

POST PLENUM BULLETIN NUMBER TWO

••• Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution and News and Letters Committees: The Struggle to Concretize Philosophy and Organization as Action
by Michael Connolly, Co-National Organizer

••• Our Newspaper and Our Marxist-Humanist Archives
by Eugene Walker

••• News & Letters, a discussion
by Charles Denby, Editor

FROM THE
NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES
PLENUM
SEPTEMBER 6, 1981

News
and Letters
Committees,
2832 E Grand Blvd,
Detroit, MI 48211

Price: 50¢

7134

Report on Organization by Michael Connolly, Co-National Organizer:
ROSA LUXEMBURG, WOMEN'S LIBERATION AND MARX'S PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION AND
NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES: THE STRUGGLE TO CONCRETIZE PHILOSOPHY AND
ORGANIZATION AS ACTION

I The Opposition to Reaganism, Including Ourselves

The events of the past year have tested revolutionaries the world over, and nowhere more than in the United States. What we characterized last year as a competition between Republicans and Democrats for programs guaranteeing "missiles, missiles, missiles, but what about jobs?" has become under Reagan a government of full-blown reaction. Indeed, his eight months of barbarism in office have included on the one hand open attacks on workers, Blacks, women and youth in this country, and on the other, a constant paean to war and war preparations.

Within much of the Left this period has meant a rush to abandon a perspective of full social revolution, a rush to reformism, to adventurism, or to tailing after state powers. Instead we have posed "Two Worlds in Each Country and the Need to Transform Reality," not as any slogan, but as perspectives for action now. There is no better way to understand what we mean by the urgent need to transform reality, and what we mean by the forces that can achieve that transformation -- the two worlds within each country -- than to review the work of our own organization over the last twelve months.

Central to that review is Raya's completion of the manuscript of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, an objective event in the history of the movement for freedom. Indeed, it is one so objective that it challenges all separation between philosophy and organization, between objective and subjective. That is true even when one considers such a rotten event as the night Reagan was elected, claiming a "mandate" for his policies. Far from rooting ourselves in the fact of Reagan's election, the path to grappling with that oppressive reality was first for us to be rooted in Marxist-Humanist ground as the reality of the revolution-to-be. Thus Nov. 5 was the moment we were confronted not alone with Reagan, but with Raya's projection of what became a whole new Part III of the book -- on Karl Marx as philosopher of permanent revolution. At the same time we launched a drive, directly linked to the election results, to build up our subscription list, as a way of intensifying our dialogue with all the forces of revolution.

In a sense it doesn't matter where you begin to see the activity and creativity of our work with those fighting today's capitalist crises. So many and varied are the forces both under attack and in revolt, that it not only gives the lie to Reagan's illusion that the U.S.A. is "pacified," but demands that revolutionaries seek out new ways to help these revolts develop into the fullness of a movement for a new world. That such a development is a most difficult path is underlined for us today by nearly a century of revolutions aborted or transformed into their opposite.

Throughout the year, we have been active with workers fighting back against layoffs, "take-back" contracts and union busting, as well as working to support previously unorganized workers in the low-wage "Sunbelt" in their battles for recognition. We publicized the struggles of Latino farmworkers in Ohio and Texas, and of Black women in the poultry plants of Mississippi. From Appalachia,

Andy sent back reports on the miners' strike, that included the miners' revolt against their own union bureaucracy. In Chicago, our work with strikers at the Schwinn plant in November not only produced new readers and writers, but by spring, a whole bilingual "Schwinn Supplement" to News & Letters. And in Detroit, we joined the picket lines and helped publish leaflets for strikes and organizing drives by women at Arnold's Drug Stores and Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

New York, that intellectual center, continued to produce some of the most exciting shop stories and discussions, on safety in the subways or on conditions in the hospitals. The measure of the depth of their activity can be seen in the magnificent development of John Marcotte as the "On the Line" columnist, bringing to his writing not only the discussions with many N&L subscribers and friends in his own metal shop, but eliciting the thoughts of the whole new layer of Latin American, newly immigrant, sub-minimum wage workers in New York's enormous world of sweatshops.

There is no doubt that the revolt of American workers continues unabated. But it is also true that within Reagan's ability to fire the air controllers, within his illusions of a free hand for union busting, is the history we showed so vividly in American Civilization on Trial -- that when white labor gets separated from the struggles of the Black masses, a door is opened wide for a new period of reaction to be born. Thus the 1980s, without a fundamental reorganization, is where we will see all labor -- Black and white -- pay for the rollback of Black civil rights in the 1970s.

This year we have been continuing the projection of Black masses as vanguard of the American revolution in all our work, whether in the Women's Liberation Movement or in the anti-draft activity, in the shops or in the many Black demonstrations. As the wave of murders by both police and "civilian" KKK-inspired racists swept across the country -- with "Atlanta" and "Buffalo" becoming catchwords for Black death in white America -- we participated in marches and demonstrations from Los Angeles to New York. Lou, Allen and Gene all addressed California meetings on the crisis. Lou was able both to get his essay on "Black Reality/Black Thought" published in Ufuhamu and to appear on a Los Angeles radio station for a series of four Black History lectures drawing on our work in American Civilization on Trial, Marxism and Freedom, and Frantz Fanon, Soweto and American Black Thought.

The multi-dimensionality of our work in the Black movement stretched from participation in the founding convention of the National Black Independent Political Party to the fight against the closing of Harlem's Sydenham Hospital, and from the organization of Black anti-draft programs to reviews of literature by Black feminists. What stands out also this year is the world nature of Black consciousness on this fifth anniversary of Soweto's uprising. Olga has already reported the important new relations established with Azanian Liberationists in London. And in Germany, the publishers of Im reichsten Land der Welt, the German Indignant Heart, report that they have already sold half their press run of Denby's book. As Kevin reported, we met with the translator to suggest a new footnote to the next printing, tying Indignant Heart to Algebra der Revolution.

For the work of the Women's Liberation Committees and the Internationalist Marxist-Humanist Youth, the international dimension has also been central to all their activities. (You will hear their reports shortly and they should be considered together with this report in a full view of all our work.) So intercon-

ned have national freedom struggles become with the whole question of internationalism that it is clear that when we say "two worlds in each country," we do not mean that forces of revolution stop at the border. Indeed, the international reports you heard yesterday have had their impact in a most profound way on our own work for the American Revolution this year, whether one looks at the continuing struggle in Poland, or the Latin American Revolutions, whether at Iran or South Africa.

