

REPORTS FROM OUR 1983
CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

* * * * *

- 1 /// Statement by Charles Denby, Editor of News & Letters, to the convention
- 2 /// "Organizing for Marxist-Humanism with our Trilogy of Revolution," by Michael Connolly, National Co-organizer, News and Letters Committees
- 3 /// "On Our Constitution," by Olga Domanski, National Co-organizer, News and Letters Committees. Includes new paragraphs added to Constitution.
- 4 /// "The Revolutionary Journalism of News & Letters: Facing the Objective Situation; Entering the Battle of Ideas; Building a Marxist-Humanist Organization," by Eugene Walker, Chairman, Philosophical-Technical Committee
- 5 /// "The Black Dimension in Revolutionary Journalism," by Lou Turner, co-author of Frantz Fanon, Soweto and American Black Thought
- 6 /// "Report on Trip to Japan," by Judy, Los Angeles

* * * * *

Post-Convention Discussion Bulletin No. Two

Published by
News and Letters Committees
2832 E. Grand Blvd. Rm. 316
Detroit MI 48211

Price: 50¢

Charles Denby to the 1983 Constitutional Convention of
News and Letters Committees

August 13, 1983

As you know, I have been ill, and just in case the doctor will not allow me to attend and address this Constitutional Convention, I wanted to say a few words to all of you about my thoughts and feelings at this moment in the life of our organization. I feel very strongly about what this Marx centenary means to me -- and what Marxism means to me -- a movement to change the world totally. This year we have taken big steps in that direction, historic steps.

First, we have finally in our hands the whole "trilogy of revolution". Anyone can see and read what Marxist-Humanism has represented over nearly 30 years since our founding, since our first Constitutional Convention. All my life in the movement we have seen how many parties have turned Marx's philosophy into its opposite. But now we can say to everyone: "here is Marx's philosophy of liberation," and we know that it is the path to freedom.

Second, we have published an expanded new edition of American Civilization on Trial. I was very glad that Raya's new essay in it took up Marx's view of the Black world, and our own work. We have always spoken about and practiced the two-way road between the U.S. and Africa in the ideas of freedom, and it is as clear in American Civilization on Trial as it is in Philosophy and Revolution and in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. But the reason I am most happy that it is being published now is that it can help the movement reach a new stage.

I am thinking about the March on Washington. I was active in the 1943 March on Washington Movement. It was the greatest thing we had ever tried up to that time. Even though the Communist Party opposed it, the March idea spread everywhere across the country. But finally I was so sad when A. Phillip Randolph compromised and called off the March. The March on Washington in 1963 was very different for two reasons. First because we went through with it and held it, with a quarter of a million people, despite a lot of pressure against the march, even from the President. But second, because I carried with me the new edition of American Civilization on Trial we had just published, with the true history of this country, including the story of 1943. And I sold it to many people. Now we are going again in 1983, with our new

7954

edition, not only because we want to get rid of Reagan, but because we will meet many people who are searching for a totally different way of life along with us.

One reason I feel certain of that is the reaction I experienced to the new edition of my own autobiography, Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal. You know when I was in the hospital I sold 25 or more copies, most to hospital workers. One woman came and visited me at home, and she said it was too bad I had got so old now, just when so much new was coming out of my life and thoughts. She said she had never known about Marx or his ideas before, but she wished she had read my book years ago.

The year coming up is the year our Marxist-Humanist organization will grow, because we will put our shoulders to the wheel. The bourgeoisie understands that idea very well. They push workers to get the most production. Workers understand it too. They have to live with it every day in the plant. But now I think it's about time all of us put our shoulders to the wheel for a different purpose -- freedom. And we won't stop until we have a human society in this country and in this whole world. This is what we are all living for.

Charles Denby

Organizing for Marxist-Humanism with Our "Trilogy of Revolution"
Report to the Constitutional Convention, September 3, 1983
by Michael Connolly, Co-National Organizer

I New Kind of Activity in Today's Freedom Movements Points to a New Kind of Member

This most full and serious Discussion Bulletin #4 -- with 26 contributions totalling 96 pages, beginning with Raya's work on "Revolutions and Philosophies," and extending through our participation in current struggles to consideration of amendments to our Constitution -- emphasizes the way this year for us has been rooted both in the continuity of Marxist-Humanist praxis as we have developed it since 1955, and the newness of the way we have deepened that praxis under the impact of having our entire trilogy of revolution published.

When we met in Convention in Sept. 1982 we called this the "year of the book," and said that the focus of our work would be a challenge to all post-Marx Marxists -- on Third World revolutions, on women's liberation, on the relation of philosophy to organization. That challenge was based on the fact that Marxist-Humanism had 30 years of labor and three fundamental works recreating Marx's Marxism for our age. We thus posed our perspectives around two tightly tied tasks: (1) the intensification of our activity in all areas of the freedom movement, yet never uncritically; and (2) "Have Thumb, Will Travel" -- both as a National Lecture Tour for Raya on the Marx Centenary and as each of us took our own journeys, our own organizational responsibility for the presentation of Marxist-Humanism's challenge.

Looking back over the past year of activity in the freedom movements, what stands out is the way our work was deepened by the summation of three decades of our work, a summation that we were only able to achieve after the publication of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution in Nov. 1982.

Take our work with the movement supporting Latin American freedom struggles, at a time when U.S. imperialism has shown that it will not flinch from any atrocity to maintain its hammerlock on the entire hemisphere. All the committees have been involved, from the latest Mexicana Airlines demonstrations to work in Guatemala and El Salvador committees, and emphasizing the publication each month of our own Spanish supplement, Noticias y Cartas.

Within that movement we have challenged those who see in Central America's revolutions only suffering victims. Instead we have posed a two-way road between the Latin American freedom movements and the "Second America" to which we belong. We concretized that road most successfully this year in our unplanned pamphlet, Guatemalan Revolutionaries Speak, a pamphlet that sprang to life after the publication of RLWLKM, out of our new view not alone of Marx and the non-capitalist world, but as well of Marxist-humanism's decades-long relationship with today's Third World. The importance of concentrating that work with the Latino dimension inside the USA, next year is underlined by the new work in Los Angeles in which Maria has been involved.

In Labor we have seen not only the continuation of the work of our regular shop columnists such as John Marcotte and Felix Martin, but in nearly every issue the contributions of new writers from US Auto Radiator in Detroit, Agar in Chicago and GM/Toyota in the Bay Area. Azadkar accompanied labor page editor Bob McGuire to Canada, where they participated in the new movement of farmers stretching a hand to labor in the economic crisis. Internationally, where the UAW has joined the capitalists in whipping up anti-Asian hatreds, we supported the Vincent Chin demonstrations in the U.S., and M&L shop stories have appeared in three issues of the Toyota workers paper, Town Meeting, in Japan.

But our concept of workers as Reason was drawn most sharply in Co-editor Felix Martin's one-month stay at the Center after the Jan. 1 REB, and in his work as "guest lecturer" at Stanford University after Raya's tour there. And with the article on "Labor in New York" by John Marcotte in Discussion Bulletin #4, a very high new moment has been reached for our work in the shops next year. Listen to his comments, as he critiques the Left and insists that the "self-organization, self-awareness of labor as subject of history" is both the means and the end of shops struggles, rather than this or that reform; that out of each struggle this "intellectual sediment" is what remains to build a new society based on freely-associated labor.

The Black Dimension, leading the resistance to Reaganism here, and challenging apartheid in South Africa, has seen us marching in Azanian freedom picket lines, covering Alabama and Mississippi protests against police killings, and joining Black parents and students in the North fighting capitalism's planned illiteracy. But look also how the ground of our work changed as we experienced the Black Dimension in the trilogy of revolution, beginning with our publication -- the first ever in English -- of Rosa Luxemburg's Martinique.

I am referring not only to Kevin's review of all three books and our Archives in Africa Today, nor even only to Charles Denby's "Worker's Journal" column, suggesting that the new edition of American Civilization on Trial focus on "Marx and the Black World and Marxist-Humanism and the Black World," but also to the illuminating debate this summer on Philosophy and Revolution, Ch. 7, on "The African Revolutions and the World Economy." Out of that debate, can be seen how much more fully we ourselves are coming to know PAR from the vantage point of RLWLKM.

Women's Liberation and Youth will each be reporting on their national meetings in this session. One point that connects the two might be mentioned here. As the feminist dimension within the anti-war movement has grown, questions of organization have been central to the discussion. Too often, however, whether in Britain, Seneca or Livermore, it has been limited to form of organization, as though that could be considered without reference to philosophy.

In that light the greatest achievements this year, as we took an active part in that movement, have been the way we fought the exclusion of Marxist-Humanist ideas with reviews of our books in the movement press -- by Laurie in Direct Action, Kevin in NY Mobilizer, and Anne in Womannews (along with her famous "Rosa and Raya" letter in off our backs). Such work still largely remains a task to be done in the year ahead.

It was in this context of critical-practical-revolutionary activity that we launched our journeys of "Have I Humb, Will Travel" (HTWT), seeking to create a National Lecture Tour on the Marx Centenary by Raya, and in that process, reaching into new areas for ourselves in the battle of ideas. The journeys of HTWT were the greatest outreach ever for Marxist-Humanism. They put our challenge to the stunting of Marx's Marxism on the map everywhere, assuring that the fact that we were limited to locals in five cities would not prevent a new generation from hearing us.

But it was by no means a "tactical" question. Each journey was a new path to the development of the individual through the experience of presenting all three books. In short, we sought, through HTWT, to win a new kind of member, including ourselves. Nowhere was that better seen than in our participation in conferences.

When you add them all up it is really impressive. Just consider Black and Third World, and you see Lou at Black writers and Black Consciousness conferences; Allen at National Black Studies; Tommie and Diane at Black Women's Health; Terry and Dave at the Third World conference; Eugene at National Chicano Studies; Neda at Iranian Women. Furthermore, it was not only movement conferences. We invaded the disciplines, attending the National Women's Studies Association, the AEA, AAA, ASA, and URPE. Each with literature tables, floor discussion and sales of the three books. No less than eight of us gave papers. And everywhere we created brochures, packets, and posters. Out of one of these conferences -- URPE -- came our new pamphlet on Marx and the Third World.

After all our HTWT work came Raya's National Tour, with large and enthusiastic new audiences. We will take up the tour and its ramifications later, but for now we have to ask ourselves a most critical question: After the tour ended May 1, didn't we see such a drastic drop in literature sales, including those "laid-off organizers," undistributed copies of M&L, that the last letter you received before the Convention had to be on our financial troubles?

It is of course not alone a financial question, but a political-philosophic one, focusing again, as last year, on the need for "follow-through" in all our work. This year we want to be sure to situate that question in the uniqueness of our philosophic-organizational contribution, so that we can be fully conscious of the course we are now embarked upon, a course thus far untravelled in 100 years of Marxism. Raya's Jan. 1 presentation, "Marxist-Humanism, 1983: Summation that is a New Beginning," was the first presentation of our new course.

Another is contained within the work of this Constitutional Convention. At each of these moments we have sought to establish a fuller view of both Marx's Marxism and Marxist-Humanism from the vantage point of the need to finally work out organization inseparable from Marx's philosophy of revolution. At the same time we seek to free the "Organization Question" from all the "halfway houses" in which it has languished.

