

Marxist-Humanist Perspectives, 1984-85

Report to the 1984 Convention of News and Letters Committees
by Raya Dunayevskaya, National Chairwoman July 7, 1984

THE MOVEMENTS FROM THEORY AS WELL AS FROM PRACTICE VS. THE GREAT
ARTIFICER, RONALD REAGAN, FOR WHOM THE WHOLE WORLD IS A STAGE --
on which he rolls back the clock of history on the Black Dimension,
Labor, Women and Youth, as he drives for world war

I. THE IMPOTENCE OF THE SUMMITS, THE INTENSITY OF NEW LABOR
STRUGGLES, AS THE BLACK DIMENSION LOOMS EVER HIGHER

II. FROM MANAGUA TO GRENADA, FROM EL SALVADOR TO BERLIN, FROM
AFRICA TO ASIA -- U.S. IMPERIALISM'S TENTACLES (and those
of its Allies from Great Britain and France to Japan) EXTEND
TO THE PACIFIC AS WELL AS THE ATLANTIC

III. NOT BY PRACTICE ALONE: THE MOVEMENT FROM THEORY

He who glorifies theory and genius but fails to recognize the
limits of a theoretical work, fails likewise to recognize the
indispensability of the theoretician. All of history is the
history of the struggle for freedom. If, as a theoretician,
one's ears are attuned to the new impulses from the workers,
new 'categories' will be created, a new way of thinking, a
step forward in philosophic cognition.

Marxism and Freedom, p. 89

1. The New Sense of Objectivity: The Theory of State-Capitalism
and New Forms of Workers' Revolts

2. What Was Marx's Dialectics of Revolution to the Post-Marx
Marxists of the Second International?

3. The Absolute Method -- The Unchained Dialectic
"...our epoch is a birthtime, and a period of transition..."
Hegel, Phenomenology of Mind, p.75

4. On The Threshold, 1950-53: The Relationship of Abstract/Concrete
"Every emancipation is a restoration of the human world and
of human relationships to man himself."

Marx, The Jewish Question

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL TASKS

Post Convention

Bulletin No. 2 August, 1984

News & Letters Committees, 59 E. Van Buren, Chicago, IL 60605 75¢

Report by Raya Dunayevskaya,
National Chairwoman
News and Letters Committees

July 7, 1984

Marxist-Humanist Perspectives, 1984-85

THE MOVEMENTS FROM THEORY AS
WELL AS FROM PRACTICE VS.
THE GREAT ARTIFICER, RONALD REAGAN,
FOR WHOM THE WHOLE WORLD IS A
STAGE --

on which he rolls back the clock of history on the Black Dimension,
Labor, Women and Youth, as he drives for world war

I. THE IMPOTENCE OF THE SUMMITS, THE INTENSITY OF NEW LABOR
STRUGGLES, AS THE BLACK DIMENSION LOOMS EVER HIGHER

The only "new thing" that came from the so-called "economic summit" of the seven big industrial powers of the West and Japan is their economic impotence. Because they could do nothing about the continuing global recession and ever-rising unemployment, they decided, instead, to make a political declaration. Because for electoral purposes, Reagan also wanted to change his image from the war-hawk reality to a peace image, we saw on the TV, instead of the usual Reagan screaming about the "evil empire" at the other nuclear Behemoth, Russia, a smiling dove image saying he is ready to go anywhere, anytime, with no set agenda, to talk with Russia. This doesn't fool Russia which has eons of experience of doing the same type of thing which, in their case, means using Marxist language to cover up their state-capitalist actuality as "communist." But it is not they that Ronald Reagan is concerned with. The people he wishes to fool this election year are the American voters who, like the masses in the rest of the world, are desirous to stop the insane drive to a nuclear holocaust.

What Reagan's film crew (that he brought with him to record all his "successes") didn't record were the massive demonstrations against him in every country he visited, be it Ireland or West

Germany, be it Great Britain or France, be they workers or anti-nuke demonstrators, or solidarity supporters of the anti-U.S. imperialism Latin American struggles. In all cases they were massive, they were unmistakable, and they were not against the American people, but against Ronald Reagan's policies, which the American masses likewise oppose.

Whether we start with the Auto-Parts strike in Ohio (which resembled the Auto-Lite strike of 1934 that became the catalyst for the whole new page of industrial unionism both with its spontaneity and labor solidarity from other industries) or whether we look at West Germany which is now witnessing the greatest strike since the end of World War II -- it now involves no less than 300,000 -- we can see that we are now in a new stage of labor struggles throughout the world. It doesn't matter, for example, whether we probe into the Phelps-Dodge, Arizona copper miners (who have carried on their strike for no less than 12 months) and against whom the National Guard has been called out twice by now; or whether we examine Great Britain where the miners have been involved for 14 long weeks in the most militant strike and are still engaged in a most brutal confrontation with Thatcher's police thugs who have resorted not only to police brutality, but to tactics never before used there by the police, as water hoses and even sub-machine guns, it is clear that the kind of so-called economic recovery that we supposedly are experiencing is not being accepted by the proletariat, whether it be on the question of unemployment, or workers being forced to grant more concessions, or to work longer hours.

Moreover, it is not just workers in basic industries who are displaying such militancy, but the so-called service industries. Nurses have carried out the greatest nationwide strike of nurses in U.S. history. What began in Minneapolis-St. Paul spread nationwide so that we now have 6,000 registered nurses on strike in 15 of the largest hospitals. On the other hand, all the institutions of government are busy moving to the right. Thus, the Supreme Court of the U.S. is helping Reagan against the Black dimension,

be it on labor or civil rights, which produces revolt not alone by revolutionaries, but even such moderate civil rights groups as the NAACP whose director, Benjamin L. Hooks, on June 13, 1984, declared the following: "To uphold the 'last hired, first fired' doctrine in a nation that had a history of excluding classes of people because of race, creed or sex is to turn our backs on the reality that such discriminatory practices have had and continue to have upon excluded groups."

That strikebreaker, President Reagan, ought to be learning finally that it isn't all that easy to break a union, no matter how mighty is the power of a Behemoth ruler. The very Patco union whose death he engineered is re-emerging with the new air controllers, some of whom had been acting as strike-breakers previously, but now are themselves demanding a union.

Even in such reactionary governments as South Africa, there have been strikes and indeed some unions fighting for recognition. For that matter, in Guatemala the strike there against Coca Cola ended in a victory for union recognition.

The so-called great economic recovery is all relative to the fact that in Europe unemployment is still double-digit and growing; even in the U.S. it is supposedly "only" 8%. If even we put aside the fact for the moment that 8% is hardly full employment, the truth is that 8% is "average" which actually means that for all the smokestack industries, unemployment is still double-digit, especially for Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania. Steel, which employed 726,000 workers in the late 1970s, has now only 390,000. Furthermore, the unemployment for Blacks is twice that for whites. And above all the youth, especially Black youth, are still not counted. All Reagan is doing is trying to use that as an excuse to break up the minimum wage structure.

As for the astronomical trade deficits, now the biggest in history, running at \$150 billion annually; as if that were not staggering enough, wiping out the gains made in the high tech industries, the prediction for the next 3 years is that the de-

ficits will run annually at the sum of \$200 billion. This wipes out jobs and forces more and more plant closings and does ever greater harm the world over.

