

PERSPECTIVES REPORT TO THE SPECIAL CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION
OF NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES
BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA, NATIONAL CHAIRWOMAN
SEPTEMBER 3, 1983

THE MARR CENTENARY DISCLOSES
THE NEED FOR THE PHILOSOPHY OF
"REVOLUTION IN PERMANENCE" FOR
UPROOTING REAGANISM OUT TO
SHACKLE THE PEOPLE WITH 'MIND-
FORGED MANACLES' OF UNFREEDOM

'Human concepts are subjective in their abstractness,
separateness, but objective as a whole, in the process,
in the sum-total, in the tendency, in the source.'

---Lenin, Vol. 38, p.208

- I. The Reagan Retrogression Era Confronts the U.S. with
Myriad Economic-Political-Social Crises
- II. U.S. Imperialist Tentacles Circle the Globe
- III. Marxist-Humanism's Challenge to Post-Marx Marxists and
Other Alternatives to Marx's Marxism, its Dialectics
of Liberation

Appendix: Letter of Aug. 26, 1983 from Raya Dunayevskaya
on paragraphs added to Rosa Luxemburg, Women's
Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution
since publication

Post-Convention Bulletin Number One

September 1983

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

Price: 75¢

7925

Report by Raya Dunayevskaya,
National Chairwoman, on
Perspectives, 1983-84

THE MARX CENTENARY DISCLOSES THE NEED FOR THE PHILOSOPHY OF
"REVOLUTION IN PERMANENCE" FOR UPROOTING REAGANISM OUT TO
SHACKLE THE PEOPLE WITH "MIND-FORGED MANACLES" OF UNFREEDOM

"Human concepts are subjective in their
abstractness, separateness, but objective
as a whole, in the process, in the sum-
total, in the tendency, in the source."

-- Lenin, Vol. 38 CW, p. 208

I. THE REAGAN RETROGRESSION-ERA CONFRONTS THE U.S.
WITH MYRIAD ECONOMIC-POLITICAL-SOCIAL CRISES

That supreme artificer and B-picture actor, President
Ronald Reagan, seems to be overconfident that Teddy Roosevelt would
come out of his grave to congratulate him on the fantastic job he
is doing with his advanced technology, which has translated Teddy
Roosevelt's "big stick" and "gunboat diplomacy" to the armada Rea-
gan now has surrounding Latin America, just to intimidate the small
country of Nicaragua. Reagan also has the MX Missile to show off,
as if that other nuclear Titan, Russia, doesn't have tricks of its
own for the final confrontation.

Reagan acts as if he is unaware of the fact that his Gar-
gantuan attempt to intimidate the masses of Latin America is not
just a "game." If he doesn't soon learn the difference between
reality and play-acting about a "winnable" nuclear war, these "war-
games" may very well end in nothing short of the actual nuclear
holocaust that will mean the end of civilization as we know it.

The true determinant -- true because it is the human way --
is, however, the opposition at home and abroad to Reaganism,
his economic, political, philosophic retrogressionism. The mass
upheavals that are now going on throughout the world can, however,
be under no illusion about the might of the imperialist armed
forces facing the Latin American masses or create consoling illu-
sions about the fact that small countries can win, as was proved by
Vietnam. Let's by all means avoid creating "mind-forged manacles"
on ourselves.

7926

Nor can we afford to over-estimate the Pentagon-type of opposition to Reagan, which is trying to warn him that he is "spreading himself too thin" -- that is, risking being at the wrong place, at the wrong time, with too much weaponry, just when the "real enemy", that other Behemoth, Russia, may prepare for a confrontation somewhere else, and he will need to be in that "somewhere else" in a hurry. That is a totally phoney opposition. The masses have only themselves to depend upon -- and that includes, above all, their philosophy of revolution.

The whole point for our age is that we are confronted with unfinished, soured revolutions, revolutions transformed into opposite, as we face a degenerate capitalism, be it private or state, and a nuclearly-armed imperialism (always state-controlled), in total crisis, both trying to save themselves. On the home front they are trying to do that with robotics, and when they cannot do away with human beings altogether, they are forcing them into a lower standard of living, extending the feminization of poverty and putting the brakes on all unionization, while the rulers are in such disarray politically that they are flirting with the most horrible of all illusions -- a supposedly "winnable" nuclear war.

Let us look first at the economic front -- and then at the U.S. imperialist tentacles. None here, I'm sure, are in any way fooled by the balleyhoc about the so-called strong recovery. Not only do the percentage figures about "growth" that are being bandied about sound "good" only because they are comparisons with the highest unemployment since the Great Depression, but none can hide that we are still in deep recession. First, there are no less than 10 million still unemployed. Indeed, what the June figures had shown was that, though the labor force as a totality has increased, and some million workers got called back to work, there was an actual increase of half a million newly unemployed. Furthermore, when it comes to Blacks, the 10 percent unemployed gets doubled -- and that is without counting youth, who are no less than 50 percent unemployed.

Secondly, no less than 20 percent of those working work only part-time -- which means that they swell those living below

the poverty level. The official figures reveal that no less than 34 million of us live at that level. That is the highest rate since the mid-1960s, at the start of LBJ's so-called "war on poverty." And, once again, the rate for Blacks is three times that for whites, and the rate for Hispanics nearly as great as that for Blacks. Moreover, when the Administration's figures are corrected on the basis of the actual costs of a market-basket of goods, we find at least 60 million people falling below the poverty level -- not too far from the full one-third of the nation it was when Roosevelt felt that if he was to avoid revolution he had better initiate a New Deal and coined his memorable phrase that one-third of the nation was "ill-clothed, ill-housed, and ill-fed."

What we have still not touched in all these figures is the status of women. There the poverty level is so great that the only suitable phrase for it is the "feminization of poverty." This summer the Census Bureau revealed that by 1982 more than 45 percent of all poor families were headed by women. If you look at poor Black families, it is 70 percent! We surely need not go to the poor countries of the Third World to know hunger. It is right here in the richest country of the world.

Listen to how the Chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families (George Miller) explains it: "Since the Administration took office, more than two million children have become impoverished. Half of all Black children are living in poverty, as are more than half the children in the rapidly-expanding number of female-households. Among Black and Hispanic families, headed by women, 70 percent of all children are growing up poor. Overall, 22 million children -- more than 20 percent of our nation's children -- live in poverty. Nor is it limited to the jobless and minorities."