II Philosophy that Creates Ground for Organization: From Marx's Marxism to Marxist-Humanism

Opposition to the vanguard party has been so characteristic of the whole age since the Russian Revolution transformed itself into state-capitalism and workers organized their revolt in workers councils, that our singling out their form of organization is often considered what is new. The truth is that from the Paris Commune through the Soviets to the Hungarian Revolution's councils, workers have done very well at creating their own forms of organization. The questions we have to answer is about the role of the Marxist organization today.

Instead of grappling with that, too many, even when they succeed in rejecting the vanguard party, have reduced the question to one of centralization or decentralization. It isn't that decentralization is not a very concrete question, but when we ask it we also have to ask: are we seeing decentralization as concretization of a philosophy of revolution, or as one more evasion of philosophy. Ever since Marx's day, both tendencies have been present.

With the publication of RLWLKM we have seen that Marx, as "philosopher of revolution in permanence" created new ground for organization in his 1875 Critique of the Gotha Program. But how did that breakthrough come about for Marx? And how did Marxist-Humanism, after a 100-year-long discontinuity, re-connect with Marx's vision and begin to concretize for our day what Marx had pointed to in 1875?

Marx's March 1850 Address to the Communist League on "revolution in permanence" had to be studied and memorized for transmittal by members of the Communist League. Yet by Sept. 1850, what was clear was that for many in the organization "revolution in permanence" was a slogan with a content far different than any Marx had intended. To Schapper and Willich it meant that the way to re-start the revolution in the face of counter-revolution was to constantly plot conspiracies with all sorts of adventurers. They attacked Marx when he concretized "revolution in permanence" as his teaching classes for exiled worker-activists -- classes which were the early expressions of what would become his Capital -- and later for his interest in what they called "exotic parts of the world."

Thus no sooner had Marx formulated his concept of "revolution in permanence" than the fact that the phrase could get entirely divorced from its philosophic context and organizational ramifications led to the split in, and end of, the Communist League. It was no longer a realisable form of organization, not because the 1848 revolutions were defeated, but because the new highpoint in Marx's summation of that revolution was followed-through by Marx alone.

Marx's next participation in organization was the International Workingmen's Association, founded in 1864 in the midst of struggles for Polish independence, the U.S. Civil War, and strikes all across Europe. It was always much more a coalition than a "Marxist" organization, and Marx had to contend with not only Lassalleans

after Lassalle, but Bakunin and Blanqui and their supporters as well. All of the conflicts were to come to the test when the Paris Commune erupted.

In RLNLKM Raya emphasized Marx's view back to the IWA from the perspective of the 1875 CGP, as he insisted that international working class activity was not dependent on the existence of the IWA: "It was no longer realisable," Marx says, "in its first historical form after the fall of the Paris Commune." What was the dialectic of events that preceded that summation?

Mehring's biography of Marx defends Bakunin against Marx, and views their conflict as an honest argument of anarchism vs. Marxism. The truth is that Bakunin never fought on those grounds, but rather on his call for decentralization -- each IWA section as "autonomous." When this was the unprincipled basis for opposition he could unite with even those of views anathema to anarchism. In short, autonomy for Bakunin meant so autonomous from philosophy that he was not even faithful to his own philosophy of anarchism.

Blanqui was a very different question. From him Marx learned much about armed struggle, and it was Blanquists he placed on the General Council of the IWA after the Paris Commune to replace the reformist trade union leaders who were horrified by actual revolution. But even Blanquists -- what happens to them when the group of insurrectionists is united only on a basis of affinity of shared experience or deed, rather than a shared philosophy? Then instead of insurrection as an act of the masses, it becomes an act of a clique.

Decentralization as evasion of philosophy was what Bakunin and others were posing in opposition to Marx exactly at the moment when Marx's summation of the Commune was being translated into organizational ramifications. In Marxism and Freedom (p. 187), Raya translated part of Marx's speech to a session of the 1871 London Conference of the IWA, where he terms the trade unions "an aristocratic minority" and points instead to the new immigrants, to the slums of London's East End, to the peasants.

The Minutes of that Conference remain to this day untranslated into English, but from the vantage point of RLNLKM, we can see how full was Marx's philosophic-organizational summation of the Commune, and how concretely it was rooted in the new subjects of revolution he was to focus on throughout his last decade.

From these Minutes, and from the minutes of the General Council of the IWA in the first three months following the Commune, we view Marx making four proposals:

(1) A resolution for the formation of IWA branches exclusively for women. Marx argues that it is "most necessary in industries where women are employed in great numbers; they prefer to meet for discussions among themselves. Women play a very great role in life: they work in the factories, they take part in strikes, in the Commune, etc. They have more passion than men." He then recounted their participation in the events of the Commune, but the minute-taker did not record the remarks.

(2) A resolution for sending organizers into rural districts to found branches of the International among the peasantry, to secure unity of farmers with the industrial proletariat.

(3) In response to a letter from Calcutta, India, to the General Council, Marx not only supports the formation of a branch there, but urges "the necessity of enrolling natives in the Association."

(4) Secures the election of a Secretary for Ireland on the General Council (the first for an area not a sovereign nation) as encouragement to the formation of branches of the IWA in Ireland, in order to offer the national movement there a perspective of proletarian and agrarian revolution.

These are the directions that Bakunin wished to evade by counter-posing decentralization as his answer to all political questions. For Marx, however, the four proposals read like a road-map of his agenda for his last decade, as Marxist-humanism has presented it in RLWLKM. It is a decade that centrally includes CGP and its projection of the need to finally work out the inseparability of philosophy and organization. It could not be worked out in the IWA.

Thus the First International was "no longer realisable in its first historical form" not alone because the Commune was defeated, but because so new a projection of philosophy and organization had been presented that the future organization would have to stand on the entirely different ground of the CGP.

Indeed, just how difficult that working out of philosophy and organization has always been is seen in as great a revolutionary as Engels, who declined for six years -- until 1870 -- Marx's appeals to help with the work of the IWA. These are the years that Marx is writing Capital and complaining about the time taken up by the work of the International. Engels' response is to say: Stop the IWA work; concentrate on the book. Yet wasn't it exactly the experience of working out philosophy within the International that Marx gave concrete expression to in the "Working Day" chapter, in the view of Black America, in the change in his perspective on Ireland? In the last analysis, the question couldn't get worked out in the 19th century.

The fact is that the task of first re-connecting with, and then recreating, Marx's final concept of organization has fallen to our age to work out. In our discussions on the development of Marxist-humanism, from its 1941 beginnings as a state-capitalist tendency through Raya's 1953 Letters on the Absolute Idea and the 1956 founding of Laws and Letters Committees to this Constitutional Convention, we have traced our trek to work out Marx's vision for this very different historic period. It is not possible here to go into the false starts that still separated philosophy and organization -- whether within the bureaucratic collectivism of the Workers Party or with C.L.R. James' emphasis on "culture" in Correspondence Committees.

Instead, let's go right to the most recent decade, since the new revolutions began with Portugal and Africa in 1974-75. Within that revolution arose a decentralized challenge to the vanguard parties -- apartidarismo, the soldiers' councils, the critique by the Women's Liberation Movement. All are powerfully described in Ch. 8 of RLWLKM. Yet keep in mind also that 1974 was only one year after P&R was published, with its projection that new beginnings cannot emerge alone from new forms of organization, no matter how decentralized, if organization remains a preserve free from philosophy, divorced from the new beginnings that emerge from the Absolute Idea.

Haven't the events of the last decade, Iran especially, confirmed that the committee form alone is not the answer to the problems of our age? So much is packed into that Ch. 8 that it demands re-studying now. Just reconsider the title on the "Unique and Unfinished Contributions," and see if the unfinished contributions are not alone on women's liberation, but on the distance the whole movement still needs to travel.

The question of "new kind of organization" centered for us in the current period first around Ch. 11 of RLWLKM as a new view of Marx's CGP. It was summarized in a very different way by the time Raya concluded the book with "A 1980s View" because it combined Marx's Marxism with our history. But it was only at the Jan. 1 REB this year that we reached the turning point, because it was then -- with all three books in hand -- that for the first time in 100 years of Marxism and 30 years of Marxist-Humanism, we began to be historically, philosophically conscious of CGP as ground for organization -- our organization.

It is only a beginning. That very specific document against Lassalleism cannot be simply "translated" for our problems today. Nevertheless, it was so new a beginning that on Jan. 1 we called a Constitutional Convention, wrote a new "Who We Are" statement for our paper, and launched the National Lecture Tour on the Marx Centenary by Raya.

III "Follow-through" and the National Lecture Tour: Working with the New Pamphlets and with the Trilogy of Revolution

The national tour on the Marx centenary this year surpassed all others in our organizational history. Study the display on the wall, and you can see how new it was, whether one focuses on geography -- covering the breadth of the USA; the sheer number of talks -- 46 speeches and 6 mass media appearances; the sales -- over \$1,000 a month in sales of the trilogy alone; or the new dimensions in audiences -- from Iranians through Third World women to Native American activists to a lecture in Salt Lake City.

In presenting the trail to the 1980s that Marxist-Humanism singled out from Marx's work, there was no separation between Raya's presentation of Marx's Marxism and Marxist-Humanism. And so significant were the serious new contacts made, that there was no

separation between new openings in theory and openings for organizational growth. In the Midwest, the fact that the Chicago stop on the tour was successfully extended to Urbana, Madison, and Iowa City, meant that we could pose the possibility of Chicago as a Midwest sub-center for the future.

In viewing the tour for our organizational perspectives now, what is of the essence is to see how the tour created new moments for our work, and yet how those breakthroughs demand further development in the months to come. In the years after M&F* path-breaking discovery of a movement from practice that is itself a form of theory -- for struggles in Africa and America, in the shops and on the campuses. This year we have seen the projection of three new pamphlets directly rooted in RLWLKM, with hardly any time lapse at all. Indeed, two of our new pamphlets -- the fourth edition of American Civilization on Trial and Peter's pamphlet on Marx and the Third World -- are already in hand.

Out of the tour came new relations with Black intellectuals, interviews on Black radio stations, and the important videotape with Prof. Cedric Robinson, who wanted to know not just about "Marx and the Black World," but about Marxist-Humanism's history within that struggle. But it was Charles Denby who suggested that that be the focus of the new edition of ACOT, which we now have in hand, and which we began to sell and discuss with people at the March on Washington last week.

In many ways the new edition is not the same as the old one, beginning with the ads that reveal what a different organization we are now than in 1963. When we focus now on a "1980s View of the Two-Way Road between the U.S. and Africa," it is the Black philosophic dimension that becomes critical, tracing the paths by which both Fanon and we came to project a revolutionary "new Humanism."

In L.A., Gene and Karl have already distributed a most creative leaflet for ACOT in the Black community, and the Center is preparing a mailing list for review copies and publication announcements. This new edition will open many new doors for us, if we do not separate its worldview from the projection of the trilogy of revolution as a whole.

Now look ^{at this} beautiful new pamphlet by Peter: Marx and the Third World: New Perspectives on Writings from his Last Decade. Jam up this real concretization of RLWLKM's view of Marx's work with the excitement we saw on the tour for working out Marxism's relation to Third World revolutions in our day, and you see that there are many areas open to us with this pamphlet. One thinks about the work of Iranian exile-activists, about the correspondence this year with Indian women who answered our ad in Manushi, about our activity with Central American support movements. With this pamphlet also, we will be creating special mailing lists and seeking reviews.

