

①

Sept. 11, 1959

Dear Frank:

This is the first of my letters from the boat, which means at one with a world free of details, and an ocean stimulating to thought. This is not to say details cannot be so. On the contrary, a great deal of this letter concerns the simple detail never noticed before because England was not ever as actual to my thoughts and that is that the translation and translator's preface to Hegel's PHENOMENOLOGY OF MIND--one J.B. Baillie--comes from the University of Leeds. That gives yet a new aspect to the lecture in Leeds for this is one of the few "interpretations" of Hegel that has something to say.

(Immediately there are details for you: Find out if you can whether Prof. Baillie is still alive--the introd. was written in 1931 & I have not heard about him; also, although he gives no hint that he may be anything but a semi-religious philosopher, find out from MacIntyre whether there is any interest on his part toward Marxian philosophy, not Communist distribea, but Marxian philosophy. If he is alive, please send him a copy of my book and I will follow it up with a letter soon.)

The importance of the detail I "discovered" as to where the Introd. was written is the very essence of the Hegelian concept that there are no accidents in history--that the sum total of "accidents" tell you the true course of history. Concretely, it means that while I have been anxious to give a lecture on Hegel in universities and found no takers, the fact that I do get a chance to speak to a university there and that university is the very one that has a Hegelian tradition already justifies my concept that European trip is a necessity to making Hegel's Absolutes as real in the English edition as Abolitionism was made in the American edition.

Here is what is important on finding native roots--to (I take for granted that the proletarian developments will be the basis always and a country that is as rich and advanced in its proletarian history as is England with its Levellers, Diggers, Chartists, will produce many "firsts" to the preface of such an English edition) find the philosophic root which is at the same time method and result. In this case to combine root, method and result is neither dilettantish nor too all encompassing. It means that only in today's proletariat, English proletariat will you find the continuators of the Hegelian tradition. And if that is not obvious is because no intellectual has been looking seriously while you had begun just the "details" of a lecture tour found one wanting connection with proletariat who, because of M&F, gives us a platform. Now then I am not creating a theory out of the "accident". But here is the history of Hegelianism in England to show you why my confidence has a solid basis. Hegel didn't get to England (I mean his philosophy of course) till quite late, the 1890s. The theses that then flowed from these intellectual translators and commentators was not much, especially since evidently philosophy was only a word game unconnected with the world. (In US the 1890s are known as "the heartbreaking '90s" because of the violent strikes; what is England known for?) This continued all the way till the 1930s when the introductions, although strictly academic, began to show some ray of understanding. In this period Baillie belongs (1st edition was 1910 which is also not insignificant but standard is 1931).

Here is what he then says which is of importance to us, referring to the misunderstood statement that the individual is representative of humanity: "In Hegel's view this is not accidental, but principle underlying human experience. The individual is potentially

9433

capable of accomplishing all that humanity has explicitly realized. The wealth of human resources is <sup>his</sup> rightful inheritance & endowment; the achievement of humanity is his own fulfillment, its range and its height, the measure of his stature and his worth."

That may have been meant by Baillie as a hit at the Fanners that began sprouting in the 1930s or it may not but he certainly was not unaware of the world in which he lived. The ~~key~~ proof that philosophy is concrete to him is the fact that he refused to capitulate to anyone who thinks thought is abstract; he not only in his comments before each section relates each stage of consciousness to the historic period, from Greek civilization through the French Revolution, to which it pertains. But he relates the whole movement from abstract to concrete in Hegel to the movement from potentiality to actuality. In a couple of places indeed he reminds me of Marx. You may recall if you knew about it (Inez; please send ~~me~~ a copy of my old mimeo'd article in Balance Sheet Completed, that deals with my polemic against Wright & Ward) that I once wrote a piece on what Marx meant by his statement that the whole C.M. could be summed up in the one sentence "Abolition of private property". He said it after he defined pvt. property as all in bourgeois society & then said "In this sense", etc. Now I find Baillie several times has to resort "This means", "From this point of view", "In this sense" which surely shows profound awareness of how readers are willing to take things out of context.

How could possibly a man like that failed to be interested in some of Marx if he had ever heard of it outside of its perversions, direct and indirect. Now the indirect one concerns me now. Because that famous English scientist-philosopher whose name escapes me just now wrote a new Preface to HEGEL'S SCIENCE OF LOGIC in the early 1950s and even at that late stage asked the reader to disregard Hegel's "Absolutes" and pay attention only to the "Method". To me that is like saying forget the whole and manipulate the parts to fix your own taste. Naturally he didn't say it that vulgarly. But the truth is that that is the very best English "Marxists" could do, and naturally they could make no inroad into the Hegelian schools which must contain some young minds that would be alert to contributions to that most profound of all philosophies.

Therefore I say if we get that platform and take a couple of workers along to listen to the lecture and be able to identify themselves with this revolutionary philosophy, we would be in a position to found a M-H movement on most philosophic and therefore comprehensive foundations. What I would learn from them would be transformed into such an extension of Marxian philosophy that, in turn, they could ~~identify~~ recognize a new quality in themselves. Let's try it and keep at it.

Keeping at it means making sure that, whether the lectures are on philosophy or on the working day, we have some one to approach them and see whether some would not also want to found a M-H movement. I would like not only to follow each lecture up with a discussion with a group in the particular town, but that some could perhaps travel along to other towns, or at least by the end of the tour you could call a conference of all who heard and were interested, (1) to draw conclusions from it for activity (including the mind's activity) and perspectives to be followed by the British movement for the next per, (2) to undertake a British edition of M&F if even we must all do it ourselves which would include a new introduction that could become a sort of manifesto, provided it was not sectarian, but historic and broad for today's needs, and (3) relate all this to the British class struggle of the day and decide whether you wouldn't officially become the British "section" of N&L, supplemented by ~~the~~ mimeographed bulletin of your own, but until a real paper can be printed in England, make N&L your organ, taking over a solid page perhaps.

(2)

Sept. 11, 1959

9435

Dear Frank:

This is my second letter which I begin with a sort of p.s. to the first to the effect that a Dr. Turner of the Dep't. of Phil. of Liverpool University is being thanked by Prof. J.B. Baillie for "having kindly undertaken the arduous labour of correcting the proofs." Dr. Turner then must have been a young man whom the big professor is still using for such "manual labor" as correcting proofs and if we had a movement that were on its toes in Liverpool, then Eric would promptly have visited that department and found out a few things about him, and with the added fact that I speak at Leed U., have perhaps been able to get also a lecture in Liverpool U. Not that that is so important, but that it shows all the facets of a movement that our old radicals don't think, much less do anything about, in their narrow field of trade unionism and big results in a hurry. Enuf!

Isaac

On the debate with Deutscher, if it does come through, be sure to have on hand all, or almost all, that Stalino-Trotskyite-bourgeois through-and-through intellectual. Let me tell you something about this curious writer who is in love with his own words which he manages nably enough so that he is never right. Yet his name is so big that he writes for London Economist as a spets--right now some series on how well Russia manages trade in E.E. Then he writes on end about Russia--super big spets--But he never even mentioned Malenkov, much less Khrushchev in the last days of Stalin. Then, although he saw nothing would be change because it all was already so well planned, he promptly wrote on how everything is changed and Trotskyists are just nearly part of the family. He supposed to be non-party carrying, as witness his books on LT, which praise theory of per. rev. as even bigger than Lenin's, etc. He talks at all times out of both sides of his mouth, but his footnotes, appendices sources of never-before read works, etc. are endless. I don't want to bother with him if the debate falls through so I didn't bother to refresh my memory on his works, but if it goes through have at least the last 6 books (he writes them by thereamful) ready for me to look through. It would be a true feat if we could get it both to put SR in England in its place, and perhaps to break through some circles in Am. on my return which I couldn't before because the conspiracy of silence is not only the making of the bourgeoisie but the old radicals as well.

On the working class meetings. I will always want to get the feel of the audience, so it would be good if I met whoever knows many of those expected and have him talk to me 1/2 hour before meeting. Where you cannot be with me I would write you a formal letter describing it, and if you could afford it, you should have a mimeographed sheet or two circulating weekly while I am there. Glasgow is an entirely different area. With such an old stalwart as McShane it will be both easier and harder to get a group together as he will have so much history and past in him--but that letter of his was wonderful, much more warm than Eric's review. There was another old man in Glasgow. I think his name was Aldred, but I may be mixing it up, and he is the editor of "The Word". He wrote most enthusiastically about M&F, and had an editorial on it promising a long review, but that never was. I wondered why or if anyone there knows about him. Aldred (if that is his name) must be over 70 and is sort of independently Trotskyist-anarchist. He should certainly be informed of my having a meeting in Glasgow and that I personally want to see him.

You are obviously and naturally the "greatest find" of all and therefore it would be important that I see as much of you as possible, which means that if at all possible, you should try to take some time from work. I know what money means especially as you are a prospective father, but think seriously & we'll see what can be worked out

Now then a little bit more of philosophy. The question of the movement from the abstract to the concrete that I touched on in my last letter. What I liked about Baillie's concept of the concrete is not alone that he does not limit to thought alone, but sees it in actuality; indeed he says the Absolute Reality is the framework of Hegel. But that he makes history inseparable from freedom. Now you can say, if you are a religious philosopher (now that field buried poor Hegel, even more than the party Trotsky!) that you move from slavery in pre-Christian society to freedom in Christianity & the French Revolution (they never have explained why such immeasurable break in time between the coming of Jesus and genuine freedom on this earth in the French Revolution) and then say higher than even this is "inner" freedom and that is what Absolute Mind is. Certainly Hegel himself seems to say just that, which only goes to show that this greatest of all philosophers of consciousness was quite unconscious of many of the objective pulls on him and from him on Marxist Humanism.

Again, if you fear to go it alone, you say well, Marx, surely attacked Absolutes and after all did not get to finish his essay on dialectic just when it reached Absolute.

