

Warmest regards to all the friends; I was especially glad to get the signatures of all the mailers and feel that I was missed.
Yours, Raya
Nov. 7, 1967

Dear Olga:

Some one told me today was Thanksgiving --no turkeys here but I trust that Detroiters are having their open houses and feeling so relaxed as to forgive me for not writing before this. In a certain sense, there is little I can say now too, and that is not only due to the fact that Hong Kong was for research, not for contacts with movements, but also because it is difficult to ~~evaluate~~ evaluate when, upon study, impinge the realities of a colony. Even though that colony be a "favored" one and "window to Western freedom" the truth is that Mao needs only to keep quiet and let the imperialists continue with their work and the masses will automatically be for "the other side." And it isn't from not knowing that Mao's China is very far from heaven. There is practically no relationship between the refugee Chinese and the Hong Kong Chinese, but all you have to do is look at those awful shacks without sanitation to know both what they must have escaped to accept this, and to know how bitter life can be under imperialism of the Western type as well. And there is the Chinese language to bind them together; very few even among those who learn English bother to use it for talk among themselves; it is strictly the foreigners' language.

Now the various institutes for the study of mainland China are, in turn, divided between British studies and American ones--the British wishing not to be too harsh on Mao as they trade with him and, above all, the people they rule over consider themselves and are Chinese, not British. The Americans, on the other hand, are all Taiwan men --not by birth but by outlook, and yet they too learn to admire "the ancient, classic Orient" and, at least on Sino-Soviet conflict, will not brook ideas as to who is superior in polemics--Russian or Chinese. And none know Marxism! Which does not stop them from being "experts" in the field and in the polemic.

But there have been a few interviews with refugees, not of the late refugees who just crossed over during the famine, but who escaped a little earlier, those who are intellectuals, some "Rightists", or at least opponents, and one Leftist. The one Leftist is the real find. Bess and I just interviewed her, with the help of a Chinese translator, but we found she really knows sufficient English, and therefore have invited her to dine with us Sat. and first then we will get to know more. The point is she went willingly to China not only when Mao first came to power, but because she felt the territorial status of Hong Kong and wanted to be part of the new China; and she returned again in 1954, with child, and worked at Peking University, and even volunteered to go in for manual work in building dam. That was the end of any illusion about what "abolition of division between theory and practice" means in China --the sweated labor, the "mass line", the lack of sanitation, the futility of some of the work, and totalitarianism in thought. She said though she did not know much of Marxism--no one seems to know much; all you learn is what Stalin and Mao said it was--she felt that Mao was the real revisionist. It will all be of value also to the book. I will try to find some time afterward to write more, but, as it is, I'm jealous of what time I have here to study; it is all ending next week; and in Japan I expect to have even less time but from there you will hear in more detail and in work more directly related to the movement as it will be all meetings, so just be patient till then. N&L came and looked wonderful; it is still the best paper anywhere in the world. And I trust Inez should be ready to return to cartooning so our own M-H need not get in only indirectly--

9678

Nov. 20, 1965

9679

Dear (let):

Because of crossing the international date line, letters coming from USA lose a day while letters coming from Hong Kong gain a day; I therefore trust that this will reach you in sufficient time before deadline, while it is correct for you to have stopped writing here, and let letters go to Japan from now on.

Yes, I do believe that the lead should be on Vietnam rather than on Rhodesia precisely because we can have eyewitness reports (and it will make it easier for you to write both because you know the material & because you might very well utilize one of the in-person reports; it would certainly be excellent if Broadhead --see below quote from Eugene--could thus be used.) Naturally this means that the TW should not carry a reproduction of my 1961 piece on Vietnam--use the M-H article instead--and also cut down on some of the eye-witness reports, and further make p.1 look different by beginning OI&T, (which should be the one to deal with Rhodesia 1st) & of course WJ is different.