It is of course too early to speak so specifically about the 1949-50 miners strike pamphlet now in progress. You heard Andy *and throughout the 1960s, our pamphlets concretized M&F's

relate the continuous miner to today's robotization, and we can think of Ned calling himself a "mobile worker," after having been shipped to Oklahoma by GM. The writing of the '49-50 pamphlet has meant as well a view of the whole of our work, of the leap to Marxist-Humanism that had an important part of its origin in that strike. We can involve all -- old members, new members, and not-yet-members, in discussions even before the pamphlet is finished. Indeed, it would be wrong to view any of the three pamphlets as intended for separate audiences. Each in its own way is an expression of the totality of our philosophy.

At the same time that we are excited about the new pamphlets, it would be the wrongest attitude to consider RLWLKM as if it were an "old book." The very opposite is proved objectively and subjectively since its publication. At a time when the Latin American revolutions have brought onto the world stage new Subjects fighting for freedom, the fact that Spanish will be the first language into which the entire trilogy has been translated is no accident. In the months to come we will have the opportunity to work with the book as we continue our activity inside the freedom movements -- whether anti-war, or Latin America; the Black struggles in Azania and America, or Women's Liberation; in the shops, or continuing our presence on the campuses. Here again we are speaking of follow-through.

The collection of paragraphs for RLWLKM Raya has written since publication underlines the constant digging, the permanent revolution in thought that characterizes the category of follow-through in its fullness. We traced earlier how Marx's summation of the 1871 Paris Commune meant, not an end to those ideas, but a whole new agenda for his last decade. When we say that "revolution is never the first act alone," doesn't it relate also to our work in this period, now that we have all three books?

In the months since the national tour there has been some very exciting follow-through. The study groups that were formed immediately after -- in L.A., Chicago, Ann Arbor and Salt Lake City -- all drew serious new friends, some of whom are here today. I hope they will speak of their experiences. And where we considered "Have Thumb, Will Travel" as a continuing category, rather than as a period that ended with the tour, didn't we make a real impact this summer on NWSA with Suzanne's paper, at Soweto Day where Lou spoke, or with the farmers conference which Bob and Azadkar wrote up as a most original Lead? Furthermore, follow-through internationally meant trips on the ground of the books to Portugal, Spain, Italy, France, Germany, Britain, Mexico, and Japan -- trips that will surely have ramifications for us.

Nevertheless, we have just begun to break through the wall of silence that surrounds the book, as evidenced by the very few serious reviews yet published. Raya's trip to New York this month to present her paper on "Marx's New Humanism and the Dialectics of Women's Liberation in Primitive and Modern Societies" is in part another way of forcing these reluctant radical intellectuals to engage in a battle of ideas, on our challenge to post-Marx Marxism. It is a battle we will all have to find new ways to fight, new areas to break into, this year.

The all-too-modest organizational growth we have achieved since the tour -- in Detroit and Los Angeles -- cannot possibly satisfy us at a time when the urgency of both the objective situation and the need to revitalize Marxism on Marx's ground is so evident. It can, however, be a beginning for our work next year when we recognize that even the newest member stands on the same ground as those who founded this organization if that ground is the summation of 30 years of Marxist-humanism as we are working it out at this Constitutional Convention.

I was struck with the way Raya tied the question of organization to follow-through in her letter to the youth, when she pointed to the unfinished nature of Marx's work in his last decade and said:

"It compels us to work it out, to labor at what Marx has only in notes. This is what we must all work at for our age. Here is why we so urgently need a new type of member, and need to see ourselves as a new type of member, to continue the development of what the new book, in completing the trilogy of revolution, has begun."

If our emphasis in the past has been in part on the new form of organization that had begun with the rejection of the vanguard party, the emphasis for this period has to be on each one of us working out, in the movement, the way philosophy -- the Marxist-humanist philosophy of liberation -- becomes ground for organization, for revolution, for a new human society. This is the historically-philosophically-organizationally unique perspective that we set for ourselves today. I would like to invite all who are not yet members to join us in working to make that perspective a reality for all humanity.

Report to News and Letters Committees
Convention, Sept. 4, 1983, by
Co-National Organizer, Olga Domanski

O N O U R C O N S T I T U T I O N

It is fitting that this session on the Constitution and the amendments we wish to make to it in this, the Marx centenary year, comes right in the middle of our Convention deliberations -- both because it is the centerpoint (that is, the reason we transformed the national gathering this year from a Plenum to a Convention) -- and because it can become a mediation from our Perspectives to real organizational growth. For the truth is that, though the amendment we are here to decide upon is a so-called "paragraph", it is the kind of paragraph that must so succinctly summarize both the profound new stage of cognition that has been reached and the new objective questions posed in this decade (whether by revolutions of the 70s from Portugal to Iran or by a movement like Women's Liberation) -- out of which objective developments that new stage of cognition flowed and then further developed -- that it becomes the kind of summation that is a new beginning.

You all have in hand by now the paragraph that the REB is submitting -- and, believe me, it was not an easy paragraph to come up with. We have been struggling with its formulation all summer long. It is not only that it is so much more difficult to focus in one short paragraph rather than in a whole thesis on what you look back to see as the essence of what you have done, but that it isn't just "essence" but the movement to "notion" that we are trying to express. If we can do that we will be articulating what we mean by philosophy as action -- which has been the focal point of our Committees since our birth, but which, with Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, has reached a yet newer stage, objectively and subjectively.

To grasp that new point, I believe it will help us to first return to our very first Constitutional Convention -- in 1956 -- when this magnificent Constitution of ours was first worked out so profoundly as the founding of a totally new kind of organization that the truth is that we have not had to change a single point in the entire 27 years since then. Rather, every amendment made has been a question of an expansion made necessary by a whole new stage that had been reached objectively and subjectively. There have been only three times when that has happened, as each one of our trilogy has appeared.

How did we manage to create such a document that was both binding -- in the sense that it established those Marxist-Humanist principles on which we all agree -- and yet open to all the working out of the new question that the objective movement would be demanding answers to, and that we would be asking others to join with us in helping to work out? The "answer", of course, lies in our concept of "philosophy as action." But that cannot be left as a cliché -- so let's see what that has meant to us, most concretely:

First, startling as it may be to some who were not with us back in 1955 when News and Letters Committees were born out of the split in the state-capitalist tendency which had begun what we then thought was going to be a new kind of paper and organization, with Correspondence Committees -- we never had a Constitution in Correspondence. Evidently, it was supposed to be a sign of how new and "free" we were. Instead, it proved to be the way "one-man" rule was established without our even knowing it. One of the documents we seem to keep going back to, and seeing new points there, is the Bulletin Peter Mallory O'Brien wrote on "Johnsonism: a Political Appraisal." We refer to it on the question of war and revolution and the split in the Prologue of our 25 Year History. But I want to quote to you one brief paragraph from another section here -- the section called "The Transformation of the Marxist Method into its Opposite". Just listen to this description of the founding convention of those "new" Correspondence Committees:

"Without any previous presentation of fundamental positions with co-leaders, far less with ranks, Johnson presented his thesis -- for the first time on the convention floor itself -- that this is only a period of 'examining ourselves' and sometime in the undefined future we would face the public and actually return to 'traditional Marxist politics',,, The analysis of state-capitalism was suddenly simplified to mean nothing more than inward contemplation of ourselves with a total disregard of objective developments."

Just contrast that to our relation to objective developments that is so inseparable that when we sat down to write our history in 1980, we found that we had to give it two titles, for it is both a history of "25 Years of Marxist Humanism in the U.S.," and at the very same time, it is "a history of worldwide revolutionary developments."

But that is not the only total contrast. Just consider what it means that our Constitution provides a full 90 days period between a Call and the Convention, with resolutions and discussion material to be presented in bulletin form at least 60 days before the Convention to permit the fullest discussion by the membership. The truth is that in practice, ever since 1975 (and I believe this was one of the direct concretizations of Philosophy and Revolution on the question of Organization) we have expanded that by-law in our Constitution to the actual publication of the Draft Thesis right in the pages of the paper itself, so that all, anywhere in the world, can participate in those discussions with us.

Moreover, the Perspectives Thesis that year of our Founding Convention, where we met together to adopt that Constitution, is the one that we called "Theoretical and Practical Perspectives: WHERE TO BEGIN." That question surely takes on a totally new significance now, when Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution has dug deep into that as the very question Marx posed for himself, and was answering, not only at the beginning of his 40 year development of a whole new continent of thought and revolution -- but again, at

the very end of the 40 years, when he discovered those "new moments". The point is that it is not only how you answer "where to begin" (that is, how you spell out the revolutionary dialectic for your own age) that unchains the dialectic -- but that it is unchained anew at each new stage of cognition. So that I believe what we are doing right at this Constitutional Convention is also posing once more that kind of "where to begin", in the sense that what we are trying to formulate in our new amendment is our consciousness of the very new discoveries we have made with the new book -- yet with the full awareness that, as high a point as was reached with the concept that the philosopher of revolution in permanence had created ground for organization, that does not mean we have got all the answers worked out for our age. "Where to begin" is where we begin.

What we have already been seeing unfold, though it may appear to be only the merest of beginnings, is how that consciousness of the new stage we have reached gets translated into the most concrete actions -- whether that is the impact the book has already had on the newspaper (which is seen in the expansion to our 12 pager as well as in the new title for the Theory/Practice column) -- or whether it is seen in the "new type of member" we have been talking about, by which we include ourselves -- or whether it means the three new pamphlets we will have this year -- or whether we are talking about that 96 page Discussion Bulletin we suddenly found had outpoured for this convention.

But, again, let us return to our very beginnings to see the fullness of what posing "Where to Begin" meant in 1956:

Consider that we had already begun to work out the answer to that question in the year since the break. We already knew "in general," even then, where we were going. We certainly knew we didn't want to go back to examine ourselves again, but began to publish N&L at once as a unique combination of worker and intellectual. And although we gave ourselves a full year to work out what our Constitution would be, we did not wait to publish the 1953 Letters on the Absolute Idea. By 1956, the two things we knew without a doubt were: 1) that we would have a Constitution that would project what was uniquely ours -- the profound, basic principles that would bind us together, and 2) that the two poles of our Constitution would be News & Letters AND Marxism and Freedom -- which was assigned right in that Constitution itself.

But look what happened between that assignment and the actual working out of that book we called "not a program but our theoretical foundation." In place of the "assignment" to (and this is how it was worded in 1956) "express Marxism as a world view and as an exposition of the workers' struggles in America in this period of Automation" -- in 1958 we have what you see in the Constitution before you -- namely, what Marxism and Freedom objectively accomplished: 1) the establishing of the concrete American roots of Marxism; 2) the re-establishing -- for the first time anywhere since Marx -- of Marxism in its original form of a new Humanism; and 3) making that integral to our own age of Automation and workers revolt. The difference between the assignment in 1956 and the summation in 1958 of the actuality that was

achieved, reveals how Marxism and Freedom changed not only the whole development of the paper, but the whole course of this organization.

But perhaps the most relevant of all the events of that period for us today, when we have the whole trilogy in hand, is that it was in 1958, when we amended the Constitution with all those "firsts" that Marxism and Freedom had established, that we saw our task to be selling it not as "book" but to be "selling as founders." That is the kind of philosophy as action that we grappled with again in 1973 when we amended our Constitution for the first time in 15 years and that we must grapple with anew today as we prepare to add the third of our trilogy.

