

July, 1982

Draft Perspectives, 1982-1983

A Philosophy of Revolution Needed: Mass Opposition to Reaganomics and the Drive for Nuclear War

... our epoch is a birth-time and a period of transition.
— Hegel, Phenomenology

... Alias: Cognition not only reflects the world, but creates it.
— Lenin, Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic

I. The Secret Pentagon Document on Nuclear War and the Mass Global Anti-Nuclear Movement

The dramatically new phenomena in the greatest-ever political demonstration in the U.S., when no less than three-quarters of a million anti-nuclear demonstrators marched in New York on June 12, manifested not only the massiveness of the outpouring, not only the varied composition of the marchers, and not only its internationalism and solidarity with the hundreds of thousands of freedom marchers throughout Europe in opposition to Reagan's nuclear stance, but, above all the depth of their opposition to the totality of Reaganism — economics as well as militarization, racism as well as foreign policy, sexism as well as the renewed drive to draft the youth. Thus:

1) "Make jobs, not war" was the slogan of many in the middle class as well as of factory workers.

2) The opposition to Reagan-racism was evident everywhere. In San Francisco a group of U.S. and Haitian Blacks marched together under their own banner. Moreover, the Black dimension has been integral to anti-war demonstrations ever since the Vietnam War. They have just concluded the long march from Alabama to Washington, D.C.

3) The women not only participated in the protest at the UN but followed that through in other cities and in singling out their solidarity with those women who went on a Hunger Strike for the ERA and chained themselves before the Illinois legislature to denounce Reagan's move backward not only on nuclear questions but on all questions concerning women.

4) The youth, who have always been the most active and resolute in their opposition to the Establishment — whether in the anti-Vietnam War movement or the Mississippi Freedom Schools or the Free Speech Movement, all coalescing in the turbulent 1960s to the point of near revolution —

were presently displaying the totality of their opposition both as war resisters and draft resisters.

5) Finally, the anti-nuclear marchers made it clear that they were against both the U.S. and the Russian drive to war. Indeed, the demonstration was held not only before the so-called disarmament conference at the whole UN, but was continued at the embassies of all the nuclear powers: Russian as well as U.S., British as well as Chinese, French as well as Israeli and South African.

Notwithstanding this massive, varied, vocal and militant outpouring of opposition to the drive for nuclear war, the Cold War warrior Reagan — who just a few days earlier had been forced by a quarter of a million anti-nuclear protesters in Germany to hypocritically declare, "I would march at your head if . . ." — had actually underwritten the Pentagon's fantastic, secret 125-page document that did nothing short of projecting a strategy for the next five years. Actually what they are doing is preparing for a prolonged five-year nuclear war!

What is needed, therefore, is to look at this actual preparation for nuclear war, articulated secretly, but leaked to a few chosen representatives of the press. (See front page article by Richard Halloran in *The New York Times*, May 30, "Pentagon Draws Up First Strategy for Fighting a Long Nuclear War"; see also *Time*, June 14.)

The secret Pentagon strategy discloses what the U.S. military brass is conniving to unleash. Not only do they think a "tactical war" is "winnable" (sic!), but totally unchained is their concept of the prolonged war they are preparing for. Just read the Pentagon gobbledygook for yourselves: "The U.S. nuclear capabilities must prevail even under the conditions of a prolonged war." Nor does the pro-

longed war put an end to the utterly insane "counterforce" missile-rattling. It speeds to the conclusion: "The U.S. must never emerge from a nuclear war without nuclear weapons."

Totally dismissed was the report of an independent two-year study by a high-level commission on disarmament headed by the former Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, and including former U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, former British Foreign Secretary David Owen, Tanzanian Foreign Minister Salim Salim, and Soviet Central Committee Member Georgi Arbatov. The study assailed the thought that anything less than assured destruction of much of the world would result from any nuclear confrontation.

The massive demonstrations against nuclear weapons clearly reveal that all the hallowed words of "arms reduction" are fooling no one, any more than does the equally hypocritical Russian declaration not to be the first to use the bomb.