Just look at Poland. This year we were able to produce a new edition of Today's Polish Fight For Freedom, with both Raya's "All Roads Lead to Gdansk" and Marx's 1875 speech on Polish freedom included. That edition has already sold more than 700 copies, and not only in Chicago, where the best work has been done with it, but at El Salvador support demonstrations in the Bay Area and New York. We were also able to have "inter-regional" trips by Urszula Wislanka and Andy Phillips, speaking on Poland, trips which challenged both the U.S. Left and right-wing Polish nationalists to see the historic origins and current development of Marxist-Humanism within East Europe.

What we were able to begin this past year with, first in draft and then in published form, was the first history of our political-philosophic tendency and its organization, 25 Years of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S.: A History of Worldwide Revolutionary Developments. We advertised it to our readers and in several journals, and not only did it sell very well through the mail, but it sparked the greatest response ever from the outside to our financial Appeal. What we were pointing to, at the mid-point of the year, and as a way of gathering together all the threads of our activities in the movement, was the series of classes in our history: "Marxist-Humanism: In the Battle of Ideas, In Mass Movements." We saw them as one way to help ourselves and our friends grasp the uniqueness of our organization and its centrality for transforming today's nightmare realities.

Yet the fact is that despite all our activity in the movements for freedom, despite all our stress on the "unity of philosophy and organization" as a "general principle," the classes did not fully achieve, either on the question of organizational growth, or on breaking down all separation between the organization and "the book," the needed breakthrough that we had projected. It is not a question of whether each class was presented well or not. It is a question of appreciating what it means that Marxist-Humanism was able to make the link back to re-connecting with Marx's Marxism, and to extend and deepen that new continent of thought for our own age and the problems we face. That is what our history is all about. Why then did we have so much difficulty viewing it as what it is -- "a history of worldwide revolutionary developments?" Did we tend to place the history of Marxist-Humanism and its organization in a separate compartment from those "revolutionary developments?"

What did help us, finally, with the difficult task that the 25 Year history pamphlet calls the "critical question" for our age -- digging out the "single dialectic that emerges from actuality as well as from thought" -- was the completion of the new book, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. The struggle to concretize philosophy and organization as action is there seen as one that takes us back to Marx's time -- most crucially to his last decade and his Critique of the Gotha Program /and forward to Marxist-Humanism's expression of that question for today, especially as it appears directly in the experience of the National Chairwoman's lecture tour this Spring. It is to those two points we now turn.

II. Breaking Down the Separation Between Philosophy and Organization --
In Marx's Time and in Our Own

Encountering Marx in the last decade of his life is a tremendously exciting experience of discovery. This is so both because it is so new to the whole world of revolutionary thought, having been hidden and misrepresented for a full century, and because Marx's work in that decade reaches into every corner of the world, into every period of history, into every area of revolutionary praxis. Thus, when we encounter Marx's 1875 Critique of the Gotha Program -- a critique of the proposed program for a United Workers' Party of Germany -- it is as an integral part of the summation Marx was creating out of the experience of the first workers' revolution in history -- the Paris Commune of 1871. Indeed, with in the new book, the whole last decade of Marx's work is seen as as much a fundamental recreation of his theory of permanent revolution, after the defeat of the Paris Commune, as were his writings in the aftermath of the 1848 revolutions -- from the 1850 Address on Permanent Revolution to the Grundrisse -- its first full creation.

The year 1875 itself was not only for Marx the year in which he wrote the CGP. It is in fact at that exact time that he is completing the French edition of Capital, and republishing for the first time since it was written in 1850 his Address on Permanent Revolution, as appendix to the new edition of the Relations of the Cologne Communist Trial. What is so stunning to see is how the concrete summation of the experience of the Paris Commune lead Marx and those who called themselves Marxists in Germany to such totally different conclusions once the question of organization was at issue.

Where the German Marxist comrades wished to merge with the Lassalleans to form a United Party, and do so through agreement on a common program, what Marx insisted was, "Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programs. If therefore it was not possible ... to go beyond the Eisenach program, one should simply have concluded an agreement for action against the common enemy." Organizational responsibility for ideas, as Marx saw them, meant never submerging your philosophy, your goal of a class-less society, under the supposedly "practical" organizational perspectives governed by a far different philosophy. It isn't alone a question of a critique of Lassalleanism and its program. It is instead what our age has contributed to first help us see: that what Marx did was to give us ground to uproot the separation between philosophy and "activism," in whatever form it appears.

As Raya focuses on the CGP what leaps out is how every concrete point against Lassalleanism becomes at the same time both a projection of Marx's vision of a fully human society and a foundation for action that points to new revolutionary subjects. Thus, in hitting out against all fetishism of organization, even Marx's own International Workingmen's Association is seen as "only a first attempt ... no longer realisable in its first historical form after the Paris Commune." Unless that fetishism is broken, one's eyes are closed to the new organizational forms that will emerge, whether from American railway workers or from a "backward" land like Russia.

Thus, in exposing the way the Gotha Program places all instruments of labor in the hands of the capitalist class alone, it is to focus on the way the landlords are let off scot-free. In the context of the whole of Part III of the book, doesn't this lead us right back to the question of Marx's view of the

peasantry as revolutionary subject?

And when the Program saddles the working class with "striving for emancipation within the framework of the present-day national state," gutting the movement of all revolutionary internationalism, isn't Marx's counterposing of the work of the International Workingmen's Association another way of bringing us back to the question of national self-determination, as Marx and the IWA had expressed it in supporting the Irish struggle against their "present-day national state?"

When philosophy and organization get separated, when what is supposedly "practical" is counterposed to the goal, what gets lost first is the relation to actual forces of revolution. And for us, in a very explicit way, that includes philosophy as revolutionary force. Thus, in critiquing something as seemingly inoffensive as the Gotha Program's demand for "an equitable distribution of the proceeds of labor," Marx's response leads to his most profound projection of the vision of a new world, a projection of "goal" that is far more concrete as Perspectives for the movement than any program divorced from philosophy. It is here that Marx gets to the heart of the whole freedom movement of humanity when he envisions an end to the "antithesis between mental and physical labor" so much so that labor becomes the "prime necessity of life," rather than the means by which you struggle to survive. It is this section that concludes with what first Stalin and now Deng have tried to bury: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!"

It is not alone that new beginnings determine the end. It is as well that when philosophy becomes such a force for revolution that it can project a concrete vision of the end, the goal, of our movement, it helps us work out those concrete perspectives in activity that are truly new beginnings. In Marx's life this was implicit throughout his work. But we must return to our own age, and our own contribution, as Marxist-Humanism has sought to make the concretization of philosophy and organization as action explicit. And for us, this year, we can best see it by focusing on Raya's Spring tour to present Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, and the ramifications of that tour.