But in that you case you would have to explain why he went to special trouble in his French edition postscript to CAPITAL not only to call attention to the fact that he used the dialectic for his exposition, but what is far more important, that it arose out of concrete capitalist society in both its negative and positives to such an extent that for the negative--unemployed army--he used the phrase "general absolute law", and for its total opposite or negation of negation, he used "new forces and new passions." (Do you remember how he defines passion in the Early Essay as a "striving for"?)

The reason I am going into all this is not Baillie or even any of the English so far as I understand MacIntyre, but the French and also Marcuse who introduced my work. First a word on Marcuse, not having accepted my analysis either of Hegel's Absolutes nor Marx's nor the proletarian opposition to Automation, he got himself in such a mess on the fact that "History" is all dialectics applies to, not "Nature" as Engels would have us leave, that in his latest work he is just an apologist for Russia! He says, in most abstruse and complicated and impossibly philosophical language, that "all" that is wrong with Soviet dialectical philosophy, Soviet "Marxism" (sic!) is that they assume a socialist society and of course there will be no contradictions there, so then they quote all those quotations, but the quotations themselves are not wrong."! (Which reminds me you did not send us the Soc. Leader that published you & you should always do that when it has something like that & do it via air since it takes about a month for a paper to arrive.) Now he may be surprised that he ended as an apologist--certainly the bourgeoisie is so surprised they fear to review him! But the Stalinists caught it immediately--and sure enough there is a sympathetic review of his book in the Stalinist "Science & Society".

Now Maximilian Rubel of Paris, who wishes to avoid quite that pitfall, has decided that all Marx used was "Method" and that both "dialectical" and "historical" materialism are Engels's vulgarizations. Now there is no doubt Engels was just a follower and the humanism of Marxism and the simplicity of the dialectic escaped him so that his 1883 version of "Feuerbach" is vastly inferior to the young Marx's of 1844 which he was "bringing up to date". But to accuse Engels of not understanding that for Marx both reality & thought are one continuous process is to misread the young Marx's criticism of Hegel's idealism for a criticism of actual thought. In the end, Rubel had to say Lenin made same "mistake". So here is one who does understand "humanism" but because he doesn't see it concretely as end of division of mental and



manual, he suddenly calls it all "ontology", i.e. a closed philosophic system, beginning and ending with thought's development and nothing else, and of course if it ~~xxx~~ (Absolute Idea) were only "ontology" we would reject it.

Now I say all this to you because if you have no Rubels and Marcuse bearing such names we will be meeting them bearing other names once we try to penetrate the intellectual closed circle--and we must have some first class intellectuals in the proletarian movement. We will have to teach them to give the million ways they have of avoiding the proletarian reality and then they'll be good-- I'll even call them indispensable if they accept the proletarian discipline. Let's use my trip to go searching for some.

No doubt I'll have some letters waiting from you when I reach Milan (this boat is later than I thought & I don't get to Italy till 22nd) and know exact dates. I'm now pretty sure in my mind I would go from Milan to London, and take in Paris either in between or at end.

Looking forward to seeing you soon,  
Yours,

*Raja*

Copy

September 12, 1959

Dear Frank:

This is the third letter from the boat, and will center mainly on the conference I proposed. It should not be called when I'm in England the first round, but just before I ~~can~~ sail on ~~the~~ November 12th, which means the weekend before then. This means that you would get a report from me ahead of that given to the REB on the whole of the European trip. The ~~my~~ report by yourself on the activities you have engaged in since your break with WL, and if JY is with us, perhaps a report, much briefer than yours, by him. Other local reports may be given BUT, on the whole, this is not a conference of what has been done, but what will be done once we have a theoretical foundation under our feet. JY hardly could have understood my letter to him on the greatest lack of theory in the English movement, including the days of Marx when even he could not find an Englishman of even the calibre of a Kautsky, or he wouldn't have continued his erratic ways. It is this theoretic foundation that must be the center of the conference, or it will have no more meaning than those in a sort of constant session by the old radicals, or the ones who have hurried to the LP like SR and principles have gone straight out of the window.

Naturally we will work on it when I get to England, but you should begin putting out some feelers right away. And, as an indication of the type of mentality I wish to avoid I'll go over from England to France and from a proletarian like JY to an intellectual like Rubel who has published the most definitive bibliography of KM's works as well as an "intellectual essay" of KM. (Please look up for me one thing I could not locate in America to which he refers: "Short Communication on the Unpublished Writings of Karl Marx dealing with Mathematics, Natural Sciences & Technology and the His. of These Subjects" by Prof. E. Colman. A paper read to 2nd Int. Congress of the His. of Science and Technology by the delegates from the USSR, London June 29-July 31 1951. Ed. Kniga England Ltd. Now the Rubel note says this is to be found in the royal lib'y of Brussels, III, 89,657 A 22 but perhaps ~~see~~ near CPer or British Museum more likely could get it for you "for a library loan.")

Now then this Rubel--and he is the best of all those now writing on Marx--has a lot to say on how all 6 books mentioned in 1st draft of Capital and repeated in Critique of Political Economy have never been published and so CAPITAL is "incomplete," and not one single word on how the structure of CAPITAL changed in the years 1861-1871. Not only that, if even we allow that only the American proletariat could have shown the way to that, an intellectual still was bound to see what it all meant to Marx. Instead Rubel complains that the Paris Commune "wiped out once again the theoreticain of CAPITAL" so that to him (Rubel) "the political man and the author of the powerful pamphlet on the Commune" only leads to the conclusion that "From 1873 until his death, he would be able to add nothing of value to his as yet unfinished work." Now some one must love (I use the word not with abandon, but with the passion Marx describes as a "striving after" a new society) theory as much as the proletariat itself to be able to stick to a path struck out anew as M\*H. What JY is doing is clinging to his individual proletarianism in such a way that it has all the earmarks of a petty bourgeois intellectualism rather than the good proletarian revolutionary he actually is. Marx had a word for it, but I won't give it to you in German because it has since been used by every conceivable bureaucrat when he wants to twist it to mean "backward worker." But what Marx was concerned with was that the revolutionary factory worker would find yet one other impediment in his way that is the craftsman--journeyman tailors and clock makers they were then--who was self-taught and had all the negative features of the intellectual and none of the positive ones, while his own proletarian origin was blunted in the process.

Rae.

9438

4

9/12/59

9439

Dear Frank:

(4th)

One more letter on conference as theoretic foundation. I would like an opportunity either on first round in England (preferably) or last stay to give at least 3 lectures on M&F. Whether people read it or not (and not many did), studying it, and studying it with author, is something else again, and our friends must get used to that love of theory where they will not put aside a book of this order because they have already it with the same speed they read the latest murder-mystery. If they had studied it as theoreticians, then they could prove this by producing an English supplement to it in the manner in which "Nationalism, Communism, Marxist Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions" was produced. When there are no such penny pamphlets available for the English proletariat, then they better take a second look at method and learn to draw out every implication in M&F, for to make explicit that which is only implicit--for this we have the word of Hegel--sums up the whole province of philosophy, and we might add, revolution.

(Have you been able to establish any contact in those African Committees in England where I could talk to some genuine Africans; if not a lecture, then a personal talk will do. But I certainly count on the fact that through England I would come in some sort of life contact also with Africa, as well as Hungary, but the Hungarian refugees I leave to another Hungarian-Frenchman, F. Fejto, but it wouldn't be wrong for you to get any addresses you can get in London and send them an Afro-Asian pamphlet, marking in red the part on Humanism in the Hungarian Revolution.)

The main ~~purpose~~ purpose of this study of M&F would be to master method so that the English friends would be able in the not too distant future to think of a paper like M&L of their own. If of course we could inveigle an Italian and Frenchman to be present, that would be best, but we have to function with what we have that is best now, not later, and what is best is England and you. Method is all I can give you--the content, research, analysis must come from you all. But here I notice that there will be an election soon in England & no doubt all the little busybodies have gotten busy to put LP back into the seat of gov't, as if that is what is needed now. Gaitskell has returned from Russia in a hurry but he has nothing more to offer than what Khrushchev said he would agree to, but which he rejected when MacMillan proposed it, and in any case all 3--Khrushchev, Macmillan & Gaitskell--are one set of triplets state capitalism has given birth to that would be hard to duplicate even when they "fight". The perfect example was this horrid LP conference taking place where one delegate whose name escapes me--but please do keep for me clippings of this--stated that with Automation the fight for wages etc. is really somewhat dated as are all trade union struggles "except, of course" not to let go of the trade unions "until" they do discover a new way, "perhaps" the shorter workweek. Now, in such an atmosphere, why should the Healyites or the SR group or even JY be so concerned. If it is because all the workers are in LP--then it still doesn't answer the question: on what basis do you wish to win them? Perhaps it is necessary to function in LP--I wouldn't really know, although I have my doubts--but nothing at all can be done until the primary question of what theoretic foundation for your functioning will be done. All I note from the results of Trotskyites is that the Healyites now accept "all" & not only Trotskyites, and god only knows what the state capitalist theory has done for Cliff as I understand he even favored "limited war" against Formosa by Communist China.

I will now ~~be~~ <sup>be</sup> off for a few days & turn my mind to Italy and France.

September 19(?)1959

Dear Olga(for the REB)

Naturally I have no idea whether they will or will not have a conference when I reach Milan or anywhere. But I thought I should get down my ideas on what I would say in the first statement of challenge for theoretical leadership. Here it is, (or rather will be since I made only one copy and decided to send it through Bessie to avoid extra work in office and save me stamps--money is going awfully fast and I'm still on the boat!) It would be good if you had a brief discussion on it, and a brief summation was sent me, altho of course each person who wishes to elaborate can write me as well. But my point was that much change and freedom must be allowed for, and it is best under the circumstances not to divert from the concentration there on growth, to thinking of Europe here. Until I actually get there and begin talking around, there would be no point to my asking for your views on the general lines we have already discussed. The same is true insofar as membership is concerned. Until I actually begin writing news, it is best not to divert in any way from their concentration on work there.

