed "Mao's Thought", which is supposed to have made "original contributions to Marxism," especially his On Practice, and On Contradiction, as they relate to his rise in power. Here I must limit myself to the fact that the humanist debate was in danger both of becoming a purely academic question, and of being separated from the "political" debates on "revisionism." Fortunately Marxism does not exist only in books, nor is it the possession only of state

powers. It is in the daily lives of working people trying to reconstruct society on new beginnings.

The liberation from Western imperialism, not only in Africa, but in Latin America (Fidel Castro too first called his revolution "humanist"), unfurled a humanist banner. Thereupon the Russian Communist line changed. Where, at first, it was claimed that Leninism needed no sort of humanization, nor any of the reforms proposed by the proponents of "humanist socialism," the claim now became that the Soviets were the rightful inheritors of "militant humanism." Thus M.B. Mitin, who has the august title of Chairman of the Board of the All-Union Society for the Dissemination of Political and Scientific Knowledge, stated that Khrushchev's Report to the Twenty-first Congress of the Russian Communist Party was "the magnificent and noble conception of Marxist-Leninist socialist humanism."²⁵ And in 1963, at the thirteenth International Congress of Philosophy, held in Mexico, it was the Soviet delegation that entitled one of its reports "humanism in the Contemporary World."²⁶ Thus, curiously, Western intellectuals can thank the Russian Communists for throwing the ball back to them; once again, we are on the track of discussing humanism.

Let us not debase freedom of thought to the point where it is no more than the other side of the coin of thought control. One look at our institutionalized studies on "Marxist Leninism" as the "know your enemy" type of course will show that, in methodology, these are no different from what is being taught under established Communism, although they are supposed to teach "opposite principles". The point is this: unless freedom of thought means an underlying philosophy for the realization of the forward movement of humanity, thought, at least in the Hegelian sense, cannot be called "an Idea". Precisely because, to Hegel, "only that which is an object of freedom can be called an Idea," even his Absolutes breathed the earthy air of freedom. Our age can do no less. It is true that the Marxian dialectic is not only political or historical, but also cognitive. However, to claim that Marx's concept of the class struggle is a "myth" and his "glorification" of the proletariat only "the end product of his philosophy of alienation"²⁷ flies in the face of theory and of fact. In this respect, George Lichtheim's criticism that such an American analysis is "a sort of intellectual counterpart to the late Mr. Dulles's weekly sermon on the evils of communism"²⁸ has validity.

Marx's humanism was neither a rejection of idealism nor an acceptance of materialism, but the truth of both, and therefore a new unity. Marx's "collectivism" has, as its very soul, the individualistic element. That is why the young Marx felt compelled to separate himself from the "quite vulgar and unthinking communism which completely negates the personality of man." Because alienated labor was the essence of all that was perverse in capitalism, private or state, "organized" or "anarchic", Marx concluded his 1844 attack on capitalism with the statement that "communism, as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society." Freedom meant more, a great deal more, than the abolition of private property. Marx considered the abolition of private property to be only "the first transcendence." Full freedom demanded a second transcen-

dence. Four years after these humanist essays were written Marx published the historic Communist Manifesto. His basic philosophy was not changed by the new terminology. On the contrary, On the eve of the 1848 revolutions, the Manifesto proclaimed: "The freedom of the individual is the basis of the freedom of all." At the end of his life the concept remained unchanged. His magnum opus, like his life's activity, never deviated from the concept that only "the development of human power, which is its own end" is the true "realm of freedom."²⁹ Again, our age should understand better than any other the reasons for the young Marx's insistence that the abolition of private property is only the first transcendence. "Not until the transcendence of this mediation, which is nevertheless a necessary presupposition, does there arise positive Humanism, beginning from itself."

"Positive Humanism" begins "from itself" when mental and manual labor are reunited in what Marx calls the "all-rounded" individual. Surely our nuclear age should be oppressively aware that the division between mental and manual labor, which has been the underlying principle of all class societies, has reached such monstrous proportions under capitalism that live antagonisms characterize not only production, but science itself. Marx anticipated the impasse of modern science when he wrote in 1844: "To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie." We have been living this lie for one hundred and twenty years. The result is that the very survival of civilization as we have known it is at stake.