Here is how Leon Panetta, the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Nutrition, who is trying to increase the distribution of surplus Government commodities, put it: "This country faces a very serious problem with regard to hunger. Everywhere we went, whether it was Cleveland, Ohio, Birmingham, Ala., or Los Angeles, California, we heard the same story. The use of soup kitchens, food pantries

and hunger centers is up dramatically in the past two years, in some areas by 400 and 500 percent."

It is true these are admissions by Democrats who want to act as if life was heaven before and it is only under the Republican Administration that life has become so miserable. But they do tell the truth of the conditions now, even though these are the conditions of capitalism whether Democratic or Republican controlled. Look at the Agriculture Department. It has cut back on the distribution of free food. It now holds 473 million pounds of butter; 1.3 billion pounds of nonfat dry milk and 876 million pounds of cheese. To explain the cutback, John W. Bode, a deputy assistant secretary of agriculture, pointed out that commercial sales had decreased recently: "We are convinced," he said, "that the distribution of cheese by the government was responsible for these declines. Cheese sales had been rising until late 1982." Which immediately inspires the Administration to come to the aid of the rich!

What has been zipping right along are the profits -- which is exactly what the capitalists are out to get by whatever means, as they deliberately divert attention both from the plight of the unemployed and from the actual conditions not only of the workers in their plants but even of their own obsolete plants themselves, which they have refused to modernize. They divert from all that by claiming that their economic problems are all due to the low productivity of the American workers as compared to competitors like Japan.

With the unions helping them to wring concessions from the workers, and with help from Reagan, they have moved to destroy the unions. The only thing that exceeds that, is the Government's pouring all it can manage into Reagan's militarization -- the greatest of any time in history (and this is peace time!) -- which will produce a deficit of no less than \$200 billion for the next four years. It is against this fantastic militarization that it starves its own people, devising so many roads to war and counter-revolutions that the myriad crises besetting it become countless. What Reagan retrogressionism does not count on are the human responses -- the American people in the second America who are girding to fight him both here

and abroad, building support committees for Latin American, South African, Middle East, and Asian rebels against the imperialist outreach.

Right at this moment, the Black dimension is at the head of the opposition, having just returned from its March on Washington, which is not the conclusion but just the very beginning of that movement, in which the multi-dimensionality of the forces that marched with Black America saw many more white marchers than 20 years ago as well as an international dimension -- all united in their determination to end Reaganism.

This fall the anti-nuke movement, again both here and abroad, will reveal that the fight is by no means limited to its immediate goal of fighting the MX missiles in Europe. The Youth -- in their anti-draft movement -- reveal many other facets of the struggles, from the fight for a true education related to their fight for freedom, to working out a philosophy of freedom against Reagan's reigning philosophy of UNfreedom.

The same holds true for the Women's Liberation Movement. Indeed, what is called a "gender gap" is not only already calling itself a "gender gulf", but has arisen before Reagan and will continue after him as a revolutionary force for the uprooting of this exploitative, racist, sexist society.

What the March on Washington showed is the breadth of the coalition today, with Black still as central, but with Hispanics, the WLM, the anti-nuke movement and the Left all readying themselves for battle against Reaganism both at home and abroad, especially in Central America, while Azanian fighters were there to let none forget that battle for Freedom.

II. U.S. IMPERIALIST TENTACLES CIRCLE THE GLOBE

That ignoramus, Justice William Clark, who displayed his ignorance unabashedly at the Senate confirmation hearings -- very nearly boasting that he didn't know the names of the President of Zimbabwe or of South Africa, nor did he know the countries in West Europe that had refused to have MX missiles stationed on their soil -- is the U.S. National Security Adviser. It is easy to laugh at such an ant-brain in such a powerful job, and laugh some more at the stories about Judge Clark's ancestors, who had given the name of "Peacekeeper" to the Colt 45 which supposedly "tamed" the Wild West, and inspired his think-alike, President Reagan, to similarly name his MX missile.

But it is no laughing matter. And not only because he was smart enough to bring back into the government the erudite Kissinger. He does have important talents for the President, as an administrator effective enough to have maneuvered Haig out as Secretary of State, and who is now subordinating Secretary of ^{State} Shultz's position to his own. Again, nothing could be more wrong than to think that it is Clark who is responsible for the most reactionary foreign policy American imperialism is now practicing. It is Reagan, and Reagan alone, who is responsible for Reaganomics, Reaganpolitics and the whole retrogressionist philosophy we rightly call Reaganism.

The slogan Clark is credited with coining -- "Let Reagan be Reagan" -- tells the whole and true story. Clark is Reagan's "good friend," i.e., he agrees with his boss's line so much that he does most faithfully carry it out, so much so that he is also willing to be the target for all the anti-Clarkisms as if it were he, rather than Reagan, who is responsible. In a word, in face of the totality of the crises at home and abroad, the fantastic militarization in so-called peace-time is Reagan's Americanized world view. No doubt he does get some help from that madman, Defense Secretary Weinberger. Everything is exacerbated by the political opportunism in this election year -- including trying to make him sound as if he is sometimes giving in on the "Woman Question" or Black civil rights, or the poor, for whom his "heart" but not his pocketbook

"bleeds." We must under no circumstances let ourselves be diverted by laughing off the idiocies of Clark.

Instead, we must look soberly at the absolutely unbelievable number of military bases U.S. imperialism has built throughout the world -- 359 in no less than 19 countries.* These cover Western Europe, (especially West Germany where the whole European Command is located), Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa (even those areas where we have no bases whatever and which are in the "sphere of influence" of an allied country like France -- where Reagan could not, even in his wildest dreams of an "American century" claim that sending AWACs to Chad is in the national interests of the U.S.).

There are so many points of world crisis that it is hard to even begin to choose what to focus on as the most immediate point that needs to be worked out in a Perspectives of opposition. Let me give you one example by quoting the note I wrote to myself on Wednesday, Aug. 17: "Just because the Philippines are not now in the headlines does not mean that that impoverished country has no movements against its own rulers and against U.S. imperialism. The Philippines are especially important now because it's there that the biggest base is and it's in that country that the first great resistance movement following World War II -- the Hukbalahaps -- very nearly won."

