

4 3 3 4

PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION

As I see the book now, it will have the following parts:

PART I. Will consist of a chapter on the objective world situation, the relationship between the advanced and the backward economies. It is not, however, to be limited to economics. It is a philosophical question, the philosophic question, of whether the new human forces which dynamism brought them political independence are to become nothing but "subjects" now that the non-aligned countries have, in fact, aligned with one or the other of the poles of world capital.

The question is: should I deal here with the theory of State Capitalism and Marxist Humanism? Should I bring in the question of automation? Must I relate the ideological questions, especially those in relationship to Hegel to the objective world situation, or should I leave open the question by merely stating that the crises are not only economic and political but philosophic and, therefore, we must see how it is that Marx and Lenin dealt with these questions when they were confronted by similar crises.

There is also the question of China. Should that come in at once? If it is to come in ~~later~~ in Part 1. on the question of world economy, can it serve as the transition point to part 2. on the Hegelian dialectic simply because it raises more pseudo - philosophic questions than either the private capitalist world or the Communist world?

-2-

In that case, we would need to deal with China, first as it raised the question of contradiction during the Yenan period, especially in 1937, then with the same question after it gained power and when the Communist World in Russia was first challenged in Eastern Europe, both in 1953 directly after the death of Stalin and in 1956 after Khrushchev's de-Stalinization.

On the economic front, on the other hand, state-planning would have seemed to assure it a much more rapid industrialization than in India. Yet having reached the high stage in 1957, China went, not to a further continuation of state-planning but rather embarked on the great leap forward in 1958 and the cultural revolution in 1966-1967. What is the difference between these two deviations from the Russian path?

In the first case, there was the illusion of being able to skip, both the capitalist and the "Revisionist" path. That is to say, industrialization which relied, more or less solely, on technology. But this cannot be taken out of its international contacts, either insofar as the first Sputnik brought Russia ahead of the United States in space, or insofar as the new element -- the "Third World" is concerned. In truth, to Mao this meant not merely "ideological" victories but the actual establishment of a new world axis led by itself -- the Chinese cultural revolution in 1966 -- The Peking-Djakarta axis. Is ~~it~~ only a question which resulted from the collapse of that Peking-Djakarta Axis. Or, is it only internal due to the differences between state planners and "voluntarist"?

4335

This has one disadvantage, that it might be so prolonged a part, that it would lead to a very wide gulf between parts 1. and 2. An alternative, therefore, might be to mention China and say it is not accidental that the philosophic questions were raised there, but put off the answer to those questions until the end of the book, except that I have expressions "before we can do this, we have to do that".

PART II. would deal with Hegel, stressing why I concentrate on the absolute idea; Marx, both as transcendent of Hegel and as return to Hegel; Lenin, both the great break in his thought and the ambivalence. Actually, it appears to me that this Part II. should begin the work, except it would sound altogether too abstract and address itself to too circumscribed an audience.

PART III. deals with alternative ideological approaches, from within Marxism - - Trotskyism - - and from outside the Marxist movement Existentialism.

Perhaps I could here deal both with China and automation, China being the alternative within the Communist movement and automation calling forth new forces of opposition.

Or, instead of automation, I could bring in the question of the Negro revolution.

-4-

finally, should there be a Part IV., or should there just be a conclusion where I tie in the threads of both the objective movement and the philosophic problems. If so, do we end on a philosophic note, relating Hegelism to our day. Or should it be on the new human forces, <sup>out of</sup> ~~the~~ African revolutions and the Negro revolt in America.

Can I possibly escape dealing with Castro. Could that be subsumed under the question of Guerrilla War?

Or would we return to the difference in the recurrence of Marxist Humanism between the 1945 to 1947 when it became the topic of dispute, both in existentialism and in the theological world, and 1955-1957, when it became a problem for Eastern Europe, extending it to 1960-1965 when it was taken up by the Third World.

What about Marcuse and his one dimensional man, on the one hand, and the technocrats and technologists, who welcome Mechanism as the answer to all questions?

This work cannot do what Marxism and Freedom did, stop at issuing a challenge, it must itself meet the challenge, and if not issuing a "blue print" at least definitely state that this is the path, the road to liberation and no other road can substitute.

4337