I will look forward to seeing NEWS & LETTERS which I assume will be waiting for me in Milan. Please also tell me the deadline for the October issue. I should have asked you that, if I am not on time with my TW, you should just proceed to take one of my old numbers that is on a general topic that have not been used in NEWS & LETTERS--may from Correspondence have not been used--and either reprint as is, or you have perfect freedom to edit and include a paragraph that would bring it up to date. There used to be a time when I would ask REB members to "substitute" for me and I originally thought of that when I left. But, again, my central point was always not to give extra work and thus I did not. Now that I see that I might not have the time, why I authorize you in advance to use some old TW--for example the one on civil rights since we have not had one for a very long time. If I do get a chance to write my column, then it could go in the last minute.

I do not now recall whether I had also made one copy of the speech for Genova and sent it to Bessie, but if I did, then I now ask her to forward it to you. As I said in the first letter, only when I will need advice or action on some point, then I will speed it directly to REB and ask for direct replies without sending any to Bessie, which then will be in your hands.

Yours,  
Rae

9440



Sept. 20, 1959

Dear Friends:

This will be my last letter from the boat, and I will send a copy also to FW in England for it is time he began knowing also the Italian movement, though this will be very sketchy on that subject, as most of it will once concern philosophy.

First I found the prepared notes for speech at Genoa which I had evidently not sent to Bess so I'm sending it to you first, and will ask you to send it on to her.

Secondly I reread (really read for first time through as at the time of the Milan conf. when Bess sent it to us my Italian was too sketchy to read) Damen's thesis. It is true that its conclusions on the need for "vanguard party" being the one and only problem & the one which spelled out defeat for Hungary is as wrong as we thought when we glanced at it first. However, despite wrong conclusion and dragging in the question of Hungarian Revolution, the thesis is mainly on French group and in that I believe he is quite correct, and we can learn from that some of the positive features of this ~~sketchy~~ revolutionary. Here are its main features: 1) Socialisme ou Barbarie called for Workers' Councils "to defend the salary of the workers and bring peace to Algeria. That was their answer to DeGaulle's coming to power. 2) Damen says rightly Workers Councils arise on crest of revolution--as in RR so in Hungarian; where they do not, then such a slogan could be entirely reformist as it means functioning within capitalist framework. It appears that Gramsci (one of the originals of CP in Italy who died while in prison and whom the CP has made into the theoretician, altho he was evidently not at all in their direction; I suspect Damen fought with Gramsci at time they all were sent to prison by Mussolini) had more or less such a "deviation" on question of workers councils vs. party as axis of rev. movement, but not conceiving as any time but that of rev. 3) "Therefore" concludes Damen the one thing that faces you is bldg. of party. Now while we disagree with the "therefore", there is no doubt that our calling at that time on the anti-Communists groupings re-evaluating their own failure to act as polarizing force, and insisting that the intellectual responsibility must move toward working for a unity of theory and practice is a great deal closer to Damen's to anything Chaulieu ever wrote, despite the fact that in the abstractions Chaulieu appears close.

The greatest weakness of Damen is the abstract way he keeps repeating the need for a vanguard and, above all, his rejection both of t.u. and parliament as any real arena for rev. work; he seems to conceive all the work outside the factory gates. I've just recently learned more of the his. of both Damen and CP & splinters & I want to summarize those facts for you: (Problems of Communism, Jan.-Feb. '59 carries a quite good article by an ex-CP'er Enzo Tiberti)

1) Chronologically the Damen group comes first and it is the only one of the splinters that have persisted. The author treats the grouping without considering split from Bordiga; indeed he doesn't mention it. But in any case then ICP was founded 1940 so it must have been while still in prison, based on 3rd Congress of CI which stood for rev. action while Lenin still alive & which was evidently published in Italy that very year, 1921. Damen was a Communist leader in Italian Parliament when fascism came to power and in prison in 1930 broke with them. When in 1944 CP began attacks on group, the organizer of the P, Mario Acquavia was slain & on 7/23/48 Battaglia Comunisti accused CP of it.

9441

- 2) In '44 1st break from CP--"Red Star" group founded in Piedmont by old time Communist militant, Temistocle Vaccarella whom the CP murdered on 6/19/44 and that group disintegrated after that.
- 3) In '48 over Yugoslav defection another small opp. started by Aldo Gucchi & Valdo Magnani, also from underground, & they were expelled in 1951, which led to formation of 1 group that had affiliated with Trotskyists; while Magnani dissolved his group and went into SP (Nenni); Gucchi went into Dem. S.P. (Sarragat)
- 4) There is not another serious break until 1956 with Khrushchev's speech at 20th RCP, which gives birth to Azione Communista, est'd. 6/56 by Giulio Seniga "former deput-chief of PCI's "vigilance comm." and Bruno Fortichiarì.--We know whether that has ended. At same time another group formed 1/57 by Eugenio Reale, former ambassador to Poland, and his group as Corrispondenza Socialista exists.
- 5) In 12/56 Giulio, Damen, Trotskyists & some anarchist group tried uniting but it didn't work. Evidently it is all on basis of action as against CP who betrayed & then each group begins interpreting action different, but lets not forget that in all this Damen does hold out at all times.
- 6) The thousands and thousands who broke over Hungary--only a few of them org'd, but they seem to be leaning to Socialists. Reale has launched "Alleanza Socialisti" & local groupings in Sardinia, Apulia, & Mesagne have either broken in to to or sufficiently a maj. to keep Communists from winning in local elections, but I see no one bothering to go to the workers and seeing what it is they want; with Damen's attitude on parliament (anti) I can't see he could reach any of these if even he had a much larger org. The 300 ex-CPers who met in convention in Rome are thus far without anything positive & none has touched t.u., although that is where the CP influence has shrank mostly from 604,982 in '46 to 237,000 in '57.

(Well, the rest will have to wait till I get there. O yes, the starhear PCI is so that you do not confuse these initials which stand for Italian CP with ICP which stands for Int. CP or Damen's group. I suppose the Trotskyists too call themselves some new adjective plus CP just to confuse matters further.)

Now to the philosophic confusions in France outside S ou B which has no philosophy even as Johnsonites declared philosophy to have ended. So it is good to see what Marx did to such in his day (1844--Critique of Hegel's Phil. of Right): "In a word, you cannot abolish philosophy without putting it into practice. The same error, only with factors reversed, is committed by the theoretical party... It believes it can accomplish this negation by turning its back on philosophy, the while its averted head utters a few irritable and banal phrases over it. Moreover, its horizon is so limited as to exclude phil. from the realm of Ger. actuality unless it imagines philosophy to be implied in German practice and in the theories subverting it. It urges the necessity for linking up with vital forces, but forgets that the real vital force of the German people has hitherto pullulated under its skull. .... The weapon of criticism cannot in any case replace the criticism of weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force, but theory too becomes a material force as soon as it grasps weapons. (masses) Theory is capable of grasping weapons (masses) as soon as its argument becomes ad homine, and its argument becomes ad homine as soon as it becomes radical." (Then follows that wonderful quotation we always quote to be radical means to grasp a thing at its root and the root of mankind is man.)

What however do French do now? (I'm talking about Rubel who is the outstanding "Marxologist" in sense of compiling bibliographies, writing intellectual biographies of Marx & evidently, according to his last letter also having a small group of some sort).

By  
1) saying dialectics is only "method" not "ontology" (closed system limited to thought processes alone), they in fact reduce method to practice or criterion alone, denying it has any relationship to theory of knowledge. Thus they fall into both CP & old 2nd Int. trap of saying since Marx stood Hegel ~~xxxxxxx~~ or rather Hegelian dialectics on its feet, instead of on its head, therefore only "action" counts. By standing dialectics on its ~~xxxxx~~ feet, however, Marx did not cut off its head. Far from beheading philosophy, he humanized it, which means he gave it a head, a body, a heart, a soul, if you please.

2) By insisting that dialectics is merely a process one uses when one deals with abstractions--a method of exposition which help you get to the analytical or concrete--Rubels falls into Trotskyists trap which always insisted that CAPITAL was dialectical where it was abstract like in first chapter on Commodities, but when it got to the Working Day, it was just historically concrete, not abstractly dialectical. Piffle! The dialectics of the Working Day--that is to say, its own dialectic, dynamic, revolutionary, human movement is what gave the drive, the dialectic and humanist drive to all of the book. Even a bourgeois like Baillie sees that in Hegel movement from abstract to concrete does not mean merely transforming a lot of concrete facts into an abstract generalization but, on the contrary, a movement from a potentiality to an actuality. That is to say, in the first chapter, the commodity as a unit of capitalist contains all capitalist contradictions but only in embryo, and the worker himself is sort of just abstract labor. By the end of Capital, having gone through the mediation of the Working Day, all the capitalist contradictions have been concretely revealed in capitalist accumulation and crisis and the "absolute general law--unemployed army", and the worker is no longer either just abstract labor or just an individual but the great mass, force, that is bringing capitalism down, etc. So that it is even more dialectical at the end than at the beginning if you wish to get into "quantitative" nonsense of "more" and/or "less" instead of qualitative changes for a new society. Sometimes, try as I might, I just can't understand these intellectuals and their flow of words toward nothing; if only their words could be sunk into this tremendous wonderful ocean I am on and we could then talk both sense in class struggle and sense in thought. To deny Marx meant dialectics as thought by the clever use of the word "ontology", which Marx naturally rejected just adds up to the fact that I believe these intellectuals have never seen a worker, much less grasped any of his aspirations and thoughts.