Also make sure that our M-H comes through, for which here is a brand new quotation from the North Vietnamese themselves when they were carrying their 100 flowers campaign: first, this poem: "You, who defeated invaders

And who did not bow down
Under colonial domination

Why do you bear with these villains
Who Same our Fatherland?" The "villains" are the Communists & the poem appeared on August-29, 1956. Or you can make a reference to the fact that the students in No Vietnam there had their own oppositional publication ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ (Dat Moi, New Land) while the central oppositional paper was called Nhan Van (Humanities or Humanist?) There had evidently then been both a peasant uprising, and workers' unrest as well as intellectual revolt. In any case either a single sentence to the effect that being against American imperialism and for self-determination of the Vietnamese does not mean being for Hanoi who likewise knew how to suppress opposition, both coming from the working class and peasantry as well as from the intellectuals in 1956, and who no doubt have not given up the totalitarian practice of suppression of freedoms --or the quotation of the above poem will be sufficient to distinguish us from the Militant type of reporting which you rightly detest.

I'm not sure Eugene sends you as good reports as he does to Bess, so here is a par. "Louise went up to Berkeley for the march. There were about 15 th., altho the newspapers all reported 5 or 6 th. She did not sell much, but what is important is that Dick was very good. He evidently considers himself sort of a member, He helped Louise sell & turned over money to her for a M&F & some other lit. tht he sold during the past couple of months. He also was very willing to arrange a meeting for me and I am writing him after finishing this letter with Dec. 12 or 13 as the day I will go up & speak. I a, sp sendome out a letter to our mailing list today. Announcing that we will have classes on M&F around the tapes. The classes will start this coming Tues."

Supplement this with report I'll write John this evening & give him any clippings I send you on Rhodesia. Warmest greetings to all. May drop note to Tim but really cannot promise. It is my last few days & both interviews & warming up of so-called scholars, incl. one now who will go to Macao to interview latest peasant refuee, makes this hectic here. Yours, *Ren*

Dec. 4, 1965

Darling John *(Please show this to Reg. et al)*

This is the first morning in Japan, and last night there was quite a "Welcome Raya" committee at the airport. Exciting, especially because it was, in part, unscheduled. I mean Yukiwama and Tsushima, our coms., and Kurokawa and ~~Ikemoto~~ *Ikemoto*, the Zenshin group, that has scheduled most of the meetings, were there, with their sign, but sedate and respectable. The other Zengakuren faction--Sigeru Mori and real, real marvellous, beautiful, intense, alive youth--about 50 of them--who had been excluded from the "Welcome Raya Committee" just came down anyway and, like all you, just "took over." They insisted in making a speech in Japanese, with translator right there and then, which not only welcomed me as a Marxist and "fighter against imperialist aggression", but also complaining against the others for their exclusion, informing me that they have a meeting of their own scheduled for me on the 19th--and want me to answer the statement they have drawn up for me, whereupon 3 big statements were handed me. The one that was just made up that morning for me--12 long pages (and I mean long--it is 2 1/2 times the width and the legal size in length) asks questions all the way from "Correspondence to Cardan, and from Stalin to anarchism, and from Hegel (actually incl. the German word, Aufheben, transcend) to the Humanism of Marxism, and demanding 2 more days of discussion with me beside the 1 day for the public meeting allotted them by other group. In any case, with their little camera flashing, and all the excitement, the older coms. did feel it was better I cut this reception short, which I did after some 10 minutes, of which only about 1 minute was mine in acknowledging greeting & stating at once theory too was activity. (They informed me they came from one demonstration & will be at another tomorrow) By now it was 11 p.m. & the regular comm. took us to our hotel room, where we talked for another 1 hour, & they'll return to talk more at noon--bet. demonstrations--& bring me to my 1st meeting. They were pleased as punch that they had only 2 days notice I came with a speech all written out that the translator can study overnight so he can translate more easily even tho I'll

not follow the text. Yes, I am nervously looking forward to that 1st public meeting, and I expected me question period so we get a feel of the New left here from their works after they had 20

Dec. 5, 1965

Dear ~~Cher~~ Friends:

Victory! The first public meeting in Tokyo was a great success. The anti-Stalinist organizations--about 3, with Zenshin--counted on having their largest meeting--500--and got a hall to seat that many. However, 700 crowded in; they were all over the isles, sitting on the floor and blocking every exit. It was a most receptive ideas to the question of Marxist Humanism and new international relations.