Indeed, if we are to truly be able to summarize not only the new book, but to do it in such a way that we catch in that summary the kind of Hegelian recollection and inwardization that projects what the whole trilogy is, we must also grapple with what we have been referring to throughout the pre-convention discussion this summer as the fact that Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution is "grounded in Philosophy and Revolution"-- and that, while it may seem to flow most directly out of Chapter 9, it flows much more fundamentally out of Chapter 1, where P&R achieved such a deep penetration of heretofore unexplored lands that the final three Syllogisms of Hegel's Philosophy of Mind were worked out anew, for our age. Though this relationship to Hegel is not spelled out in our Constitution -- for the very good reason that our relationship there is fully to Marx and to Marx alone -- we do have know it is, so to speak, "there."

The truth is that what each generation of Marxists has confronted is how to discover what, in the Hegelian dialectic, can help to work out the problem of its own age. Thus, though Lenin's task was to answer how his organization, the Second International, could be transformed into its opposite, and how he could then transform that betrayal into its opposite, social revolution (for which his return to Hegel was through Science of Logic), the question that confronted our generation was "What happens after?", and how to put an end to all the soured, unfinished and aborted revolutions of our day. That required not stopping with Science of Logic, but continuing to those three final syllogisms, which were Hegel's summation of his whole life's work.

It is true that the first plunge into those paragraphs that unchained the dialectic for Marxist-Humanism is what we know as "the Letters on the Absolute Idea" and it began right there in 1953. But it took two full decades of further developing the theory and practice of Marxist-Humanism before those three paragraphs (#575, 576, 577) were both developed philosophically in Chapter 1, and concretized in Chapter 9 of P&R as all the new passions and forces. And it is only now, with the new book, in the Marx centenary year, and with the totality of Marx's works in full view, that the relationship of that philosophy to organization can be seen rooted so clearly in Marx's "revolution in permanence." It is only now that we have become so fully conscious that this is what our Marxist-Humanist organization has been painstakingly working out over these full 30 years and that we have reached a

new stage of cognition -- though we must also be fully conscious that ground for organization is not yet actuality. That is still a task that remains to be done.

It is a cause for amazement to confront what the new book has brought out to full view: that Marx's Critique of the Gotha Programme has never, until now, with this work, been considered an "organizational document," that is, one disclosing Marx's philosophy on organization. But is the error any less if we do consider our own Constitution an organizational document and yet fail to grasp it, at one and the same time, as a deeply philosophic document that cannot be separated from its organizational nature? And project it precisely as such?

The challenge to all post-Marx Marxists, above all on the question of the integrality of philosophy and organization -- including even Lenin and Luxemburg without whom we could not have reached what we have achieved; and including even Engels, without whom we would certainly not have had Volumes II and III of Capital; and certainly including as well WL, which is the newest of the four forces of revolution to take the historic stage today -- is the new challenge Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution has issued -- the challenge we want to articulate in our summary paragraph.

The urgency of the challenge flows precisely out of the new high stage of the objective developments since 1973:

For Labor, the 1974-75 crisis has meant not only no more booms, but that Marx's Absolute General Law of Capitalism is here -- the permanent army of the unemployed.

For Youth, the anti-Vietnam War struggles have not just assumed the new/old form of opposition to Reagan's wars against Central America, but have reached a total anti-nuke, anti-draft, anti-war, global dimension.

For the Black dimension, it is Black Consciousness, as movement, that exploded in Soweto in 1976 which has reached a new world stage.

For Women's Liberation, the new is not only all the unique contributions our age's WLM has made, but the fact that by now it has truly reached a crossroads where it has become urgent for WL to move to a full philosophy of revolution or (as Marx put it in relationship to the Russian commune) "miss the greatest chance history has ever offered" a revolutionary force to make it -- just as the speed with which the new revolutions of the '70s in Portugal and Iran faced counter-revolution makes it urgent to grasp revolution in permanence both as depth and new forces and "second negation" -- whether we are talking about the women, or the Kurds, or religion.

These are the reasons all post-Marx Marxists are being challenged to return to Marx's Marxism and why the expansion of our Constitution is not just "adding a paragraph" but must be seen, instead, as the type of summation that truly synthesizes all three works of our trilogy and demonstrates our historic right to be the continuators of Marx's Marxism for our age.

Let us read together, then, the paragraph the REB has submitted for discussion and decision here:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION, to be added as new paragraph after first paragraph on p. 4, which ends with "revolutionary maturity of the age and its passion for a philosophy of liberation."

The third of our theoretical-philosophic works, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, was published in the Marx centenary, when the three-decade-long movement from practice to theory that is itself a form of theory was challenged by the totality of global crises in a nuclear world. It was also the period when Marx's heretofore unknown writings from his last decade had finally become available. It was there that we, as Marxist-Humanists, discovered a trail to the 1980s in Marx's "new moments" on new paths to revolution, on new concepts of man/woman relations, and on philosophy of revolution as inseparable from organization. Thus, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution projects that the totally new relationship between technologically under-developed and developed lands, which Marx was working out, needs further development now that a whole new Third World has emerged in our age. At the same time, the "new moments" of Marx's last decade, as well as his first discovery of a whole new continent of thought and of revolution -- his "revolution in permanence" -- were seen as calling for a critical re-examination of the relationship of spontaneity and vanguard party in the revolutions of the ^{early} 20th century, the Russian Revolution led by Lenin and the German led by Luxemburg, in light of the soured and unfinished revolutions of our age. We see the absolute challenge to our age as the need to concretize Marx's "revolution in permanence" not alone as the determinant for theory and practice, but as ground for organization in place of "the party to lead," in order to achieve the total uprooting of this exploitative, racist, sexist society and the creation of truly new human relations.

(The next paragraph on p.4 is then changed to read as follows:)

Because Marxism and Freedom (1958), Philosophy and Revolution (1973), and Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution (1982) -- which we have concretized on the American scene and for the Black dimension as American Civilization on Trial (1963, 1983) -- are rooted in and parallel the movement from practice to theory of our age with our own theoretical development since our birth, they are the theoretical foundations for the Marxist-Humanist organization, News and Letters Committees. However, they are not a "program" ... (the rest of the preamble continues as is.)

OTHER AMENDMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED ARE:

1. At the end of paragraph 4 of the Preamble, insert a footnote as follows:

* For our participation in the 1949-1950 Miners' General Strike, see both the Prologue to 25 Years of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S. and the documents on deposit and on microfilm at the Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs of Wayne State University under the title: "The Raya Dunayevskaya Collection: Marxist-Humanism -- Its Origins and Development in the U.S., 1941 to Today."

2. On page 3, first line of first paragraph to be changed to read:

News & Letters shall be published at least ten times a year. News & Letters was created so that the voices of revolt from below could be heard not separated from the articulation of a philosophy of liberation.... (the rest of the paragraph continues as is from "It is our aim" to "of the working-class.")

3. On page 3, last paragraph, where Philosophy and Revolution is mentioned for the first time, include the full name of the book:

Philosophy and Revolution -- From Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao.

Report on News & Letters newspaper by Eugene Walker:

THE REVOLUTIONARY JOURNALISM OF NEWS & LETTERS: FACING THE OBJECTIVE SITUATION; ENTERING THE BATTLE OF IDEAS; BUILDING A MARXIST-HUMANIST ORGANIZATION

I. Revolutionary Journalism: Facing the Objective Situation

Revolutionary journalism begins with the objective situation. This past year we have witnessed forces of revolt and forces of oppression sweep the continents from the Central and South America of Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Chile, to the Africa of Azania and Chad, to the Europe of Poland, the Middle East of Lebanon, Iraq and Iran, the Asia of the Philippines and Pakistan, as well as our own continent, North America. How has News & Letters faced the objective situation in what we have written in four areas: Central America, Poland, South Africa, and the United States?

Within our paper no force for revolution has been more deeply represented than that coming from Latin America. It is Central Americans who have most concretely been facing revolution/counter-revolution daily. We have made sure those voices of Central America's revolt are within the pages of our paper. Each of the articles by Guatemalans that has appeared in the last year, and which go to make up the pamphlet Guatemalan Revolutionaries Speak, has in turn represented dimensions of our involvement as Marxist-Humanists in the ongoing struggles in Latin America. Manuela Saquic's article was a result of the work of the News and Letters Youth Committee at Cal State which sponsored her. It was part of the work that the Los Angeles local has been doing on the Latino dimension. From New York the work of Bert and others with a Guatemalan support committee, including Guatemalans, enabled us to have the interviews with Rigoberta Menchu and Nicolas Balam as well as the statement from the New York Guatemalan support committee. From the Chicago local came the interview with Iztoy which in turn helped in Chicago's continuing work with Guatemalans in exile. Thus, the articles where Guatemalans spoke for themselves came from the organizational work of locals who did not confine their work with the Latin American dimension to collecting money and going on demonstrations.

The Center was able to contribute to the form of the pamphlet in seeing that the voices from below were not separated from the historic and global dimensions of the struggle which we put forth in both the essay article on the Peasant Dimension in Latin America, which reached back to Marx and the peasantry and to Bolivia, 1952, as well as Guatemala of the 1980s, and in the Marxist-Humanist Archives article which became so alive today within the context of this pamphlet.

Central America is a subject which radical as well as bourgeois papers have taken up this past year. What we want to grasp is how a Marxist-Humanist newspaper undertakes to write on this objective situation which separates it sharply from others. As we noted above, we begin by Central Americans speaking for themselves. Further, we have sought to show that the Latino Dimension is not only South of us, but within the U.S. We have shown the link between the opposition to Reagan's policies in Latin America and opposition to Reagan here at home. We can see this type of a presentation in the lead article last June, "U.S. and Central American youth resist Reagan's new war plans", in which the thoughts of Black and Latino youth in Chicago are presented unseparated from the ongoing resistance in Central America. Our opposition to Reagan's policies in Central America were

expressed in many short articles in Our Life and Times this past year. When health and safety workers visited Nicaragua and brought back an important discussion of health and safety in a Third World revolution, we recognized it and made sure that workers in the U.S. would have a chance to find out about this story in the pages of News & Letters. Our editorial statements, "The Domino theory and Central America" in April and "Call off the dogs of war" in August-September, tried to catch new stages of revolution and counter-revolution that were emerging. And our most definitive statement on Central America was found in the July Draft Perspectives which showed that the center point of the Reagan Administration's designs was not El Salvador or even Central America, but harkened back to the new represented by the blow the Cuban Revolution gave to U.S. imperialism and the fact that from the Kennedy Administration to the present, all, especially the U.S. military, have wanted to overthrow that revolution. This illumination of U.S. imperialism's aims was presented unseparated from the new forms of revolt in Central and South America and what we in News and Letters Committees were doing in the struggle. And the entire context was in the Draft Perspectives with its section on Hearing Marx Think.

When our focal point in the objective situation was Poland, we again began by making sure that we could hear the voices of Poland's revolutionary activists. Thus in November we printed a communication from Poland on how the unemployed were organizing themselves. And in January-February we had a direct letter from Poland from two women writing about conditions of women under martial law; we had another report from a steel worker describing the Nov. 10 protests in his plant on the second anniversary of the registration of Solidarity. In April we published an open letter from a woman imprisoned under martial law calling for further resistance. In Our Life and Times, we commented on the objective situation represented by the Pope's visit and his collaboration with the Jaruzelski regime, stating: "It is painfully clear that the deal between the Church and the State is aimed against the masses." Again it was the Draft Perspectives which summed up how this Marxist-Humanist organization both analyzed and responded to the objective situation: "Take the great outpourings in Poland at this very moment. That massive outpouring is not only to hear the Pope, much less to accept the Pope's interpretation of the origin of Solidarnosc -- which far from having been started by the Catholic Church, had its true origins in the genuinely new organization of workers and intellectuals known as KOR. Those demonstrations are to reaffirm their continuous struggle for freedom.