Four short days later, the news flashes (Sunday, August 21) reported the incredible murder -- one that would have been inconceivable anywhere except in Hitler's Germany -- of Benigno Aquino, the most important opponent of that dictator Marcos, who was returning to participate in the coming elections, who was in the custody of the "Security" police, and who was mowed down in view of the world's cameras. This was no random shot, nor was it aimed at a random spot, but directly at Aquinos' unprotected head. And, to make absolutely certain that none could prove what they saw with their own eyes, the body of an alleged random assassin was likewise shot dead -- riddled with bullets.

* See Richard Halloran's "Uncle Sam Pays a High Price for Being in 359 Places at Once", in the New York Times, Sunday, July 24, 1983.

And what were the first words out of President Reagan's mouth? He said he would not be stopped by that act to change his plans. That the trip to that bloody tyrant Marcos was still on should, I suppose, not surprise anyone who knows that U.S. imperialism's hands have been no less bloody ever since the Philippines were first betrayed after winning freedom from Spain in 1898. Karl Marx's designation of the West's intrusion into Asia as "these order-mongering powers" holds even more true today. Who, looking at Reagan's friend, Marcos, can forget that Clark Air Force and Subic Naval Base in the Philippines are two of the most important bases not only in Asia but for reaching the Middle East, since the U.S. lost its protectorate, the Shah's Iran? Could we look forward to as great a revolution in the Philippines as occurred in Iran? Now that the Iranian Revolution has been transformed into its opposite -- Khomeini's counter-revolution -- we must intensify the criticism Marxist-Humanism has always maintained for revolutions lacking a philosophy of revolution.

The martyr Aquino was a serious dissident, but no revolutionary. The 500,000 who marched after his murder, especially the youth, were way to the Left of Aquino. Then came the funeral and over a million poured out. The shouts at these demonstrations were for "Fight!" and for "Revolution!" Furthermore, there are two active guerrilla movements. It is a great beginning, serious enough to make Reagan pause before going on with "business as usual," but nevertheless the merest beginnings of revolution.

The mass outrage at such totalitarian "democracy" may or may not force Reagan to delay his trip, especially now that the first marines have died in Lebanon. But the truth is that, if we leave it in the hands of that Behemoth, nothing will change. What can stop the hand of U.S. imperialism -- and its neo-fascist national rulers, whether in the Philippines or in Lebanon -- will be the masses in motion. U.S. revolutionaries must show their solidarity in support committees with all the opponents of U.S. imperialism.

Let's take a closer look at Lebanon. Just as President Carter, once the Shah was overthrown by a revolution, had created

the Rapid Deployment Force and sent the ships into the Indian Ocean, so Reagan not only kept faithful to this Carter outreach, but launched into militarization in such a skyrocketing manner that his roads to war and counter-revolution stretch out to circle the globe. But the very fact that Lebanon's existence began with one kind of imperialism at the end of World War II -- French -- and then was taken over ^{by} U.S. imperialism, Democratic and Republican alike, allows us to see that the nature of capitalist-imperialism is by no means limited to Reaganism. Indeed, we must now also include Israel, and see that the absolute opposite, the 1975-76 Civil War, was thwarted by PLO-backed Syria.

There is no doubt that Israel's genocidal invasion of Lebanon*, which the U.S. secretly encouraged, is the cause of the much-aggravated situation all around -- but the ground for it was laid in the unfinished 1975 Civil War in Lebanon (to which we'll return in a minute). Last year's imperialist invasion of Lebanon by Israel showed its class nature, and it, too, did not have its ambitions satisfied; even though militarily Israel won against the PLO, even though it also succeeded in getting the U.S. directly involved, even though Lebanon is now partitioned de facto as was its aim. But look what faces Israel now.

The other occupier of Lebanon is Syria -- a Syria that has been rearmed by Russia; a Syria that has achieved its imperial ambition of a "Greater Syria" when it entered Lebanon in 1976 and was gleefully greeted by the PLO, whom it has finally succeeded in splitting, with itself lording it over that section of the PLO which is in the crucial Bekka Valley; a Syria that reintroduced a Russian presence in the Middle East so that now both nuclear Titans are in a place chosen by others!

U.S. imperialism is thus faced with: 1) the possibility of a new Arab-Israeli war; 2) an ongoing Iran-Iraq war; 3) a Middle-East cauldron, where a conflagration can be set off by these "others" -- small powers telling the nuclear Titans: "Hic Rhodus! Here you must dance!" That, of course, is not what concerns us -- they

* See our 1982 Perspectives Thesis on "Israel's Genocidal Invasion of Lebanon" and N&L, Oct. 1982 Lead, "Down with the Perpetrators of the Palestinian Slaughter."

will find their own way to make the smaller powers dance to their tunes. What does concern us is revolution.

Seven years after that 1975-76 Civil War in Lebanon we must take another look, not because history repeats itself, but because the "repetition," where not resolved in a revolutionary way, appears in a more retrogressive form. Thus, back in January 1976, Arafat seemed to be in top form both in his dramatic appearance at the UN to sponsor the UN Resolution against "Zionism," and because, above all, he was heading a revolution in Lebanon. It was then that we warned against confining a revolution to the narrowness of the PLO-type of nationalism which sought to subordinate to itself the genuine, indigenous, Lebanese revolution:

Those Lebanese Moslem Left, who are fighting a genuine revolutionary class struggle against its rulers, Christians mainly but Moslem too, are being kept in check. The over-riding order is never to forget that Israel is the enemy. Lebanon, 1975-76, is in danger of replaying the slaughter in Jordan, 1970-71. Will Syria enter, or the PLA under its control? The PLO allows its adherents anything except a revolutionary class struggle within "the Arab nation." Whether that will be made "law" by the PLO under Arafat's leadership, or by the PLA under Syria's sponsorship, or by the other Palestinian groups in the umbrella organization, PLO, the governing idea will remain twofold: 1) only Israel is Enemy; 2) no genuine revolutionary force will be allowed to achieve its goal.