Well, I'll see what I meet in Paris when I get there, but at the moment I look forward more to those lectures in Leeds, and I do hope I am asked there to speak on philosophy. Let the Healyites squirm and giggle about "abstractions" and I challenge MacIntyre to be able to stand them for one moment after the lecture.

I trust NEWS & LETTERS is off the press and one will be waiting for me in Milano; that preparations for Oct. issue do not take up so much time that there is any diversion from concentration on our growth, subs, sales of pamphlets, contacting, daily, esp. in Detroit, from editor to organizer and parallel, crosswise, and dialectically through all. Do not take time up to discuss the part on philosophy, though it would be good if you studied it

individually, at your leisure. Yours, Rae

Sept. 23, 1959

9444

Copies sent to  
LA, Mass

Dear Friends:

To pay us

Handwritten notes on the left margin:  
I hope you'll be able to get a couple of weeks done  
I hope you'll be able to get a couple of weeks done  
I hope you'll be able to get a couple of weeks done

When I arrived in Genoa, instead of being met by the Genovese whose description I asked for from Bess, I was met by the one, Luciano Raimondi, I did not expect. However, without a moment's hesitation we recognized each other and he was first in line and I was second to get off by virtue of having stolen into 1st class for that purpose. It seems that Resaz travels around, could not come (was not in Genoa) when the boat came late, and had not arranged a meeting for me there. Luciano took me to meet 2 of friends who had been involved in the recent ship strike and who will come to Miano this Sunday where the meeting is arranged for me for morning, while in the afternoon the Azione Comunista group, now that Gino has left, and the Damen group will discuss unification. The meeting will be of a different caliber also in the sense that instead of exchanging views with the workers in general, we will stick closely to theory, and I have 1 1/2 hours for a lecture on M&F, and then the rest of the morning and as long as it is necessary for lengthy discussions and summation, which is just as well since it is impossible to move a step without considering the theoretical foundation.

It turns out that the publication sum originally agreed to when Gino was to have paid was not \$200 but a little over \$400! I had thought that included translation and since we already paid, etc. But no, it seems that the translation was one thing the publisher had volunteered to do, but, again, Gino, said, no he will pay. In a word, I now find that we will have to pay \$500. What I proposed therefore (and I do hope that Saul's \$100 comes in time as it is of the absolute essence because if I give up \$300 instead of as I thought \$200 I will hardly have enough money to get to England much less travel back, etc.) is that if he puts in writing the definitive promise that book will be off by the end of Dec. I will turn over \$300 now and the remaining \$100 when I see the book actually off the press. Damen just telegraphed for an appointment tomorrow and will take me there. *(Incidentally, editor is a member of parliament - Social Democrats.)*

There is also the problem of the translation itself, which (1) while on boat I found quite a few other political errors, and (2) which both the friends and publisher say is quite awkward Italian in many respects sounding like a translation by a non-Italian. However, the literary aspects the translation himself supposedly corrected, and it is this we will straighten out. If not, Raimondi promises to go over word by word with me this week if it takes all day and all night. The reason I had not asked for a description of him was that he had not done the Bibliography as he had promised when the other Luciano (Bianciardi) stood me up, and therefore I thought him unreliable. It turns out that as soon as he realized there was a delay in publication, he took time off but when heard I was coming, he got right down to business and in fact met me with that in hand before ever he said hello. So we are set with him.

My Italian won't last me too long, but I do understand what Damen says and no doubt will understand all the political speeches; it's the everyday that has me beat, but the Damen family is so glad I know some that we have been chattering away without translator--in fact I slept at his home and had dinner here; I also went downtown on my own and picked up my mail at Am. Express and returned on my own. In fact, I hardly feel away from America because I feel so perfectly at home here, and they all say that only my eyes are the same as Bessie's, otherwise she is American and I Italian.

Do not write me here beyond Oct. 5th as I will depart for London then.



Sept. 23, 1959

9445

Dear Frank:

I arrived in Genoa and Milano yesterday and this morning I already bought my ticket for London since I knew if I need to be here longer it would require a trip back but that otherwise I could handle everything in the 11 days I have given myself. Therefore I would appreciate being met in London on Tuesday, October 6th at 8 p.m. I take the Express which leaves Milano Monday, October 5th at 9:59 p.m., 2nd class, go through Calais, and sleep on a "couchet" since only 1st class passengers get a bed. I did not realize that the trip is that lengthy and one or I might have been tempted to go 1st class. It is just as well however since by the way money is being spent I wouldn't last much.

The main meeting here will be this Sunday--a whole day session where the morning is devoted to M&F with me talking, and the afternoon is devoted to the unification of 2 groups here--Battaglia Comunista and Azione Comunista. In between I go to Florence for conference with publisher and we'll see whether we can get that book off the press by Christmas.

Now, on your meetings, all is o.k., except I'm not clear as to whether what you propose as "an aggregate meeting" and what I had proposed as a conference to found a Marxist Humanist movement in England is one and the same thing. I agree that what you propose is of fundamental importance, but I do not see necessarily that that would result in elections of a committee that would first discuss collaboration while preserving autonomy. What is basic, after all these splinter groups with their miserable little mimeographed sheets, is not yet one more group that is "broad". What is needed is a group that knows where it is going and lays the Marxist foundation for it. Once it does that, it can collaborate with all other groups it wishes, to the extent that is required, etc., etc. Before it does so, on the other hand, it would only add to the confusion, not to the clarity. I will leave in your hands which should precede which. Or it may be best to wait till I get there, especially now that I am coming 2 days in advance of time, and discuss first of all with you in person.

Once more against what you call duplicated and we mimeographed type of papers--it will never be read by the "masses" and it certainly cannot compete with ULR on the intellectual level on the face of it. It is much better that M&F be studied, N&L be accepted as your paper with a full page of printed English news, reviews, comments, etc. than a homegrown edition. But I do believe that if these things were decided ahead of my coming and their hearing and discussing with me it would sound as if you are "giving a line" and they'd revolt against "domination", so it is best that we concentrate on the meetings, and let this slide until I arrive and we can discuss at length and in detail.

I may not get a chance to write again or much, but in sending some packages and also a note from Hartley I just got offering a room--again I'll put it in your hands, except I append a thank you which you hand him. Only one thing, must be understood and that is that I must have a room to myself since there will be a great deal of work & speechifying--I hardly have a single one prepared in advance and I will therefore need quietude, privacy, and work, work, work. The time for meeting and talking will be as much as possible--but it cannot be a question of "dropping in" at all times. I say that because I had impression that Hartley's was a dance studio. Yours, KC

Confidential! Yes I certainly will work to meet whether I daughter - all our books become automatically members of RSB! Read to parents



Copy to Res

Dear Olga (for R&B)

Sept 26 1959

The matter with the <sup>min Augustus</sup> publisher is beginning to look very bad indeed, altho Damen still has not all hopes, but is sure book will be published. However here are the latest developments - (1) La Nuova Italia write today that translation is completely unacceptable as it was not good which he contacted with Beaumardi etc. (2) This book is "out of time" with the times which show "democratization" in Russia (process 2nd + joining attention only & fit so if all the money, energy etc to new translation, I've called Beaumardi who just this minute left the house & promised to have all corrections in a week. I'll be a very nervous week for me plus a lot of hard work -

All this means money besides - therefore please take up press at R&B whether final has been sent (we the \$100) & if not it must be sent so that I get here by Oct. 3rd.

The letter to JH will tell you the matter re tomorrow's conference & how I must hurry to concentration at the Hotel 9446

Sept. 27, 1959

Dear Friends:

The meeting just ended. About 30 were present, nearly all of whom, except about 3 intellectuals, were workers, ranging from sewer workers to metallurgy, but the skilled here in pay are really closer to production workers in America. The Azione Comunista, I had the impression, had the younger ones, with a different air of the Partisans, whereas the Battaglia Comunista were more the older ones who had been through the mill and inclined to pessimism. However, all did not take their eyes or ears away for a single second from me. It is clear how very interested they are in the American workingclass, American movement, American ideas that are Marxist.

It was good that I had the 10 pages of excerpts typed in advance and the Italian friends mimeographed 50 copies—some were not present because it rained considerably and they are not from Milan but from its many environs and some had to work Sunday and refusal to work would have meant being fired. It was also good that I had written out the speech so that Raimondi who knows little English could translate well because he already was acquainted with all the main ideas not only because he had seen them, but because yesterday, in translating into Italian for Damen, meanwhile had them all expanded by me in person as that was a discussion in itself. The result was that I spoke without notes whereas he both listened to me and read the notes so that his translation was accurate. (It turned out that Resor who knows better English was not there as he is travelling around; and Munis was in Paris and said he could not return till Wednesday, which shows a type of irresponsibility that Damen is certainly not guilty of. There is no doubt whatsoever that as a leader, as a person, as a revolutionary he is the most responsible one and it is up to him a little bit of Raimondi that this book will, if it will, and I think it will be published in Italian.)

Damen, in his introduction, stressed that we have much in common in the general Marxist theory and in the feel for the spontaneity of the proletariat. But that he wants me to present all the points so that the friends can see for themselves, which include the different views on the role of the vanguard party, the role of philosophy in which he considers me an idealist, and in Humanism in which the Italian proletariat has a different experience. (It turns out that he has an actual program in his party program opposed to Humanism, which in Italy, says he, is the excuse for all those who have left the movement and search communion with reformism, etc.). He also stressed that the book will be published and is a very important contribution, especially in its economic parts both of Marxist theory and on state capitalism, which are fundamental points unite the American movement and the Italian.

The speech I made, much elaborated from the notes but it is only the notes that are typed out, I am sending you under separate cover. For the present, all that is important is that I had 3 concrete points in the conclusions: (1) Just as the Italian movement is showing its int. responsibility in publishing M&F, the American is anxious to publish what the Italian friends, especially the workers, have to say, and that they write directly to News & Letters, without going through "party channels" and we will translate and publish. (2) That within a year, when they have studied M&F in Italian, a conference will be called that is genuinely international, and include the English which I am sure will result out of this year's work there, and (3) that the sale and wide distribution of M&F, as well as that which we consider as a supplement to it, Afro-Asian Revolution pamphlet, proceed alongside of our doing same for international movement on the important things they publish.