There is no ground for the euphoria of the Catholic Church, which is calling these outpourings 'spiritual'; nor is there any reason for the Communist totalitarians to think that by allowing the Pope to visit Poland they would accomplish any significant lifting of the sanctions that have been imposed on Poland by the West. Above all, what all of them -- the Pope, the Communist Party, and the Western rulers -- agree on at this moment is that nothing will be said or done about the trials the Communist rulers are planning against the revolutionary dissidents, Kuron, Ledzelewski and other KOR founders."

And just as with Central America, we do not see Poland in revolt by itself in isolation. In our May issue we linked the struggles of workers in Poland to that of workers in South Africa. The concrete point of affinity between South African Black workers and Solidarity in Poland was the revolutionary dimension that infused the concept of what is a trade union. Our writing on South Africa this year has tried to show that new stage of Black labor which the movement has

developed in the most recent period, how this dimension of Black labor has intensified the struggle in South Africa. We have tried to show the parallel between that and the stage of revolutionary thought which is becoming ever more fully manifest among liberation fighters in and from South Africa. This new stage of activity and thought has brought forth the developing relation we are having with the Black Consciousness Movement. In the May issue we introduced our readers to the first issue of Azania Frontline -- the newsletter of the Azania Liberation Support Committee. In June we presented news from South Africa by reprinting excerpts from Solidarity, the official organ of the Black Consciousness Movement of Azania.

In July, Lou Turner, after participating in the Black Consciousness Movement's Soweto Lay, wrote of Black Consciousness and Marxist-Humanism and we presented Tokolohe, the AZAPO newsletter from the Soweto branch. In August-September, John Alan begins with workers in the Black trade union movement in South Africa fighting against being called boy, and moves to discuss Language, Consciousness and Freedom ranging from Africa to America, from Steve Biko and Frantz Fanon, to Ralph Ellison. What can be seen clearly in how we face the objective situation of South Africa is how in the pages of News & Letters we never separate counter-revolution and revolution, voices of revolt and freedom activities, the ideas of Black Consciousness and their relation to the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism, the organizational forms of the Black movement in South Africa and the organizational expression of Marxist-Humanism, News and Letters Committees. If you want to see what permanent revolution means as a movement from practice, then the three revolutionary movements -- Central America, Poland, and South Africa -- as they were brought forth in the pages of News & Letters this past year, let you see the revolutionary subjects emerging -- women, youth, labor, Indian, peasant, Black Dimension -- and the multi-dimensional forms of open and underground struggle taking place.

Facing the objective situation is for us not separated from a presentation of freedom ideas, and in fact, involves the necessity of a battle of ideas, a battle against other attitudes to objectivity, ones which fail to reach fully toward freedom. Thus, I would like to see how our newspaper has undertaken this battle of ideas as we concentrated on facing the objective situation in the U.S.

II. Revolutionary Journalism: Entering the Battle of Ideas

We have entered the battle of ideas in the last year differently than ever before. It is not that our newspaper has not entered that battle over the almost three decades of its existence. Instead, what has given us a new vantage point for doing this, not alone as a movement from below but as a permanent revolution of the Idea of Freedom striving to become the reality of freedom, is the publication of our newest theoretic-philosophic work, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, as an expansion of and deepening of Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution. The work of our newspaper is now under the impact of this new book. Let us see what this has meant in the past year and what challenges it presents us in the period ahead.

The seeming accident of completing the new book on the eve of the Marx centenary meant not only a time for celebration of a centenary, but immediately a plunge via the tour to work out still newer pathways forward, standing upon the ground of Marx's revolution in permanence as presented in the new book. The

intermings of book, tour, centenary, became reflected within the pages of News & Letters over the past year in a number of areas: In the November issue, we published the Introduction to the new book, including the new paragraph for the Introduction written after the book went to press. Columns took up various aspects of the book. That same November issue had Terry's Women as Reason column on Luxemburg's revolutionary democracy. December saw Eugene's essay on Marx and non-capitalist lands. January-February saw the presentation of our new Who We Are and What We Stand For statement, incorporating both the new book and the Marxist-Humanist Archives.

March was the Marx centenary issue. A new category of Readers' Views was initiated in that March issue entitled: "Marxist-Humanism's Trilogy of Revolution Challenges Post-Marx Marxists." The April issue saw a guest Theory/Practice column on the last section of the book -- A Trail to the 1980s and A 1980s View -- as well as a youth column by Jim on the Michigan campus tour. June had Raya's Theory/Practice on The National Tour in the Year of the Marx Centenary, as well as Charles Denby's Worker's Journal on the new edition of American Civilization on Trial, including Raya's summation paragraph for the book on the Black Dimension. July's Draft Perspectives issue presented the Constitutional Convention flowing out of the new book's publication. August-September published the new Introduction to the Iranian edition of the Afro-Asian Revolutions pamphlet, written under the impact of the Trilogy of Revolution.

A series of ads were created for both the new book and the trilogy of revolution which tried to be educational that discussed different aspects of either the new book or the three books. In addition we created an announcement for Raya's Marx centenary tour from East Coast to West Coast.

Most important for seeing how we could enter the battle of ideas was the Marx centenary issue. For so many Marxists, Marx has become a vas, and the Marx centenary issue was a confirmation of this. For the centenary, they could do no better than a short summary "popularizing Marx," or a few quotes from his works, or even a reproduction of Engels' graveside speech. All was past tense. In contrast, look at our Marx centenary issue. It is living Marx from Raya's "Marxist-Humanism, 1983, The Summation That Is a New Beginning," to Mike's discussion on Marx's Ethnological Notebooks, to Lou's on Marx and the Black World, Denby's and Felix Martin's Marx On Labor and Marxist-Humanism, and our reproduction of passages from Marx's editing of the French edition of Capital, unseparated from commentary by Raya on how precise parts of Marx's additions to the French edition become points of departure for Marxist-Humanism's developments in the 1940s and 1950s. Our presentation of the Marx centenary was one with our presentation of Marxist-Humanism as today and as future. And this Marx centenary issue had our contributions on the women's liberation page, the labor page, Black/Red, Our Life and Times -- in short, our analysis of the world we live in, March, 1983.

If we look at the issues since the book has come out last November, there is no doubt that the book was reflected within our pages. And it was done so not superficially, but as appearance on the way to becoming ground for our paper. But to become truly ground for our paper's future functioning is a very difficult task. It is not conditioned by how many times we mention the new book, or even take a direct subject from the book and develop it. It is rather whether the methodology that guided the creation of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and

Marx's Philosophy of Revolution becomes the method of the articles written for the paper, and most important, the methodology whereby each single issue of News & Letters represents a totality of forces of revolution and Reason of revolution and in turn becomes worked with as such a totality by the members of the Committees. One way to test where the methodology of the book is becoming ground for the paper is to see how each section of the paper entered the battle of ideas as part of facing the objective situation.

Let's begin with the Black Dimension. We have covered that Black Dimension in the U.S. from reports on Black Chicago on the move to reports on activities in Alabama, Mississippi and Miami. We have written on demonstrations such as the Harlem peoples' court in New York to protests against police killings in Los Angeles. We have analyzed a host of reports on Black America from Herbert Hill's on race and labor, to the Urban League's on the State of Black America, 1983. We have attended, participated in and written about a number of conferences including the National Black Studies Conference in California, and the Black Women's Health Conference in Georgia. Thus, we have covered many of the developments that have been occurring on the Black question. But unseparated from this we have entered the battle of ideas on the Black Dimension in how we participated in events and by how we wrote them up in News & Letters. I want to single out two of these writings: Lou Turner's column on "Soveto Day: Black Consciousness and Marxist-Humanism," and John Alan's column on "Language, Consciousness and Freedom."

These columns show us aspects of what we mean by the battle of ideas. They show how the battle of ideas is no abstraction but within the ongoing objective situation, such as the struggle in South Africa. See how history, in this case the struggle to define one's existence as a people, informs John Alan's article, and how the history of Marxist-Humanism's relation to Africa becomes the theoretic ground for Lou Turner's participation in and writing on the Black Consciousness Movement. And finally, notice that when we are here speaking of the battle of ideas, it does not have to limit itself to a fight against other ideologies and be cast as a struggle against sectarians. In the case of the articles by Lou Turner and John Alan, the battle of ideas takes the form of an interchange of ideas with the Black Consciousness Movement. This is not to say that there cannot be, as witness Terry's on "Feminism, Marxism, Method." The power of Terry's response is how she finds within the discussion and development of Marx's Ethnological Notebooks that has been presented by Marxist-Humanism's newest work, the weapons for a critique of McKinnon.

The new book has shown us in its last part the magnificent power of the two-way road between Marx and the world we live in: how our age compels Marxist-Humanists to return to Marx. In so doing, we have discovered in his writings new points of departure for today. That kind of methodology is what we want to be able to use in the battle of ideas within the pages of News & Letters.

Let us look at how Suzanne chose to do this in her Woman as Reason column in the April issue on "New Bedford: The Infinite Degradation of Man." I believe she was able to express a quite new reading of Marx's expression on the relation of Man/Woman, and thereby shift the entire ground of discussion to the degradation of this sexist society and the necessity for its total uprooting. How to have the Woman as Reason column be an anchor for the page, and enter into the

battle of ideas in each issue, is an important task for the women's liberation page in the coming year.

The youth particularly in anti-nuke and campus tuition protests, have been very active this year. And our youth page certainly has had on-the-scene reports, whether of Lawrence Livermore Labs anti-nuke demonstrations, tuition protests on campus, articles on draft resistance and from within the military, as well as from young Black workers within job corps programs. However, in the battle of ideas and our specific Marxist-Humanist contribution, I do not believe the youth page has entered in a decisive manner. And this becomes all the more crucial when we realize that the National Chairwoman's tour on the Marx centenary was precisely a battle of ideas on the university campus. Our most decisive entry into the battle of ideas with youth as a category occurred not on the youth page, but in the April lead on "Rising campus protests confront militarism, Reaganomics, racism."

The key to the battle of ideas for the youth, and for other parts of the paper, lies very much in posing the question, What Is Theory, and seeing that the Marxist-Humanist answer is rooted both in looking at what is flowing out of the objective situation and what precisely within Marxist-Humanism and Marx's Humanism can help give that action a direction. And it lies in choosing which battle to really undertake -- which represents something important in the objective situation, which are related to the theoretical needs of this organization at a particular moment. Otherwise, the theoretic labor we do will spin itself in abstractions or in the pull of other ideologies.

Two paramount examples of the battle of ideas tied to both the objective situation and the specific Marxist-Humanist contributions of this organization are the December lead by Raya on "Andropov's Ascendancy Reflects Final Stage of State-Capitalism's Degeneracy," and the June Theory/Practice column, "The National Tour on the Marx Centenary." Ask yourself -- didn't this objective event of Andropov's ascendancy take on a different meaning when it was put in Marxist-Humanism's state-capitalist analysis of the objective-subjective crisis of Russia and East Europe. And didn't the seeming subjectivity of Marxist-Humanism's National Tour on the Marx centenary become jammed together with objectivity in terms of discussions with the Black Dimension, with women's liberation and with labor? This, precisely this, is what we mean by the battle of ideas within the objective situation.