As for the underdeveloped countries, between the huge debt and outright drought it is not just that there are no jobs. Human beings are dying by the thousands and tens of thousands. Nor is it only the African Sahara. No less than 24 countries in Africa are affected. And all the Big Powers could come up with at their "Summit" was the "multi-year rescheduling of debt repayment."

When it comes to high-paying jobs in the high-technology field, we have first to consider the industrial magnates' attitude to technology. At one and the same time, they are talking about Robotics, which would displace the so-called high-paid blue collar workers but they no sooner speak of that than some other new technological innovation becomes the cure-all, specifically micro-chips. And there is definitely more investment going into micro-chips than into production industries with or without Robotics. It's not that those monopolists were worried about the worker who was killed by a robot. For that, they always have an answer -- "human error"; they know the first killed will not be the last. It is the illusion that everything can be programmed* and yet nothing can change, not just the fact that investments always go where the most immediate and highest profits can be made, but the money needed to buy the Robotics or micro-chips is so immense that the capitalists at the same time take the easy way out: that is, via mergers rather than investing in production (whether smokestack or high technology). Stagnation in production is what worries the ideologues who are trying to make some sense out of high-tech capitalism.

One of the most astute, Wassily W. Leontief, is quite worried about the whole computer revolution for not only turning the labor

* See Ron Brokmeyer's discussion article on "The Fetish of High Tech, Marx's Mathematical Manuscripts, and Marxist-Humanism's Great Divide."

market topsy-turvy but, as the business spets for the NY Times expressed it (Sunday, June 17, 1984), that it threatens to "render the human brain technologically obsolete." In all cases, neither the ideologues nor the monopolists consider the human being, his force and his reason, whether it is in basic industry, or in the service industries; whether it is the youth who have not yet entered industry or the women who continue to be marginal to the state-capitalists' thinking.

The real point, however, is: we have entered a new stage with the ongoing strikes, with the massive anti-nuke demonstrations, with the solidarity with struggles everywhere, from Africa to Latin America. To all these the two nuclear Behemoths have only one answer: the preparation for a nuclear holocaust.

II. FROM MANAGUA TO GRENADA, FROM EL SALVADOR TO BERLIN,
FROM AFRICA TO ASIA -- U.S. IMPERIALISM'S TENTACLES
(and those of its Allies from Great Britain and France
to Japan) EXTEND TO THE PACIFIC AS WELL AS THE ATLANTIC.

To Ronald Reagan, for whom the whole world is a stage where he prances around with a smile on his face but armed to his teeth, this year's trip to the Summit was preceded by, and is being followed by, getting Congress to enact all his goals whether it be on the MX missile and the astronomical deficits, or whether it be in playing up the "strong recovery." The real coup he recently engineered was the continuation of the stranglehold on Central America, specifically El Salvador. As initiated by his first Secretary of State, the war-hawk Haig, who had declared El Salvador the center point of the global crises, this is continued by the soft-spoken but equally rapacious Shultz. The latest image Reagan had put over on Congress (who had heretofore not approved the money for El Salvador) was the presentation of Duarte as a democrat who would put an end to the death squads if only Congress would provide the money to help him "control the Army." That is the phrase used by Duarte for many a year now, and hardly for democratic purposes.

It is true that Duarte did not enjoy the confidence of the extreme rightist regime against whom he had won the election in 1972, that he had been arrested, tortured and exiled in 1972. It is not true that he represents the people of El Salvador. Upon his return, he became part of the five-man "Revolutionary Government Junta." It was the period when the Archbishop of San Salvador was murdered and his funeral became the occasion for D'Aubisson and his death squad to enact another mass killing. Duarte continued to talk nonsense -- and he knew it -- about "controlling the Army." It was the period of the murderous weeks at the end of 1980 when the four nuns were raped and murdered and two American agrarian reform experts working for the AFL-CIO and the U.S. Embassy were shot to death. This still failed to satisfy those death squads and the Army that aided in the cover-up. On the contrary. The murders -- indeed, the massacres -- continued by the hundreds.

The peasants who were slaughtered were those who were supposed to get the land due them through the Land Reform Act. Indeed, there is an ongoing civil war still. While it's true that Duarte, by comparison with D'Aubisson, can be considered very nearly a moderate, the more important fact is that the National Guard that Duarte is supposedly disbanding now, he is actually only reorganizing. Thus far only the five who were directly responsible for the murder of the nuns have come to trial and been sentenced. But the Army that participated in the cover-up is doing so to this day on all other assassinations and massacres. Surely we cannot forget that the very person who was the head of the Army that had jurisdiction over these death squads -- Carlos Eugenio Vides Casanova -- is right now Duarte's Minister General of Defense.

Duarte himself was the ranking civilian member of the same government as Vides Casanova when the land reform was supposed to have been instituted back in 1980 and the only thing coming out in 1981 was the account of the massacre around the village of

Mozote, where hundreds of peasants were murdered.*

Duarte is keeping away from getting directly involved in the question of Nicaragua. Honduras, too, had removed the direct stooge for U.S. imperialism, and right now is trying to draw a line between U.S. imperialist designs on Nicaragua and itself, though this may be merely a ploy to exact something more from the U.S. than the previous head of government, who danced all too joyfully to Reagan's every tune.

While Reagan is trying to make us think a new day has dawned since his rhetoric openly declared Russia the "evil empire", and named Nicaragua "its" surrogate, the truth is that though -- and that even before the Allies pressured him to change his tone on the question of Russia -- he had sent Shultz to visit Nicaragua, he did not stop for a moment in his arming and financing of the counter-revolutionary army of mercenaries in Honduras, directly on Nicaragua's border, with the aim of overthrowing the sovereign state of Nicaragua.

Towards that end, Reagan had assigned Henry Kissinger to head a special, so-called "bipartisan" commission to report on all of Central America. Kissinger was glad to comply. His so-called "bipartisan commission" has prepared its report which will further continue the old policy of treating not only Central America but also the Caribbean as if it were an American Lake. Kissinger may be under the illusion that he can do to Nicaragua what he did to Allende in Chile when he helped engineer the installation of a most reactionary, brutal, militaristic, neo-fascist regime of Pinochet. But this is 1984 and such ideological fetishisms aren't fooling even the Allies, much less the actual people in the respective countries, whether it be in the Philippines or Chile, where tremendous mass movements have burst out and are continuing despite the reactionary, brutal repressions in Chile, in the Philippines, and in El Salvador.

* See "Saving Salvador", a review of six books in the NY Review of Books (June 14, 1984) by Christopher Dickey. He is no radical, having once been the Washington Post head for Mexico and Central America and a member at the Council on Foreign Relations, 1983-84.

Reagan has no intention of making peace with Nicaragua that, by revolution, rid itself of the brutal, savage, corrupt U.S. stooge, Somoza, to establish a government free of U.S. imperialist tentacles. What he is doing is looking for ways to avoid such a fiasco as he had in Lebanon, to see whether he can find some less corrupt stooges, either through the Church or through newspapers like Prensa, who have decided to stop publication altogether rather than undergo such drastic censorship. Reagan is so involved in so many covert operations which are known to all that he seems to have lost any ability to invent a new fetish that could be acceptable for open action.