With a nuclear Damocles' sword hanging over civilization's very survival, it becomes imperative for the opposition to nuclear war to grapple creatively with the vision of what a totally new society of truly human relations would be. Toward this end, the 1982-83 Thesis will demonstrate that the hieroglyphic "3 books, not 1" — far from being a bookish expression that this is the 25th year since the publication of *Marxism and Freedom*, the 10th since the publication of *Philosophy and Revolution*, as well as the year of publication of a new work, Rosa Luxemburg, *Women's Liberation*, and Marx's *Philosophy of Revolution* — is, in fact, the summation of 30 years of the movement from practice that is itself a form of theory, and the development in theory toward a new relationship of practice to theory. It is only when the movement from theory is rooted in and meets the challenge of the movement from practice that a new unification of theory and practice can achieve a successful revolution.

The trail to the 1980s, found in the new moments in Marx's thought in the last decade of his life, was this: the need for a "revolution in permanence," one that would continue after power was achieved and thus keep the revolutionary goals from turning into their opposite. It is to that end that both the expression "3 books, not 1" and the Perspectives for 1982-83 are directed. That is the absolute challenge to our age. It becomes necessary to spell this out as we analyze both the mad rulers' "long-range strategy" for nuclear war and the immediate problems of the ever-deepening Recession as well as the ongoing imperialist wars propped up by U.S. imperialism.

(Continued on page 2)

Humanities Press in the U.S. and Harvester Press in Britain are bringing out new editions of Raya Dunayevskaya's *Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution* this month. (See special ad, p. 12.) They will have her newest work off the press by early fall.

ii. The Objective Situation: Reaganomics, Thatcher's Colonialism in the South Atlantic, and Begin's Genocidal War in Lebanon

The reality of Reaganomics now is: 1) 10½ million unemployed — and that counts only those who still receive compensation, not those who have exhausted theirs and given up any hope of getting work; 2) The youth have it hardest of all (and not only students whose tuition costs have risen to unconscionable heights). For Black youth, the unemployment rate is now 60 percent overall in industrial centers, and 85 percent in Detroit; 3) Women, who were among the first to lose their jobs, have retained what jobs they still hold because they get the lowest pay; 4) There is such deep discontent among rank-and-file workers who have been forced by the labor bureaucracy to accept all kinds of concessions and give-backs, that nobody doubts that the winter of discontent, far from being over, is sure to flare up to revolt dimensions.

Lest Reagan has forgotten what economy he is attempting to roll even further back, there is a fundamental difference between an ordinary cyclical crisis and the 1974-75 Recession that not only is still with us but that he is exacerbating. To grasp the difference between ordinary cyclical crises such as occurred in the so-called prosperity period after the war — when all of West Europe and Japan were saved from total collapse by the Marshall Plan of economic aid followed by U.S. multi-nationals dominating the world and the U.S.'s nuclear umbrella — and the period since 1974-75, all one needs to remember is that from 1945 to 1974 the average rate of growth in industrial production was four percent (with the lowest at two percent and highest six to eight percent and with Japan topping it at ten percent). Beginning with 1974-75 and continuing to today, it is less than one percent, with the highest never reaching above two or three percent. Where U.S. state-intervention could in the past assure the monopolists super-profits both at home and abroad, that has reached a dead-end.

So critical are both the deep economic Recession in the U.S. and the disintegrative state of NATO — i.e., Reagan's foreign policy — that any crisis, no matter where, immediately takes front center of the historic stage. Thus, the Falklands/Malvinas conflict, which first gave Reagan the illusion that he could play a "neutral" game between Britain and Argentina, soon became, instead, the total expose of NATO's "Atlanticism" as it revealed one more display of global imperialism with its outreach spelling out its death agony. It is this which is compelling Reagan to place his counter-revolutionary "urgencies" in Latin America on the back burner.

The U.S. rulers never did depart from the Cold War, not only against Russia, but reaching into Africa where, from the very start of the African revolutions, U.S. imperialism was engaged — with the connivance of the UN — in plotting the murder of Lumumba. Just as the so-called "Atlantic" Alliance had long since designated Japan as "the West," and just as the U.S. declared the Persian Gulf to be its "national" interest when the Iranian Revolution burst forth, so now Reagan's retrograde politics are deepening in the U.S. itself against rank-and-file labor, Blacks, youth and women.