On this subject, as with so many others, we have a great deal to learn from the creative mind of Marx. In other writings and reports we have discussed the revolutionary journalism of Marx. As writer and editor of Rheinische Zeitung in the early 1840s he chose journalism as the starting point for realizing his philosophy and immediately found himself face to face with Prussian censorship as he wrote on such topics as the distraught condition of the German peasantry, and, in his words, tried to make the press "the ruthless language and manifest image of the historical spirit of the people."

In the midst of the 1848 Revolutions he founded and edited Neue Rheinische Zeitung and wrote on revolution/counter-revolution in Europe, the workers struggles in France and in Germany, and presented to the workers his Wage-Labor and Capital in a daily newspaper.

Today I want to look briefly at how Marx throughout the decade of the 1850s again had journalism as a way of projecting his ideas. What has been misnamed "the American journalism of Karl Marx," because it primarily appeared in the New York Daily Tribune, was in fact a world and historical view of that decade as Marx saw it. I want to bring it forth here because the dimensions of revolutionary journalism I have spoken of -- facing the objective situation; entering the battle of ideas -- are what Marx did so profoundly in this decade of newspaper thinking and writing. Not only did much material later enter into the text of Capital, but the world scope and the historic debt found in these articles stands up a century and a quarter later. Topics are far too numerous to mention but briefly -- from the debates in the British parliament to following the development of China's Taiping Rebellion, to India, to the Crimean War between Russia and Turkey and then England.

But to catch the flavor of Marx's revolutionary journalism as he wrote of the objective situation and the battle of ideas, let me concentrate on a series of articles Marx wrote between August and November 1854, entitled "Revolutionary Spain." Beginning in the Spring of 1854, a movement against the reactionary government led to a military coup and a bourgeois revolution. Marx, besides writing on the unfolding events of 1854-56 began an historical study of Spain's previous revolutionary movements. He filled five notebooks with excerpts from English, French and Spanish authors. Marx traced particularly the revolution of 1808-1814 against Napoleonic occupation. What is so thought-provoking about these articles is all the dualities Marx shows in the revolutionary process. Thus, those who wish to break away from France are in part narrow nationalists who wish to replace France's rule with a restoration of the Spanish King Ferdinand VII and a return to many of the old feudal ways. However, others caught the spirit of the French Revolution and wished to bring forth its premises as well as rid themselves of foreign occupation. Thus Marx has a marvelous article which analyzes the Spanish Cortes' Constitution of 1812 which sought to bring forth bourgeois democracy. There he shows that this was not a foreign doctrine imposed on Spain from the outside, as many contemporary bourgeois historians had been arguing, but was indigenous to Spain's own history. It is a real battle of ideas with these historians.

In another magnificent article, Marx takes up guerrilla warfare, not as an abstract universal, but as a concrete reality within Spain's fight. He shows different periods of that guerrilla force, observing: "The French were obliged to be constantly armed against an enemy who, continually flying, always reappeared, and was everywhere without being actually seen, the mountains serving as so many curtains." But as well he pointed to the dualities of guerrilla warfare: "As to the guerrillas, it is evident that, having for some years figured upon the theater of sanguinary contests, taken to roving habits, freely indulged all their passions of hatred, revenge, and love of plunder, they must, in times of peace, form a most dangerous mob, always ready at a nod, in the name of any party of principle, to step forward for him who is able to give them good pay or to afford them a pretext for plundering excursions."

We do not have time to develop this further. It is in Vol. 12 of the Collected Works. But look at Marx as journalist -- world-centered, historically rooted, tracing revolution/counter-revolution, dualities, projecting a full vision of social change -- look, and you will see many dimensions which are alive within our own conception of revolutionary journalism. To return to today...

I have not taken up essay articles as the important category that they are in the battle of ideas, though I will shortly have a suggestion in this area -- and we certainly need new contributions -- because I wanted to show other ways of entering into the battle of ideas within our paper.

The illumination of what is the objective moment of a force of revolution is found not only in a major discussion article, but in a short piece that poses something sharply. Ask yourself if a certain stage of labor in the U.S. today isn't caught in the Readers' View from Gene in Los Angeles: "Your Perspectives Thesis talks of 32 million unemployed in the West. The crisis is so real. We used to think of people going from plant to plant looking for a job. Now they are going from state to state. The other day I met a man from Mobile, Alabama. He had been in Nashville looking for a job, and now was in California. And my brother had to go all the way to Hawaii to find work." And the short article from Ned, GM mobile worker, who after describing his forced move from closed GM Southgate to GM Oklahoma City, writes: "What I see happening is that this system is creating a new kind of worker, one who will have to go from state to state to find work. My friend's brother had to leave New Mexico. Where he was, there was 30% unemployment. He is now in Utah. He doesn't really know where he'll end up."

We have caught the objective situation of labor in the U.S. today in many articles on labor that we have published. And I think the regular contribution from Agar has resulted in the development of Beth as a writer, so that her shop reports are both concrete and pose sharp questions. In addition, in labor we have a most exciting contribution to the battle of ideas which is not yet in the paper, but which is a contribution to how Marxist-Humanism views labor. However, I wish to discuss this under News & Letters building a Marxist-Humanist organization, as I would like to suggest how such a contribution can be concretely worked within labor.

III. Revolutionary Journalism: Building a Marxist-Humanist Organization

The labor contribution I am speaking of is John Marcotte's in the fourth discussion bulletin. I believe this forms the basis for an essay article for an issue of News & Letters this fall. John Marcotte is able to make so concrete what the unions are today, and as well provides a critique of the Left who still wish to be the unions' so-called Left wing. Though written as a contribution for us as Marxist-Humanists, it is a powerful contribution directly to labor on the shop floor. Not only should it be in our paper, but we need to consider how we can have it on a more permanent basis for plant distributions and discussions with working people. We can do this in a very convenient form by immediately reprinting it from the paper and having it as a mini-pamphlet in the same way we created one for Rosa Luxemburg's Martinique essay. It can be one basis for renewing our discussions in the shops, and become an aid in building this Marxist-Humanist organization.

The battle of ideas which I spoke of in Part II of this report becomes a reality not only in how we write for the paper, but in how we work with the paper. I am sure all of us were struck by Peter Mallory's powerful expression at the Residential Editorial Board meetings on the paper when he spoke of each undistributed News & Letters as an unemployed or laid-off organizer. How do we employ News & Letters in a fuller way? How can we work with News & Letters in a creative manner in the year ahead?

I would like to discuss this by looking at ways that we did work with the paper creatively that brings us closer to revolutionary journalism being a builder of this Marxist-Humanist organization. We have created reprint packets for three specific conferences. Tammie and Diane created The Revolutionary Dimension of Black Women for the first national Black Women's Health Conference in Atlanta. Mary Joan and Suzanne put together one on women for the National Women's Studies Association conference in Ohio. The McGuire's, Azadcar and his brother Bob, created one on Farmers, Farmworkers and Peasants for the International Farmers Conference held in Ottawa. You may not think we had a wealth of material on farmers, but what we did have was quite interesting, and especially how we chose to link it to Land and Freedom in the Black South, to Farmworkers struggles in Ohio, to peasants in Guatemala -- gave new dimensions to the farmers conference. These mini-packets represent a way of concretizing our relationship in the battle of ideas. It is not that we need to create a full one for each conference. But can't each of us with a shelf of News & Letters select those articles on certain subjects that we want to bring to a discussion with someone we meet at a literature table or a demonstration? Are we able to show to those we meet how living is each issue of this paper for weeks, months and years?

When we speak of working with the paper as unseparated from building a Marxist-Humanist organization we need to discuss Readers' Views. When Readers' Views are sent in -- but not forgetting that many times they are not sent in by the locals -- do Readers' Views come in as a collection, as an ought, once a month, or do they flow out of the day-to-day work of this Marxist-Humanist organization and its paper? It is not Readers' Views as a quantitative or even a qualitative question that I am speaking of. Rather, at its highest level, Readers' Views as the pulse of this organization, reflecting its members' ability to work out the totality of what we represent with those we meet. I don't here simply mean being active, for I know we are very active. I mean activity in the sense of practical-critical activity -- of making the full organizational-philosophical connection with those we meet so that they will feel so moved by our presentation of what is in a particular issue, that they will feel the need of making their own comments, which become our Readers' Views.

When I speak about totality with the paper, either in its creation including how we elicit, or in our projection with it, I don't mean that the paper is a universal. The paper here is a particular which has the role of mediation -- that of jamming together the individual with the universal. The paper becomes such a particular, such a totality of expression, when it is able to bring forth all the individual forces of revolution -- the four forces for America, the international as well as the national -- and jam them up against our Marxist-Humanist philosophy. It is the act of jamming them up which gives the forces of revolution a universality, and makes the philosophy a living concretization. For the paper to be a particular, it is not alone a question of saying that over an entire year the paper was such a totality. It needs to be such a totality in each single issue within the year. We on the Philosophical-Technical Etc. are trying to work this out by keeping in mind that while each of our meetings for putting out a paper may have a technical name -- pre-deadline, copy shoot, mark up, paste up, page proofs -- they in fact also need to be philosophical meetings concerned with totality as we look at the paper through each stage of its creation.

You as writers also have to have a concept of totality in what you submit. Isn't the question of the 4 W's--who, what, where, when and the 5th W, why--a way of breaking down, concretizing, our concept of totality? How one puts these 4 W's, how the 5th W, why, flows out of the other 4 W's, not as something appended, is what drives our articles to be concrete totalities. Finally, all of us together as distributors of and as communicators with this paper need to recreate that totality as new beginning. News & Letters allows us to hear Marxist-Humanist thinking month by month. Let's make that new beginning of thinking and doing a new beginning for organizational growth.

Subreport on News & Letters by Lou Turner:

THE BLACK DIMENSION IN REVOLUTIONARY JOURNALISM

My presentation is broken into two parts which is also its title: 1) the revolutionary journalism of Karl Marx and Frederick Douglass -- philosophy born of struggle; 2) the Black dimension in the revolutionary journalism of Marxist-Humanism.

Since the topic of my report is Black journalism, I am sure that no one will be surprised if I begin with the 4 W's -- Who, What, where and When -- in order to get to the philosophic fifth W of Why this year we have chosen for the first time to have such a report. Who refers to the Black dimension in revolutionary journalism. And in this Marx centenary year which is also the 20th anniversary of American Civilization on Trial, we will see how Frederick Douglass as journalist and Marx's view of revolutionary journalism relate to Marxist-Humanist journalism. In our case who is also Charles Denby as Black worker-editor of News & Letters, and as his own autobiography states, that means not just an individual question but as a "life story as part of the worldwide struggle for freedom."

What, for us, is Marxist-Humanism and the Black dimension. But unseparated from that is the specificity of what is needed for this Convention. The "trilogy of revolution" and the new edition of ACM are our challenge within the Black movement to Black intellectuals and activists to "let the dead bury the dead", i.e., to break with the old politics, old conceptions and old organizational forms. As we will see, in just the three years since NEL expanded from an 8-page paper to a 12-pager, that is what we have been practicing within that new expanded form and that is what has helped us to develop as new kinds of members eliciting from ourselves and as activist-thinkers in the Black movement eliciting a new revolutionary Black dimension in thought and activity.