The task that confronts our age, it appears to this writer, is, first, to recognize that there is a movement from practice -- from the actual struggles of the day -- to theory; and second, to work out the method whereby the movement from theory can meet it. A new relationship of theory to practice, a new appreciation of "Subject," of live human beings struggling to reconstruct society, is essential. The challenge of our times is not to science or machines, but to men. The totality of the world crisis demands a new unity of theory and practice, a new relationship of workers and intellectuals. The search for a total philosophy has been disclosed dramatically by the new, third world of underdeveloped countries. But there are also evidences of this search in the struggles for freedom from totalitarian regimes, and in the West. To discern this mass search for a total philosophy it is necessary only to shed the stubbornness of all philosophies -- the concept of "the backwardness of the masses" -- and listen to their thoughts, as they battle automation, fight for the end of discrimination, or demand freedom now. Far from being intellectual abdication, this is the beginning of a new stage of cognition. This new stage in the self-liberation of the intellectual from dogmatism can begin only when, as Hegel put it, the intellectual feels the "compulsion of thought to proceed to ... concrete truths."

The espousal of partynost (party principle) as a philosophic principle is another manifestation of the dogma of "the backwardness of the masses", by which intellectuals in state-capitalist societies rationalize their contention that the masses must be ordered about, managed, "led." Like the ideologists in the West, they forget all too easily that revolutions do not arise in the fullness of time to establish a party machine, but to

reconstruct society on a human foundation. Just as partynost, or monolithism, in politics throttles revolution instead of releasing the creative energy of new millions, so partynost, in philosophy stifles thought instead of giving it a new dimension. This is not an academic question for either the East or the West. Marxism is either a theory of liberation or it is nothing. In thought, as in life, it lays the basis for achieving a new human dimension, without which no society is truly viable. As a Marxist humanist, this appears to me the whole truth of Marx's humanism, both as philosophy and as reality.

* * *

FOOTNOTES

1 In his Preface to Volume II of Marx's Capital (Kerr edition), Friedrich Engels lists the original manuscripts in such a way that the pagination tells the story of the restructuring. For my analysis of this, see pages 87-91 of Marxism and Freedom (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1958, 1964).

2 Marx's 1844 Manuscripts are now available in several English translations, including one issued in Moscow, but the one more readily available here is by T.B. Pottomare, and is included in Marx's Concept of Man by Erich Fromm (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1961). Outside of the essay on "Alienated Labor," I am, however, using my own translation and therefore not paginating the references.

3 See especially The Ethical Foundations of Marxism by Eugene Kamenka (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962).

4 The Civil War in France, by Karl Marx, is widely available in many languages both as a separate pamphlet and in Marx's Selected Works and Collected Works.

5 Capital (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1906), Vol. I, p. 688.

6 Ibid., p. 82.

7 Ibid., p. 92.

8 The indispensable book for the English reader is The Hundred Flowers Campaign and the Chinese Intellectuals by Roderick MacFarquhar (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960). The voices of revolt in China should then be compared with those in Eastern Europe. By now the books, not to mention pamphlets and articles, on the Hungarian Revolution are legion. A few which I consider important for tracing the role that Marx's humanism played are the following: Love Nagy on Communism (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1957); Franzosa Fajta, Behind the Rape of Hungary (New York: David McKay Company, 1957); The Hungarian Revolution, A White Book edited by Melvin J. Lasky (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1957); Bitter Harvest,

edited by Edmund O. Stillman with Introduction by François Bondy (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1959). For eyewitness reports, and especially those relating to the Workers' Councils, the issues of The Review (periodical published by the Imre Nagy Institute, Brussels) is quintessential. Some reports also appeared in the magazine East Europe, which did a competent job on Poland, especially in the publication of the debate on Marx's humanism between the leading philosophers in Poland, Adam Schaff and Leszek Kolakowski. Both of these philosophers are also translated in the collection entitled Revisionism, edited by Leopold Labedz (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962).