It may sound like a truism to say that the tour couldn't be undertaken before the book was completed. But the fact is that seeing the book as a totality changes the way everything looks, and rivets our attention on the critical period in its writing that changed all -- the creation of what became Part Three, on Marx. That is what allowed the creation of a whole Part Two, on Women's Liberation, and what demanded the reorganization of Part One, on Rosa Luxemburg. But it is when all were presented for the first time as a totality that we could all see so many new points of departure leap into view.

And just as something we thought we all knew from the beginning of the book -- the Appendix on Trotsky's Theory of Permanent Revolution -- took on an entirely different aspect when viewed in the context of Marx's letter to Engels on the need for proletarian revolution in Germany to be supplemented by a "second edition of the peasant wars," so too our own 25 Year history was illuminated in a new way with the completion of the book. I am speaking of Raya's presentations on 40 years of Marx's Marxism, 1841-83, and 40 years of Marxist-Humanism, 1941-81.

Throughout Raya's tour, those lectures brought out precisely the way the book and the history of our organization are related: that Marx's philosophy of revolution is being re-articulated in our age by one and only one tendency --

Marxist-Humanism; that that re-articulation is at one and the same time a new understanding of what Marx did, and an extension, a deepening, of the new moments in Marx for our age.

What we have to consider at the same time is that the tour revealed the presence of a large and varied audience eager to hear about and discuss the ideas presented in the book. In fact, the audiences and literature sales from this tour were the best we have ever had. In California, what added to the excitement of the tour was the involvement at every meeting of those with the urgency of ongoing revolutions in the Middle East and in Latin America. In New York and in Berkeley there was the Black dimension, and especially Black women. Everywhere, from Urbana to the Bay Area, and from Ann Arbor to New York, was the participation of women's liberationists, and in a very new way -- as interested in hearing about Rosa Luxemburg and about Marx's philosophy of revolution as they were in what was called Women's Liberation directly. In the Bay Area that took the form of a collective at work on a radio show about Luxemburg. In Ann Arbor, it meant interest in "Marx's Capital, Chapter One, and 100 years of Marxists writing on it."

These new and varied audiences surely included ourselves, as the tour helped the organization as a whole first begin to hook up its activities with what had been achieved in the book. When you review the ramifications that emerged from the tour, in every local, in every area of our work, you can see that even if we are just now beginning to end that separation, the beginnings are very substantial ones indeed. Taken as a whole, what they underline is the way philosophy and organization can so unite as to reorganize all our work, stripping it of the dead hand of the "routine."

Take the work we have been doing all year in the shops. We saw in the beginning of this report something of its intensity and creativity, as in the Schwinn Supplement Chicago produced. But it was only after the tour that beginnings were made to break down the divisions between putting out that Supplement and the work of the local as a whole; with several workers from Schwinn attending pre-Plenum meetings given by Olga and Mike. Or consider Los Angeles, where our West Coast Editor has put many years into the struggle at GM Southgate. But it was only after the tour that Felix Martin and other workers were inspired to consider how to answer the company's new stage of production with a "Blue Sheet" that produced a great response.

When we pointed to the involvement of Middle Eastern and Latin American revolutionaries in the California meetings, it was not just to point out the urgency they brought with them. It was also to focus on the way their confrontation with the book as a whole, and with Raya's presentations of our own history, led them to new activities. Thus, for example, it was here that the new objective situation in Latin America and the new developments in theory for the Latin American Revolutions came together in a way that brought out both new friends from that continent and the projection of our new bilingual pamphlet, Latin America's "Revolutions: in reality, in thought."

Nor do we have to limit the international impact of the tour to the Middle East and Latin America. In both Olga's and Kevin's reports, it was clear that the book as a totality was a very specific manuscript they held in their hands to present to publishers, but it was also the determinant of all the discussions with the Black dimension, with Women's Liberation, with the youth in revolt.

The truth is that we could look at each of the locals, and at all the forces of revolt, and ask ourselves whether we have caught the way a new periphery was developed, and relations with old friends deepened, as in New York; or the new openings that are appearing for Women's Liberation work in everything from the essay on Middle East women that Neda Azad wrote, to the latest activity in Feminists Against Militarism and the struggle to stop the Family Protection Bill. But what is most crucial for us to grasp for the year ahead is the way the far-reaching reorganization we have already begun will not end with the completion of the manuscript, but rather, will be intensified in the critical period between now and the date of publication.

Presence on the campuses becomes essential for precisely that reason. Thus, we wish to enter into movement activities and the battles of ideas within them on campuses like Berkeley in the Bay Area and UCLA in Los Angeles; at CUNY and Columbia in New York; at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor as well as Wayne State in Detroit; at Loyola as well as Circle in Chicago. So important is it to not underestimate what it means to have a full presence in an intellectual-cultural center like the Bay Area; that first Urszula, and then Mary, will be moving there this year. In New York, Russell, who has already been active in support for the Latin American struggle, will be on campus full-time this year. Chicago will be able to benefit not only from Erica's move there, but has begun making plans to involve themselves in actions and discussion at several schools, plans that include speaking engagements for David Wolff as the translator of Luxemburg's Theory and Practice.

Most importantly, the reorganization demanded by the completion of the book is that right here in the Center of our organization, Detroit. We will again need four full-time Marxist-Humanists. And again the relationship of the work with Raya, to the national organization, the paper and the office will be the most urgent one to work out. Where last year, however, when Eugene arrived at the Center from L.A., it was to assume the duties of chairing the Philosophical-Technical Committee that puts out N&L and the Archives Committee as it reorganized the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection, this year the stress on organizational growth demanded that he become the organizer of the Detroit local. Isn't this another way of trying to put into practice, into each of our activities, the new understanding the book and the Archives have given us of 40 years of Marx's Marxism and 40 years of Marxist-Humanism?

As we turn directly now to the work in the months ahead, let's concentrate on three of those activities: the new classes in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, the Latin American pamphlet just off the press, and the work to both study our Archives and spread them far and wide to libraries in the U.S.A. and around the world.

III The Classes, the Latin American Pamphlet and the Archives: Three Points on Organizational Responsibility for Marxist-Humanist Ideas

When, in the book, what was then the concluding chapter was titled "The Philosopher of Permanent Revolution Creates New Ground for Organization," what was posed, in part, was the relationship between the totally new presentation of Marx's philosophy as 40 years of the working out of permanent revolution, and our own responsibility for Marxist-Humanist ideas. That permanent revolution is not alone in activity, but in thought -- and in both at the same time -- is

what leaps out at you from both the new Archives Guide and the process of the writing of the book. We saw how the revolution in thought that created Part Three on Marx demanded a responsibility to follow out, very concretely, all the ramifications of Part Three with the writing of Part Two on Women's Liberation, and the extensive reworking of Part One on Luxemburg. Yet consider that when Raya presented the book to the REB on March 16 as "a totality," she only read us notes for what she called a still unfinished "last page." After the experience with the tour, and on the eve of this Plenum, organizational responsibility for ideas and permanent revolution in thought as well as action, demonstrated their inseparability with the transformation of that "last page" into the concluding chapter we were able to hear a part of yesterday.