It was a most exciting adventure, such as neither Bess nor I witnessed. It began with a film of the 1960 demonstrations. Then the three leaders of the organizations made brief speeches introducing me, with Tsushima calling me "the most powerful Marxist theoretician in the world today."

Then I spoke an hour, first bringing greetings from the second America of workers, Negroes, youth who are struggling against the same forces they struggled in in 1960--US imperialism, but national brand. After that I explained the Humanism of Marxism, 1844, 1950, 1956, 1960. With the translation it took another hour.

By now the audience had been in the hall--the trade union hall of the Tel. & Tel Workers--for 3 solid hours, with no one moving, despite the crowdedness of the hall, the heat, etc. And they first got ready for the questions, which ranged from the "Void" and "Nothingness" in Oriental philosophy, in Hegel, and "negativity" in Marx to what precisely is being done in USA against the Vietnamese war, the status of the Negro Revolution, and how to establish a new international on Marxist foundations. In all, they had been there 4 hours. And they were ready to stay for more except time was up, whereupon they sang the "International" as we have never heard it sang before, with the same time of hand motions we know as snake dance--a sort of combination of "We Shall Overcome" hand gesture but swaying to and fro each row slightly different from the next. It was the most beautiful sight, with fish bulbs going to show that *the Americans were doing it unison with them.

By 10 p.m.--we had been there since 6 p.m. as that is the usual starting time of meetings in Japan so that workers who finish work at 5 can come straight there; and Bess and I had been meeting with the preparatory committee, translator, etc. ever since noon, with time out to go down to their demonstrations held at 4 p.m. All the literature they had of their pamphlets were sold out, and so were M&F, News & Letters, and anything else they could get hold of from our Committees.

9681

The applause was also something I haven't heard before with such vigor. As for the schedule they set up for me to cover the length and breadth of Japan--~~look~~ look at your map of Japan and see what we will be doing the first week:

Mon.,--more meetings with leaders of different groups to arrange for meetings when I'll return from the trip.

Tues. leave 7 a.m. for Hiroshima, 6 hours travel, meeting at 5:30 p.m.--on Early Essays of Marx --Memorial hall of A-bomb victims.

Wed. travel to Fukoka ~~---~~ ^{Thursday talk} Kyushu Univ. group near Miike mines (like West Virginia) with miners group in audience-- 1 p.m. and afterwards with individuals --Perspectives of proletarian revolution--USA ~~Thursday~~

Friday travel--15 hour journey to Nagoya -- Sat. Nagoya University--topic:History of Ideas in Modern society group-- talk early aft., Evening dinner and interview with Asahi editors (this is the NY TIMES of Japan & I have no idea of the kind of questions they will ask, or even why--some liberal professors arranged that one. Again travel bac, Toyota City (known as "East Detroit") Sun. 1 p.m. talk to auto workers on Automation & the 1955 Detroit wildcats

Mon. at Nagoya University speak to student group 1 p.m.

Leave for Kyoto and Tues. Kyoto Univ. group --Travel more --Talk at Rikumei University --night meeting Back in Tokyo Wed.//talk to Waseda Univ. Meeting; Smaller meetings to get the schedule of the rest of the week and the rest of the month--they have me occupied till the first few days in Jan. I will be speaking on Sat. to the Russian History Group on the 1917 Revolution and the lessons for our day. And then that same evening to the competing youth group that met me at the airport that was not part of the Welcome Raya Committee. After that there is a full day conference on perspectives and relations between America, with "in-between" one on State Capitalist theory, and one on all the works of Hegel. Which doesn't account for all the extra individual meeting, including with one who had spent 9 years in jail in Russia as a Japanese prisoner of war, and who now has translated (he learned Russian in prison evidently) some works by Trotsky.

There is no doubt whatever that this has started discussion in all the New Left on a new scale. For proof of results we'll have to wait to the end of these 6 intensive weeks. That Saul should be absent without leave in ^{your Raya} this important period is criminal, absolutely criminal.

Dear Olga type the above. Send to all local CPs. Of course I'll say that last sentence on Saul's steps in. I decided it is best to let them know the way.