(Political-Philosophic Letter #1, Jan. 24, 1976)

By August, when we summed up the situation in Lebanon as "The Test not only of the PLO but of the Whole Left" (Political-Philosophic Letter #6), we wrote:

The New Left, born in the 1960s, so disdainful of theory (which it forever thinks it can pick up "en route"), has a strange attitude toward imperialism. It is as if imperialism were not the natural outgrowth of monopoly capitalism, but was a "conspiracy," organized by a single imaginary center, rather as the Nazis used to refer to the Judea-Catholic-Masonic Alliance, or Communists under Stalin to the "conspiracy" of the Trotskyists and Rightists in league with the imperialist secret service....

Evidently nationalism of the so-called Third World is of itself revolutionary even when it is under the banner of a king, a shah, or the Syrian Army. Thereby they canonize nationalism though void of working class character, as national liberation....

This does not mean that we give up the struggle for self-determination, Palestinian especially. It is that we do not narrow our vision of the revolutionary struggle for a totally different world, on truly Humanist foundations, the first necessity of which is the unity of philosophy and revolution.

"In returning to the scene today, it is not for purposes of any "I told you so," whether that be the warning against PLA, or PLO, nor is it that we will not continue to fight against the horrors of Israel's genocidal invasion of Lebanon as well as solidarizing with all freedom fighters, including the Israeli dissidents fighting their own government.

No, it is for bringing home -- and that includes our comrades in Central America -- the inevitable result of lacking a philosophy of revolution; for, without it, history repeats only abysmal retrogressions set off by wars and counter-revolutions. Thus, the Israeli slaughter of Palestinians became but one step in an unending series of rolling history's clock backwards. The de facto partition of Lebanon by both Israel and Syria, not to mention the so-called sovereignty of ^{the} fascist Phalange over Beirut, propped up by the U.S., France, Italy and other so-called "democracies" became the second step. And the disarray of the PLO is the third in what followed after the unfinished 1975-76 Civil War.

All of these points of crisis have not diverted Reagan from his preoccupation with attempts to strangle ^{the} Central American freedom fighters. Take the immediate, concrete armada in Central America -- the battle group with the Coral Sea that was ordered from the Atlantic, the Carrier Ranger and the battleship New Jersey ordered from the Pacific. Above all, look at Operation Big Pine II, in which 5500 U.S. troops are to descend on Honduras and stay there for no less than six months. And let us not forget where the Guantanamo Naval Base is located -- Cuba!

With this awesome display of military hardware, Reagan certainly hopes to provoke a war, if he can get the Latin Americans, especially Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua (and let's not forget Guatemala) to do the fighting and dying for him. After all, Guatemala was the first in the post-World War II period to suffer from

U.S. imperialism's counter-revolution against a democratically and duly elected government way back in 1954. Dulles engineered that one, whereas now it is Clark-Kirkpatrick-Weinberger roaming through Central America. And let's not forget who else is with them in Latin America -- the infamous one who engineered the coup in Chile in the Nixon era -- Kissinger, who is now heading a "bi-partisan" commission and who is now ready to supply the "erudition", not to mention the imperial conceit of being able to create "mind-forged manacles."

He had better first look at Chile, ten years after he saddled them with the dictator Pinochet. The months between June and August in Chile are the months of protest strikes that at first were organized by the central workers command, but then were joined by most political parties, as well as student groups who burned an effigy of Pinochet. Not only is the unemployment at 20 percent, and not only are the strikes also political, but the fact that Pinochet on August 13 ordered 18,000 army and airforce into the streets, the first time in ten years that more than a handful of troops have been used in civil disturbances, resulted in 26 dead. Note please that the soldiers who were wounded were shot by snipers. That is a measure not only of militancy, but of armed guerrillas.

None of these are about to be fooled by the imperialist power that forced them into a native fascist dictatorship, whether the one who engineered it first was the erudite Kissinger, or whether it is now the ignoramus who bears the august title of Assistant to the President on National Security. They suffer from both and their passion for freedom is a passion also for a philosophy of freedom, for those "new paths to revolution" Marx hewed out. Let the Marx centenary year open that road.

III. MARXIST-HUMANISM'S CHALLENGE TO POST-MARX MARXISTS
AND TO OTHER ALTERNATIVES TO MARX'S MARXISM, ITS
DIALECTICS OF LIBERATION

As everyone knows, Marxist-Humanists celebrated the Marx centenary by publishing our latest work, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, along with re-publishing two other fundamental theoretical works, Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution. Naturally, it is with eyes of today that this trilogy of revolution traced both the revolutions in Marx's day and those in Lenin and Luxemburg's day. The expression, "with eyes of today," refers of course not just to 1983, but to the new world epoch opened in 1950 when new forms of revolt and new forces of revolution emerged -- workers against Automation in West Virginia and against new work-norms in East Germany; Black revolt both in the U.S. and in Africa; the birth of a whole new generation that aligned with the Black dimension and against the Vietnam War; indeed, the emergence of a whole new Third World -- in Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa, in Latin America.

Marx had been working out, as new paths to revolution and to thought, a new relationship between the industrialized West and the non-industrialized East where the "archaic" peasant communes persisted which nevertheless could become ground for revolution arising first in the East rather than in the West. These new paths to revolution were a challenge the World War II generation failed to meet. Whether or not the availability of the Ethnological Notebooks could have cast as total a new illumination as they do in our age, which has witnessed the emergence of a Third World, there is, naturally, no way of knowing. History, in any case, cannot be rewritten. The responsibility is to this generation. The challenge is to this age, and Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution includes in that challenge all post-Marx Marxists, beginning with Frederick Engels.

What the Marx centenary is challenging this age to do is both to work out Marx's "new moments" in his last decade and to re-examine the very beginnings of his discovery of a new continent of thought and of revolution, because both periods are urgent for the

post World War II world. In that same critical year of the General Miners' Strike against Automation, 1949-50, when something so new came from the movement from practice, what came supposedly from theory, with the new type of national revolution that emerged from Mao's China, saw a new, though false, challenge make its appearance.

That which had given the appearance of "a new world" -- a Sino-Soviet orbit -- soon turned, however, into a Sino-Soviet conflict, and it was then that Mao rose to offer himself as the "storm center" of nothing short of "world revolution." Mao's "Cultural Revolution" did succeed in becoming a polarizing force for the world's youth, totally alienated from existing society and desirous of shortcuts to a "continuous revolution" which included "new" life-styles. It becomes necessary, while holding on tight to the "new moments" of Marx's last decade, to return to his early moments, including aesthetics and art, to see what a new Universal meant to the young Marx.