9 African Socialism by Léopold Sédar Senghor (New York: American Society of African Culture, 1959); Sekou Toure's "Africa's Path in History" was excerpted for the English reader in Africa South, April-June 1960, Capetown; now available only abroad. See also my Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions (American, 1958, and English, 1961, editions available at News & Letters, Detroit, Michigan).

10 I do not mean to say that I accept the West European intellectual's attitude on either the question of the degree of belatedness, or the low level of discussion in the United States. Four or five years before Europe's first rediscovery of Marx's early essays, when Europe was under the heel of fascism, Herbert Marcuse dealt with them in his Reason and Revolution. It is true that this was based on the German text of the essays, that no English translation was available, and that the discussion of Professor Marcuse's seminal work was limited to small groups. It is also true that I had great difficulty in convincing either commercial publishers or university presses that they ought to publish Marx's humanist essays or Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks. I succeeded in getting both these writings published only by including them as appendices to my Marxism and Freedom (1958). Even then they did not become available to a mass audience. It was not until 1961, when Erich Fromm included a translation of the 1844 Manuscripts in Marx's Concept of Man, that Marx's humanism reached a mass audience in the United States, and received widespread attention in American journals. Nevertheless, I see no substantive reason for the intellectual arrogance of the European Marxologists since, in Europe as in the United States, it was only after the Hungarian Revolution that the discussion of humanism reached the level of either concreteness or urgency. When I refer to the belatedness of the discussion, I have in mind the long period between the time the 1844 Manuscripts were first published by the Marx-Engels Institute in Russia, in 1927, under the editorship of Ryzanov, and the time they received general attention.

11 A History of Economic Analysis by Joseph Schumpeter (Oxford University Press, 1954).

12 Marxism and Freedom. See especially Chs. V through VIII.

13 A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (Chas. H. Kerr), p.ii.

14 Poverty of Philosophy (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr), p. 157.

- 15 Capital (Kerr ed.), Vol. I, p. 649.
- 16 Pod Znamenem Marxizma (Under the Banner of Marxism), Nos. 7-8 / 1943. The crucial article on the law of value from this issue was translated by me under the title, "Teaching of Economics in the Soviet Union." Along with my commentary, "A New Revision of Marxian Economics", the article was published in The American Economic Review (September 1944). The controversy around it, in which professors Oscar Lange, Leon Rogin, and Paul A. Baran participated in the pages of that journal, lasted for a year, at the end of which (September 1945) my rejoinder, "Revision or Reaffirmation of Marxism?" was published.
- 17 Capital, Vol. I, p. 84.
- 18 See Hegel on "The Third Attitude to Objectivity": "What I discover in my consciousness is thus exaggerated into a fact of the consciousness of all and even passed off for the very nature of the mind" (Hegel's Logic, first Wallace translation, Oxford University Press, 1892).
- 19 See "Alienated Labor" in Marx's Concept of Man by Erich Fromm, pp. 103, 195.
- 20 Capital, Vol. I, p. 195.
- 21 Ibid., p. 48.
- 22 Ibid., p. 217
- 23 Voprosy Filosofii (Questions of Philosophy), No. 3/1955.
- 24 See the new chapter, "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung" in the paperback edition of Marxism and Freedom (New York: Twayne, 1964). For an analysis of a similar perversion of Lenin's partisanship in philosophy into Stalin's monolithic "party-ness in philosophy," see the well-documented and perceptive analysis Soviet Marxism and Natural Science, 1917-1932 by David Joravsky (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961).
- 25 Pravda, Feb. 6, 1959. The English translation used here appears in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, June 3, 1959.
- 26 The report of this conference by M. B. Mitin appears in Voprosy Filosofii, No. 11/1953. For a different report of the same conference see Studies in Soviet Thought, No. 4/1963 (Fribourg, Switzerland).
- 27 Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx by Robert Tucker (Cambridge University Press, 1961).
- 28 George Lichtheim's "Western Marxist Literature 1953-1963" appears in Survey, No. 50, January 1964.
- 29 Capital, Vol. III, pp. 954-55.