In this light it is clear that the classes, the bilingual pamphlet, the Archives, are not organizational tasks which we fulfill out of any sense of "loyalty." Rather, organizational responsibility for ideas centers on carrying through those revolutionary ideas wherever the "self-determination of the idea" leads. For the classes in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, doesn't the self-determination of the idea mean that we put an end to thinking that there can be an internal self-development -- a studying -- of the book, that is not at the same time a projection to others who are not yet Marxist-Humanists, but who are engaged along with us in the struggle for freedom?

That is why all our activities need to be intensified in the months ahead -- in the Women's Liberation Movement and in the shops, in the anti-war movement and in the Black struggle. For it is within the mass movements for freedom that a central part of our battle of ideas will be waged. In the immediate future we have the opportunity to present what we will be studying in the classes to everything from Feminists Against Militarism conference to the AFL-CIO March on Washington, and from the North American Labor History meeting to the marches now being scheduled against the neutron bomb and the MX missile. Within all of these events there are audiences for the book.

There is another way that the ideas expressed in the book help us see why the classes scheduled for this fall are a totally new type. It expresses itself in the way we are posing that one experienced person from each local be responsible for the first lecture, the last lecture and the presentation of the book as the totality the author had in mind.

It isn't that the rest of the participants have no role to play. It is exactly opposite. What organizational responsibility for ideas means for us in these classes is never letting go the need to finally create a philosophic cadre -- an organization in which each member truly feels himself or herself responsible for the presentation of our unique contribution in such a concrete way that every current event, every new struggle, is not separated from the fullness of what Raya has put forward in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

Nowhere is that more true than with our new pamphlet on Latin America's Revolutions. Yes, it couldn't have happened without the very new and exciting period of revolutionary upheaval now in Central America, and we have a very fine contribution from an El Salvadoran freedom fighter to the pamphlet. But the only way that we will see the implications for revolution in the U.S.A. is to realize what unique contributions we have made theoretically to the Latin American

revolutions, even though the Trotskyists, Maoists, and Stalinists all have organizations there and we don't. Look at what we have done in this pamphlet and why we are including it in the classes on the book:

(1) Where before we were the first to single out the movement from practice as it emerged first in East Europe in 1953-56, and declared that it had inaugurated a new age, now we have seen within the Bolivian Revolution of 1952, and its repercussions throughout Latin America, that the movement from practice that is itself a form of theory had its origins deep in the Third World, in a country that is branded as the most backward -- Bolivia.

(2) The Trotskyists, following their Transitional Program of the Fourth International, managed to call for a "workers and farmers" government, despite Trotsky's position on the peasantry. But when the peasantry did rise up as a mass mobilization, the Trotskyists failed totally to recognize what that new subject represented. The truth is that we are the only ones who, at one and the same time, reconnected with Marx's concept of the peasantry as revolutionary force, and pointed to the way Latin America has seen in our age proletarian and peasant together, in a very different form than Lenin was able to when he had to pose it as the need for the German Revolution to join the Russian.

(3) The totality of Latin America, North and South, and as within the United States, is what we are focusing on, even though today it is Central America that is the center of the action. For us in the United States, the "Latin question is no longer, if it ever was, south of us."

There is no way to divide the sales and discussions on the pamphlet from the way we will be studying it in the context of the book, or to separate either from the trip Anne will be taking this fall directly to our friends in Latin America, including those who are now at work translating Raya's writings on women's liberation into Spanish.

At the same time that we will be participating in the classes on the book and working with the Latin American pamphlet, a crucial task for all the locals will be that of spreading the Marxist-Humanist Archives to libraries and interested friends in each area of the U.S. as well as around the world. Eugene will be taking up those Archives next. But here what is needed is to note that although Wayne State University's mailing of their press release on the new microfilm edition of the Archives last month to 400 libraries and individuals was a beginning, our work first now begins. When we return home from the Plenum we will be engaged in writing to and visiting intellectuals and activist friends who can help convince libraries in their area to purchase the microfilm.

Such a campaign leads us right back to the book, the classes, and the Latin American pamphlet, because there is no way to present 40 years of Marxist-Humanism without being able to directly project our unique contribution, and projecting it concretely in a way that considers the interests of the particular person you are approaching.

Thus, the study of the archives by each of us individually will help us in the study of the book, as it illuminates the way we have followed organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanist ideas 1941-1981. Our whole history in

digging out Marx's Humanism from under the debris piled by a century of those calling themselves Marxists was simultaneously a deepening of those moments in Marx's work that his age could not fully make explicit, and which are urgently needed in our own period.

The history and present of Marxist-Humanism is a struggle to concretize, in each area of our work, philosophy and organization as action. If, in the year ahead, we are able to express that in all our activity, organization and growth will not be left as a task that remains to be done. We would like to invite all who are here today, and who have not yet taken organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanist ideas to do so now, by joining with us in News and Letters Committee.

Report on News & Letters/Archives by Eugene Walker:
OUR NEWSPAPER AND OUR MARXIST-HUMANIST ARCHIVES

I Introduction: Three 1981 Marxist-Humanist Publications and 25 Years of Marxist-Humanism

We have all created in this past year new forms to express ourselves. By all I am speaking not only of the U.S. Marxist-Humanists who have had in News & Letters an expanded 12-page newspaper for an entire year, but I as well mean Middle East activists who launched a new newspaper and the British comrades who began the paper Marxist-Humanism.

Both separately and together these three expressions of Marxist-Humanism show the worldwide character of the freedom movement, and Marxist-Humanism's impact upon it, as act and as idea.

What a magnificent anticipation of the July days in Great Britain was the May/June issue of Marxist-Humanism with its section entitled "British Civilization on Trial." As well they had their own "Introducing Marxist-Humanism" section complete with the announcement of Oiga's tour, and articles on such topics as Fanon and the lead on "Recession ... And Resistance" in Great Britain.

The launching of a paper by Middle Eastern friends is truly a historic event. Already the response -- from reprinting of their articles to the dozens upon dozens of responses from across the country and internationally, and the responses from within the Middle East show the tremendous interest and solidarity of ideas.

And our 12-page expanded News & Letters has broken some very new ground as well, ground which I will return to in some detail in the third section of this report.

The newness of the 12-page N&L, the British Marxist-Humanism, the Middle East paper, are tied to all the objective events -- of Great Britain, of the United States, indeed world wide. At the same time, what made these three publications possible, what allowed us as international Marxist-Humanists to have all these contributions on the high theoretical/practical level that they are on, has been the first 25 years of News & Letters newspaper, of News and Letters Committees, of the revolutionary-philosophic heritage of Marxist-Humanism as the continuation of Marx's Humanism.