Enter here the ideologues. While the Big Powers in Summit session let Reagan off easy -- they were definitely too worried about the crises in their own countries and were too jealous of the economic growth the U.S. did achieve -- those ideologues who are presently not holding onto government jobs took advantage of that fact to speak out. They spoke out on the depth of actual disintegration of both Western Europe and the U.S. This is especially clear in the statements from Kissinger* before the Summit and Helmut Schmidt** while the Summit was in session, the latter actually holding a press conference during the Summit. He was anxious not to appear as the only one who held those critical views. Thus he was full of praise of Kissinger's earlier statement on "reshaping NATO."

The centerpoint of both pundits was that it was not Latin America or any part of the Third World but Western Europe which continues to be "the fulcrum" of the policies of American foreign policy as well as that of Western Europe.

On closer examination, it will become clear that, Schmidt's over-complimentary article on Kissinger notwithstanding, they actually manifest A NEW GREAT DIVIDE between Western Europe and America.

* "Reshaping NATO," Time Magazine, March 5, 1984.

** "Saving the Western Alliance," NY Review of Books, May 31, 1984.

They do agree that, as Kissinger puts it: "There is less intellectual and philosophic agreement than in any previous period." Actually, however, they have totally different analyses for the "why" that is so. Kissinger's essay is just a repeat of Kissinger's old speech about Europe's interest being merely "regional" while the U.S.'s alone is global. To Kissinger, that spells out Pax Americana.

The only new twist in Kissinger's present presentation on Europe is the threat to remove half of the American troops from Europe if it does not assume the "responsibility" for "protecting" itself. In searching for an example of "irresponsibility", Kissinger accuses Europe of "advocating policies that amount to unilateral nuclear disarmament for their countries, thereby leaving Europe vulnerable to nuclear blackmail." He concludes: "We must not let our future pass by default to the neutralists, pacifists, and neo-isolationists who systematically seek to undermine all joint efforts."

He then attacks Europe for having dared to criticize the U.S. invasion of Grenada: "What could have been in the minds of the leaders?...They could hardly have wanted us to fail."

"Kissinger," says Schmidt, "has hit the bull's eye. The Alliance needs a grand strategy." The "grand strategy" Schmidt seemed to have in mind, and how it most fundamentally differs from Kissinger's Pax Americana, is not obvious on the face of it. At first sight it appears as merely an elaboration of the question of dependency. Kissinger raised it as "Dependency corrupts." Schmidt added: "Dependency corrupts -- and corrupts not only the dependent partners but also the oversize partner who is making decisions almost single-handed."

Secondly, Schmidt contrasts two different periods and personalities, all American: the 1960s and 1970s when Kennedy did have "respect for Europe as well as for MacMillan and De Gaulle," (as against Johnson's preoccupation with Vietnam.) The high point,

however, is not only a criticism of Reagan for his nearly complete turnaway from Europe, but (1) the insistence that detente is not what encouraged Russia's expansionism: "SALT could not rescue Vietnam, Cambodia or Afghanistan," and (2) his critique of Reagan for "a series of recklessly militant speeches from Washington..." which (3) ends with a real whammy against U.S. (Reagan's) "innocent unawareness" of Europe: "Today the centers where opinion is formed in the U.S. are Atlanta, Houston, Los Angeles -- places where not very much is known about Europe."

Schmidt's near-ecstasy about Kissinger's "brilliant" and "his usually subtle" essay is all due to the type of olive branch Kissinger is offering Western Europe -- namely, that if Europe assumes responsibility for sufficient militarization, he would propose that a European become Supreme Allied Commander of NATO! It is this -- just this -- that is the real point of attraction for Schmidt. It is this -- just this -- that, at one and the same time, explains all the compliments for Kissinger and manifests the "why" of that new Great Divide between the U.S. and the Allies. This was actually what tells the truth: there is a new Great Divide between the U.S. and the Allies. Yes, indeed, Schmidt wants a "European" (a German?) to be the Supreme Allied Commander!

What happens then to all these flashpoints and myriad crises not only in the Third World but between East and West and within East and West, between North and South, and within each orbit? Take just one example, the talk about trying to end the Iran-Iraq war. Yet no one has really raised the question seriously to do anything. I'm referring to the aspect in the Iran-Iraq war that relates to Syria, whose opposition to Iraq (though it is an Arab land, run by the same political party as Syria, the Ba'ath) does not stand in the way of their alignment with Iran and shutting off the oil pipeline from Iraq.

Here we are touching the old nerve of the unprincipled nature of this capitalist-imperialist world, not only as it im-

pinges on East-West, North-South, nor as Iraq-Iran in itself is concerned, nor as it relates to Syria, but all those crises in that volatile region of Lebanon. Here Syria's ambitions to become the dominant power in the Middle East are clashing with the Shi'ites who follow Khomeini as the "one true Islam."

Or take Israel, whose genocidal war restarted the unfinished 1975-76 Civil War in Lebanon. It seems on the move again; certainly one cannot exclude that it would include confrontation with Syria.

Or look at another flashpoint. What has happened to Grenada after the U.S. imperialist invasion of it? Kissinger may be ready to use the invasion of Grenada as "proof" that Western powers have no right to criticise the U.S.; Great Britain has certainly muted its criticism now that it has been handed back that "commonwealth" country with only a few strings attached, like knowing who really is boss: the U.S. That is the exact opposite, however, of what the Grenadians think of it all; they have no intention whatever of becoming a colony all over again, be it British or American. And what the new boss has revealed is that it considers not only Grenada but both Central America and the whole Caribbean its Lake.

We are back to where we started: Central America and the Caribbean as if that were an American Lake and the center of the world's crises which suddenly makes it integral to the U.S.'s "national interests."

As against the paralysis reached by these capitalist-imperialist ideologues, the trail to the 1980s can be worked out from the "new moments" Marx experienced in his last decade, which ended in 1883 but in fact anticipated developments in the whole Third World. The ground for that was laid as Marx developed the ultimate that the accumulation of capital would lead to, with its concentration and centralization of capital in the hands of a single capitalist at one pole, and the unemployed

army and its revolt at the other. Which is exactly what produced the end of private capitalism in the Depression and the outbreak of World War II. The age of state-capitalism emerged not alone in Russia, but the world over, be it in Nazi Germany or the U.S.'s state intervention into the economy.

III. NOT BY PRACTICE ALONE: THE MOVEMENT FROM THEORY

He who glorifies theory and genius but fails to recognize the limits of a theoretical work, fails likewise to recognize the indispensability of the theoretician. All of history is the history of the struggle for freedom. If, as a theoretician, one's ears are attuned to the new impulses from the workers, new "categories" will be created, a new way of thinking, a step forward in philosophic cognition.

Marxism and Freedom, p.89

1. The New Sense of Objectivity: The Theory of State-Capitalism and New Forms of Workers' Revolts

Heretofore we criticized the theory of state-capitalism by stressing that, without developing into the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism, it was incomplete. While that is true, it would have been impossible to get to the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism without the theory of state-capitalism. We would certainly have had to find the important missing link in our encounter with state-capitalist society, as is all too obvious from Herbert Marcuse and other Left intellectuals who, without the ground worked out by the state-capitalist theory, had no theory for criticising "Soviet" regimes and, by no accident whatever, fell into the trap of apologists for these regimes. (See my critique of Marcuse's Soviet Marxism titled "Intellectuals in the Age of State-Capitalism", News & Letters, June-July 1961.)