We met at 10 and adjourned at 12:30. With translation I took up an hour and a half, and another 15 minutes in summation. As you can see, therefore, there was little discussion. However, the outstanding facts were (1) Fertichiari who is the theoretician for the other group did say that, while it is impossible to say whether M&F is "the" theoretical foundation since the Italian experience is so different than the others, but they "accept it as the American contribution."

9447

for regroupment. Although he does not foresee ~~a~~ new Int. in the near future, we certainly must constantly prepare and it is good we have prepared. (2) the Youth in whom I was most interested--from one of the small industrial towns around and who ate up everything I said although they understood no English, replied to a direct question from me as to why they were not participating in the discussion. "The American workers movement is one of the most important in the world. It is this we came to hear. You presented so many new ideas we must digest them first. Also we will study the excerpts, and look for the book, and then perhaps will write you." (3) The 2-3 who dominated most of the discussion, while they spent their time on the need for a party, and that for the Italian movement no question is more important, and that the American experiences are American, did have to admit, after my summation, that it is not because they meant it was only American, that they realize I use Humanism in a Marxist way and have brought it to Hungary and Afro-Asian revolutions, but still they disagree, but, again, want to emphasize the importance of the theoretic as well as practical work we have done, and thanked me for the presence, etc.

It was interesting, incidentally, that the only time I was interrupted in the speech--the first few minutes when I speak about the few here as compared to the 2 million in CP show us our problem, was a remark by Fortichiarri that "but these few are very good, and we have others who did not come because of work, but they too are of the best." I agreed they were of the best, "the very best," but reality and totality of crisis only emphasize the task. The fact therefore that they are vanguard or, as they put it even more precisely, "nucleus of vanguard" is important for their morale as for other things.

The concrete motions were accepted and we will see whether we actually do begin receiving such factory stories. Of course I hope others will be able to translate--all you are studying Italian N.B.--I understood the political speeches easily enough and there was no ~~any~~ necessity to translate, but I do not know how factory stories sound, or whether they are even aware of important sans "interpretation."

At the moment everything returns to the translation and whether we are able to force the publisher to go through with publication despite "Khrushchev-Eisenhower peace" and "Russian democratization."

Do try to make copy of all 3 speeches for Italy I have sent, but meanwhile just send out this letter for I made only one copy and since I wish this time to send to FW rather than Bessie even she does not have a copy.

We have made a beginning in bringing Marxist Humanism on the contemporary and, if I may be forgiven "national" Italian scene. Once the book is published there is no doubt there will be the theoretical foundation we lay as the very center for no one else is doing anything serious theoretically, although in action and others they are tops.

Yours,  
Rae

REB (copy to Bess)

Oct. 1, 1959

Dear Olga:

You will have to forgive me--yesterday I wrote John to tell you I would have a TW and/or editorial on Khrushchev, but I no sooner wrote it than the work on checking translation all over again and I have been at it around the clock and tomorrow at 5 a.m. we are finally off to Florence for a showdown with the publisher. Under the circumstances, the best I can do is to skip the TW and have you use an old one, although the one I intended was quite important as their latest journal shows how Russia is worked up about abolition between mental and manual and pervert it to mean (hold your seats)--the abolition of those jobs that are being eliminated by Automation! But this latest morsel from their theoretical journal will need await a little more leisure on my time and I'll think instead of Nov. issue.

But I do think it is important to have things on Khrushchev-Eisenhower for we cannot go press just on national issues when what happened ~~xxxx~~ at Camp David threw off the front pages of all of Europe any other news. So, for what the REB can make out of it, here are the notes I would have used for an editorial or other well-played up article that would have begun as the 3rd article on p.1:

The show is over. The unprecedented TV, radio, press coverage to the point of White House interference with any local politicians that thought this would be a good time to scoop the news with some byplay had receded, first, into the stillness of Camp David where secret agreements between such two great warlords playing at peace as Eisenhower-Khrushchev would not be open to mass media coverage; and, secondly, where the whole circus tent was taken down.

All the official communique tells us ~~xxxx~~ carries almost as frigid an air as before the well and over well-publicized thaw. Nothing but "clarification" of the two opposing positions seems to have been achieved on the question that brought about the crisis in the first place: Berlin. But that is only because another, <sup>show</sup> more sinister than the one put on on TV, has to be put on for the benefit of the independence of "Allies", especially West Germany. The main reason for Khrushchev concocting the Berlin crisis--trade with America--also seems to be played in a low key where first it will be given to experts to see what Russia will pay for its Lend-esse debt. And, finally, another show, this time for Eisenhower has been put off till Spring, with the homey ~~xxxx~~ <sup>stipend</sup> on the part of Khrushchev that it would be easier for ~~the~~ grandchildren to accompany him.

But all these are appearances. Of course the Berlin crisis could not be "resolved" because the two contenders for world power have no intention whatever to do anything but prepare for the holocaust of World War III. But meanwhile--while that missile becomes so operational--that each is sure it is "the other" ~~xxxxxxx~~ that will be annihilated in the struggle for world domination--we will have "peace"--and trade. For the biggest victory was for that part of Big Business which wishes to do business with Russia.

9449



AND THIS CONTAINS THE GREATEST OF ALL THREATS TO THE AMERICAN WORKINGCLASS FOR THE SIMPLE REASON THAT AT THE BASE OF THIS DOING BUSINESS WITH KHRUSHCHEV IS THE PRESSURE TO DO AS KHRUSHCHEV DOES TO HIS WORKERS. LET US NOT FORGET THAT THE BIGGEST "INBULT" TO EISENHOWER CAME NOT FROM A "FOREIGNER" BUT FROM HIS GOLF PLAYMATES\*\*BIG INDUSTRY, SPECIFICALLY STEEL. Here was the President of the United States, the most powerful single ruler in the whole world, wishing to show off the steel industry to the most potent rival, Russia, and willing to invoke the Taft-Hartle Act (which no doubt he'll soon do "for the national interest" when the Industry is ready) to get the workers back to industry, and steel industry does not feel it has yet succeeded in compelling submission on the part of its workers, and therefore says, "NO." The "No" was loud and clear and insulting, but Eisenhower chose to obey it because that is exactly his capitalistic mentality --the American workers must be chained to the machine and factory management, burdened by unbearable taxes for added discipline, and "to assure no inflationary trends", and deprived of its elementary rights of strike with any teeth in it.

It is good to return to these class fundamentals for they will also illuminate the other side of state capitalist world--Russia-- and see that we do not forget that Khrushchev came here NOT because all was well at home, BUT BECAUSE IT WASN'T. IF the Russian workers had meekly accepted the Khrushchev 7 Year Plan with its impossible goals of stretch in labor productivity and not been ingenious in its slowdown, Russia would have achieved what it wants to industry-wise, and not come begging for trade with the country it is supposedly well on the way to "surpassing". IF the Russian peasantry were as eager to obey quotas and overreach them, and had not been ingenious in its resistance, Russia with its reaches for the moon would not have been so ~~xxxxxx~~ technologically backward in its agriculture, that it had to have its Number 1 Man go to praise Iowa corn and Midwest cattle and eat hotdogs ~~in~~ ~~xxxx~~ sans vodka, to boot. IF the Russian youth were not so restive and frustrated at this new society that was promised them for 3 decades now but is yet to be seen, then Khrushchev might have addressed himself to them instead of to his best friends--the American capitalist class.

And Khrushchev isn't limiting his peace overture to America-- he has an advantage none of the other capitalist rulers have,-- and that is that he is travelling under the usurped banner of Marxism, although Communist totalitarianism is the opposite of that great banner of liberation. Indeed, the stupidities of the State Department is nowhere seen so clearly as in the fact that they thought their image of socialism with horns would keep the American masses "in place". It is clear, instead, that they have a very different public to deal with ~~xxxxxxxhruxx~~ after Khrushchev visit than before for that master showman Khrushchev, not because his hands are bloody WHICH THEY ARE, but because he has usurped the banner of Marxism and knows how to expose "the other" capitalists' warmongering so that the great desire for peace on the part of the peoples seems answered.

As usual, Russian Communism exposes its hands not where it merely speaks but where it acts--whether that be against its own proletariat or suppressing the Hungarian Revolution against Russian imperialism. Presently, the period of peace Russia desires is so urgent for it that the Communists throughout the world



have very nearly forgotten about the class struggle in any country, including the colonial world. Thus M. Leon Felix, the French Communist leader, has just published a long statement in their official organ, Humanite, to the effect that the Algerian resistance movement is a "responsible body" and would not flatly reject the offer "as General de Gaulle hoped." ~~The~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ last phrase is the meek attempt to pretend that they are not quite like all the other betrayers of the colonial movements of liberation when they demand they capitulate to DeGaulle because, allegedly, although De Gaulle offered the plan, he really "hoped" it would be refused!

No, from United States to Algeria, from China to Germany, from France to South Africa, ~~xxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ the one theme Russia is playing now is "peace". Even its reaching the moon is played down for "peace" as if all along what they aren't testing is the thrusts, not into ~~xxxxxxx~~ scientific space exploration, but into the most destructive war weapons hurtling across continents to threaten the very existence of mankind. And the people are just supposed to sit with folded arms, peacefully forget their class struggle, and be drowned in incestuous illusions of peace!

But, just as the steel workers have refused to be cowed, although their stomachs are getting pretty empty, just as workers, American and European and African, do not separate this fight for bread from that for freedom, so these hypocrites of state capitalist leaders on both sides of the Atlantic will first/88<sup>front</sup> their real protagonists--the workers in their own country. Until that question is settled, none others are because all the others only mean various new names for the same old exploitative society.