Where, if not from the form worked out within those pages of N&L, from 1955 on, did the Middle East newspaper put forth the concept that all the forces within the Middle East must speak for themselves? This took place even if of necessity from exile or by long distance communication. I do not mean that it was done mechanically. The Middle Easterners -- youth, women, workers, minorities -- speak with a distinctively Middle Eastern, not American, voice, even when American revolutionary thinkers have a contribution to make. Our contribution is in the universality of freedom ideas, in helping to point out developments within the revolutionary process, not in the exact specifics that are to be articulated in the Middle Eastern movement, which only they can work out.

Where, if not from the long labor of News and Letters Committees on the Black question's crucial relation to American Civilization, did the British

Marxist-Humanists not import, but recreate British Civilization on Trial in the particular of the dimension of color in Great Britain? Here, it was also Raya's contribution on racialism in Great Britain, written in 1968, which was of great aid to the British comrades as they formulated their perspectives.

Where did the new essay-type articles in the 12-pager emerge out of, if not from the methodology practiced by the National Chairwoman's writing "Two Worlds" columns within the pages of NLU for a quarter of a century?

This form of presentation, of analysis, of projection, the way of working organizationally and theoretically, is the heritage that we have both striven to grasp from Marx and have created anew throughout our 25 years of existence.

Thus, within the revolutionary context we have been practicing this past year, in the new forms that have been created specifically in Marxist-Humanist revolutionary journalism within the context of three different countries, on three different continents, can we not see that all of us, when we stand on the new ground of 1981-82, do so with the specific revolutionary experience in action and in thought of Marxist-Humanism, over the past quarter of a century, and more. It is Marxist-Humanism not as prescription, dictum, party program. But it is Marxist-Humanism with the concrete specificity of particular political practices, theoretical analyses, organization forms and a philosophic foundation. Let us consider this in more detail by looking at our Marxist-Humanist Archives.

II. The Marxist-Humanist Archives

The Hitler-Stalin Pact and the outbreak of World War II began the Marxist-Humanist Archives. That may sound like a rather strange beginning, but the Archives will become ongoing to us when we grasp their deep objective nature, their link to specific historic moments. For example, when we presented Dunayevskaya on Capital from the Marxist-Humanist Archives to the Resident Editorial Board, Raya wanted to make sure that the title should not be left at singling out the works on Capital, but show a relationship to the specific periods documents were written in. Thus the title became "Dunayevskaya on Capital from the Marxist-Humanist Archives; its relationship to specific historic periods: that is to say, the objective situation both then and now."

Let us take three contributions on Capital from the Archives and ask what was their relationship to specific historic periods:

(1) From 1941-1943, two documents: "Russia is a State-Capitalist Society" and "The Nature of the Russian Economy." Today we are perhaps familiar with, at most to the point of taking for granted, the nature of the Russian economy. But forty years ago, after the shock of the Hitler-Stalin Pact; and then the Communists and official Trotskyists defending Russian in the War, to painstakingly work out the economic categories of Russian society as capitalistic, to proceed to present these within the Trotskyist movement and even among the academic-bourgeois world -- both of whom were eager to make an amalgam between Marxism and Russia -- to do this was an opening on very, very new ground. And because that opening was so tightly tied to Marx's own work Capital, and to the first work with Marx's Humanism in the form of the essay "Labor and Society," it became a pathway toward the development of what we now call Marxist-Humanism. At this stage it was only an opening as in these first documents the primary task of the

Tendency was battling to put forth an analysis of the new objective stage that had been reached -- state-capitalism.

(2) The next contribution on Capital I want to take up jumps to 1967 and is quite a different one. Here in the document "State-Capitalism and Marx's Humanism or Philosophy and Revolution" the task was not to prove state-capitalism as the stage of the Russian economy. Indeed, it was written as a contribution to a discussion with a Japanese comrade who had already independently arrived at a state-capitalist analysis of Russia. State-capitalism as such was not the issue. What was being asked was: Is a state-capitalist analysis sufficient, or was something more needed? By 1967 China was now not only claiming to be Marxist but had begun challenging Russia, calling Russia state-capitalist, and proclaiming its own pathway.

Our posing of the alternative, Marx's Humanism, was what was compelled by the objective-subjective situation of the 1950s and '60s. As a Tendency we had done this comprehensively in Marxism and Freedom in 1957. Here, for 1967, we want to see how state-capitalism and Marxist-Humanism was raised and developed in a period where others were also breaking with Russia, some even doing so on the basis of state-capitalism; but what we want to see is how our contribution on state-capitalism meant posing that these breaks could not develop into a new stage within the Marxist movement unless they posed the Humanism of Marx.

(3) 1976-1978. Here the contributions were the Political-Philosophic Letter on "Today's Global Crisis, Marx's Capital and the Marxist Epigones Who Try to Truncate It and the Understanding of Today's Crisis" as well as the full pamphlet Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis. Something new happened in 1973-74 with the Arab-Israeli War, the oil boycott, and the subsequent quadrupling of oil prices.

And yet in the period shortly after the boycott and quadrupling of oil prices many economists of the Left, the most well known being Ernest Mandel, misinterpreted the world recession, seeing it not as a global shift in politics related to deep changes in capitalism's economic structure, but as only a temporary setback to bourgeois economic growth. The point was not alone their misinterpretation, but that the ground for such misinterpretation went hand-in-hand with their truncating of Marx's greatest work Capital. Thus the contribution of Marxist-Humanism here both provided a cohesive analysis of the direction of the world economy, one that has set us on a firm footing as we now look at the attempts of American capitalism to restructure its economy, and was a way of entering the battle of ideas with those who claim to be Marxist theorists today.

This singling out of the Marxist-Humanist work on Capital is to provide one way in which we can enter the Marxist-Humanist Archives.

When we enter the Archives we do so not for history but for today. We do so in the way that Raya enters Marx's Archives. Her final chapter of the new book, as we heard yesterday, is entitled "The Last Writings of Marx Point a Trail to the 1980s." One overriding contribution that emerges from that chapter, from all chapters of Part Three, "Karl Marx -- From a Critic of Hegel to Author of Capital and Theorist of Permanent Revolution," and indeed from the entire book is how at each moment after Marx's death, the post-Marx Marxists did not see Marx pointing a trail to their period in the same manner we do today. That may sound

fantastic to say, since how more profound a grappling with Marxism has there ever been than Lenin's confrontation with the Hegelian-Marxian dialectic? And how much greater a contribution can one leave than all of Engels' labor on Volumes II and III of Capital? And what greater a Marxist revolutionary activist was there than Luxemburg? So in no sense are we saying that they did not see Marx as pointing out direction.