The reality of the Vietnam War is that they "lost" Vietnam (which was never theirs), both because Vietnam defeated U.S. imperialism on the battlefield, and because within the U.S. there arose a strong and massive anti-Vietnam War Youth movement, which had been preceded in 1960 by the Black Revolution and was followed by the emergence of the Women's Liberation Movement.

At the same time, the U.S. lost the air of invincibility with their co-capitalist West European rulers. By 1973, the Arab-Israeli War was soon followed by a shocking four-fold increase in the price of oil (which is now 12-fold!). That spelled the end of cheap oil and raw materials on which imperialism had gluttonously enriched itself. By 1974-75, it

all added up to the deepest recession ever since the Depression. This was by no means an ordinary economic cyclical crisis followed by a boom. It was so internal, so structural, so deep in the vitals of the capitalist production system that it spelled out the truth of capitalism in its death agony: there would be no more booms.

The Recession that is now prevalent in the U.S. is by no means limited to this country. It is world-wide. In Great Britain this economic crisis and the massive proletarian opposition to it was definitely moving to throw out the Conservative government when war was declared against Argentina. Argentina embarked on that adventure when the discontent in that country was so great that a General Strike was actually in progress. Thatcher, no doubt, is convinced that the chauvinistic patriotism she aroused has saved her regime, but a deeper look into the whirlwind that war produced will show that, far from solving the economic crisis, it deepened it — and has moved the political crisis from being just a British phenomenon to one that calls into question the structure of NATO and creates the ground for a total shift in the relationship of the entire Latin American continent and the Western powers. This freedom dimension begins where decolonization ended; that is, with the realization that decolonization even after India and even after Suez had not ended imperialism's insatiable hunger to re-establish it in new forms, and that the need therefore was to continue Latin America's struggle not only against Britain but against U.S. imperialism.

Thatcher's military "victory" in the Falklands over the Malvinas, far from assuring that she can transform that outpost into "a fortress" for British imperialism, is sounding the empire's death knell. Although it will be a long time before all the actual costs are known, that war has already cost Britain no less than \$2 billion, not to mention the thousand dead British and Argentine youth. It will be more than those thousand that will haunt her. It will be the millions of living opponents — and not only in Argentina or even the whole of Latin America, but in the entire Third World.

The hatred that the neo-fascistic regime in Argentina had earned for itself from its own people — and, indeed, the whole world — has now been transformed into red-hot hatred for British imperialism with its great delusion of empire-building, which at this very moment has extended itself also to Antarctica. This "victory" is a Pyrrhic one. What it discloses is that imperialism keeps revealing its mailed fist. It must be totally destroyed and uprooted.

Indeed, that is what has been initiated by the victors themselves, who, in the process of achieving victory reached both the beginning of their own end as an empire and the undermining of NATO itself. It is clear now that what the ruling classes initiated in a "simple war" over "sovereignty" of some barren islands, and the passions it aroused in the Latin American masses opposing ever-renewed colonialism, are worlds apart. And that is no mere geographic dimension but one that is measured in freedom aspirations.

The totality of the economic-political crises is now enveloping not only the U.S. and West European imperialism but Russian state-capitalism as it extends its imperialist rule from East Europe to Afghanistan. The counter-revolution

2. With the exception of U.S. imperialism's ambassador to the UN, Jeane Kirkpatrick, who invented a difference between acceptable fascist authoritarians and unacceptable totalitarians, the whole world looked aghast as it realized that the inspiration for such distinctions stemmed from Reagan-Haig trying to win Argentina's support for the genocidal war in El Salvador.

that Russia and its puppet, General Jaruzelski, imposed on the Polish people has not closed that chapter of history. Quite the contrary. The revolt of the Polish masses began a totally new historic stage of rebellion and a new form of practicing truly human relations of mass control over production and politics with the creation of Solidarity. That great movement has, by no means died with the imposition of military rule last December, 13. The mass opposition and its search also for a philosophy of revolution is continuing.³