Dec 9, on train to Fukuoka from Hiroshima

Dear Friends:

One feels very sombre entering Hiroshima and also conscious on how deeply internationalist the Marxists are to arrange a meeting for Americans here. As soon as we stepped off the train and were met by enthusiastic youth, the first thing he pointed to outside the station was the large poster advertising that RD, an American anti-war fighter was to speak on M-H. For an indoor meeting the 300 that were in the hall was the largest the anti-Communist movement ever commanded. The meeting started at 6 p.m. and adjourned at 9 p.m. There were three brief speeches of the 3 participating organizations and then I spoke 1 hour. (With translation it makes it a 2 hour speech everywhere and they are really the most disciplined audience. Moreover, there is an hour's discussion and the eagerness with which they meet collaboration with American M-H, the interest in the Negro Revolution, the anti-Vietnam war struggles and theory/really/seriously
Marxist-Humanism is being put on the map and every one speaks as one, making only an exception to "state capitalism". which we're first going to discuss in full when we return to Tokyo.

This, having been the public meeting, and adjournment was at 9 p.m., that, of course, was too early to call it a day, so another one was called at 9:30 p.m. in the hotel lobby--the largest in ~~xxxxxx~~ Hiroshima and even that fancy one must allow for such meetings, so strong is the anti-war movement here. This was a group of about 25 from the larger meeting who were interested in continued discussion and asking me about my life "since you were born, how you came to the revolution, and how you broke with LF." It was 11 p.m. when we finished here. We had been up since 6:30 a.m. to catch train and travelled all day.

The next morning we were taken to an auto factory--more automated than Chrysler--~~Togo~~ and also the Hiroshima Peace Museum. Beginning noon the round of meetings started all over again--Marxist students at Hiroshima University--about 75--again M-H and the relationship of it to American mass movement of Negroes. But, again, is not to be understood ~~at this time I spoke on VII~~ ~~t that~~ ~~is of the~~ ~~essen~~ ~~of an interview~~

with the students paper at the university. This was no sooner over than I had been invited to make brief address to a meeting that had been called by others on anniversary of "Japanese imperialism" attack on Pearl Harbor--or rather for the workers and students who fell in that "imperialist war" I said Roosevelt had called Dec.7 (Dec.8 here because of int.date line change) "a day of infamy" and I certainly don't wish to minimize Japanese imperialism's role, but the ~~real~~ day of infamy that will live in world's history is the bombing of Hiroshima and I was here to bring them greetings from the second America that is determined there should be no more Hiroshimas.

Hardly time from here to grab a bite and go to the last meeting with the Zenshin people ~~which~~ that included several workers from auto factory

They wanted to know about auto workers and got a speech on 1936, 1943, 1955, and WORKERS BATTLE AUTOMATION which is soon to come out in Japanese. There were also 2 shipyard workers, and they wanted to know about Clyde and Harry McShane. There is nothing these people who are so eager to know and establish relations with movement in America don't know about. The last hour of the meeting, however, was pure philosophy, the structure of M&F, the new work planned on Philosophy & Revolution, and both the auto & shipyard workers have a Marxist paper in the shop itself which is full of M-H. They are busy translating and publishing many articles from N&L and very nearly everything I write.

Again we had to wake early & now we are on the train to the next meeting place, 5 hours ride away, and that is the way it will continue for the entire week, after which we return to Tokyo, and a new set of Every one wants to exchange papers with us, and we will have to send to Zenshin itself 10 papers & later I'll send in local news. Yours, Raya

Dec. 20, 1965

Dear Friends:

Charles Denby, John Allison and Pete Hastings have gone down into history. Their letter, as rank and file workers, addressed to the auto workers of the "East Detroit of Japan"-- Toyota has been translated into Japanese, read out at two meetings in Toyota, and will be answered by the workers of Toyota when they get some one to translate their answer in Japanese into English.