In his simultaneous struggle to separate himself from Hegel and to battle against Prussian censorship, what the young Marx chose to make a Universal of was freedom of the press. (His statement appears as the frontispiece of Marxism and Freedom.) On the threshold of Marx's discovering, in reality, the proletariat as Subject -- Reason as well as Force -- who would resolve the class contradiction that was gnawing at the vitals of society, fragmenting humanity while the reigning philosopher was dehumanizing the Idea of Freedom, the young Marx made the deepest dive ever into Culture. Whether he was examining religion or Art; aesthetics or the peasant theft of wood; individual artist or masses in motion, the young Marx felt he was witnessing paralysis setting in, disintegration abounding, unless a way was found to release vast, untapped, creative energies for universal self-development.

The process of Marx's jamming up reality against philosophy led to Marx's discovery of a whole new continent of thought and of revolution he called "a new Humanism" and "Revolution in permanence," concretized as materialist foundation, with history disclosing the direction of human development, ^{and} with dialectics -- "negation of the negation," the Absolute Method for continuous revolution -- as the determinant.

Of all the post-Marx Marxists who tried to grasp Marx's multidimensionality by singling out Art, only one succeeded, and he did it by refusing to separate the subject of Art from Marx's total philosophy. Where others culled the statements on Art and ended by offering alternatives to Marx's Marxism, Mihail Lifshitz showed art's integrality to Marx's Marxism. Because new alternatives will be multitudinous now that we have issued challenge to post-Marx Marxism's failure to grapple with Marx's "new moments" of his last decade even as they reduced the very first moment of discovery to a "residue of Hegelianism" in the young Marx, allow me to quote from Lifshitz's The Philosophy of Art of Marx, as he demonstrates how, ^{for} the young Marx, even when still a Left Hegelian, but fighting journalisticly for the freedom of the press, the concept of "Revolution in Permanenz" was dominant; "... reflections upon the ancient world show that the historical analogies permeating the works of 1841-42 remained with the mature Marx ... he never renounced this inheritance."

At the same time, please reread what may seem far removed from this -- my pamphlet on the Afro-Asian Revolutions (including the new Introduction to a Farsi edition of the pamphlet, which appeared in N&L, August-September 1983). It is there that I warned (and that was before the Cultural Revolution) against an alternative ^{arising} from within the so-called Communist world. It was Mao, "The Leader," the administrative mentality in power, presenting a claim to leadership of the Third World!

American youth of the 1960s, attracted to Mao's so-called "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution," failed to see that the manner in which Mao articulated Culture (with a capital C) was not only an evasion of the class nature of China -- state-capitalism -- but was also philosophically wrong. It is true that a great writer -- a Shakespeare or a Tolstoy or a Melville -- can envision the "human element," an "original character," and give us a glimpse of the future. In all those articulations one age is disappearing and a new age is arising. It is what the philosopher Hegel called "a birth-time of history and a period of transition." It can be seen in the dimension Shakespeare created in Hamlet at the emergence of a new world of individualism, the historic emergence of capitalism. It

can be seen in Lear at the death of feudalism. Or in what Tolstoy created as an original character in Anna Karenina, and in what he presented as historic period in War and Peace.

And it can be seen in what Melville did in Moby Dick on the eve of the Civil War, and in his Confidence Man with his concept of the "original character" with original "instincts." Melville felt that the way to define this "original character" was to compare it to "a revolutionizing philosopher."

The point, however, is that the great artist is not that revolutionizing philosopher, or, more plainly put, that "philosopher of revolution" -- Karl Marx. Not being that philosopher of revolution, aiming to transform reality, he, more often than not, does not understand the masses in motion that have inspired his vision. He remains the "outsider looking in."

For us, as revolutionaries, as Marxist-Humanists trying to catch the link of historic continuity with Marx's new continent of thought and of revolution of the 1840s, and the trail to the 1980s he left us in the 1880s, we must finally meet the challenge Marx put to us to work out the new paths to revolution. This demands that we see revolutionary forces not only as muscle but as Reason; it demands, at the same time, that we do not relegate those forces to "characters" (original or otherwise) on a play stage, but see them on the historic stage with the masses in motion transforming reality.

Doing this for the last three decades, we have both paralleled what came from the movement from practice, and met its challenge to rise to philosophy, grounded in practice in a way that not only changed the whole relationship of theory to practice, but also made historic-philosophic contributions -- as the trilogy of revolution shows. This year these are extended in the three new pamphlets we are issuing -- a new edition of American Civilization on Trial, a new pamphlet on Marx and the Third World, and our projected work on the 1949-50 General Miners' Strike.

The forces from below show anew, at one and the same time, that the movement from practice was itself a form of theory and how

it challenged the movement from theory to rise to a philosophy. Our unique contributions during those 30 years reached a culminating point that allowed us, in working out the Ethnological Notebooks, to find that trail Marx left and to look anew at the 1980s, thereby permitting Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution to issue a challenge to post-Marx Marxists and all other alternatives to Marx's Marxism.

What is new in this Marx centenary year is that, with the tour around the whole trilogy of revolution, so many new doors were opened to Marxist-Humanism -- be that in Afró-American studies or in Third World Women's Conferences or with Youth, including Latinos -- that what became clear was that all these revolutionary forces struggling against the myriad capitalistic economic-political-social-military crises manifest an impulse to see that their revolutionary energies and Reason will not again be thwarted. Revolutions ^{are} soured not alone because of the might of these tyrannical, exploitative, sexist, racist powers, but for lack of a philosophy of revolution. It expressed itself most concretely in the fact that I saw the additions to the book which I had been writing after its publication as a need from below, so that I began reading them at the lectures as if they were, indeed, in the printed book. You have been receiving them over the year -- and they have been typed out with a new introduction and are in your convention packets. Let us work them out together right here and now, concretizing them for our imperative organizational growth, not as it will be done in the Organization Report this afternoon, but by relating them to what is a fact of the objective situation in two instances that we have not yet cited in this Report, first in Poland and then in Africa.