The crises have taken their most monstrous shape now in Israel's genocidal war still ongoing in Lebanon. The wanton invasion of that land and the barbaric destruction which, in six days, caused the death of over 10,000 people and left hundreds of thousands homeless, seems to show there are no limits to the imperialist aims for a "Biblical" Eretz Israel, Begin-Sharon style. Begin, the terrorist had from the start dreamed of that type of Eretz Israel (Land of Israel) and fought the Jewish leadership, anxious to found a homeland, no matter how small, for Jews after the Holocaust. And Sharon has rejected even Begin's minor attempts at compromise. Look at what these two are reaping now:

Where Israel's declared aim was to drive the PLO from where it could and did engage in terrorist attacks on Israel, Begin-Sharon have shown total disregard for the civilian population, Lebanese as well as Palestinian, and Palestinian whether or not they were PLO. The destructiveness of their military might does not stop them because the destruction of Lebanon is exactly what they are driving for. It is true that, above all, they want to destroy the PLO. It is not true that they do not want "a single inch" of Lebanon's territory. They want the whole of Lebanon under control of a puppet regime, specifically the neo-fascist Phalangist army that the Lebanese masses had fought and were on the verge of defeating in the 1975-76 Civil War.

That Reagan is presently supporting Begin-Sharon's Israel which is now ravaging Lebanon is clear beyond any peradventure of a doubt. The U.S. has gone so far as to invent a myth that there is "no Lebanon," that supposedly so chaotic were conditions in Lebanon that even Israel's genocidal war can pass for "peace." What they think is the end of Lebanon will prove to be the beginning of the end of global imperialism, headed by the U.S. and achieving its most gory form in Israel's wanton ways of trying to destroy Lebanon.

The opposition to Begin's rule within Israel is as yet small, but it is vocal. It has just had a Peace Now rally outside of Begin's office, in which the Citizens Rights Movement participated and which showed the intensity of its opposition. Professor Benjamin Cohen of the University of Tel Aviv wrote of Begin-Sharon's rationale for the genocide in Lebanon: "These Goebbelsean lies enrapture me." (The letter to Pierre Vidal-Naquet, an organizer of the Jewish intellectu-

als who demonstrated in front of the Israeli Embassy in Paris, was printed in *Le Monde*, June 19.)

Israel's present blitzkrieg has a stark resemblance to nothing so much as Hitler's "final solution" for the Jews. Begin should have learned from that Holocaust that you cannot destroy a whole people and their hunger for freedom. What Arafat could not achieve through all these years, Begin has managed to do for him by giving Arafat an expanded acceptance by the majority of Palestinians and by making him a hero.

If anything proves that successful revolution is impossible without a philosophy of revolution it is precisely Lebanon. The 1975-76 Civil War in that land was taking place in the period when, on the one hand, there was the greatest worldwide Recession since the Depression and, on the other hand, new forms of revolution were arising that posed new questions. Didn't, for example, the revolution in Portugal really begin in Africa? The Portuguese Revolution also witnessed a tendency that called for *apartidario* (non-partyism). The entire decade was concluded with the 1979 revolution in Iran that made revolution rather than oil the characteristic aim of the Middle East.

It wasn't, however, the 1970s that had first begun the new age. A whole 30-year movement from practice began in the 1950s when it became clear that the banner of Humanism, raised by the totally new appearance of freedom fighters from under Communist totalitarianism, was so universal a form that it characterized all the freedom fighters of this age—including those fighting Western imperialism as well, be that in Africa, or Latin America, or the Middle East, or right within the U.S.

3. See our 1981-82 Perspectives Thesis which had analyzed that movement before martial law was imposed, and our Lead Editorial in the January-February 1982 NSJ on the situation after that counter-revolutionary crackdown.

4. On Dec. 4, 1940, *The New York Times* ran a letter signed by 28 of America's most respected Jews, including Albert Einstein and Rabbi Cardozo, which protested the visit of Menachem Begin, then leader of the Herut Party, which it described as "closely akin in its organization, methods, political philosophy and social appeal to the Nazi and Fascist parties."