---

Olga, make what you can out of it, and use it as you wish, either in W, or front page, or separate article. It needs a lot of working over and simplification since I have not so much as had notes before me but typed directly to typewriter.

Meanwhile, I assume FW has written/<sup>you</sup> that McShane has given permission for his statement on M&F to be published under his own name, so be sure to include that in N&L. Do not however, use any of the quotes I have given of the Italian meeting. In fact I believe it is best not to use any from any reports I make until after my return.

--

Trust the contacting is going on well--I would like to hear who comes to meetings, etc. There is nothing like us anywhere in the world, but it is in America that we must prove it through growth. Greetings to all,

Rac

*One personal copy kept for [unclear] -  
I have two more - [unclear] to [unclear]*

9451

**RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA**

will speak on

**MARXISM AND FREEDOM**

At the STORK HOTEL, Queen Square, Liverpool

On SUNDAY, October 11th, 1959, at 7.45 p.m.

YOUR ATTENDANCE WILL BE WELCOME!

9452

Dear Olga I'm writing this on  
the train to Liverpool so I  
can mail it as soon as I get  
off to tell you that I agree  
with you on Rev. Her. Fayer  
Latham Am - Let Johnny  
expand his remarks - he  
did an excellent one the  
last time he wrote & now  
with Karl & Jimmy there it  
ought to be better still. It  
will be int'l enough  
considering we have  
youth - 3 - in England and  
who will be most interested.  
They are not teenagers - work

"new" to politics - wouldn't  
love the or get excited  
about who would get in  
this election but at  
up all I said on Marxist  
Humanism & have been  
following me around &  
mtgs. also with radicals.  
Considering this was let  
& both all 3 are handsome  
lads who had heavy  
dotes they broke to  
hear me, I think will  
get somewhere.

I hope my cable  
was following or playing up  
British election - For ever

9453

purpose it doesn't matter  
whether it's "first sale" or  
edition - the English publisher  
name was on it, it was  
recovered in Turkey; nothing  
will convince anyone under  
the circumstances it wasn't  
a British edition. Indeed,  
that was the biggest favor  
I've made to the Western  
Press here - and he really  
held his tongue then I  
began copying well, then I could  
really make a British edition  
+ Preface, etc - Of course  
all our friends should know  
the more facts (less possible story)  
etc - But it is not so  
concerned to appearance they  
have but only for the Yours - Rae  
his humble - some

First fold here

9454



Oct. 13, 1959

To the REB (copies to Bess & FW)

Dear Friends:

This is a report of the most exciting meeting (?) thus far in ~~the~~ Engl. and it is peculiar that it should have occurred in an academic hall. Here is why it was nevertheless the most valuable of the meetings--(of course it is only the beginning, so a later report may differ on this):

We underestimated the tremendous stir in intellectual circles in Britain as a result of the Hungarian Revolution. In the circles around the Universities and Left Review there is much less of a tinge of Stalinism than in the actual journal which, as always, represents the tops only. Not that the intellectuals here are necessarily all part of the MLR movement, but that is the "organ" so to speak of "the Left"--in fact ULR & New Reasoner are combining to form a new united journal called the New Left, and we may as a result of this tour have some slight in into it.

Meanwhile at University of Leeds, in the Philosophy Department there are 3 who are more or less open Marxists. They themselves however had underestimated the appeal of Marxism for they assured me ahead of time that they had had a philosopher from Poland, and he drew 12, and therefore that is all I should expect.

Over 40 showed up, perfectly willing to sit on the floor or stand for the whole 2 hour period, 1 hour lecture on Marx's Debt to Hegel, and 1 hour discussion. The whole philosophy department staff was there plus 2 sociologists as well as one professor who came all the way from Manchester to hear and who is anxious to invite to the University there if I can find a day before my return; the other half of the audience were students.

9455



Among the staff was a Mr. Milligan the one who had translated the Early Works of Marx that was published by Moscow. But it turns out that he had done this work 3 years ago, that they had disregarded it, that he then broke with the CP, and suddenly the translation appears, sans his Introduction and with the kind of Communist Introduction we know with which he disagrees violently! When I further called attention to errors as well in the translation, especially on the word, "Transcendence", he hit the ceiling. (He happens to be totally blind and must have people read to him and he had not rechecked translation after he got mad about introduction. We had agreed to continue correspondence via tapes.)

He defended my whole view warmly, as did the man mainly responsible for this invitation, the one who, after his review of my book, joined the Trotskyists, and at whose home I am staying! He too is very stimulated and agrees to continue correspondence with me--perhaps even actual collaboration on a follow-up to M&F which would center around Hegel!

The head of the department is a liberal Catholic, and of course he argued against Marx, as did another member of the philosophy department who is an existentialist. The discussion became so heated that it sounded like a political debate, and somewhere a halt had to be called; but all, without exception, said they had never heard anything that excitingly controversial, and the 3 Marxists were licking their lips and said they will not get it down into the records that a Marxist was there, etc.etc. (I'll also get £10 for the lecture, and the paraphernalia that goes with a formally invited lecturer.)

The students who are more

interested in politics than philosophy decided to have another meeting for me tomorrow, my last day here, where I will have a chance to speak on Russia and Marxism.

Also the sociologists who, though empiricists, are interested in a sort of distant way in Marxism, especially one who is from South Africa (white) has invited me to talk with him between the meeting and the leaving, and it is possible that some sort of collaboration at least on Africa, on which he is very well informed and very active; he is studying my pamphlet on it, but is inclined to say, First let's make the revolution, which is o.k. with me.

One of the students was so busy defending me that he actually insulted the head of the department, so that I had to come to the latter's defense for the broad-mindedness in the invitation and the concern not to bury Hegel.

The discussion was far more aware of the objective world than the few workers (skilled of course) in Liverpool who were so broken up over the loss of the elections by LP they could not see beyond "prosperity and "youth" who don't know depression and voted Tory! I'm sure I will meet a different type in Scotland, but I must emphasize that as of now both the meeting of radicals in London and the one in Liverpool were far inferior to this one on campus.

Yours, *Rae*

I'm beginning to worry over whether I'll have any time for TW for Nov. When is deadline?

SEP 11 1959

Dear Friends  
 I'm sorry for the  
 mess. After Phil Dyer  
 found it had a mass  
 attendance of 45 instead of 17, the  
 Labn youth on the campus, with  
 but a single day at it despite  
 because I was not supposed to  
 be in Leeds that day at all, make  
 a meeting with 150 showed  
 up. Not only is 150 3 times  
 over 45 + 1 day a little less  
 than 2 weeks the philologists  
 had to prepare. But, above  
 all, the discussion was  
 as lastly above the philologist  
 discussion there are the  
 bases of comparison. For  
 one thing it was concrete: Russ  
 & Merxion. The discussion

make it even more concrete  
 today, England, the youth  
 what faces them in a nuclear  
 war. Secondly, they have  
 had trouble with the Communist  
 youth on the campus who see  
 us as "Marxists" rather  
 than tackle me in  
 discussion. They walked out  
 the Labn youth because they  
 that theoretically too they had  
 scored a coup - and wanted  
 me to address another, this time  
 public mtg, but I did have  
 to leave for Glasgow.

I noted the preparation  
 for discussions - The one org.  
 bull. of people plus me more  
 on your drops (whatever else  
 and for Dave Atkinson - NY (700  
 in London wish to submit) is  
 quite sufficient. This is not a

consultation, but a gl - and for  
 what I can see I hope I  
 wish I see more of editor's  
 contacts with outside, the new  
 found will be to continue  
 make it regular routine &  
 not something that "was done"  
 a expansion late reached  
 naturally only those  
 in apt can reach conclusions  
 his job is my reaction for  
 here & reading RSP makes  
 I'll not get a  
 chance to report in Glasgow  
 till after I've returned to  
 London as I catch train direct  
 after mid but I'm glad to be  
 in so gl - a town & to know  
 M. Shaw -

Yours  
 Joe

9459



New letters  
 8757 Grand  
 Detroit 4, Mich  
 U.S.A.

Sender's name and address:

AN AIR LETTER SHOULD NOT CONTAIN ANY  
 ENCLOSURE; IF IT DOES IT WILL BE SURCHARGED  
 OR SENT BY ORDINARY MAIL.



Oct. 19, 1959

Dear Friends:

*(Copy to Bess)*

9460

The news from Scotland is so extraordinary that I must leave it for tomorrow for I cannot do it justice when you consider I have just gotten off the train from Glasgow and must already hurry to make the rounds for individual appointments and of course tonight is another meeting--~~for~~ some old radicals (in this case Advance people) must be spoken to since both as individuals they work for meetings in trade union branches and as people ~~xxxxxx~~ the Italians still have faith in them.

However, one piece of news I must ~~xxxxxx~~ get off to you for it is not often I do have good news to report when it comes to finances. Well, today I do have. First the publisher has come across with \$119 royalties (I should have threatened suit before) and I'm sending this directly to the bank and check for it to NEWS & LETTERS so we can pay for October issue in good part. Also I got the 10 pounds from one university and an invitation to speak, paid at another, so I am writing to Inez to stop sending me the chairman's fund and turn that back into N&L. The third piece of good news is best yet, but this money I cannot yet turn over until we are sure of Italian edition, but surely part of it if all is well by December I will be able to do so, and that is that JB has sent me \$300.

I'm sorry I keep sounding ~~xxxxxx~~ confusing when it comes to plenum; what isn't due to my tiring schedule is due to whether Bess can be there; and what isn't due to your end is the fact that I changed my mind on question of open meeting (I mean public and separate) on my return. Therefore here is the way it stands:

Plan a plenum weekend of 24th or later if you can't make it with Bess. That is in November.

The evening session of that first day will be my European report--as part and parcel of org., and therefore although all are invited and we better begin going out now and never give up until day of plenum, and no one, absolutely no one, is excused from coming with others to the plenum.