[The reading of the letter and handing it to the worker-councilman (Toguchi) touched off more than applause --it brought out, in discussion, the whole story of labor conditions in Toyota, where the factories are just as automated, but salaries are lower, and it is an actual company town like I've seen in mining towns at their worst, but not in places where modern production dominates. It shows you what happens when a country makes so fast a leap from feudalism into industrialism. [The thing, however, that brought the house down was the ^{an effort} attack on Reuther: they hate him here too, ^{thought that was the best} a
[It seems that, as the "city sister" of Detroit, he was here--but since the most the town sports is a Japanese Inn, he stayed at a plush ^{new} hotel 50 miles away, not without, however, leaving his picture to hang in the union (sic!) hall! It is a real company union that pretends independence because it is run by the extreme right wing of the S.P. But since it is in the "Western" camp, Reuther had nothing whatever to say against company union, much less the conditions they live on company lots where single men are segregated from families, ^{men} workers who are h.s. graduates from those who are college grads--and not only they cannot bring friends there, but even parents must get permission to visit! [When I told them how the Pittsburgh power strike resulting from a company union they took down every word--every word I say is, in any case, always tape recorded and by the next stop a summation is already published (mimeographed) for the next town!]

The joke was we held both meetings--150 at each-- in one city hall since that is one of the privileges of councilman and this one young worker maverick got elected for the first time. Talking about 1917 still living; this worker (Toguchi) learned Russian and wrote "Long live" in beautiful Russian on the welcome to me, showed the film Potemkin at the evening meeting as a warm-up for a talk by a Marxist-Humanist. The morning meeting was on "Workers Battle Automation"; the evening one on the theoretic void left in the movement since Lenin's death.

9686

The big town near Toyota is Nagoya and there we were back in university atmosphere. There was one from the "New Left"--that, here, is one more name for fellow traveller; the intellectual atmosphere is all that type--who invited me to address an exclusive (exclusively bad) group of 70 professors, and who himself played a most strange role with Asahi so that I still do not know whether his "interpretation" or my actual article is the one that was accepted and printed there--the schedule was too tight to follow through such matters. However, the fact that he contributed a page to the mimeographed booklet the Marxist Student Club issued welcoming me shows that there are some openings to genuine Marxism. As against the 70 professors, the students brought out 400 to their public meeting. These people are sure gluttons for punishment--each meeting is a minimum of 3 hours, generally 4 1/2 of talk!

In every city there is generally a small meeting for Zenshin people which includes Marxist Workers League and Marxist Students League discussing more "intimate" political questions on international relations among workers' and students' groups, and theoretical questions facing the movement; then there is a public meeting where the international relations are represented as solidarity between workers across national lines--and again theory. Both here Marxist-Humanism presented and hear of the Negro Revolution in America, and anti-war struggles. In Fukuoka, the first meeting was attended by 100, then 2nd by 400. (Kyushu University was quite a remarkable meeting.

But the most amazing one was in Kyoto where a professor --the only one who so acted--gave me the grand tour of the campus, his autographed book--on the philosophic basis of CAPITAL. His name is Kakehachi and he is a leading intellectual light. Unfortunately, their intellectualism stops at the door of Russia where they, at best, prattle about "degenerated workers state", though the Trotskyists, officially, are very nearly non-existent. It is there where I took Mill, so, though I am well now, the 3 days I missed in this insane schedule--and the fact that I now asked public meetings stop, (and we get down to brass tacks on state capitalism and Marxist Humanism with the leading committee of the group closest to us (of those who do not accept our position; Tsushima and Yukiya are, of course, fully Marxist-Humanist) is a good a place as any to end this hurriedly. By now thousands have heard the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism. Till the next time --I trust the organization has been

Dec. 22, 1965

Dear Coms. Ignatius and Yukiwama:

You're absolutely right about the confusion and contradictions in the position on Russia on the part of the comrades of the Zenshin. I don't know whether it helped any to try to present state capitalism from the philosophic rather than strictly economic point of view. But what I attempted yesterday was to show that Marxist-Humanism is not only opposition to Alienated Labor, nor is it only the ultimate of the new human dimension. Rather it is in the daily consideration of the working man to becoming the whole man; that, if once a Marxist theoretician loses sight of this, he is compelled to the bourgeois solution of solving crises through manipulation of things rather than through the self-development of man. In any case, I attempted from this vantage point to trace through the "planning" vs. "planlessness" debates among Marxists since a new world stage of economic development—Autopoly-and then state-capitalism. Topics: (1) Rosa Luxemburg's Accumulation of Capital vs. Hilferding's Finance Capital vs. Lenin's Imperialism --- 1910-1915; (2) economics of the "Transition Period"; Lenin vs. Bukharin and Preobrazhensky; Kretsky debates merging into the 1920-21 trade union debate, 1919-21; during the Depression the debate with Trotsky as it moved from the "Russian Question" into the question of world economy and alienated labor; (4) the post World War II debate among Stalinists themselves; the famous "Varga controversy" as it relates to Marx's concept of capitalist crises** on the one hand, and the type of regimes in Eastern Europe and China, on the other hand.

Whether this manner of debating achieved results I naturally do not know. It does seem to me that it is not this that will be "the breaking point", theoretically; rather it will be the "organizational question". Therefore I should like to present to you what I

— I was asked whether I knew your position on this question as developed in your book. I had to say, No, and I do wish that before I leave Tokyo, I would get at least a short summation of your book in English; would it be possible for the translator to spend an extra hour or so with me on this one day next week?

**Did I ever send you my article on the Varga controversy? Has the material of that discussion been published in Japanese? Both matters would be important for your essay—can I call it a part of my next book? That would be a new stage in theoretical collaboration if your name and mine were joined in one book!

9688

intend to present tomorrow on this question to their PC. The concrete reports by Tagawa, Yamamoto, Yamatano, Yamamura, Nozima, Shimizu and Iacoinake it possible for me to take the question out of its national context and put it in a world one for, in a very fundamental respect, the experiences of the "New anti-Stalinist Left" of the 1955-59 period in Japan are more like the 1947-50 period in Western Europe than the de-Stalinization period in Western Europe. Or, perhaps, more accurately expressed, Japan, by telescoping the mid-1940's and mid-1950's, retains illusions as to the "revolutionary nature" of Communist Party members that the Hungarian revolution should have disabused them of. (I will return to the question of historic continuity at the end.)

I believe I have written you once before about the parallel I see in developments here and those in Western Europe when a million members joined the French CP and 2 million the Italian and altogether too many were looking for Stalin to put the question of proletarian power on the agenda. Such illusions can arise only from a mistaken view of the class nature of the SU (and, we must add now, of China). Yet the comrades here still look for major recruitment from CP members or ex-members rather than trying to organize "the raw masses." Hirota seems to think that perversions of Marxism come not from the class nature of Stalinism, but from considering Marx "a closed system"; as for Fascism, I believe they totally underestimate its power, state power. Philosophically, just when they should finally see Man, they suddenly put Cognition, as if "consciousness" rather than actual self-development of man, can abrogate the law of value!

The most difficult of all problems, however, is that of the concept of the "vanguard party", 1903 vintage. Not only has my development of the changes in Lenin, 1903-1923, made no lasting impression, but Hirota (and I assume he represents the whole tendency; I mention him only because he happened to have made the formal report) seems to think that criticism of Trotskyism consists in re-establishing What Is To Be Done. As if it wasn't precisely the re-establishment of the 1903 vanguard party concept in Trotskyism, 1928-40, that brought about its downfall. As I expressed it in the analysis of Trotsky as A Theoretician, if LT had only met the challenge of the times in theory instead of in a factual "cadre"! The concept of the Japanese friends seems to be a combination of Trotskyist (Leninist, 1903) concept of the party and the Zinovievist "electrifying the masses", 1921.

Practically, I suppose, they can consider me on weak grounds, because they do have a good organization here, and it is


larger than the Marxist-Humanists have in USA (though by no means as influential on a world scale). And I do suppose, in reaction to all those who are always out to lead, never to listen to the voices from below, we may seem to be characterized by a lack of what to them is "theory" on the party question. But I cannot see how one can "first" build a party, and then follow through with theory, rather than first clear one's head and answer the challenge to theory which will, of necessity, lead to "building the revolutionary organization."

They do not seem to be weighted down with the concept of what is philosophy.

They are --again, you're right here--the best group to collaborate with here; the Kuroda-Mori group is absolutely impossible; I've never seen such Stalinist behavior parading under the banner of "anti-Stalinism".