5. Of all the Arab lands, Lebanon is the one that permits the freest expression for all political tendencies, and included a Communist Party even before Lebanon gained an independent existence in 1943. It was because of the narrow nationalism which the Stalinists reintroduced in the 1975-76 Civil War in Lebanon and which persists to this day that our August 1976 *Pellreal-Philosophic Letter* on that Civil War ended with: "When history and theory got into each other's way, and philosophy and revolution got separated, there is no exit from counter-revolutionary consequences." It is these counter-revolutionary consequences that we are suffering right at this moment.

III. Methodology and Politicalization: The 30-Year Movement from Practice that is itself a Form of Theory, and the Theoretical Developments that Reach Philosophy

The new age had begun with a new stage of production, the introduction of Automation, the predecessor of the robotics of today. The questions the workers raised in the mines where Automation was first introduced had never before been posed. Instead of asking about wages, the workers battling Automation wanted to know: What kind of labor—mental/manual—should men and women do? And while this seemed at first to be limited only to the mines and then the auto shops and to appear only in the U.S., the question that was raised in East Germany in 1953 also came out of "norms of work." With that very first revolt from under Communist totalitarianism the world's attention shifted to East Europe, where it reached a climax in 1956-57 in Hungary. It was there that, along with the revolution, Marx's Humanist Essays were brought onto the historic stage. This movement from practice that was itself a form of theory marked a new world stage in production, in politics, and in philosophy.

When the capitalist ideologues had declared the 1950s to be the decade of the "end of ideology," the masses in motion displayed a passion for a philosophy of liberation as powerful as the actual battles. Both spread like wildfire throughout the world with the emergence of a whole new Third World in Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, as well as new forms of Black, youth and anti-war revolts in the technologically advanced world, including the U.S. itself.

However, instead of Marxists digging into the new movement from practice as the new challenge to themselves, post-Marx Marxists continued with their old economist analyses. Indeed, even some of the Marxists who had participated in the development of a new theory of state-capitalism to meet the challenge of the 1930s—the theory which showed that the first workers' state had been transformed into a state-capitalist society—failed to meet the still newer movement from practice that was itself a form of theory. We alone completed a comprehensive philosophic-theoretic major work, rooted in that movement from practice, with the publication of *Marxism and Freedom*. Moreover, it was preceded by the breakthrough on the Absolute Idea in 1953 six weeks before the actual outbreak of the first East German Revolt, on June 17.

The four-year period between that breakthrough on the Absolute Idea—which saw in it neither a total abstraction nor a God but a movement from practice as well as one from theory, in which their unification was "absolute"—led to a re-examination of Marxism. Instead of stopping at the theory of state-capitalism which had met the challenge of the Depression, on the one hand, and the transformation into opposite of the first workers' state into a state-capitalist society, on the other hand, we now did not merely translate Marx's 1844 Manuscripts but situated those Humanist Essays in the post-World War II period. Furthermore, we related Marx's 1844 internationalist-Humanist principles to the American roots of Marxism.

The significance of this was that Absolute Idea—as a movement from practice to theory as well as from theory to practice; as a new relationship of the two; as a new beginning—laid the ground for hearing all the new voices from below in the turbulent 1960s. We published them in a multitude of pamphlets, from *Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves to Workers Battle Automation* and the *Free Speech Movement*, and worked out new aspects of the Black dimension both on the American scene in *American Civilization on Trial* and on the African scene in the pamphlet on the *Afro-Asian Revolutions*. At the same time, along with the first English translation

of Marx's Humanist Essays we published the first English translation of Lenin's *Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic*; both translations were published as appendices to *Marxism and Freedom* in 1958.

Without such philosophic preparation for revolution, activism in itself, even when it reaches such a high point as 1968, cannot achieve a successful revolution. A new stage of cognition was reached with the end of the illusion that activism by itself was sufficient, and that theory could just be picked up "en route." That new stage of cognition—Absolute Idea as New Beginning—was spelled out in *Philosophy and Revolution* in 1973.