I do not plan to leave on return date -- the 17th -- but I must consider that

*that that weekend should be the one set just in case things run counter to plan. To make things harder for me the typewriter as you see has just gone haywire - but tomorrow do make the attempt for the full report on it.*

*Yours  
Joe*

*Look up Sec 1157 Leader 10/17/59 a letter is on "for all & reply"*



Copy

Oct. 20, 1959

TO NEWS & LETTERS COMMITTEES:

Dear Friends:

The 2 public meetings in Scotland were so extraordinary that the friend who arranged them, Harry McShane, said: "This is the turning point for us." Here is why: 1) For the first time in a decade all shades of radical view was represented, even dissident Communists; that was at the Sat. meeting. 2) It was directly after Labor Party defeat when too many were bewailing the fact that that defeat means "backward step" whereas the meetings revealed that what the workers wanted was something far greater than a "vote"--they wanted a full flag unfurled for a truly new social order. 3) The arrangements were made by that one man--I'll explain why later--and with no advertisements, just word of mouth--which shows how very well rooted in the labor movement McShane is--and yet one day after the other, with a downpour of rain that would have kept all but the hardiest souls at home, 40 showed up for the first meeting on Sat. and between 75-100 to the 2nd on Sunday, so that all present agreed that with any sort of preparation and advertisement, they could have a genuine mass meeting, which, again, hasn't been had in years.

Harry McShane is a man who has been in the workingclass movement and active in every battle from general strike to anti-war all the way from end of WWI when he was a lad till now. A few years ago he broke with the CP and the editor's job he held and returned to the "production line" in the shipyards where he still is--he is 68. It would be hard to find a man half his years with that energy, devotion to the proletarian class and Marxist ideas.

The local Trades Council in Glasgow to which he belongs--and the other 2 locals to which 2 of the other 3 with him belong--are very different from the bureaucratized trades union you know in the Stat altho when it comes to the national bodies there is no difference from the bureaucracies all over the world. But in the local 2 of the latest events they did are outstanding: 1) After the Russians suppressed the Hungarian Revolution, they not merely got one resolution passed condemning, but the same resolution said: only hope is rank and file relationship between unions across borders is of the essence, and those rather than the int. bodies of either "East" or "West" should meet each other. 2) He found a tombstone in a cemetery which had testified to the fact that 3 weavers had been shot down in the first recorded class struggle in Glasgow--1787--2 years before the French Revolution, more years before there were any organized trades unions, much less working class political parties. He got the trades council to agree to find out all the facts and begin writing their own, workingclass history, and he was assigned to do the job. (Under separate cover I am sending you the pamphlet.) I'm sure I needn't tell you how much digging has to be done to find the truth--just try to find out about the local committees of correspondence before the American Revolution--and you will see--and this revealed that in that early year of the industrial revolution no less than 7,000 weavers had amassed to protest wage cut, military had shot into them, killing not 3, but 6. So to the Calton Weavers Memorial, 1787, the workers of Scotland had rededicated themselves in 1957, with pamphlet, stone, and knowledge of their own uninterrupted struggles for freedom, which back in 1787, had declared the weavers' right "to exercise their inherent right to choose, or refuse, to have their ears bored to the door-posts of their oppressors."

9461

2.

Now then Harry McShane had this trades council announce that I would be in town, speaking on MARXISM AND FREEDOM, and the 100 on Sunday came from that body and other workers. But on the day before, Saturday, he had not done anything because some petty bourgeois intellectual --Universities & Left Review is now merging with New Reasoner, both to be called The New Left--thought they'd wish to sponsor me, especially since I was "respectably" only speaking at Departments of Philosophy in some universities. However, after much debating back and forth whether the "new Left" could start right off the bat sponsoring a Marxist Humanist, they decided No; only Harry McShane didn't know about it till the last day. Not only that, when he brought me to the friends around this group with whom I was to stay, (a home of a son of a Member of Parliament, Labor, incidentally!) we ~~found~~ found the deep despair in their ranks for they had told me that their local of Labor Party which on paper has hundreds, has only 12 attending meetings, and only 6 active, so she hardly thought many would come to Marxism; anyway a room at a hotel was gotten seating 12-15 whereupon over 40 showed up. The important point about that is that people weren't anxious to stress where they come from, although they stated it. (Present too was the daughter of John McLean which is the name which, up until his death in 1923 and even now, stands for the one who got his Socialist Party in World War I when the whole 2nd International collapsed, to vote against imperialist war!)

I spoke on Marxist Humanism from 1844 through Hungarian Revolution of 1956, with a good deal of time on the contribution of the American Miners in their 1949-50 strike to the question of "What kind of labor should man perform?" At the end McLean's ~~daughter~~ daughter began to say that since the days of her father she had heard nothing like it "genuine Marxism," etc. etc. I gave out News & Letters and sold 6 pamphlets and 2 Marxism & Freedom.

The following day I concentrated on State Capitalism for that is the one analysis they still don't know much about, although everyone fights the appearances and brutal results of Russian state capitalism, such as suppression of Hungarian Revolution. Somehow it is hard to loosen here what in 1917 Russian was a workers' state.

~~The surprising attendance at this meeting was the entire Trotskyist youth--6--and truly teenage and alert--who were so impressed they began to apologize for their Trotskyism "After all we were in the Labor Party youth and they had nothing for us; we were going to leave when the Trotskyist began to unfold their militancy." In any case, to everyone's surprise, they didn't wish to leave at all and since I had to catch a train directly after meeting they grabbed my bags and begin to carry them, and before we knew it something like 25 came with us to see me off on the train. "We could have had hundreds and hundreds at your meetings" everyone bewailed.~~

Between these 2 public meetings which have really set a basis for McShane and a theoretical interest by workers no one credited them with before, I met with McShane and the 3 around him to analyze the meetings and draw conclusions for collaboration--and of course this is the key to all I do here--and the following concrete actions were passed which I feel sure you will all great:

1) Until such time as the British friends can publish paper of their own, they will supply a full British page in NEWS & LETTERS. If that is page 3, they can put that as page 1 when it is sold here. We will begin with December issue.

9462

3.

2) They wish to be part of any Int. Information Bureau which should base itself on opposing both world capitals--Russia and America--fighting for world conquest--and the unfoldment of MARXIST HUMANISM.

3) On the question of state capitalism and the other fundamental points in MARXISM & FREEDOM, they will now begin the systematic study thereof. Of course I inscribed a book to them, but they will undertake sales of M&F at once.

4) They will continue a mimeographed sheet they have been putting out "The New Commune" (sent to you separately) for supplementary news in Scotland, and collaborate with F.W. in London whether as part of us or any larger group that may result here who aim in the same direction.

As you know from my reports from Leeds, the Labor youth there brought out 150 and the discussion was lively enough, but all of the previous meetings outside Scotland were more or less on the scale in the States when I speak to universities; there is no way to concretize and bring it to an organizational conclusion. Glasgow, on the other hand, and I am sure it will be so also in London when finally I have finished the "general" talks, are Marxist Humanists, so that we are establishing world foundations.

Y<sup>o</sup>urs, R.

9463

INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY  
LONDON & SOUTHERN COUNTIES DIVISION

Second FORUM of 1959-60 season :

THURSDAY, 22nd OCTOBER, 1959  
7.30 p.m.

at CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE,  
near Holborn Underground Station.

LECTURER,

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

well-known Socialist writer and speaker, one-time Secretary  
to Leon Trotsky, author of "Marxism and Freedom" (1958)

SUBJECT,

"CAN MAN BE FREE IN AN AGE OF AUTOMATION  
AND STATE CAPITALISM?"

QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION.

ADMISSION FREE.  
COLLECTION.

A L L W E L C O M E

Inquiries to Arthur Duncan,  
Education Secretary,  
c/o I.L.P., 6 Endsleigh Street, W.C.1.

9464



To the REB (copy to Bess)

Oct. 27, 1958

Dear Friends:

The hectic pace is finally catching up with me and I do not feel very well; hence the report will be very brief. Moreover I must catch a train to Manchester where I speak to night. Since they were so anxious to have me that when they found I could not make an afternoon lecture, they arranged one for the evening, and it seems I'm competing with Mendes-France who is there the same evening. I cannot renege. Nor will I be able to tomorrow when I speak to African Forum and then comes the final night of summation with the few friends, after which I am off to Paris where the 3 days might be easier on me since the meetings are only with individuals.

250 last night showed up at the ULR--a good crowd of course but so mixed in attitudes--the <sup>students</sup> are moving away from Marxism, at least in this garbled version of it; then every tendency is present and take time in discussion and help make Marxism appear mechanical, etc. However, some workers followed me here from the trades union branch and I believe it is the first time that group ever had any workers in its audience. The leadership--and they are worse elite than those of the vanguard parties--almost boycotted the meeting and the one editor that did show up walked out after asking a question. This gave me a wonderful opportunity in summation to ~~xxx~~ attack them without gloves and ask the secretaries to take it down: 1) That they complained why I was so "anti-Russian", but the type of question they asked showed how very necessary it was not only because they are falling into the CP trap, but because, despite being intellectuals, they read not Marx, but what R. Palme Dutt says Marx says, with the result that that editor (Taylor) presented a vulgar materialist against whom it was easy to argue, 2) That he had not even read my pamphlet so his concern that since countries were unindustrialized in Africa, I would not be "interested"--and I read out the paragraph "A people mature enough to fight for its freedom is mature enough to take destiny into its own hands." 3) Finally for Humanists as they call themselves, not one word was mentioned by them, now that I placed Marxist Humanism as the only 20th c. humanism. One of the assistants came up, as did many others, saying that I was "brilliant" and "if I had been in speech as I was in summation, they would have been for me. My reply was: I never would have made the summation as the speech because your approval would have meant nothing you wouldn't have understood it if you had not first been compelled to understand Communism as state-capitalism and as the thing that keeps you imprisoned. (Incidentally the literature table was angry because our stuff sold better than theirs--if I had had a dozen M&F, they would easily have been sold but I only had 1, 12 pamphlets and about 20 papers, and names and addresses of those who wanted to hear more and be put on mailing list, etc.etc.)