Looking forward to seeing you Sunday at 11 a.m. We must then be sure to arrange for at least one other full day type of ~~meeting~~. Unfortunately, it will not be possible to have it the following Sun., Jan. 2, as that day I'm to go over with the comrades translating "State Capitalism and World Revolution" the whole document. However, if that should be the only possible day (Jan. 2), please call me at once so that I can see whether they can change the day. I also will wish then to consider some practical matters.

Yours,



Dec. 24, 1965

Dear Friends:

Well, Maoism finally showed its face, and, as always (though it remains shocking as if it never happened before) it came "from within" -- that is, from one of the anti-Stalinist groups, one that had originally been excluded from the "Welcome Raya" Committee, and that I insisted had a right to discuss with me, and sponsor wide discussions among the "New Left".

On Dec. 19, this Sigeru Mori group (a split-off from Trotskyism) held a meeting for me at Waseda University. By then I had already been in Japan more than 2 weeks, had spoken widely throughout the country, gotten publicity not only from the Zenshin group, the main sponsors and closest to us politically, but also in university papers and, in the case of one of the important district papers (Nagoya edition of Asahi), the main press. No less than 1000 students turned out to hear. They became witnesses to a spectacle I have not seen in the movement since the Stalinist days.

Thus, the "Welcome Raya" consisted of three speakers, one right after the other, with a total of 2 hours and 15 minutes between them, attacking our position, without the audience having had a chance to hear the position expressed by myself instead of by those who oppose Marxist-Humanism under the guise of being "anti-Stalinist", and at the same time peppering their remarks with attacks on Zenshin for having supposedly taken "political advantage of me" by using my name to build their own organization, whereas these supposedly had not done so. (Never mind that they wouldn't, on their own, have rated more than the attendance of a hundred instead of a thousand.)

When I finally got the floor, I had at once to say that this is not the way to start an international discussion that is supposed to find the unifying force for gathering all anti-Stalinists into a genuinely Marxist organization, and since that meant a defense of Zenshin, it brought the first hiss. And the leadership of the group kept heckling and talking throughout the 1½ hours of my speech! (including translation). While they were by no means the majority, I need not belabor the point how a Communist group, strategically placed, can give the appearance of "representing" the audience. The points at which the giggling began was quite telling: as soon as I mentioned the theory of alienation, and when I quoted how Chou Yang attacked the early Marx, that was very nearly the only moment of silence -- silent approval of Chou Yang. As for the audience's reaction to calling Communism state-capitalism, that brought such well-rehearsed-in-English remarks as "sheer nonsense."

As the farce drew to a conclusion, this group showed their understanding of "broad discussion" by calling upon still another leader of their group as the one and only "questioner" and the question consisted of a 20 minute tirade against my preface to the Japanese edition of MSF, where I speak against Communism whereas they are for "real Communist." By then even the audience shouted for him to get to the point of the question, if it is a question he has in mind. Bess by then was even worried for my safety in the hall.

The fact that ~~200~~ 1000 turned out to hear, and they heard a 1½ hour presentation of Marxist-Humanism, ⁶bought plenty of literature (the publisher finally is impressed with the effect I have on sales and offered to pay part of the hotel bill!) is, of course, very important and impressive, regardless of the Maoist atmosphere. And yet to see the administrative mentality, the near-hooliganism, and the pull of Maoism emphasizes the fact of Mao's challenge, a challenge that I believe is greatly underestimated by many of the friends here.

9691

There are many smaller groups I talked to that I have no chance to report on, and that will have to await evaluation when I return. So many calls upon speeches also to special worker groups, as well as students and academic world, have been added that I wonder now whether they will allow us time to pack. Here is how it shapes up until Jan. 5 the day we leave:

Saturday, Dec. 25: a "free day", for writing a 1500 word article for the Waseda University paper.

Sunday, Dec. 26: 11 AM to 3 PM discussions with Tsushima and Yukiama; 3 PM to 8 PM a public meeting of workers.

Monday, Dec. 27: a talk with the director of a labor college and a tour of that college (all schools are now closed for the holidays, but, unfortunately, that means no free time for us since that's the time for the "small meetings").