1974-75 is the second new stage in capitalist production in the post-WW II period. Whereas the first basic new stage of production in 1950 when Automation was introduced cleared the ground for ever-greater mass profits for capitalism—and capitalists could play "dead to workers' demands for a new kind of labor—the 1974-75 crisis hit capitalist production in its very innards with such deep structural changes and such drop in the rate of profit, when related to the high costs of high technology, that it became clear this crisis would not be followed by any sort of boom. Shockingly, once again, most post-Marx Marxists, instead of feeling a compulsion to reorganize their thinking, continued their plodding, vulgar, economist way.⁶

With the publication finally, in the 1970s, of a transcription of Marx's *Ethnological Notebooks*, however, we were enabled to see Marx's work as a totality and to recognize those new moments in Marx's last decade, when he declared that "The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation"—the climax of his greatest theoretical work, *Capital*—was characteristic only of Western capitalism but not a universal form. That is, it was not relevant for what we now call the Third World, which, could, Marx said, have its revolution ahead of the West.

It is in this last decade of Marx's life, the very period when the first post-Marx Marxists behaved as if it were very nearly nothing but "a slow death," that we found the trail to the 1950s on the question of "revolution in permanence."

Rosa Luxemburg was the first great revolutionary Marxist who had raised the question of democracy after the conquest of revolutionary power. A study of Luxemburg as revolutionary theorist and activist as well as in her heretofore unexplored feminist dimension, together with a view of today's Women's Liberation Movement as revolutionary force and Reason, became integral to the third book, *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*.

When, in the period between 1878 and 1882, Marx projected the fundamental Man/Woman concept that he had raised in his very first discovery of a whole new continent of thought and revolution in 1844, he was also reading the latest in anthropological studies—Henry Morgan's *Ancient Society*. Marx, of course, wasn't just "reading." He related the much freer Iroquois women and the Irish women who had more power before Britain subjugated Ireland, to the type of ground needed for totally new human relations. Methodology and Politicalization, i.e. the concretization of a philosophy of revolution, is of the essence precisely because it illuminates the immediate as well as the ultimate problems.

6. It is important to study again the analysis made in the NBL pamphlet, *Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis*. See especially the critique of Ernest Mandel and the Trotskyists, "Today's Epigones Who Try to Truncate Marx's Capital."

IV. New Moments in Marx and Today's New Challenges

The deepening Recession in 1980 and Carter's imperialist and tragic fiasco in the desert of Iran illuminated one thing only—how rapidly the U.S. is hurtling down a dead-end track. The two major conclusions we drew from the Draft Perspectives for our last convention, "Tomorrow is Now; U.S. Imperialism in the Iranian Desert, and, at Home, in Deep Recession and Resurgent Racism," were that, in intensifying all our activities, the need was to expand N&L from an 8 to a 12-page paper and to continue working out a philosophy of revolution for our age. We called 1980 "The Year of the Book" and aimed to complete a new work, *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*. In the past two years we achieved both these goals.

What we've learned from both the expansion of N&L (which permits us to listen to ever new voices, record activities, and work out new developments in theory) and from the new book now going to press is how urgently relevant to our age were Marx's "new moments."

Marx spent all his life developing that new continent of thought and revolution he founded in 1844 as a philosophy of world revolution rooted in the actual class struggles pitted against capitalism whose economic laws of development and crises Marx analyzed most profoundly and originally. At the end of his life he found still other "new moments"—that is, new paths for development:

1) New revolutionary forces, no longer limited to the proletariat in advanced lands but present also in the underdeveloped countries.

2) New cultures which, even when "primitive," actually disclosed more human relationships, as witness the Iroquois women.

3) The multi-dimensionality of civilizations, in which the West was by no means seen as "civilized" and the Orient as "backward." There is no Chinese Wall between civilizations. Dialectical development allows for no such unbridgeable stagifying.

Were any post-Marx Marxists grounded in such a magnificent vision of humanity's "absolute movement of becoming"? What became tragically evident in World War I, with the collapse of the Second International (which, after all, represented the world's established Marxism) was that a Great Divide was needed, not only a Great Divide against betrayal and reformism, but a Great Divide in thought. There were many great revolutionaries, like Rosa Luxemburg and Leon Trotsky, but one and only one—Lenin—felt any compulsion to reorganize not just politically but philosophically. Such a new dimension in Marx unfolded for Lenin on his return to Hegelian dialectics that he could conclude (in his *Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic*) that none of the Marxists had fully understood *Capital*, "especially the first chapter."