The Draft Perspectives 1984-85 states correctly: "Put another way, since the new enemy comes, not alone from traditional capitalism, but from state-capitalism masquerading as Communism and

continuing to use Marxist language, the struggle for total freedom becomes both more arduous and in need of a totally new relationship of practice to theory."

At the same time we must not forget that those who could not break through to the Absolute Idea and thus the road to Marxist-Humanism -- the Johnsonites* -- kept using the word, state-capitalism, as if that alone exhausted the theory for meeting the challenge of the new reality. It becomes imperative to look deeply into the period, 1941 to 1953, as it actually developed. There we will see the points in which the Idea of Marxist-Humanism was implicit -- i.e. the movement from practice as well as from theory -- and have hindsight help us grasp how different were the views of C.L.R. James and Raya Dunayevskaya towards these movements from below when we were on the threshold of breaking through to the Absolute Idea which had led us to Marxist-Humanism.

There is not time to go into the whole decade when we were functioning as a united Tendency on the theory of state-capitalism. Thus, we will leave aside the fact that as early as 1941, when I was completing work on the Five-Year Plans from original Russian sources, I found an article by Marx on "Alienated Labor". It is true I did not know that this was part of the famous 1844 Economic-Philosophic Mss. But I quoted it at the top of the section titled "Labor and Society", both in order to show the transformation into opposite of that workers' state into a state-capitalist society and to point to new forms of workers' revolts. Thus, the 1943-44 period became most crucial to our whole political analyses of new types of mass revolts, with the heroic Warsaw uprising of the Jewish ghetto in 1943, and in 1944 the whole Polish nation rising up against the Nazi occupier, only to have the "Red" Army remain outside the Warsaw gates to let the nation bleed to death. Our analysis was called "All Roads Lead to Warsaw."

*It is not quite correct that this means all the Johnsonites, as James's (Johnson) co-leader, Grace, when James was not there to order her (she was in California then) enthusiastically greeted my Letters on the Absolute Idea as doing "for our age" what "Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks had done for his."

Thus, when the Black Dimension burst forth in 1943 at the same time as the first-time-ever in wartime miners' general strike, its global dimension could be seen in the Madagascar Revolt that became the De Gaulle massacre in that same fateful 1943. Now let's examine the critical years, 1950-53, which I designate as "On The Threshold", which will be further developed in the next section. It is sufficient here just to single out the year 1950, because it is there, precisely there, where those two "subjectivities" -- Johnson and Forest -- in their attitude to the masses in motion, acted totally differently.

We are first now getting reacquainted with that period through the new pamphlet on the Miners' General Strike. But, please note carefully that it is by no accident that we do so with eyes of this year, that is to say, not only because it is the 1980s, but because we now stress not only the spontaneous new stage of revolt which we finally saw also as a category, as a form of theory itself, but the movement from theory, in turn, that was on the way to philosophic second negativity. Let's tarry also on 1952 and the Bolivian Revolution, its uniqueness:

Here are its achievements: (1) It was not only the first post-war national revolution in Latin America, which would have given it sufficient historic importance. Nor (2) was it only a peasant revolution, which again would have granted it an outstanding place, historically-speaking, as well as concretely-speaking. No, (3) its outstanding, unique feature was that the miners on strike and peasants in revolt -- jointly challenging the big imperialist Behemoth of U.S. imperialism as well as its own rulers -- made the revolution of such new world importance that, along with all the new passions and forces in 1950 and the final break with Trotskyism in 1951, the Latin American dimension nudged us to that new Second Great Divide in post-Marx Marxism -- Marxist-Humanism.

A new sense of objectivity cried out to be released, but none were there to embrace it as two kinds of subjectivity engaged

in internal tensions, inevitable but nevertheless diversionary from the objectively developing new situation. We were nearing the eve of 1953, that is to say, the philosophic breakthrough in the Absolute Idea, which saw in it not only a movement from theory but from practice which led to recapturing the philosophy of Marx's Humanism and the departure of those who refused to go beyond the theory of state-capitalism. Johnsonites separated from Forest and the majority, especially proletarian, membership.

Because state-capitalism is not just a Russian but a world phenomenon, it gave capitalism a new lease on life. While the first appearance of state-capitalism was via counter-revolution, transforming the workers' state into a state-capitalist society, the objective pull from world production and the world market imposed itself on the new national revolutions in the post-World War II era, as they remained in a statist framework. That absolute contradiction remains to plague us. Thus, with the very first test which came in 1961 with the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, we felt it imperative to declare that, although we had already shown that Cuba was being pulled into the state-capitalist orbit of Russia, we were under no circumstances going to let that keep us from fighting U.S. imperialism's invasion of that country and its revolution to free itself of the U.S. imperialist stranglehold.

Quite the contrary. We at once started something new, in order not to wait for the next issue of News & Letters which was, after all, unfortunately just a monthly. Instead, the same day, we began Weekly Political Letters. Do reread them (they are in Vol. 5 of the Archives, beginning on p.2906); or at least reread the abbreviated version in 25 Years of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S., especially pp. 8-10, singling out from p.9 what we stress in no uncertain terms:

"This is beyond the Cuban struggle. This is the American revolution. This is the world anti-war struggle." This was further developed not only in our 1960 Resolution on "War and

Peace", but led to our Resolution on "War and Revolution" the following decade. In a word, principles of revolution do not change, be it directly against the enemy at home -- U.S. capitalism -- or in critical solidarity work with Left groups.

These political principles of revolution must under no circumstances be separated from the philosophical principles. That is the whole significance of our expression of the whole body of Marxist-Humanist philosophy contained in "the trilogy of revolution" -- Marxism and Freedom, Philosophy and Revolution, and Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. These must never be reduced either to a mere abstraction or to the so-immediate concrete that we hardly become distinguishable from some sort of "popular front" in the solidarity committees. We are, after all, indigenous to the Latino world and have used precisely Marx's theory of the philosophy of revolution in permanence, not as an abstraction but as the actual concrete needed in order both to be armed against being pulled into the world market of the whirlpool of capitalism, state as well as private, and as requiring a decentralized organization whose ground is that continuing "revolution in permanence."

Here is how I put it in my May 15, 1978 Essay on "The Latin American Unfinished Revolutions" after we had worked out the movement from practice: As for the claimant, J. Posadas, holding that he is the "real" Fourth International, by further twisting Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution not only to give "primacy" to the colonial revolutions, but actually elevating that as the "World Development of Permanent Revolution", this further proves the theoretical void left by Lenin's death. It was certainly not filled by Trotskyism, be it "orthodox" or flowing from the new claimants to the title. No matter where the place was, the question re-emerged -- whether in Bolivia, where they had actually become part of the class-collaborationist government, or in Cuba, acting as if Castro were a composite of both Lenin and Trotsky -- the point was that we had to know how, at one and the same time, to be part of solidarity support committees but to do so very

critically. Nicaragua demands the same type of critical activity.

Here are other contradictory manifestations in the Third World, not only in Latin America but in Africa, where along with the revolutionary upsurges that were successful in gaining independence, they also bore the mark of Single Party State. Since, however, these came about not, as in Russia, through the workers' state being transformed into its opposite -- a state-capitalist society -- but through revolution against imperialism which a unified people fought as one, we wanted to examine "in person", so to speak.