But what our age realizes that no other age has come face-to-face with in quite the same way, is how comprehensive, how profoundly revolutionary for each succeeding age, was Marx's vision. Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution traces how even the greatest revolutionaries -- Engels, Lenin, Luxemburg, Trotsky -- had their own selectivity, even if unconsciously so, of Marx's work.

The concept of Marx's "new continent of thought" was posed in Philosophy and Revolution in 1973. In Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution the concreteness of that continent of thought is worked out in new ways -- especially in the last writings of Marx. Those "New Moments of the Revolutionary-Philosophic-Historic Concepts Discovered by Marx" are by no accident being rediscovered by Marxist-Humanism as we enter the 1980s. We do so not only because of availability of Marx's works; many works including Capital have been available for 100 and more years. Our rediscovery is not done as history, as scholarship. It is very much a question of today, our problems, our own labors to recreate revolutionary dialectic for this age. The return to Marx's Archives is unseparated from our extension of Marxism into our age. And it is these new developments in the book just completed which illuminate this for us.

When the National Chairwoman was on tour and she developed the talk on 40 Years of Marx's Humanism and 40 Years of Marxist-Humanism, it was not for any reasons of easy comparisons and superficial links. Rather it was a digging for historic parallels as methodology, as way of helping us to appreciate our own labors in developing what we now know as Marxist-Humanism, of seeing that the digging back into Marx was intertwined with the 40 years of our own development.

In the period between 1843-44 and 1850, a period we have had the opportunity to study and contribute much original research to, Marx breaks from bourgeois society as well as from his contemporaries among the Young Hegelians, challenges classical political economy, begins the working out of his new world view -- a unity of Hegelian philosophy and proletarian revolution -- in the Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, issues the Manifesto, participates in the daily activity of revolution, and lays forth the ground of Permanent Revolution in his address to the Communist League. The strands of what we know as Marx's Marxism, his world-philosophic-historic tendency, were certainly laid down in this seven-year period.

Within the Marxist-Humanist Archives, Volume Three, there is recorded the work of the remarkable years 1949-1955. This Volume is crucial for seeing the growth and development of what would become Marxism and Freedom, and at the same time the steps to create a full Marxist-Humanist Tendency, News and Letters Committees. Let us look at these years: "From the Miners' General Strike to the East German Revolt; From the Appearance of Differences in the Johnson-Forest Tendency to the Historic Re-emergence of Marx's Humanism."

What the Archives here present is first, what had emerged with the objective

world: on the one hand, a new stage of production, Automation, together with a new stage of revolt; the workers' response, particularly in the mines; on the other hand, the death of Stalin and the response in East Europe, the East German Revolt. Second, within the Archives is shown the movement of a revolutionary theoretician whose impulse to work out revolutionary theory for our age comes, at one and the same time, from the new objective world stage of capitalist production with its crises, from their opposite, the new human stage of revolt East and West, and from a digging deeply into the revolutionary dialectic of Marx, of Lenin, and finally of Hegel.

Let us follow the Archives at this stage in more detail. In the Miners' General Strike of 1949-50, Dunayevskaya participates and writes articles for the radical press. She also writes directly to a miner in the strike. At the same time she finds and begins translating Lenin's "Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic" and initiates a philosophic correspondence on it with the co-founder of the Tendency C.L.R. James and a leader who was philosopher of the Tendency, Grace Lee (Boggs).

The texts of Dunayevskaya's letters to James and Lee are remarkably rich with ideas on the structure of Marx's Capital and on Lenin's philosophic breakthrough. Many of these will find their way into the pages of Marxism and Freedom. This correspondence was supposed to be part of the work on a book on Marxism that the three leaders of the Tendency were jointly writing. In fact, the Archives contains two book drafts written by Dunayevskaya. As early as 1947 she had completed an 80-page outline entitled "State-Capitalism and Marxism."

But the book as Dunayevskaya is working on it in this period is transformed in her mind by two new vantage points, the role of the American proletariat, as seen by the Miners' General Strike, and Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks that she had translated and begun commenting on. She holds a discussion on this new concept of the book with the other two leaders of the State-Capitalist Tendency, and invites a worker, J. Zupan, to participate in the discussion.

The conception of the book has an analysis of state-capitalism based on Marx's Capital, the philosophic ground of Marx's Humanist vision as well as its American roots, Lenin's new philosophic vantage point from which he viewed the crisis of capitalism and prepared himself for revolution, and the self-activity of the American working class in their battle against a new stage of production.

The next pillar for what would become Marxism and Freedom comes in 1953 with Dunayevskaya's own confrontation with Hegel's dialectic. Her original "Letters on Hegel's Absolute Idea," of May 12 and 20, which form the decisive philosophic point of departure for our age, are presented in the Archives. It is here where the concept of a movement from practice towards theory which is itself a form of theory within Hegel's Absolute is first presented, what Dunayevskaya considers the "new beginnings" of Hegel's Absolutes. Six weeks later the East German Revolt as a movement from practice to theory in life occurs.

It is this period of 1949-1953 that will in turn bring forth in 1955 a spirit in the State-Capitalist Tendency, and the birth of a full Marxist-Humanist Tendency as the organization News and Letters Committees, as the newspaper News & Letters and in book form in Marxism and Freedom, published in 1958.

When we draw the strings of those seven years, 1949-55, together -- practical revolutionary activity in America, especially with the miners, working out

the philosophic heritage left to us from Marx and from Lenin, finding the revolutionary philosophic point of departure for our age -- we see how this brings you to be able to establish simultaneously a new form of organization, News and Letters Committees, a new kind of newspaper, News & Letters, and to the final labor for establishing the philosophic-theoretic ground for our age with Marxism and Freedom. Can we not here see that Archives are not Archives, that the reach back is intimately intertwined with the way ahead? Yes, 40 Years of Marx's Humanism and 40 Years of Marxist-Humanism, but crucially for us will be the extension of Marx's own Archives and Marxist-Humanism's Archives into the 1980s by our own revolutionary labors.

Marx's Archives and Marxist-Humanism's Archives are to our age, in Dunayevskaya's words, "a trail to the 1980s," and it is our labor in further hewing out that trail that becomes our task in the period ahead.

I want to stop here for a moment to make the following points on the Archives: The Guide is a very beautiful document, but the Guide is not the documents that make up the microfilm. It cannot speak for those documents and it only begins to speak to them. First, the Archives Guide did not spring out totally new; it was built upon the first Guide issued in 1969. Second, the greatest difficulty we as an Archives Committee had was in learning to let the documents speak for themselves. We learned in the process of creating the Guide the historic objectivity of these Archives which stand on their own without the burden of popularization. Third, no interpretation of any volume or section by any of us can substitute for a Marxist-humanist's own quiet, serious, individual study of those documents, those periods that she or he feels impinge upon the political-economic-philosophic problems faced today.