Lenin's break with his own philosophic past and re-establishment of the dialectics of revolution laid the ground for 1917. The very obvious transformation of Russia as a workers' state into its very opposite needs hardly to be proven now; yet no Marxist, when Lenin died, grasped Lenin's dialectic methodology and met the challenge to analyze the new stage of the economy and the new horrific transformation of Russia into a state-capitalist society.

Each discovery of new writings of Marx followed a revolution. It was only after Lenin broke with his philosophic past, only after the actual successful 1917 Revolution that attempts were made to discover the full Marx heritage. None knew of the 1844 *Humanist Essays* before the 1917 Revolution unearthed them; from the closed vaults of the Second International. None grasped the 1857-58 *Grundrisse* before the Chinese Revolution made Marx's analysis of the "Asiatic mode of production" concrete for today. It took the birth of a whole new Third World as well as the development of Women's Liberation from an idea to the new force of Women's

Liberation as Movement before Marx's last writings, the *Ethnological Notebooks*, were transcribed and published.

The new worlds that were emerging were not just geographic but new spheres of thought, whether we consider those that came from East Europe asking for "Socialism with a Human Face" or the Black Revolution in the U.S. with its slogan of "Freedom Now." Put differently, the movement from practice that was itself a form of theory demanded that its challenge be met.

It was with that challenge to the movement from theory that, for the first time, a few Marxist theoreticians finally began to feel the compulsion to return to the sharp distinction between theory and the total reorganization that a philosophy demands. No matter how important theory may be—and the theory of state-capitalism was crucial—it is this distinction, between theoretical analyses of the objective situation and philosophic grasp of the new subjective forces of revolution as Recession, that is crucial as the ground for both current activities and philosophic preparation for revolution, and which led to the shocking discovery that no post-Marx Marxist was deeply grounded in Marx's Marxism.

What was born, objectively, to point the trail was the movement from practice which required the recognition that since those new moments provide ground for theoreticians, theory itself must develop to a total outlook, a philosophy.

The most shocking experience in working out the book was to find what the post-Marx Marxists had done (or more correctly, had not done) to preserve, much less develop, the unfinished writings of Marx. The best, Engels, had achieved what no others could have done, by editing Volumes II and III of Marx's *Capital* for publication. But neither the heirs he chose for Marx's archives, nor even he himself (who was no Marx) led anyone to grapple with the totality of Marx. Indeed, he was the first post-Marx Marxist whose talent at popularization far outdistanced his grasp of Marx's Marxism. That popularization proved so popular that it, and not Marx's Marxism, became ground for the Second International.

Seeing Marx's work as a totality made it possible for the first time to criticize not only reformists but also revolutionaries, including Lenin who alone had reorganized philosophically and met the challenge of WWI and the breakdown of established Marxism, thereby creating ground for the November 1917 proletarian revolution, but who had not extended that philosophic reorganization to the old vanguardist 1902-3 concept of the Party, though he had often modified it.

Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution reveals both that first view of Marx as a totality and the needed break with all post-Marx Marxists who congealed Marxism to their dogmatism and failed to work out the new moments as a continuing development. Just as the publication of *Marxism and Freedom* laid the ground for listening to and projecting all the voices from below; and just as *Philosophy and Revolution* laid the ground for such pamphlets as *Frantz Fanon, America's First General Strike*, and the *Latin American Revolutions*; so there is no doubt that the new book will increase our outreach not only in general but specifically on Rosa Luxemburg as a revolutionary spontaneist, on the Women's Liberation Movement, and on the totality of Marx, himself. Thus, our contribution with "3 books, not 1," synthesized with what happened ob-

jectively and subjectively for the past 30 years, manifests what we mean by the "Second Great Divide."

That is the philosophic and not only the political need, theoretically as well as organizationally, to prepare for revolution. This calls, not for "a vanguard party to lead," but for a philosophy of revolution that is rooted in the new three-decade long movement from practice and thus integrates spontaneity and organization.