In the case of Poland the instance I wish to cite is due to the fact that the counter-revolution is in the saddle in a state-capitalist land that dares to call itself "Communist." And I wish to cite the situation in Africa here because it is directly related to philosophy as the most imperative kind of ACTION.

In Poland we learn of the women who did not qualify for Jaruzelski's amnesty -- Ewa Kubasiewicz. She was unwilling to sign the statement promising not to engage in "illegal" activities. In-

stead, here is what she wrote: "It is so easy to exchange your barred window, with its sharp outline of barbed wire, for freedom ... (but) such a declaration would be a denial of your own self, would wipe out your life's meaning ... By choosing the human condition of a political prisoner, you are preserving hope."* She wishes to preserve her legacy so passionately that she is willing to sacrifice her very life.

Another political prisoner, who is one of the original KOR members and is waiting trial which could lead to a death sentence -- Adam Michnik -- reached out to solidarize with the Chilean workers on strike: "I express to the political prisoners my admiration and solidarity." And he signed his message: "Adam Michnik, Investigation Prison, Rakowiecka St. 37, Warsaw."

I cite these not only to show their courage and integrity but to show the reality of our age which they are fighting against, by offering "Alternatives" not to Marx's Marxism, but to existing Communism!

And what of Africa, where it is a question of both philosophy and organization. What made me return to the relationship of philosophy to Africans was the article in our Pre-Discussion Bulletin No. 4 (which Bulletin as a whole is a magnificent demonstration of how both Absolute Idea and "revolution in permanence" as ground for organization, which the new book has expressed so fully this Marx centenary, has been concretized by the whole organization, even as "Have Thumb, Will Travel" opened a whole new stage for each member). I have time to bring to your attention only one of the articles, "Regression vs. Philosophic Ground for Organization", by Dave, from Britain, which tells of the splinter Trotskyist leader, Gerry Healy's degeneracy to the point of accepting money, not to mention the line, of Quadaffi. Being an African, Quadaffi has one great feature and that is situating his politics in philosophy.

What is it in the African dimension, I asked myself, that makes him, even when totally wrong, nevertheless pose a new point of

*The full text of her statement appears in the Fall 1983 issue of Survey, a Journal of East and West Studies.

departure philosophically? It led me to return to when, long ago, Nasser chose to entitle his report of no more than a Free Officer's coup as Egypt's Liberation, the Philosophy of Revolution. The year is 1955, and the very first words on the very ^{first} page of the text say, concerning the use of the word, "philosophy": "I stand before a boundless world, a bottomless sea." The next category Nasser singles out is "Idea" as "seed of revolution."

Long before this re-reading, I used to recommend the work, but the stress then was on his not being interested in facing the enemy as enemy at the negotiating table, but instead in quoting the Israeli chief's account (Yeruhan Cohen was his name) of what pre-occupied Nasser. It was the "struggle of Israel against the English and how we organized the underground resistance movement against them in Palestine and how we were able to muster world public opinion behind us in our struggle against them."

Nasser then introduced his third category: History. Clearly, to Nasser, the point was that unless one has a Promethean vision, is not an eclectic and is steeped in history, a leader will not succeed with his revolution. The flaw was and remains that their philosophy continues to be in a vanguardist framework of organization. In Nasser's case it was the "Free Officer" corps -- and we saw it in African regression long before its further degradation in the Quadaffis. Our focus remains the unique African passion for philosophy. There the African dimension -- as has been clear through the years, whether in an intellectual like Senghor or a trade union organizer like Sekou Toure -- is seen at its most positive in the actual movement in South Africa today called Black Consciousness.

It is no accident that, like us, they have singled out Frantz Fanon as the great Third World theorist. It was he who combined to the fullest the unique African passion for philosophy with the Marxian-Hegelian dialectic and Marx's philosophy of "revolution in permanence." But we alone have shown that to be inseparable also from organization. Without "revolution in permanence" not only "in general" but as ground for organization, we face today's

myriad crises/with the Reagans deluded that even a nuclear war could be "winnable." -- poverty-stricken in thought.

This, then, defines our focus on organizational growth rooted in that philosophy of "revolution in permanence."

One more word, concerning Engels and Marx not being "one." Let us remember what Marx said long before 1875 to Engels, as he was completing the first edition of Capital in 1866. Noting that it was ready, he wrote to Engels (2/13/1866) that it "cannot possibly be edited by anyone but me, not even by you." And he warned the readers of the French edition in his 1/8/1875 postscript: "whatever the literary defects of the French edition may be, it possesses a scientific value independent of the original and should be consulted even by readers familiar with German."

It is high time to sum up this year's achievements with the publication of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution and the National Tour inseparable from it. There is no other way to map out Perspectives for a Constitutional Convention that will be measured against the objective world's needs.

The central point for today is the need for projection of Marxist-Humanism, not just "in general" but as organization, along with elicitation from below. The two determining elements -- projection and elicitation -- hold whether that be at the March on Washington from which we have just returned, the labor rallies that are now taking place, or the anti-nuke activities which will gain their greatest momentum this Fall as we oppose the stationing of MX missiles abroad and endless militarization and retrogressionism in all fields from Black and Labor to Youth and Women on the home front. What becomes of the essence in this year is the struggle all this demands for a new type of member, including ourselves, who is grounded in this Marx centenary year on the trilogy of revolution with its challenge to post-Marx Marxism and all alternatives to Marx's Marxism, as new ground.

Thus, "Have Thumb, Will Travel" cannot be treated as the "past" but as ongoing; and it is not directed to any national tour,

but is for each individual's perspectives and action, for his/her projection of Marxist-Humanism far beyond our present organizational strength. The National Tour has opened so many new doors that this new point of departure must give a new meaning to "follow-through," not just as concept but as act. Therefore, let's first follow - through on the trail to the 1980s we discovered in Marx's last decade and focus once again on the year, 1875:

First, let's follow as Marx added new "paragraphs" (after Capital was published in 1867) to the very first chapter in the section on fetishism. Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution helped us to focus on the Paris Commune's form of stripping away the veil from the capitalistic commodity-form. What is new this year, with the new book, is that there we singled out both the reference to Marx's 1841 studies and his work in the final decade on pre-capitalist societies as well as new paths to revolution in the capitalist monopoly stage. The footnote in Capital right in the very first chapter (p. 89 in Kerr edition) showed what Marx was pointing to that needed further development; that turned out to be exactly what he did in his Ethnological Notebooks and in the letters he wrote in that last decade that flowed from his study. This had remained hidden until now when we worked out the trail from Marx's "new moments" in the new book.