Only 2 other meetings will I describe here of the London group because of my need to hurry: First and most

9465

important--the talk before the trades union branch. They were painters--55 of them, which is about a 1/3rd of that local's membership, and I believe one of the finest turnouts they ever had. It is the only place that was interested in hearing of the American workers, and it is on that that I spoke. The questions on Automation, which they are not yet confronted with, showed they believe the American workers' attitude, and not those of engineers and labor bureaucrats that Automation will bring the millincum. The anti-labor laws was the next point after those of wages and conditions of labor. When I got to break down that \$3.20 an hour for "lowest" steel workers into the days they work, the price, etc. they were quite convinced if there is any gold on the streets of America, it is not where any workers live. But most important of all was the interest in NEWS & LETTERS, the wish to get it regularly (They not only grabbed up all the copies there, but voted to make a donation to M&L at next meeting--they were an hour late in adjourning, there was so much interest) and they really do intend to write for the British page--I'm sure of that.

I'll describe

The other meetings (I leave out the one for the Fabrites of all things! those with Michael Kidron, altho it is not without its importance, and those for "Advance" and a few others) is the for the ILP, which has long been dead on its feet. This branch generally has about 6-10. Nearly 60 showed up to this one, and since there weren't any seats stood the whole 2 hours. The stupidities of that leadership is seen by the fact that while he showed his surprise and said he had never seen so many before, he still attributed it to "the advanced" people who would "educate" the workers. So here too I said I was appreciative of the platform they gave me, etc. but I must take time out to criticize their leaflet at election time, for it surely does not surprise me they got only 168 votes. It sounded like a Stalinist front! Of course they are brave and are against capitalism, their capitalism. That used to be sufficient. But now you must also say where you stand in a world divided between two world masses of capital--America and Russia, and when all the slogans just happen to parrot Stalinist line and not a word against Russia, why should a British worker not think it is put up by Russia; they too are against British capitalism.

The discussion was very lively, especially on the part of the youth; ILP has none so those who came did not come for ILP but for M&F as was indeed seen by the friends I made afterward (1) There is a possibility now of a German edition; one person there who is German is willing to become literary agent for it and try. He is enthusiastic and thinks it could come out in a paper edition and thus be smuggled in your coat pocket to East Germany! I dare not be that optimistic, but it is the first chance ever opening up; not a single group on the international scene has connections in Germany. 2) Another youth who is connected with Nuclear Disarmament and a sort of combination of pacifism and direct actionism is interested enough to have followed me around ever since and will come to the meeting FW is calling of the few around him to sum up the stay and see what can be done when I leave. I must end abruptly--sorry--perhaps I'll have a chance to continue when I return from Manchester.

October 30, 1959

To the REB (Copy to bess, fw, mcShane)

9467

Dear friends:

I will limit myself to the description only of the Africa Forum meeting and the final one with the close ones because I'm taking for granted that Frank will write the summation of my European tour up.

The Africa Forum was no mass meeting like ULR, but it was the most exciting and, outside of the trades union local, the most proletarian and useful. There were about 25, half black and half white, the half that were Africans by far the most important. The 6 that are the executive are evidently divided between Nigeria and Ghana, and the 3 Ghanians are divided by 2 being non-critical and one very critical of Akromah. All were a bit wary before they invited me--in fact they had told Frank before meeting me they didn't think they could arrange a meeting for me, but after one met me, they went along with it. Even so, on the very eve they still were concerned that a white should be critical of the leadership of the African revolution and, as you know, the title they gave the lecture was "Americans of African Descent."

I began my talk by saying I was glad as to the title because it then allows me to speak of the American Negro and of the African Revolution. While the speech was 60% on America and 40% on Africa, the discussion was after all almost completely on Africa, so that my summation followed that line too, and we ended by being in the most fraternal relations possible. To be precise: 1) They want to be salesmen both for M&F, M&L, and African pamphlet 2) They want us to write for their journal, African Outlook, and will write for NEWS & LETTERS 3) They voted also to try to issue as pamphlet with both my LW on David Walker & a little note by themselves, reproducing David Walker's Appeal. (Com. mcShane, please note: find out printing costs of a 76 pp pamphlet and drop S. Omubo, 12 Morton house, London, S.W.9 rates on it, saying I asked you to do so.) 4) Finally they want all and every thing I ever wrote on negro question, and of course also wish to hear from CD as editor of M&L

They certainly didn't expect to like a white that much and the first thing the following morning I got a call from them as to how very pleased they were to have given me the forum, "learned so much and made such a good friend."

Now I will skip to the group here. FW is of course magnificent and everyone from friends to enemies (the little radical groups including Cliff who were just burning up with jealousy that he was able to secure so many places for me, esp. ULR that they are always after) recognizes what a piece of work he had done in putting Marxist Humanism on the British map. Around him are 4-6 E Londoners. In my various talks, I was able to pick up people who had followed me around from meeting to meeting (excluding Jimmy Young who did not appear at this one & I doubt he'll be any good to us) and 4 of these were present and one who is German and wants to handle German edition, and an Indian I believe will definitely join as Marxist humanists and one from Direct Action Peace Group will collaborate very closely. All voted for work around M&F, M&L, and int'l. info. bureau--so now there is definitely a group of 10 in S. Land and 11

*England - The real will depend on members & concerted work  
O, yes, how could I have forgotten! - an Mer 5-7 protestations well  
work on same lines at the they are "advance" group, yours - Lee*

Dest  
COPY COPY COPY COPY

October 30, 1959

To the REB (copies to Bess, FW, McShane):

Dear Friends:

I will limit myself to the description only of the Africa Forum meeting and the final one with the close ones because I'm taking for granted that Frank will write the summation of my European tour up.

The Africa Forum was no mass meeting like ULR, but it was the most exciting and, outside of the trades union local, the most proletarian and useful. There were about 25, half black and half white, the half that were Africans by far the most important. The 6 that are the executive are evidently divided between Negeria and Ghana, and the 3 Ghanians are divided by 2 being non-critical and one very critical of Nkrumah. All were a bit wary before they invited me -- in fact they had told Frank before meeting me they didn't think they could arrange a meeting for me, but after one met me, they went along with it. Even so, on the very even they still were concerned that a white should be critical of the leaders ip of the African revolution and, as you know, the title they gave the lecture was "Americans of African Descent."

I began my talk by saying I was glad as to the title because it then allows me to speak of the American Negro and of the African Revolution. While the speech was 60% on America and 40% on Africa, the discussion was after all almost completely on Africa, so that my summation followed that line too, and we ended by being in the most fraternal relations possible. To be precise: 1) They want to be salesmen both for M&F, N&L, and African pamphlet, 2) They want us to write for their journal, African Outlook, and will write for News and Letters. 3) They voted also to try to issue as pamphlet with both my FW on David Walker and a little note by themselves, reproducing David Walker's Appeal. 4) Finally they want all and everything I ever wrote on Negro question, and of course also wish to hear from CD as editor of N&L.

They certainly didn't expect to like a white that much and the first thing the following morning I got a call from them as to how ~~XXX~~ very pleased they were to have given me the forum, "learned so much and made such a good friend."

Now I will skip to the group here. FW is of course magnificent and everyone from friends to enemies (the little radical groups including Cliff who were just burning up with jealousy that he was able to secure so many places for me, esp. ULR that they are always after) recognizes what a piece of work he had done in putting Marxist Humanism on the British map. Around him are 4-6 E. Londoners. In my various talks, I was able to pick up people who had followed me around from meeting to meeting (excluding Jimmy Young who did not appear at this one and I doubt he'll be any good to us) and 4 of those were present and one who is German and wants to handle German edition, and an Indian I believe will definitely join as Marxist Humanists and one from Direct Action Peace Group will collaborate very closely. All voted for work around N&L, and int'l info: bureau -- so now there is definitely a group both in Scotland and in England -- the rest will depend on themselves and consistent work. O, yes, how could I have forgotten! Another 5 proletarians will work on same lines although they are of "Advance" group!

Yours, R.

9468



9469

RFB (copy to Bess)  
Dear Friends:

11/2/59

Today I saw Francois Fejto and it turns out that I had been invited (an invitation that got lost somewhere in Am.Express in Italy or London) to participate in a colloquium held in Belgium on Oct.25th on the Hungarian Rev. I would have been happy to have cut one of my mtgs (this is a Ger. typewriter so I do not know what keys I'll hit) in Britain to have attended. But the important point is that the invitation had been extended, and that we are known to the Hungarian revolutionaries abroad, and there is no question that that is not the end, but the beginning of a relationship. I do not know whether I convey to you how int. we really are and our contributions to every phase from Hungary to Africa is the Marxist contribution. Since it is now turning out that Paris which was to have been a "rest" is once again mtgs, I have no chance to elaborate, but I do want to say of Chaulieu group that that too is not lost.

Although I had decided not to contact in view of their past actions, the "personal" note I dropped to the student Bess met last year and the call to Mothe as a worker has brought results, so that today I not only met them too and had a preliminary understanding, but Chaulieu and others are making a formal mtg. and since I had no evenings left they begged me to change my ticket which they are now trying to do so that I'm a day late for Milan but I think it is most important because surely if there has been a change, as I believe there has been, it is important that this key country in WE be not omitted from relations.

The cousins too are working out nicely as "contacts" which I likewise did not expect, so all in all it will be a very packed 4 days plus having already taken up my time on return boat as I promised an article by Nov 20th. I will write to Saul separately to help prepare some of the research & I trust he'll