It was for this reason that the 1962 trip to Africa* was, at one and the same time, the revelation of all the new passions and forces for a new social order. Which didn't change my critical attitude to the new rulers who had been revolutionaries, and who still thought of themselves as such. Clearly, they thought their anti-imperialism sufficed without realizing that it's the internal production relations of ruler to ruled that are decisive. It is this which cannot be covered up by focusing only on the outside imperialist.

The outside imperialist will persist, as neo-colonialism proves. But genuine revolutions cannot, must not, become half-way houses. It is this I warned against in the pamphlet on Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions, as I developed the danger in any administrative mentality in revolutionaries which first became visible after power was gained, but in fact was inherent in the Second International.

* See my writings from Africa, titled "1962: Year of The Africa Trip", in Vol. 5 of the Archives, starting on p.3184.

2. What Was Marx's Dialectics of Revolution to the Post-Marx Marxists of the Second International?

We first developed the question of the administrative mentality as a danger to the revolution when we realized that

Mao was offering himself as the "new" international (vs. the Russians) Marxist to lead the national revolutions and one who had all the answers, but in fact was only packaging his own national revolution as an international, fully social revolution.

When we developed the question of the administrative mentality in the second edition of Marxism and Freedom, we did not hurry to a conclusion on "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung" (the chapter we added to that new edition). Instead, we projected the needed task as "In Place of a Conclusion: Two Kinds of Subjectivity". This was rooted philosophically both in Hegel's second negativity (which we would first develop fully in Philosophy and Revolution) and in Marxist-Humanism.

The administrative mentality that the intellectual in a state-capitalist society displayed all too clearly was actually inherent in the Second International in their failure to grapple with Marx's dialectics of revolution. What looked as only an organizational question in the Critique of the Gotha Program was the dialectics of revolution in the concrete. In our age it appeared as if it were characteristic of revolutionaries bottled up in academia. Thus, Marcuse, even after having written so seminal a work as Reason and Revolution, had regressed, first very nearly to approve of -- surely to discuss as if it were -- just a matter of discussion instead of attack -- what he called Soviet Marxism, uncritically going for Angela Davis, and still refusing to be armed with the theory of state-capitalism, and at the end, fairly falling into the trap of Mao's "Cultural Revolution" -- on the American scene at that.

We, on the other hand, long before we created the phrase, "trilogy of revolution" with the completion of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, did not fall to give our support critically only, not even if the subject was so great a hero as Che. After the aborted 1968 French near-revolution, it became imperative not to leave loopholes for the 1960s generation of revolutionaries to think that by activity

alone one can achieve a successful revolution by merely picking up theory "en route". Theory is a hard taskmaster as it develops into a full philosophy of revolution. It is for this reason we returned to the Hegelian dialectic "in and for itself", through Philosophy of Mind, where none had tread before, in "Why Hegel? Why Now?"

The movement from theory that is the concern for our age is not of theory "in general", but a most concrete manifestation of Marx's Marxism, today's Marxist-Humanism. Naturally, the revolutions of Marx's day as Marx saw them continue to be the primary ground for our day. The 20th century revolutions, whether of the early 20th century -- 1905, 1917, 1919 -- or those of post-World War II, no matter how more relevant to our day, need to be measured against the philosophy of revolution of the founder of all of us -- Karl Marx.

The fact that this was not evident to any revolutionary as a great divide before World War I broke out and the Second International betrayed, proves how far all post-Marx Marxists had not fully grasped that "philosophy", to Marx, continued to be a determinant for judging whether there truly was a movement towards new human relations, a new "social order". That was not all due to the unavailability of all of Marx's works: there was enough available as we shall see, especially regarding the Critique of the Gotha Program, as Lenin reread it when the betrayal had occurred. Even then (1914), however, only one revolutionary theoretician -- Lenin -- felt any compulsion to dig into Marx's origins in the Hegelian dialectic. That philosophy did not loom as a "principle" that was a necessity for "practical fighters" (Luxemburg's phrase for the stagnation that Marx's enemies did see in post-Marx Marxism) hindsight can see most clearly in the attitude to the 1905-07 Russian Revolution on the part of the most active revolutionaries -- Luxemburg, Lenin, Trotsky.

Here was that great, unexpected Russian Revolution. Here was Luxemburg, so original as to deny it was merely the continua-

tion of the 19th century revolution, insisting most presciently that, on the contrary, it was the first of a series of altogether new revolutions -- and we better all learn how to "speak Russian." Here was Lenin, great enough to recognize its internationalism as well as the revolutionary nature of the peasantry along with that of the proletariat. And here was Trotsky, so far ahead of his period that when a Menshevik declared Trotsky's description of the 1905 Soviet revolution as "permanent revolution," though he had skipped over the role of the peasantry, Trotsky gladly accepted that designation. Yet when it came to the 1907 Russian Congress which had all the tendencies there not only refusing, along with the Mensheviks, to put the nature of the 1905-07 Revolution on the agenda, Trotsky was vulgarly -- I naturally mean theoretically vulgarly -- saying he didn't come for a gabfest; he wanted a "program of action," what to do, as if that could be spelled out when one is bereft of a theory.

To put it in a nutshell -- and this became clear at the 1907 Second International Stuttgart Congress -- all revolutionaries were still under the illusion that an amendment to the anti-war resolution would theoretically patch up any differences and result in a unified International. Unity they achieved, but this could not, and did not, prevent total collapse and betrayal.

What created new beginnings and a successful 1917 Revolution was that after that Great Divide between reformists, who became betrayers, and revolutionaries, it was not only as a political division, but the fact that Lenin then returned to Marx's origins in the Hegelian dialectic and worked out anew, in his Philosophic Notebooks, the philosophic-theoretic preparation for revolution. Unfortunately, Lenin kept these Notebooks private so that, while it had such great revolutionary consequences in 1917, they were no help once Lenin died. The consequences of the theoretic-philosophic void left by Lenin's death surfaced the very next year by the total incapacity to deal with the 1925-27 revolution in China. Chiang Kai-shek's barbarous counter-revolution went on unhampered.

The great defeat that followed, however, was not all due to Stalin's disastrous policies. Trotsky, while great in exposing how Stalin's "socialism in one country" contributed to the defeat, once again showed in what a vise he was kept by his refusal to face the revolutionary nature of the peasantry. Indeed, it was not only Stalin or Trotsky, in different ways, but the whole leadership of the Third International, as for the Chinese Revolution Trotsky had united with the other Opposition to Stalin's China policies -- the Leningrad and Moscow Oppositions, Zinoviev -- signing a joint statement which far from mentioning permanent revolution, quoted Lenin's Second C.I. Resolution on the "Colonial and National Revolutions Question", with the slogan of a revolutionary democratic worker-peasant government. Young Mao was hardly on the scene as any sort of leader yet, and in any case was no match for the "Russian theoretical leadership." He had singled out the peasantry as the revolutionary force and went his own way (see the "Hunan Report").

Contrast this to the maturity of our age, and not alone with hindsight and experience, nor only on Cuba, i.e. the Western hemisphere, but with philosophy -- the breakthrough on the Absolute Idea -- to see the ramifications of 1905-07 to what is now known as the Third World, specifically the revolution in Iran in 1979. We had singled out from 1905-07 what had happened in what was then Persia, not alone as proletariat and peasantry and internationalism, but also Women's Liberation.