The question of where has also been a new point of departure for us in revolutionary Black journalism. It has meant a new view of the two-way road to revolution between Africa and America as we developed new relations with the Black Consciousness Movement of Azania at the same time it was reaching a new stage of development, especially with the new trade union movement. We, as well, featured new analyses of Nigeria, Namibia, Eritrea and Zimbabwe. Kevin's work resulted in a review, for the first time, of the trilogy and the Archives, in Africa Today. And not since the 1960s have we had such expansive coverage of the Black South, as we have had in the last three years, especially with Charles Denby, and with in-person reports. Moreover, it hasn't only been between the U.S. and Africa, but the Caribbean has made it a triangular movement, for our writing on the Haitian refugee crisis exposed the hollowness of American democracy as much as our reporting on the continuous Ecuadorean rebellions have over the past three years seen that democracy placed on trial and found guilty.

When refers to the objective situation, as Reagan attempts to destroy every gain made by Blacks, labor, women, and the anti-war youth, at the same time that his insane militarization brings us closer to nuclear holocaust. This kind of when is a challenge to project the totality of Marxist-Humanism. That is why we have to single out the new in revolutionary Black journalism for this Convention. Therefore, let us begin with Marx as he moves from being "Prometheus bound" to "Prometheus unbound" and Douglass, who having broken the bonds of slavery, moves to found a Black abolitionist paper, The North Star.

Marx may or may not have had Hegel's Preface to the Phenomenology in mind when instead of continuing to argue with his philosophic contemporaries he turned to the public as the sphere for making a new beginning in thought and reality. However, what we do know is that Marx, while still a Prometheus bound, first practiced Hegel's dialectic as philosophic action through his journalism, on such questions as freedom of the press and censorship. Philosophy's intervention into the authoritarian world of monarchy and slavery through revolutionary journalism was more than a confrontation of points of view for Marx. Rather, as Marx states: "The revolution of a people is total, that is, each sphere rebels in its own way; so why not also the press as press?" Our publishing of the many journals and newspapers that have sprung up in the Black Consciousness Movement in South Africa this past year and the history of Black journalism in the U.S. shows how much this applies to the Black dimension. Indeed, by the time of the Garvey movement's distribution of the Negro World throughout the U.S., the Caribbean and Africa, the Black press had transcended national boundaries and had become inter-continental.

However, more pivotal to Marx was the fact that press freedom vs. press censorship remained only a formal opposition, an abstraction, so long as it didn't extend to the question of freedom in society as a totality. Marx went beyond the debate over freedom of the press and censorship in Germany to show that freedom of the press as such is an abstraction even where that particular freedom exists fully as in the U.S. if it exists in a society based on slavery. Thus, Marx writes: "The press law is therefore the legal recognition of freedom. It is law, because it is the positive Being of freedom. It must therefore be in existence even if it is never applied, as in North America, whereas censorship can never become lawful, any more than slavery, even if it exists a thousand-times as law." Marx didn't stop there but drew the profoundest generalization that "freedom is so much the essence of man that even its opponents realize it..."

Marx may or may not have read the German edition of Frederick Douglass' Narrative which was published in the mid-1840s. However, when Marx serialized his Wage-Labor and Capital in the HRZ during the 1848 Revolutions, his critique of vulgar political economy for equating the Negro with slave was what Douglass' Narrative had shown was the lie of American democracy. What is decisive for us is Douglass' self-development from author of a slave narrative which Garrison introduced, to editor of The North Star which Garrison opposed. The difference is between telling your own story as an individual (and Douglass' Narrative was the finest example of the slave narrative as a literary form) while others drew all the political conclusions, and on the other hand becoming an editor representing more than yourself, articulating the totality of a mass movement and drawing your own conclusions. The difference is when historic narrative becomes historic reason. Is this not what relates Part I of Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal to Part II? And isn't Garrison's attitude what we have found in those intellectuals -- Black and white -- who have wanted to separate Part I from Part II of III?

* * * * *

But now I want to come to ourselves in the early 1970s when it became clear -- if it hadn't in 1968-69 -- that the movement had come to a new stage and we at one and the same time were preparing to issue Philosophy and Revolution and reaching a new stage in Marxist-Humanist Black journalism with John Alvin

beginning the Black/Red column. It is in this period that new Black theoretical journals came into being as Black studies emerged out of the movement. The Black Scholar is one expression of this. Secondly, a new stage of Black labor is reached with the Black caucuses in the unions as they publish their own shop papers. Along with Alan as Black/Red columnist to intervene in the intellectual debates, Denby participates in the workers' journals coming out of the plants.

It may seem ironic that when John Alan first began the Black/Red column in 1970 that the first article was on Harold Cruse and the crisis of the Black intellectual and that in Raya's tour this year we should meet Cruse again open to a dialogue with Marxist-Humanism. But perhaps more ironic is that nearly 10 years ago the Black intellectual interest in Marx that we see today was emerging out of the impasse that the movements in the U.S. and Africa had reached.

What was compelling the American Black intellectual to turn to Marxism by 1974-75 was the second phase of the African revolutions as Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and Angola won freedom from Portugal and sparked revolution in a capitalist land like Portugal. In March 1975, Alan's column examined both the impact that these revolutions and such theoreticians as Amilcar Cabral had on American Black intellectuals. By the time the debate over nationalism and Marxism hit the Black Scholar, we had already been tracing the dialectic of the movement in Africa and the U.S. when Raya had begun writing P&R (actually as early as the Afro-Asian Revolutions pamphlet). What is most revealing is the methodology by which we were able to anticipate the next stage from practice as the Black Consciousness Movement, Steve Biko and his revolutionary journalism. Here is what happens in N&L the year before Soweto.

In the May 1975 N&L Alan turns his column over to a young Black worker to critique the growing debate in the Black Scholar. The following issue Alan writes his column on the resignation of Nathan Hare from Black Scholar and the crisis of the Black "Marxist" intellectual in which the Black masses are ignored. The next month in the July 1975 N&L Raya's Two Worlds column is on "Instant Marxism and the Black intellectual" which traces the history of the Black intellectual's relationship to Marxism since the 1917 Russian Revolution and the statist distortions of Marx's philosophy that Black intellectuals were recreating by pursuing shortcuts to Marx and to revolution via Maoism and "Marxist-Leninism." It is in that issue that Denby informs N&L readers that we will be breaking new ground in the Marxist movement the following month with the publication of our Draft Perspectives thesis right in the pages of the paper. And in that Aug.-Sept. issue of N&L just before the 1975 Convention, Denby enters the battle of ideas and writes the lead article on "Black intellectuals probe role of Marxism and American workers." By the end of the year the Dec. 1975 N&L carries excerpts from Raya's 1944 article on "Marxism and the Negro" from the Archives.

I would only add two other points here, and that is that with the beginning of 1976 Raya starts a new series of political-philosophic letters in the March N&L leading off with an analysis of the crisis in Africa and the ideological obfuscation in the Middle East by the Left. The other point is Raya's Two Worlds column the following month (April 1976) on the Black dimension in women's liberation. Now, if you were to reread this series of articles on Black thought

just outlined, I think we would recognize that only we could, on this Marx centenary, have projected the category of Marx and the Black world...

I have only traced through one strand of Marxist-Humanism in Black thought and journalism; many others can be developed. The point is that nowhere could you find a Black intellectual like Alan, a Black worker-editor and a Marxist philosopher presenting such a total view of the questions of race and class, Marxism and nationalism in any of the Black or Left theoretical journals and newspapers. And all of it was grounded in the concrete, day-to-day struggles of Black and working people. The point is that the concreteness of the journalism had nothing to do with talking down to workers and Black people. Just as the energizing principle that made each paragraph of Frederick Douglass' and Fanon's journalism ring out with an absolute demand to the status quo and an absolute challenge to the revolutionary movement is what Marx first concretized as a whole new continent of thought and first practiced that philosophy as revolutionary journalism, so that is the dialectic that has pulsed throughout the revolutionary journalism of JNL for nearly 30 years.

At the time of the expansion to 12 pages three years ago, we understood that it meant not only more room for theory but to have fuller coverage of the movement from practice. This was tied to our projection of and perspectives around Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. Where as far back as the early 1960s we had serialized many of our own pamphlets in the pages of JNL as extensions of Marxism and Freedom, especially ACOT, in 1979-80 we serialized several chapters of a major theoretical work for the first time.

Naturally, becoming a 12-page paper wasn't only a question of quantity, but whether we have fully worked it out or not, the fact is for the Black dimension it meant not that there were more articles and more on activity in the Black world. Rather, something happened with the new book and the new space for the development of Black thought which over the last three years saw a new unity of theory and practice in our journalism in the Black dimension. Our writings on the Black South and Africa, especially South Africa, marked a qualitative development which was also a development of ourselves as writers and activists. What makes Raya's singling out of the two-way road in the new introduction to ACOT so exciting is that we have been able to practice it ourselves in such a new way over the last three years in the Black/Red page of JNL. What I think has a definite relationship to this new stage of our development is the fact that in both the areas of Black women and Black intellectuals we struggled to make journalism, as the most immediate expression of Black thought, inseparable from organization. It was that which was our life-line to revolutionary philosophy. Journalism is the way philosophy is brought in as the "household furnishings of the Here and Now."

Just in the last 12 issues of the paper we have moved from a Black/Red column to a Black/Red page. That has not only come about because of the objective situation. Our own development as writers and activists produced a new kind of member and revolutionary in the Black movement. Listen to some of the articles and activities we've had in the last 12 issues: Roy's report from the pilgrimage through the South to Washington D.C. That same July 1982 issue of Days & Letters carried John Alan's column on "Blacks and the anti-nuke movement". Aug.-Sept. JNL recorded the racism of the U.S. North and South with a talk by Eddie Cartman from Tchula, Miss. and a report on the murder of

Willie Turks in New York, as well as an editorial on "Government reports and the ongoing Black revolt." We had continuing coverage of Black women at Hedgar Evers College in New York and the new resurgence of police and Klan repression North and South. A category was created in our continuing analysis of the struggle for land, education and freedom. We looked at the Namibian and Eritrean struggles not as passing immediates but traced their historical development. Denby created a category of correspondence and reviews around LI. The Miami rebellions and the new trade union stage of the struggle in South Africa were singled out.

The Marx centenary issue saw a most unique presentation of the Black dimension and labor with a dialogue between the worker-editors of ML, Charles Denby and Felix Martin, on "Marx, labor and Marxist-Humanism," as well as a Women as Reason column, this time written by Diane, on the "Black dimension and revolutionary dialectics." Clearly, that Marx centenary issue, which featured Raya's "Marxist-Humanism, 1903: The summation that is a new beginning, subjectively and objectively," focused, at one and the same time, both on Marx's unchaining of the dialectic in 1843-1848 and on Marxist-Humanism in the U.S. working it out, 1953-1963. That same issue was one of the most activist issues we have had on the Black movement worldwide with material from Black women at Hedgar Evers, Black Chicago, and the M.L.King march in Los Angeles, from South Africa and from Black Britain.

As for Black youth, we have had Gene's material on Black youth unemployment as well as the story on Howard University -- which was a scoop because we were able to catch, in the most immediate terms, the separation of the Black intellectual from the Black subject in motion. We have had Tommie's critique of Angela Davis; and the interview with Gloria Richardson -- one of a series of interviews with activists in the South and North; and we were able to include in the Draft Perspectives issue this year a write-up of the Soweto Day Conference in Washington D.C. which I had been invited to address by the Black Consciousness Movement.

This past year we have begun to concretize what Raya has shown as the pathway from Marx's last decade to the 1960s. It has opened the view that the Black and Third World discovery of Marx is through Marxist-Humanism. With the trilogy of revolution and the new edition of ACOT, our practicing of the revolutionary journalism and the Black dimension of Marxist-Humanism is sure to bring us a new kind of member.