Secondly, although we have been pointing to 1875 as the year of the Gotha Programme Critique, it was only with Chapter XI that we made a category about it, as we entitled that chapter: "The Philosopher of Permanent Revolution Creates New Ground for Organization." We will let no-one divert from that by calling attention to the fact that the phrase, "revolution in permanence" was used by the young Marx in his 1850 Address; Marx had it reprinted in that critical year, 1875, as an appendix to a new edition of his Revelations of the Cologne Trial.

Thirdly, the direct relatedness to the problematic of our age concerns the relationship of West to East -- that is, the technologically developed, industrialized countries to the technologically under-developed lands. Even as great a revolutionary as Rosa Luxemburg didn't see what Marx was saying in the paragraphs he had added

-- or for that matter, what those little words, "so-called", meant in the very first edition, when Marx wrote of "The So-Called Primitive Accumulation"-- that is, that colonialism didn't stop with the "primitive" Accumulation of Capital. Indeed, Marx subordinated that Part VIII, making it several chapters within Part VII (called "The Accumulation of Capital") when he expanded Capital in 1875 to include its extension to colonialism and the world market, even when he didn't use the category that struck Luxemburg as so "new" that it required a "new" interpretation -- i.e. imperialism.

The truly "new moment" that none caught was that Marx insisted that the "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation" was not a Universal. Instead of saddling the East (or what we know as the Third World) with what he analyzed as the Western road, Marx was working out new paths to revolution.*

Our theoretic-philosophic contributions during the past three decades have earned us an historic right to existence, and therewith the right to challenge post-Marx Marxists and other alternatives to Marx's Marxism. What the challenge is now in need of is the recognition of what the practice of philosophy has revealed in this age of unfinished revolutions -- and that is that even such fundamental contradictions as that between Party and spontaneity are not absolutes. That is to say, not only is each by itself one-sided but even in a new unity, where spontaneity does, indeed, tower above Party, that cannot provide a direction out of soured revolutions so long as they remain outside of "revolution in permanence."

The new paths to revolution that Marx was working out and that we need to concretize for our age demand that spontaneity and organization in unity be so inseparable from the the philosophy of revolution in permanence, that the actual revolution can be released, not alone for the day of but the day after.

September 2, 1983

-- Raya Dunayevskaya
Detroit, Mich.

* See our very beautiful new pamphlet: Marx and the Third World.
New Perspectives on Writings from his Last Decade, by Peter Hudis.

August 26, 1983

To all N&L Committees:
Dear Comrades:

Because I think it is incumbent upon a Constitutional Convention which has as a focal point the inclusion in its very constitution of the latest theoretical work, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, to see in it a great deal more than just a paragraph, I would like to explain all the paragraphs that were added after its publication, in the following context:

- 1) That it is no accident that it is the Marx centenary which prompted the new publication of our other two fundamental works, Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution, and
- 2) That this led us to call the theoretical foundations of Marxist-Humanism, as a totality, a trilogy of revolution.

Here, then, are the paragraphs as they were added to each section:

In the Introduction just before the final paragraphs, I saw a need not to have the reader wait for the final chapter to know that we are challenging post-Marx Marxists. With that in mind, the added paragraph makes clear at once that the very first point misunderstood by post-Marx Marxists, beginning with Frederick Engels, was Marx's work in the last decade regarding what we now call the Third World, and what Marx called, in the Grundrisse, "the Asiatic mode of production" as well as commenting on it as he read Morgan's Ancient Society. In the new paragraph, we also ask: Isn't the Marx centenary high time to challenge the post-Marx Marxists on their understanding of Marx's last writings? And we point to the fact that we do just that in the last chapter.

(The new paragraph is added on p. xi, just before the para. which begins: "From the study of primitive communism...")

That seems to have been the first point so misunderstood by post-Marx Marxists, beginning with Frederick Engels, who, without having known all of the massive Ethnological Notebooks Marx had left behind, undertook to write his own version of Morgan's work -- his Origin of the Family -- as a "bequest" of Marx. When Ryazanov discovered these notebooks, he rushed -- before he ever had a chance to decipher them, to characterize them as "inexcusable pedantry." If an Engels, who was a close collaborator of Marx and without whom we would not have had Volumes II and III of Capital, could nevertheless so suddenly have become overconfident about his own prowess of interpreting Marx as to assume he was speaking for Marx; if an archivist-scholar like Ryazanov could, at a time when he was actually publishing those magnificent early essays of Marx (the 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts), spend a good deal of his first report on the Archives of Marx in asking for 20 to 30 people to help him sort these manuscripts out, and yet pass judgement before he dug into them -- it says a great deal about literary heirs but nothing whatsoever about so great an historic phenomenon as Marx's Marxism.

7948

Isn't it time to challenge all of the post-Marx Marxists when even those who have achieved great revolutions (and none was greater than the 1917 Russian Revolution) did not, in thought, measure up to Marx? Isn't it time to dig into what Marx, who had discovered a whole new continent of thought, had to say for himself? (Chapter XII concentrates especially on the last writings of Marx, in which this author found a trail to the 1980s.)

* * *

Chapter III of Part One jams up the different views of Luxemburg and Marx on "Accumulation of Capital" in order to show that the new events which Luxemburg called "reality", which she contrasted to Marx's "theory", could have been so contrasted because she failed to fully work out dialectic methodology -- which would have revealed a single dialectic in both objective and subjective worlds. To that end, the whole subject of methodology was expanded to reveal the difference between how Absolute appeared in the phenomenal world (and the phenomenon she had in mind was imperialism) and how Absolute was worked out in Philosophy of Mind, where it cannot possibly be separated from Subject, i.e. revolutionary force as Reason. As the added paragraph puts it: "Therein is the nub of the Great Divide between Phenomenology and Philosophy -- and because it is no abstraction, but a live Subject, it unites rather than divides theory and reality."