III: The Marxist-Humanist Years 1980-81 and 1981-82 -- An Ongoing Relationship With Marxist-Humanism as Worked Out in Our Newspaper

Let us briefly review the past Marxist-Humanist year through the pages of News & Letters. Two of the most exciting contributions to the paper this year were not exactly by new writers -- John Marcotte and Kevin Barry -- but they were writers with new responsibilities. As columnist of "On the Line" and co-columnist of "Our Life and Times" they added quite significant dimensions to our paper. Mike has already spoken of John Marcotte's rootedness in the shop which has meant a different kind of proletarian stamp than we have previously had on a regular basis on the labor page. It is one of small shops, close to minimum wage workers, primarily Latino and Black workers. The Latino dimension in that shop covers almost the length and breadth of Latin America. And with Felix Martin back at GR we as well have a dimension of auto that we need very much.

If Marcotte is anchored in the plant, Kevin Barry has been rooted in a world view that is reflected in the expanded "Our Life and Times" column. His serious reading from the world press has meant many fine contributions to the page.

In fact, the international contributions to the paper have been important on many levels. The leads and articles from our own trips -- to England and France, to Germany, to Poland -- have played an important role. The Iran-Iraq discussion article and that on the Middle East of Begin's bombs and Khomeini's counter-revolution in "Our Life and Times," the Essay Article on dissidents in

China, the Theory/Practice column on the Gang of Four Trial charade, the Editorial on Europe's Black Dimension: these are some of the ways that we contributed our Marxist-Humanist vision to international questions, in addition to the sweep of last Convention's Perspectives Report excerpts and this year's Draft Perspectives within the pages of News & Letters.

The international contributors to the paper have been very important to us. First has been a full Essay Article on the Italian Left by a Milan observer who is not organizationally connected to News and Letters Committees. To this we can add such contributions as the two articles from the Iranian revolution, one by a Kurd and the other by a Tehran worker; that appeared in the June issue; the South African Schools Boycott article from a Black Consciousness member in December; the report on the Kwangju uprising in November; the interview with El Salvadoran trade unionists in April; the appeals from Tatyana Mamonova in January-February; and the Brixton rebellion in May.

From these international contributions from the outside let us move to those here at home, first also from the outside. There were articles such as the excerpts from Crystal Lee Sutton, from the woman coal miner on strike, and the moving report from the woman in the Navy who I am happy to say is alive and sane and with us here today. We obtained an in-person participant report from the Sydenham hospital occupation; we interviewed Gloria Jordan in Mississippi about the Sanderson Farms strike; we received a report of labor organizing in Gulfport, Florida, and one from on-the-job in a Seattle post office. On the Youth page we published a Detroit Black high school student's report on a racial survey of students and a Los Angeles high school student's review of the movie "Fame." All of these were from the outside.

And we as News and Letters Committees members participated with those outside forces across the nation, and this was reflected in the way we as Marxist-Humanists wrote of the stories in the pages of our paper: reports from the coal fields, from the Vietnam Veterans encampment in Los Angeles; with demonstrations on the Atlanta killings in Washington, New York and Los Angeles; and from various El Salvador demonstrations of high school students and of Latin Americans throughout the country.

And we as Marxist-Humanists contributed in the pages of NAL revolutionary ground upon which to build. Primary among our contributions was the printing of "25 Years of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S." and the Draft Perspectives Thesis. The Essay Articles, especially on Latin America, provided new points of departure for discussion, and a core for the new pamphlet on Latin America's Revolutions we have just issued. As well have been significant columns such as Terry's on the Women's Liberation page on "Women as revolutionaries -- in history and today" and Jim's on the Youth page on "Free speech and the freedom movement," and the reviews on Black women writers in America and in South Africa.

And we should not forget that the outside on a national and an international level seeks out a relationship with us. Can it be any accident that we can simultaneously print the cover of the German edition of Philosophy and Revolution at the same time that we reprint a review of the English edition written this year -- seven years after the book first appeared -- from the Journal of Chinese Philosophy? Or that we can create a "World View of Indignant Heart" in Great Britain, in America, in Germany, because that is what there really is? Or that the article on "Middle East Women: Liberation and Social Revolution"

is picked up and reprinted by one of the major women's liberation publications in the U.S.; by a women's liberation publication in Japan -- and we have received the request for it to be reprinted in still another American feminist paper?

And yet, and yet, and yet: and yet the unity of outside and inside, of our readers and ourselves, or writers who are not yet Marxist-Humanists and ourselves, has not begun to be achieved in the way it should. I am here not talking about masses upon masses from the outside. That only occurs in the most revolutionary of times. But I am talking about a start toward that type of unity which we can do right now -- of finding and working with the not-as-yet Marxist-Humanists who are readers, potential writers, writers: those who are ready to work with us or who are ready to seriously consider working with and joining a Marxist-Humanist organization.

How can our organization's newspaper, this Marxist-Humanist manifestation that appears ten times a year, become part of the process to bring about such a unity of inside and outside?

Organizational responsibilities for Marxist-Humanist ideas can find no more concrete expression than how we work with this organization's newspaper. And yet it is precisely here where we have to confront types of dualities in our practice. These dualities are by no means genuine opposites; rather, the task we face is how to break down a false opposition which has at times arisen in our practice, in our projection of Marxist-Humanist ideas. Here I want to talk first about the creation of Essay Articles and their relation to Readers' Views.

Let us jam together these two seeming opposites, Readers' Views and Essay Articles. The Essays are the newest development within the paper, while Readers' Views has been central to N&L since our founding. As idea they seem on very different ground. The Essay is supposed to be a researched piece either on a contemporary subject -- dissidents in China, today's feminist thinkers -- or on an historical topic -- the peasant dimension in the Bolivian Revolution of 1952, Marx's 1875 French edition of Capital.

The Essay moves from appearance, the phenomena we observe such as that of peasant activity in Latin American revolutions; to the essence, that the peasant on the land is both in subsistence and capitalist agriculture, that he/she asserts Indian culture as alternative to white society, that as well he may be proletariat, especially in the mines; and finally to the universal, the notion, that the categories of worker, peasant, of Indian, of city and countryside, of woman and man, are both preserved and are transcended when all are viewed in relation to subjects of revolution, self-developing human beings transforming the world they live in, root and branch. The Marxist-Humanist writer of whatever Essay has a challenging task of putting together appearance, essence, universality.