The impact of 1905 on Iran, which created the ground for analyzing the 1979 Revolution there, was indeed seeing for the first time the uniqueness of the women's and men in 1906-11. We were thus prepared for Chapter Two of the 1979 Iranian Revolution opened by today's Women Liberationists; practical fighters, indeed, for a second chapter which much of the other Left "practicals" aided in squashing!

At the same time, however, we must not skip the period when we were only on the threshold of Marxist-Humanism, 1950-53. It is

necessary to re-examine the State-Capitalist Tendency when it was still a united Johnson-Forest Tendency (JFT). State-Capitalism and World Revolution, the summation document of 10 years of existence that we wrote in 1950, showed us trying -- trying very hard -- to meet with philosophic demands. Not, however, having broken through on the Absolute Idea, the Tendency nevertheless rushed to "conclusions." What that accomplished was to have me become aware of the differences that were emerging.

Where Marxist-Humanism now checks before and after each movement from practice also the movement from theory, and measures how we anticipated some of the events as well as created the fabric -- the single dialectic in both subjectivity and objectivity -- that was not so when we were a united Tendency in the critical period of 1950-53, when the theory of state-capitalism still operated as a united JFT.

Instead, State-Capitalism and World Revolution, in its section on philosophy, focused on Contradiction rather than second negativity and Absolute Idea, which would have brought us to Marx's Humanism. Grace, who is the author of that philosophic section, considered Humanism merely as either Christian or Existentialist Humanism, naturally rejecting both. In so doing, the Tendency went no further than analyzing the "Philosophy of State-Capitalism". Indeed, that is what it openly called that section. In a word, it went no further philosophically than we had already worked out in economic and political terms for the decade of 1941-50.

There was a possibility of another direction: the ongoing Miners' General Strike and our listening to the voices from below, as we worked out philosophically the meaning of that strike. Instead, we "stopped dead," to use Hegel's phrase against Kant, who was on the threshold of the dialectic, being the first to re-introduce it into modern philosophy, but had not worked the dialectic out fully, i.e. concretely at the same time. In a

political way, that is what was happening to the JFT as differences began to surface between Johnson and Forest. (See A 1980s View: The Coal Miners' General Strike of 1949-50 and the Birth of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S.)

3. The Absolute Method -- The Unchained Dialectic

"...our epoch is a birthtime, and a period of transition..."

Hegel, Phenomenology of Mind, p.75

The body of ideas comprising Marxist-Humanism is rooted in the new post-war movements both from practice and from theory. Marxism and Freedom, structured on the movement from practice, and Philosophy and Revolution, tracing the movement from theory, were not only worked out while deeply participating in all movements of the new age of revolutions, be it the 1950s or 1960s and 1970s, but were equally rooted in the past, i.e. history. In a word, the period was the whole expanse of the modern world that began with the industrial revolution -- indeed, we called the very first part of Marxism and Freedom the Age of Revolutions -- industrial, political, economic, intellectual.

With Philosophy and Revolution, we had a new situation. It is not alone all the new passions and forces of the 1960s with which the book ends, but the fact that the philosophic predominates over the historic, the theory over the practice; indeed, the very fact that the structure is the exact opposite of what Marxism and Freedom was -- that is, not the movement from practice, but the movement from theory -- gave the whole question of Hegelian dialectics "in and for itself" a totally new meaning, in the sense that it demanded detailing not only the movement from practice but that from theory. That movement from theory becomes the uniqueness of Marxist-Humanist philosophy and our original contribution to Marx's Marxism. That happens to be exactly where Marx left off in his critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Mind, once he

discovered his new continent of thought and of revolution. The totality of the crises of our age compelled us to rediscover the rest of the Philosophy of Mind, especially the final three paragraphs, where, suddenly, as Hegel reached what was supposed to be the final syllogism, the sequence is broken. What would have been Nature-Logic-Mind, which would have meant Logic was the mediation, is Logic replaced with the Self-Thinking Idea. But even when the absolutely Universal becomes mediation, it is no beyond, no abstraction, but it is concrete and everywhere, and Absolute Method which is simultaneously objective and subjective. Such a vision, precisely, is what has made Hegel a contemporary of the 1960s and 1970s. And it is such a method that Marx worked at in his final decade, as he worked out a new relationship of the pre-capitalist societies to his age. "Why Hegel? Why Now?" is exactly what gave Philosophy and Revolution: From Hegel to Sartre, and From Marx to Mao, its structure.

Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution did more than merely permit us to refer to our major theoretical works as the "trilogy of revolution." With the availability of Marx's Ethnological Notebooks and, in general, "new moments" Marx discovered in his last decade making it possible finally to view Marx's Marxism as a totality, it was clear also that our own contributions to Marx's Marxism helped articulate Marxism for our age. Surely, the trail to the 1980s that Marx left us in the new moments in his last decade is not something one "picks up" en route to somewhere else. It requires labor, hard labor, to work out, and the work is never done until, once and for all, we're done with capitalism and have achieved new human relations. The dialectics of revolution keep re-emerging in ever newer appearances, as new forces and new passions are born anew. And yet the dialectic principle of second negativity never changes. Take the trail to the 1980s that Marx left us from the 1880s.

We have been tracing this ever since Marx first uttered the phrase, when he broke with capitalism in 1843, and worked at its

special significance when he reiterated "revolution in permanence" in the 1850 Address to the Communist League, after the 1848-49 revolutions were defeated. He wrote it to his organization, the first time he had an organization -- the Communist League.

What makes 1875 so crucial a year in Marx's life is that, at one and the same time, he completed the definitive French edition of Capital, Vol. I, and the Critique of the Gotha Program, and that these two set the methodological foundation for absorbing all the new he began seeing in anthropological empiric studies. That illuminated for him what had been only a "vision" of the Man/Woman relationship he had developed when he first discovered his continent of thought and of revolution. Human development was, indeed, an "absolute movement of becoming."

This is what makes imperative that, to work out the new relationship of practice to theory, and theory to practice, we do not stop with Hegel's Absolutes -- Knowledge, Idea, Mind -- but recreate, as did Marx, Absolute Method -- the unchained dialectic. In challenging post-Marx Marxists, we are articulating Marx's Marxism for our age.

The Absolute Method works out a correct Notion (Concept) from the very start, even "just" the immediate, or "just" organization, seeing everything in that conceptual fabric. The point is that EACH -- both the concrete and the universal; both the organizational and the philosophic-theoretical -- moves. There is one dialectic for the objective and the subjective. Listen to how concretely Gramsci envisioned the Absolute as "Absolute humanism": (p. 193 of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution)

"It has been forgotten that in the case of a very common expression (historical materialism) one should put the accent on the first term -- 'historical' -- and not on the second which is of metaphysical origin. The philosophy of praxis is absolute 'historicism,' the absolute humanism of history. It is along this line that one must trace the

thread of the new conception of the world."

Absolute humanism is surely the articulation needed to sum up a classless, non-racist, non-sexist society, where truly new human relations self-develop. Gramsci, however, like Lenin, didn't shed the concept of the vanguard party. Which is why I didn't for a second let go of Marx's Critique of the Gotha Program.

What has brought us to reunion with Marx's Marxism is the trilogy of revolution to back up our activities as they flow from Absolute Method, whether that is expressed in our view of the 1905 Russian Revolution or 1952 Bolivian Revolution or the philosophic encounter with Frondizi or 1982 "simple" activities in Latin American or African solidarity movements, or 1984-85 Perspectives. Needed for spelling this out organizationally is a summation of the movements both from practice and from theory, beginning with the period of transition, 1950-53.