Our organizational tasks for 1982-83 flow from the "3 books, not 1," with which we greet the centenary of Marx's death and which had caught the link of continuity with Marx's Marxism, and the discontinuity between the two ages—the 1880s and the 1980s. These became ground for the 1982-83 Perspectives both as they were expressed in the analysis of the myriad crises of the day and the organizational conclusions flowing from them.

First and most important is the needed widened activity on the Black dimension. The urgency today is by no means new, however, since the Black masses as vanguard have characterized the whole American development. Whether we take as long range a view as *American Civilization on Trial*, or begin with the first theoretical work when we became independent, *Marxism and Freedom*, where the Montgomery Bus Boycott was placed on the same level as the three new pages of freedom—East Germany, Hungary and Vorkuta—that is to say, the whole historic movement from practice of the 1950s; whether we take the international Black relations as seen also in the affinity of the philosophy of Frantz Fanon and Marxist-Humanism; the present need is to intensify our activity with the Black dimension of the Center.

Along with our activities in the Black dimension, stands our work in Women's Liberation and with the Youth. And we must, of course, expand our activities with the Latino liberation movement.

As imperative as all these activities are, none are more important this year than the work around "3 books, not 1." It demands a national tour by the Chairwoman this Spring with books in hand, and the participation of all Marxist-Humanists in the projection of this work. That is what is manifested in the expression "Have thumb, will travel." That is to say, we cannot be limited to the places where we have locals. The need to project Marxist-Humanism in as comprehensive a form as has been done in the latest work requires that we cover the length and breadth of the U.S. as well as Europe.

Finally and most important—indeed, the proof that the other tasks have been successful—is organizational growth. What gives this need a new foundation is our singling out what Marx had done in his last decade as he developed the concept of permanent revolution as the foundation for organization. Too often and too superficially the fact that Karl Marx had not developed an "organization theory" in a direct

way has been used by post-Marx Marxists to contend that he had no theory for organization and that he was not an organization man, which in fact belies everything he did from the first moment he broke with bourgeois society, founded his new continent of thought and revolution and promptly organized the Communist Correspondence Committees. (And that in the very city where he was writing those Humanist Essays, Paris.)

Lenin certainly had a theory of the vanguard party and while he modified it greatly, especially after the 1905 Revolution, he never did reorganize his philosophic thinking on that subject, when he broke with his philosophic post in creating the first Great Divide in Marxism. While his great *State and Revolution* was based mainly on Marx's work on the Paris Commune and the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, the one part of the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* Lenin paid no attention to was organization.

A great new moment in that last decade was precisely that work of Marx. First to be noted is the fact that it is a critique of a program of what was to be a new organization, a unification of Eisenachists and Lassalleans. While he called it, modestly enough, "Marginal Notes," and they were written alongside the program itself, they turned out to take up 31 pages as against the four pages of the original program. Moreover, these "marginal notes" deliberately left out the strictly narrow organizational conclusions which he dismissed as "a mere echo of the bourgeois People's Party." He had addressed his critique to only a few leaders in the hope that these would project it to the Unity Congress itself.

The profundity of every single paragraph of the *Critique* is, in fact, so deeply philosophic that he touches on subjects none of his philosophic works had touched before. He actually projects the philosophic foundation for organization into what would be the needs not only of the day, not only of the epoch, not only of the revolution itself, but what the development of society would be like after a successful revolution as we come out of capitalist society still bearing its marks.

His conclusion is that theory must never be compromised and that if an activity is needed with groups other than those following new principles it should be strictly limited to the activity and not get frozen into an organizational form on an insufficient theoretical ground.

It is this we have called organizational responsibility for one's philosophic stand for a new society. And it is on this basis that we are asking those who agree with our principles to join us and take organizational responsibility for projecting Marxist-Humanism, because, in truth, philosophy itself does not reach its full articulation until it has discovered the right organizational form. Philosophy, far from being an ego trip, is the result, the summation, of the epochal striving of the masses for freedom.

—THE RESIDENT EDITORIAL BOARD
June 25, 1982