Report on Japan Trip August 1983 By Judy

In my recent trip to Japan that technologically advanced country I found some strong vestiges of feudalism and sexism embedded in its culture. ...And while women no longer have to walk through the men's room to get to the women's bathroom in public places the Japanese word for toilet "benjo" is still only to be used by men while women must ask for the "O te arai" (honorable place to wash one's hands). Just one example of how the language reflects the sexism and attitude of the government.

I met with Professor Haruke Wada at University of Tokyo. He is in the Social Science Dept. and a specialist in Russian History especially revolutionary history. His book intitled Popularism and the Russian Revolution published in 1973, has had one chapter translated into English by him. Both Raya in the new book and Peter in his pamphlet 'Marx and the Third World' have footnoted Wada's chapter.

We discussed Marx's Ethnological Notebooks which he used in their Russian translation. He has been to Russia twice but because of a protest he lodged with the Russian government, he will not be allowed to return. I gave him the new book, Marx and the Third World, PPL #2, and N&L. I will be in further correspondence with Wada on the possibility of a review of the new book as well as translating it and finding a publisher in Japanese. He certainly would be capable of translating the book himself if he so desired. Wada is also active in the South Korean freedom struggles in Japan where there is much racism against them.

When I was at Tokyo University there were many large posters about a student protest against the celebration of the University Centenary as not being worth celebrating. I also saw the Plaza' area where students had had a large protest in the late 1960's but where the University administration had now planted large hedges to prevent future demonstrations.

While in Tokyo I met with the head librarian of the Institute for Women's Studies (Ochanomizu University) Ms. Kaoru Tachi. The University has several books of Luxemburg's works translated into Japanese. Also, a good sized collection of books in English are there. I gave her many of our books and pamphlets for their library collection, including the new book. Ms. Tachi also gave me the name of a woman who is active in WL activities in Japan, a Ms. Kuniko Funabashi.

I contacted Ms. Funabashi and went to her home. We discussed the women's movement in Japan and in America. She is very active in many areas of freedom struggles in Japan.

She was very interested in discussing the new book and hearing our concept of what Marxism is, i.e., Marx's Marxism as expounded by RD. She purchased much of our literature including the new book. Her husband is a publisher and perhaps some fruit will come to bear from both of them.

The following day Ms. Funabashi and I went to a two-day women's conference of the Asian Women's Federation. This group has 500 members in Japan, and about 35-40 attended this con-

7988

ference. There ages ranged from 25 to 65 and they worked at jobs ranging from teachers and translators to office and factory workers as well as unemployed and housewives.

The focus of the conference was the problem of sexuality as it affects Asian women in Japan. In the presentations they spoke of the sex tours of Japanese men to other Asian countries as well as within Japan itself. The abortion laws in Japan and the right-wing attacks on abortion; the South Korean struggles in Japan; the conditions of women workers in Japan and other Asian countries, especially factory workers; were some of the presentations.

There was a great deal of discussion over the fact that prostitutes are not the cause of this problem, for they are women simply struggling to find a way to make a living; instead, they felt the point was to criticize the men and the agencies which sponsored these sex-tours. One woman said that many of the prostitutes had been factory workers, and that the job on the line was so horrible that prostitution was a more "humane" job than working on the line. There was also some discussion on the whole system of marriage and how you are looked upon as not being "complete" unless you are married. Another woman stated that we should celebrate divorce as it is the beginning of "something new". Much of the sex tours are directly related to the racist attitudes towards women of other Asian countries, which is all part of the imperialism of Japan towards these other countries, as it relates to the factories built there. I gave a presentation to these women where I told them that many of their concerns were the same that we were concerned with in America and that I was pleased to see that they had not limited themselves to any single issues, but were concerned with many issues for social change but that it was necessary to look at the need for a real and concrete social revolution which included all the forces for change and that we had seen in our lifetime many revolutions turning into their opposite and that what was needed was a philosophy of revolution that would mean a revolution in permanence, as Marx had expressed it. I brought up RLWLMPR especially the third section on Marx's philosophy of revolution and his concern with the man/woman relationship.

The women asked me many questions about America, and after the meeting several of the women came to talk to me about the new book, especially one woman, Masako Goto who is the secretary to the Socialist member of the House of Representatives. She told me that she had read the Japanese translation of M&F and was very interested in our ideas, though she did not completely understand them, she also said to me that she never thought she'd meet an American with the kind of ideas I had talked about. She bought a copy of the RLWLMPR book and I will be corresponding with her about it in the future. The conference closed with a discussion on what kind of actions they would take to continue their work in the human rights and women's struggles in Asia, whether it be Thailand, the Phillipines, Korea, or Japan. They plan to attend an Asian cultural forum on Nov. 5 where they are working with a coalition of groups working on Phillipine women's

JAPAN

3

problems as well as in the anti-war movement whose next meeting will be in October where the subject will be Reaganomics. I do plan to keep up correspondence with several of these women.

During the middle part of my trip I met with Tamae Mizuta a professor at Nagoya University and wife of our contact from Raya's trip to Japan in 1966. During our very short visit I found her to be especially interested in RLWLMPR. She tells me there are many women's groups in Japan and she is very active in a women's group in Nagoya. Her group is working on several issues such as the problems of women workers who are mostly part-time and receive no benefits on their job, which reflect the attitude in Japan that women belong in the home and should only work part-time; this group is also working on changes in the educational system which now has a different set of books given to boys than to girls, forcing girls into a house-wife situation. She is also active in the struggle to attain adequate abortion rights, and spoke of the need for the anti-war and peace movements to work together with the women's liberation movement. She has written a book entitled "The History of Thought of Women's Liberation", a work about European women. I gave her a copy of RLWLMPR, WFFF, and several other of our pamphlets, all of which she insisted on paying for. She said that she would read the book and correspond with me about it. This woman is certainly more than capable of translating the entire book or portions of it if she wanted to, and hopefully this will be a fruitful avenue for future dialogue.

ed

I contact Mr Masashi Toguchi in Toyota City. He is the assemblyman who subscribes to RCL and puts out a newsletter entitled "Town Meeting" which has reprinted several articles from our labor page, including the article from the July issue on Fremont/Toyota. Mr Taguchi arranged a meeting with several Toyota workers (it was vacation time for Toyota workers and therefore difficult to get more of them together as they were out of town). I was taken on a tour and shown where the company housing was, which included single women's dorms with fences and barbed wire around them, single men's dorms and married workers' housing--which didn't have barbed wire around them. I asked the workers how they felt about the company housing; they said the workers didn't seem to mind it, but then went on to say it is the goal of every worker to get out of company housing and get their own house. I asked what would happen if they went on strike, would the company lock them out; they said they didn't know, but that their union was such a sell-out to the company that a strike would never happen. One of the workers considered himself to be a union dissident as the people in power in the union were all shop foreman. The Toyota company also owns large co-op markets which end up controlling prices in the area because of their size. I was told a Toyota worker averages about \$850 a month if you don't work overtime and housing (for those who own their own home) costs about \$250 a month. One worker who did not want to live in the company married housing, lives with his parents and has just bought land to build his own house on. Although they stated that the workers at Toyota were not interested in fighting for their rights, it seemed to me as I talked to them that there was

7990

JAPAN

-4-

much underlying discontent. There is an enormous propaganda on competition with the U.S. on the part of the company, for instance the company motto is "Global Ten"; but the workers spoke of the other meanings for those Japanese characters, it also means "heaven" and also "number one" so the company claims to want ten per cent of the world market at the same time as saying it is heaven there and they will be number one. There are also safety rules which are read regularly to the workers which have very strongly military overtones. Although the workers joke about these rules, they also strongly resent them.

The company is planning to send 300 workers from Toyota to the Fremont plant and as made a very big issue about who would get to go. The workers told me that the work is so intense, and the speed of the line so fast, that there is a great deal of illness and injury among the workers. One example the workers told me about was the incidence of liver disease at Toyota, which in Europe is two per cent of the population, and at Toyota 20 per cent. The workers said that it was due to the intense type of work that they had to do. Another situation they talked about was what happens if a worker is relieved to not be working hard enough or "wasting time"; that worker is sent to the hardest and dirtiest jobs, the welding area, etc. During the period of time when a worker is sent to these areas, there is a very high rate of suicide, illness, and depression among those workers. Another story they told me about is Toyota's attitude as reflected in some public comments made by the President of the Isuzu Motors and the President of Toyota. Let me first explain that the Japanese use a small hand towel which is bigger than a washcloth but smaller than a hand towel for every type of bathing function. The Isuzu President stated that even when the towel is almost dry he can get another drop out of his workers, and Toyota President retorted with, "even when the towel is completely dry I can get more drops of work out of my workers".

The workers tell me that it is necessary for their wives to also work as they could not make it without it. I asked them about the treatment of women in Japan and at Toyota in particular, they said they suffered a great deal of discrimination, and though there were some women working against it, Japanese women traditionally had difficulty expressing themselves freely, and that that was a problem. At Toyota there are no women in the factory; only in the offices, and on the employment application given to women they are asked a question, "when you get married, will you be quitting?" If the woman answers no, she will not be hired. Women are expected when they get married, and if they are not married by the age of 29 are so they are likely to be fired as something is considered "wrong" with them. There are no promotions open to them and the only kind of work women over 30 can get are as maids or in part-time work (one of the women at the women's conference I mentioned earlier told us about her job search. She is over 30, and had quit a job as a pre-employ-

7991

JAPAN

-5-

ment investagot for a company where she was asked to investigate the school history of perspective new employees which included investigations into their personal life and political beliefs. She had quit that job and when she was looking for a new one, found it very difficult because they continually asked her why she was not married, and stated that there must be something "wrong" with her. The only job she was able to find was a part-time one.)

We also talked about the educational system in Japan and how you are encouraged to get your children special tutoring so that they can get into the "best" high-schools. The workers told me they did not want that to happen to their children, and therefore they were not allowing their children to go to any special tutoring classes. I talked to them a little bit about Marx's concept of man/woman, and they told me that in the past in Japan, woman were the leaders of the country, and that it had been a very peaceful period in Japanese history. We also talked about the racial discrimination in America, especially as against Blacks, and they talked about the discrimination in Japan against the Koreans, the Ainu as well as against the Neisci (those of Japanese ancestry who are not born in Japan). I gave them a copy of IHABWJ and WWFF and Mr. Toguchi said he would translate parts of both for them. I hope to keep up a correspondence with several of these workers.

Overall, my feelings about Japan are that it is a highly regimented country. It is a mixture of capitalism and a residue of feudalism can be deadly for the population. But there are certainly some people who are trying to fight this. It seems to me that the women that I met were the most promising because they had not limited themselves to the "womens issues". The question of a philosophy of revolution is another thing, though. There seems to be a shying away from Marxism in Japan in general. I beleive this is due to its connection with Russia and China and other so-called "socialist" countries. The women I talked to stated very plainly that if that was Marxism they didn't want any part of it--it certainly wasn't going to free them. I hope that with the dialogue I have begun, we may be able to open up a different concept of Marx's Marxism through RLWLMFR.

I was told that it is very unusual for Japanese to invite a stranger to their home, and yet both Kuniko Funabashi and Tomokaki Matsumoto (a Foyota worker) invited me to spend the night at their homes...where I learned how to take a bath, the correct way.

7992