4. On The Threshold, 1950-53: The Relationship of Abstract/Concrete

"Every emancipation is a restoration of the human world and of human relationships to man himself."

Marx, The Jewish Question

Now that we have briefly traced the body of ideas worked out by Marxist-Humanism from the mid-1950s to the present, a look back at the transition period, 1950-53, will help illuminate that historic movement from practice that was made into a philosophic category and became dialectically inseparable when theory, i.e. the theory of state-capitalism, reached philosophy, specifically that of Marx's Humanism as it merged subjectivity and objectivity with our age's breakthrough of the Absolute Idea as a movement from practice as well as from theory.

With our new pamphlet now on the 1949-50 Miners' General Strike

we can see as a unity the spontaneous activity and what philosophic problems were being worked out simultaneously. The objectivity of the movement from practice became international on June 17, 1953 when, for the first time ever, there was a spontaneous, mass revolt from under Russian totalitarianism -- a revolt which combined economics and politics as the East German workers revolted against the "norms of work" and lack of political freedom, succinctly expressed in the slogan "Bread and Freedom!"

Let us now follow, month by month, those four decisive months, March to June, in 1953 that witnessed the birth of a totally new, historic stage, economically, politically and philosophically:

(1) March. With the death of Stalin, an incubus was removed from the heads of the masses who were preparing themselves, for the first time ever, to openly revolt from under Communist totalitarianism. That brought about a political crisis also in the JFT*, as I was writing the analysis of that. Suddenly what was disclosed was the apoliticalization which deepened when, after our final break with Trotskyism in 1951, we failed to face the public either with our theory of state-capitalism, or the magnificent experience in the Miners' General Strike followed by the seniority strikes in 1951. As against Johnson's co-leader, Grace, who wished to continue with the so-called "underground" apolitical existence, Charles Denby saw so great an affinity of the American workers' daily battles against the labor bureaucracy that he asked me to reproduce my analysis of the 1921 Trade Union Debate between Lenin and Trotsky, in the context of the ramifications of the 1953 death of Stalin and the workers' revolts that were sure to follow.

(2) April. In a word, the analysis of the significance of

* The debate on the significance of the death of Stalin resulted from the fact that, though we broke from the SWP in 1951, we did not appear publicly until the fall of 1953 when it became clear that the very high tensions existing within the JFT resulted from the apoliticalization we had undergone. Those tensions became especially clear when the very (continued bottom of next page)

Stalin's death in March was followed with an analysis of what I made "The Trade Unions, Then and Now". This, in the 1953 context of both Russian and East European battles against Stalinism and U.S. labor wildcatting against the labor bureaucracy, was mimeographed and distributed at factory rates.

(3) May (12th and 20th) came the Letters on the Absolute Idea. Johnson's refusal to discuss them only led to our publishing them in our (News & Letters's) very first bulletin that followed first issuing News & Letters, and never again will there be any separation of politics from philosophy.

(4) June 17, 1953. The new sense of objectivity which we then began to discuss in relationship to the stage of state-capitalism began to be seen in the context of Marx's new sense of objectivity in relationship to all human activity.

Of course, we've been looking at some history with hindsight. But the question is not one of rewriting history, whether it be Cuba, 1959, whether that be the 1905 Revolution, or the 1955 establishment of News & Letters Committees. First, it was 1905-07 that at once confronted us with the "Organizational Question." Secondly, the pointing at the maturity of our age plus the digging into Hegelian dialectics made it possible to both retrieve Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks because we understood fully his compulsion both to return to Hegelian dialectics, (not for any scholastic purposes), and to make sure never again to separate it from dialectics of revolution. This is the kind of dialectical methodology that is needed, not just for "classes" but for the analysis of everyday events, especially those of our age which we have characterized as the movement from practice that is itself a form of theory.

first issue of Correspondence appeared and my political analysis of the Beria purge met with opposition, supposedly from outside sources. All these differences in 1953 came to a climax at the end of 1954 and early 1955, and resulted in the Johnson group breaking from the Tendency. This finally led to the creation of the fully independent State-Capitalist Tendency inseparable from its philosophic political views. Our very first decision was to publish our own paper, News & Letters, and to do that on the day -- June 17 -- in honor of the 1953 East German revolt.

Our present tracing also of the movement from theory is not the first time we have engaged in it. On the contrary, in the very first major theoretical work of our body of ideas -- Marxism and Freedom -- structured on the movement from practice, we devoted considerable space to the break of Lenin with his philosophic past, which we designated as the Great Divide in Marxism. We now face a new Divide, and this time the return to Marx's philosophic roots in the Hegelian dialectic was not to be kept in private notes, but to be developed openly, publicly and collectively. It is of the essence not to turn the trilogy of revolution into an abstraction.

Today we can surely show the trilogy of revolution as a concrete Universal, whether that be in the U.S., or in the work in Latin American solidarity committees; whether it be directly in reference to Marx's Capital, or on the peasant question and the Third World, and always, this concrete Universal must not be presented as an abstraction, but as the concrete need to be armed against being pulled into the vortex of the world market. Reread, please, the footnote in Capital, Vol. I, in the section on Fetishism (p.89, Kerr-edition; p.171, Penguin edition), where Marx writes: "A more exhaustive study of the Asiatic...form of common property would indicate the way in which different forms of spontaneous, primitive communal property give rise to different forms of its dissolution." Dissolution is the key to the whole question of what is private property, what is communal form of property, what is class structure. That appears during the transition period.

It is the clearest demonstration of what a different world Marx's Promethean vision extended to, its multilinearism, vs. the narrow unilinearism of Engels, and not alone on the "Woman Question" but on primitive communism in general and, above all, on the dualities that are present in the communal form which will lead to private property, capitalism, and is already present in the differences between chiefs (leaders) and ranks. In a word, it is present in the gens itself, irrespective of sex or culture.

The new sense of objectivity, be it in relation to state-capi-

talism or to human activity, and two kinds of subjectivity -- the masses in motion vs. that of the Leader -- point to the need to be related to the questions of abstract and concrete. Without that, we run the risk of making an abstraction of the trilogy of revolution. It is exactly what happened on the question of dialectics which was made into an abstraction, an icon everyone bowed to, but none recreated concretely. The contrast between abstract and concrete -- as if one is Universal and the other concrete -- does not free you of the danger of transforming the concrete universal into an abstraction.

Thus, to bandy about the expression "trilogy of revolution" means to act as if, at one and the same time, "everybody" knows about it, and all that needs to be done is to assert, as "conclusion", that all will need to study it in the manner in which one gets a degree, instead of seeing it as an urgent task to do. That only transforms it into an abstraction.

What the new moments of Marx's last decade show is that long before the new empiric anthropological studies he was then digging into, for Marx, Capital (1867), too, pointed to the significance of those pre-capitalist societies -- the gens in primitive communism -- that resided in the form of their dissolution. Indeed, the proof that the new moments, far from being a "break" from the "classic" Marx, were a development of Marx -- the young, the old, the mature, the in-between -- is the Grundrisse, 1857. It is there that Marx first worked out the Asiatic Mode of Production. Moreover, he considered it of such fundamental historic significance in human development, that he designated it as the "fourth form." He repeated that conclusion in the most famous of all historic materialist definitions, in the Preface to the Critique of Political Economy (1859), and it has never stopped being used as the perfect expression of historical materialism.