As idea Readers' Views seems far from that. It is a very short statement, often spontaneous, so to speak. A commentary on a contemporary event, or an article in a recent issue of N&L. We could often regard it on the level of phenomena, or appearance. But when it is viewed as within a section called Readers' Views, there emerge other crucial developments. First the form is no longer only phenomena. When certain Readers' Views are jammed together, as clashes, as a breadth of commentaries on a particular subject, then we have moved to essence, to a generalization about something. And finally when the totality of Readers' Views puts together national and international, emerging subjects of revolution

as categories, and in addition creates that most difficult of categories, philosophy and revolution, within the Readers' Views, you move to universality.

Again, the Marxist-Humanist person responsible for making up that section has a tremendous task. But, and here is the rub, it isn't and can't be the sole responsibility of the person organizing that section to create that three-fold form of Appearance, Essence, Universal on the Readers' Views page. It is impossible to do that without Marxist-Humanist organizers around the country taking organizational responsibility to create such a section.

As freedom idea, the Essay Articles and the Readers' Views are not dualities, even if their appearance is different. As essence and as a Marxist-Humanist universality there is a unity of the two. But the unity can only come forth if we do not practice a duality of Essay Article and Readers' Views as act. Here is what I mean.

When I said Readers' Views were not the sole responsibility of the person assigned to lay out that page I meant it in the sense that Readers' Views is a pulse of the organizational work of this organization in a unique way. Specifically it is a test of how we acted with the Essay Articles, or with the paper as a whole once it was off the press.

It is true that the Essay Articles did at times generate discussion with the outside. This was especially true when Reagan was making El Salvador the battle ground and we had two Essay Articles on Latin America followed by Raya's Theory/Practice column. But the Essay Articles are not only to be discussed with a current events urgency. For instance, the next issue will carry an essay on the 1875 French edition of Capital. This is unlikely to be in October's daily headlines. And yet the relationship between Essay Articles and Readers' Views is just as crucial here -- not to "have something" in the paper about this or that article, but as a reflection of what type of relationships we are able to establish with the outside, with our readers, with projection of our ideas, with moving toward the type of organizational growth we need, one based on an encounter with a full expression of Marxist-Humanist ideas.

The Essay Articles were certainly intended to develop Marxist-Humanist theoreticians. Unseparated from this, they were intended to help develop new relations with readers to make them Marxist-Humanist participants. Readers' Views become one measure of how well we have seen the idea and act of the Essay Article become a concrete projection to Marxist-Humanists-to-be. It is one way for us to think about what we mean when we say there must be an ongoing relationship between Marxist-Humanists and our organizational newspaper, News & Letters.

Finally I want to take up another aspect of our relation between ourselves and our newspaper which we need to work out -- that between the expanded 12-page paper and an ongoing subscription drive. The 12-page N&L with its special features, with its expanded coverage of labor, Blacks, Women, Youth, has not as yet meant an expansion in our readers' ongoing month in and month out relationship with Marxist-Humanism that could come from a serious increase in subscriptions. It is not so much a question of a one month to two month long sub. drive as it is a question of a subscription consciousness. A consciousness that such a relationship of subscriber-reader would mean a pathway to closer organizational relations.

Last year we began a contact with Ann Arbor that began both a study group

and a lecture for Raya. This year we hope to expand that contact. But the initial point of departure for our work was the fact that there was a group of subscribers in Ann Arbor, ones whom we could write to, could call, could visit. That is to be sure just an opening, but without that opening there cannot be the chance for the type of new beginnings we wish to make in all the locals.

News & Letters is our organizational newspaper. Its creation as writing, as technical and philosophic make-up, as finances, as well as its distribution as subscriptions, distributions, conversations, as new human relations with Marxist-Humanists in the process of becoming, is within what we mean by concretizing Marxist-Humanist ideas.

Discussion on News & Letters by Charles Denby, Editor

The unique form of the Marxist-Humanist paper called News & Letters is important not just for us, but for how it has helped new Marxist-Humanist papers start this year, for England and for Iran.

I would like to tell you about how the first part of Indignant Heart was written, and the different way the second part was done, because it will help to show what I mean. I dictated the first part back in 1952 and it was a very different thing than what happened after my ideas developed and I was able to write for myself, once I became a columnist and an Editor of our paper.

What I mean is that when I was dictating to somebody else, I was limited to just telling my own life story -- and it was as though my story didn't include any development of my thinking. The result was that the only political chapter that took up other political tendencies was the one about the SWP. But this experience did give me confidence in my own thoughts and experience.

After I became the Editor of News & Letters, we decided that we should produce a pamphlet about how Workers Battle Automation. The first thing I did was to meet with other workers, as a collectivity. They told their stories -- and they also told their thoughts. We got stories from the auto shops, and we also got stories from other workers -- steel workers, miners, rubber workers. We even got a story from a youth who wasn't working in any shop, but wanted to talk about not feeling free, and about how you shouldn't have to wait until you are 18 to be considered a human being. We also brought into our collectivity our doctor, who was writing the MD column, and who contributed a section for the pamphlet about what the monster of Automation was doing to workers' health and lives.

The main thing to me about how we wrote Workers Battle Automation was that we always emphasized that WORKERS THINK THEIR OWN THOUGHTS.

I want to say something here also about Readers' Views. We have always considered that section a very important part of our kind of paper, because it didn't mean people had to actually mail a letter to us. We have always tried to bring into that section what workers told us on their jobs, and on the streets with their friends, so that you didn't have to be a member or even a subscriber to identify with News & Letters.

All of this had a lot to do with why Part II of Indignant Heart is so different from Part I. Because in Part I, I was not drawing any Marxist-Humanist conclusions. But in Part II, which is based so much on what I had recorded in my Worker's Journal columns, I was not limited to telling my own stories, but was able to take up everything that was happening in the whole world. I was able to include everything from book reviews, like the one on Marquart, to debates with the UAW bureaucrats on Capital, to discussions about Steve Biko and American Black Thought, and even one column I am very proud of, where I took up women, and the question of sexual harassment.

All of this is what is involved in the question of form of our paper, as something that no other paper anywhere in the world has -- except those that have appeared this year which are built on these principles we have established

over our 26-year history.

* * *

News & Letters is very important. I just mentioned Readers' Views. What I was trying to say was that I have been reading the paper very carefully lately, and I notice that most of the Readers' Views have been written by our own people. This is not the way we always got Readers' Views; we got them from what people said on the outside, on the streets, and put what they said in our paper.

It's all right to print some of what people in the organization say in Readers' Views, but to keep the paper the way we established it, we have to have most of them from the outside. I hope that we can get that across in the future: that we want the paper not only for our thoughts, but as something that can add both inside and outside and make the paper more concrete.

* * *