(The new paragraphs are added on p. 45, immediately after the paragraph that ends with the italicized sentence: "This, indeed, is the nub of Luxemburg's error.")

Methodology being the dialectic movement both in the Phenomenology of Mind and in the Philosophy of Mind, let us look deeper into their difference. While it is true that in the Phenomenology we speak not just of appearance, much less of mere show, but of a philosophy of appearance, it is not true that the methodology, as we follow the movement of the dialectic in Philosophy of Mind, is either the philosophy of phenomena or even of essence. Rather, the dialectic in the Notion is that the Absolute there opens so many new doors in both the objective and subjective spheres as to reveal totality itself as new beginning.

Thus, as against the phenomenology of imperialism being merely a reflection of new surfacings of oppression, new appearances surface as so profound a philosophy of revolution as to disclose that what inheres in it is a living Subject that will resolve the great contradiction of its absolute opposites, imperialism and national oppression. It is this which Marxist-Humanists call the new revolutionary forces as Reason. Therein is the nub of the Great Divide between Phenomenology and Philosophy -- and because it is no abstraction, but a live Subject, it unites rather than divides theory and reality.

* * *

In Part Two on the Women's Liberation Movement, especially the section on the "Unfinished Task", the point I chose to elaborate was, once again, the conception of Women's Liberation not just as force but as Reason. The new here, however, was that the "proof" came from history itself -- February 23, 1917. This was for purposes of showing that the women were the ones who initiated that revolution. Even now I am not sure that we totally understand that that, in turn, depends on women practicing the immediate problems inseparable from the philosophic context. This is why I have two final suggestions: 1) Do, please, consider the paper worked out for the anthropology conference, "Marx's 'New Humanism' and the Dialectics of Women's Liberation in Primitive and Modern Societies," as well as the talk I gave at the Third World Women's Conference, as integral to and expansion of Part Two.

2) The second and key suggestion is the imperativeness of a study of Part Three without which there can be no total comprehension not just of Part Three, in and for itself, but of the fact that it is that Part that informs the whole work. It is Marx's Marxism as a totality after it has gone through combat with the greatest revolutionaries of the post-Marx period -- Lenin and Luxemburg, without whom we could not have reached the new stage we have achieved.

(The paragraph is added on p. 109, immediately after the paragraph which ends: "...or by using them only as helpmates.")

Quite the contrary. History proves a very different truth, whether we look at February 1917, where the women were the ones who initiated the revolution; whether we turn further back to the Persian Revolution of 1906-11, where the women created the very first women's soviet; or whether we look to our own age in the 1970s in Portugal, where Isabel do Carmo raised the totally new concept of apartidarismo. It is precisely because women's liberationists are both revolutionary force and Reason that they are crucial. If we are to achieve success in the new revolutions, we have to see that the uprooting of the old is total from the start.

(And to the end of the next, the penultimate paragraph, one sentence is added, after the sentence ending: "...which do not separate practice from theory.")

Which is what Luxemburg meant when she defined "being human" as "joyfully throwing your life on the scales of destiny."

* * *

It is no accident that the paragraph that was added to Chapter XII on the Black Dimension is the one that at once became urgent to the National Tour itself -- so much so that I read it out as if it actually were in the book, in my talks on the Black dimension. Nor is it an accident that Charles Denby suggested it be the center of the new introduction for American Civilization on Trial. At the same time, by considering all that Marx had said in a single place rather than separately as they had been expressed in each specific decade, you could see the totality, so that it became inseparable from his concept of "revolution in permanence," including his very last work, the Ethnological Notebooks.

(The paragraph is added on p. 194 immediately after the para. that ends: "...backward lands ahead of the advanced countries.")

With this dialectical circle of circles, Marx's reference in the Ethnological Notebooks to the Australian aborigine as "the intelligent black" brought to a conclusion the dialectic he had unchained when he first broke from bourgeois society in the 1840s and objected to the use of the word, "Negro", as if it were synonymous with the word, "slave." By the 1850s, in the Grundrisse, he extended that sensitivity to the whole pre-capitalist world. By the 1860s, the Black dimension became, at one and the same time, not only pivotal to the abolition of slavery and victory of the North in the Civil War, but also to the restructuring of Capital, itself. In a word, the often-quoted sentence: "Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black skin it is branded," far from being rhetoric, was the actual reality and the perspective for overcoming that reality. Marx reached, at every historic turning point, for a concluding point, not as an end but as a new jumping off point, a new beginning, a new vision.

* * *
(Finally, on p. 195 just before the final paragraph of the entire text, please add the following:)

This is the further challenge to the form of organization which we have worked out as the committee-form rather than the "party-to-lead." But, though committee-form and "party-to-lead" are opposites, they are not absolute opposites. At the point when the theoretic-form reaches philosophy, the challenge demands that we synthesize not only the new relations of theory to practice, and all the forces of revolution, but philosophy's "suffering, patience and labor of the negative," i.e., experiencing absolute negativity. Then and only then will we succeed in a revolution that will achieve a class-less, non-racist, non-sexist, truly human, truly new society. That which Hegel judged to be the synthesis of the "Self-Thinking Idea" and the "Self-Bringing-Forth of Liberty," Marxist-Humanism holds, is what Marx had called the new society. The many paths to get there are not easy to work out.

-5-

We have entitled the Perspectives "What To Do" -- and we didn't mean by that only when facing objective crises, but in the need to single out the new moments in Marx and the "trail to the 1980s" which we discovered there. Put differently, that "discovery" was possible because: 1) finally we had all the writings of Marx as a totality; 2) we had lived through a 30-year-long movement from practice; and 3) our unique contributions to these three decades were inseparable from the objective movement. It becomes necessary now to spell out the hieroglyphic "three books, not one," which has created the ground for the challenge to all post-Marx Marxists, and to develop the moment the masses have reached in their search for a philosophy of revolution which would enable them to succeed in an actual revolution.

With this final addition we have come to the question of Organization as likewise inseparable from the concept of "revolution in permanence." By using that as ground for organization, we must under no circumstances fall into the trap of substitutionism -- as if the ground was the actuality of organizational growth. Without becoming a dogma, "revolution in permanence" must at one and the same time underline the imperativeness of organizational growth at this crucial period.

Yours,

RAYA

7952