Anyone who doesn't see that fully today will fall, knowingly or unknowingly, into the statist mold of property-form instead of

the key production relationship Marx taught us along with his theory of "revolution in permanence." Which is how we were emboldened to criticize the heroic Che who nevertheless was wrong both in the concrete in Bolivia and in the whole theory of short-cuts to revolution and "Leader Maximum."

Hold tight to Marxism and Freedom's structure. Note that part in the section titled "Organizational Interlude". Though it is an analysis of the whole of the Second International -- the established, so-called "orthodox" Marxists -- what we focus on is not its life, but its death. Because Marx's Marxism taught us never to separate revolution from organization, the fact that the 1905-07 Revolution did not become a point on the agenda of the 1907 Second International Congress is what brought us to consider that it signalled the death of the Second International. Philosophically, there were indications before the outbreak of the betrayal-to-be in World War I, not to mention that, being burdened with the concept of a "party to lead", it blinded them to the priority of philosophy rather than leadership.

It is this which emboldens us to call the great revolutionary, Rosa Luxemburg -- who has so much to say to us on spontaneity, on woman, on revolution -- nevertheless nearly totally deaf on philosophy. We have, after all, by now broken also with Lenin not just politically, against any elitist organization, which we had done way back as still a united JFT. No, this time it was philosophically, and on the very text Lenin himself had to return to as ground for State and Revolution, that is, Marx's Critique of the Gotha Program, which Lenin read profoundly enough when it came to smashing the bourgeois state, but managed to escape saying anything on party structure, for which Marx had laid a totally different ground.

Indeed, not only ground, but "Absolute". Philosophy of "revolution in permanence" cannot possibly be only ground, or even content, substance; it is Subject, and that both objectively and

subjectively. The unchained dialectic -- both as dialectics of liberation and dialectics of thought, dialectics of self-development -- that self-development is both Individual and Universal. The achievement of that can only come with sharp awareness of the absolute contradictions in the nuclear world state-capitalist reality; to project Marx's philosophy of revolution concretely, its Absolutes as concrete Universals, not abstractions, becomes imperative. This lays ground for daily practical work and not just books or essay writing. That is our organizational task.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL TASKS

You will, of course, have a whole report on Organization by Mike Connolly, in and for itself, and you already had, in the published Draft Perspectives, the tasks listed in general. Discussion for two long days will follow. All I wish to say here is this:

Of all the concrete organizational tasks we are setting for ourselves, none, I believe, will have the impact of the new type of classes on Perspectives. I am referring to all other tasks -- from the activities in solidarity support committees with other revolutionary groups to a sub drive for News & Letters; from the sales and reviews of books and pamphlets and getting reviews of our works published, to our 3 new pamphlets -- all of which are especially central to the new home of Marxist-Humanism in Chicago.

Chicago will gain a new dimension. I say this, not because I am not aware of what it has been historically in class struggles, Black Dimension, Women's Liberation, youth developments -- as well as what it says of historic connection with Marx or, for that matter, further into the history, from the Civil War through the last decade of Marx's life which got rooted here in the person of Eleanor Marx. Rather, I say this because dialectical philosophy had been missing, though Eleanor Marx did seriously practice

the philosophy of Marx in his "new moments" and was the first to go "deeper and lower" into the ranks of labor as well as into women's liberation, to which she added, that is to say, practiced, literature and revolution, not alone in Europe but in America, Chicago especially. There her speech connected directly the Haymarket martyrs to Marx's Marxism. Just as even the Chicago Tribune ran an interview with Marx -- and that directly related to his opposition to any "cult of personality" -- so the direct presence of Eleanor Marx speaks of Chicago as home of Marx's Marxism.

Thus, projection there of Marxist-Humanism as organization, as paper, as international category for this home gives us more than just new "elbow room"; it means seeing our whole goal with new eyes. And we must not merely take for granted either it or the new type of classes since that type of world development, self-development and outreach has always been our goal. One must never take for granted what is first to be proved.

One most fundamental reason the Hegelian dialectic is so very great is that it established from the start, that to assume what first has to be proved is a most barbarous procedure. The word "barbarous" is Hegel's. The fact that he coupled it with methodology shows certainly how the absolute opposite of that was his dialectical method. Because dialectics is the development out of the internal, the self-development, it is not possible to make an a priori statement. Thus, though we know that the new book-to-be will, "in general," relate to Women's Liberation, but by no means "just" Women's Liberation but, as always with us, that seen as integral to the totality of Marx's Marxism, the point is I cannot now cite any outline of it, nor say how it will affect what I call my "mini-tours" next year around the book-to-be.

Our Perspectives projection this year is, at one and the same time, a test of us, a test of what we have been concretizing for 30 long years. This year, with our move to Chicago, we are

focusing on the fact that Marxism and Freedom, Philosophy and Revolution, and Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution -- our whole theoretic projection of that body of ideas -- notwithstanding, it will not be these we are marshalling for our classes. Rather, it is the concrete Perspectives of the year and the relationship of objective to subjective at such historic turning points as the 1961 invasion of the Bay of Pigs, as the new Third World arising in the 1960s, as the new revolutions of the 1970s that were so absolutely phenomenal not alone as revolutions but as the new questions they raised. That is to say, the simultaneity of the African revolutions with the Portuguese, who raised apartidarismo; the question of Black Consciousness in South Africa which was a stage that expressed Pan-Africanism, revolutionary national Black Consciousness, not only in continental terms but as a global dimension.

It is true that the outstanding characteristic of Black always was that it was not that of just a single country, but continental. But it is with Frantz Fanon's Humanism that the Black Consciousness Movement embraced that, in being global, it was being also as philosophic as the age demanded. If ever Marx's dialectic and international presence of new moments found a home, it is there now expressed in such youth dimensions as Miriam Gafor, a high school student, who dared a supreme justice in apartheid South Africa to manacle her mind "merely" by throwing her into jail.

The Archives remain in Detroit, but nationally and internationally they are the kind of living history that their true home is the world. It will be expressed in those kind of classes as what must become not just theory or philosophy or Archives but preparation for actual revolution.

Thus, whether we look at the 3 new pamphlets -- actually 4, for we should include "Eleanor Marx in Chicago" in this group -- whether it be the new one on the 1949-50 Miners' General Strike

in West Virginia (and I remember Illinois in the 1920s, where every Sunday was Red Sunday for going down to the mine region for distributions of papers and for talk); or whether the Afro-Asian Revolutions pamphlet, (and I remember Black Chicago) -- the point is that all 4 pamphlets as present theories and activities carry forward the work of rooting Marx's Marxism in Chicago, nationally as well as internationally.

Thus, in the 1920s in Chicago, the Blacks may have been speaking Marcus Garvey language -- to me it was the Russian Revolution. Thus, Chicago will be the address of the new book-to-be and, just as the so-called "Traxis" article was not just Women's Liberation but Marx's philosophy of revolution, so it will characterize the new book, and that over a 30-year history. We have no syllabus yet for classes to project; I will send one out soon.

Finally, if you follow the footnotes and references in the Perspectives, you will actually get Archives and the future, and everything from Literature and Revolution, to theoretic preparation for revolution.