Tuesday, Dec. 28: Morning--discussion with student editor of Waseda University paper, for I wish to be sure that the conditions are understood; the article must be published as I wrote it, with no editing permitted.

Evening--the publisher is having a party for me, but I suspect it will still mean a talk by me.

Wednesday, Dec. 29: Noon--a meeting with a group of professors in Tokyo University; Evening, Bessie meets with a group of nurses. (They were part of a meeting of Kanshin group in the industrial section of town and Bess had so impressed them about their particular problem and organization, that they called and asked her to address them directly).

Thursday, Dec. 30: intensive discussion on all of Hegel's works with a small group who are interested.

Friday, Dec. 31: 10 AM, discussion with the PC of Zenshin (this is the third and last of three all-day meetings with them on philosophy, politics i.e. the state-capitalist theory which they do not accept, and organization and international relations, which, again, will have to await full reporting when I return.)

We are supposed to have New Year's Day free since that is one day they do celebrate by returning home to their folks, but I'll believe that no other meetings have been set for us when I experience it.

Jan. 2, Sunday, the full day is for going over "State-Capitalism and World Revolution" with the friends who are translating it.

Jan. 3, Monday, is for Yukiama and Tsushima, who are those who not only accept all our positions in Kull, but who, theoretically, are the only ones doing independent work and I hope that Tsushima will be able to write a chapter for Philosophy and Revolution.

Jan. 4, we finally celebrate, since Yukiama is taking us to see the Kabuki drama. And the following day we must pack and leave. Perhaps we will be able to take off one day by stopping in Honolulu; it is an extremely exhausting tour and it is sometimes difficult not to be tired even when all the new avenues opened to us make you think no one has a right to be tired.

Today, for example, we felt proud as peacocks when the N&L arrived and we saw it not only as the unique paper it has always been, but to feel directly its international impact -- hurrah for the REB and all the in-person reports!

Yours,

RAYA

9692

Sigeru Mori - RMP-JRCL
Dear Com. Mori:

Dec. 23, 1965

9693

You may consider the continuous chatter of your leadership while I was presenting the American Marxist-Humanist position to an audience under your sponsorship "the unique nature of our movement and theory", and thus dismiss the procedure of having three speeches in criticism of that position before its official presentation by the National Chairman of News & Letters as not being in any way "defective." I, instead, consider that that procedure and that behavior—hissing, heckling, talking loudly while the speech was being delivered (not to mention your chairman's showy walk-up to the stage, no less than three times, to remind the translator that I allegedly violated the time allotted to me, when no such action was taken against your speakers who did indeed talk beyond the time originally agreed upon)—was near-Stalinist behavior. In the 40 years I have been in the revolutionary Marxist movement I have not been subjected to anything like this anywhere except in the Stalinist movement; naturally, to see the slightest semblance of this appear in the anti-Stalinist movement was, to me, a most disturbing phenomenon. You may consider such an attitude as an "emotional conflict"; I consider it the highest politics not to separate method of discussion from its content.

Nor do I agree with you that the Dec. 19th meeting was a manifestation of "the uniqueness of the Japanese anti-Stalinist movement". In the weeks since I arrived in Japan I have travelled fairly widely and spoken to many other anti-Stalinist groups, but, whether they were political groups like Zenshū or independent worker groups in Toyota, Hiroshima, Fukuoka, etc., or whether they were student groups and non-Stalinist academicians in Nagoya, Kyoto, and even semi-Stalinist professors to which you yourself introduced me to, the truth is that the depth of their disagreement with Marxist-Humanism both in theoretic content and practical tasks ahead did not lead to any behavior that tried to substitute interruptions for rational arguments at the right time and place. In a word, nowhere ^{else} did I meet with a group who did not even know how to listen; who could not discipline themselves while listening; and who did not make ^{sure} that the audience, too, understood that only Stalinists consider heckling a form of rational argument. I should also like to remind you that, just as in Europe and in Latin America and in Africa, so in Japan it was I who took the initiative of calling for international discussion and that your group got the same letter that other groups got fully six months ago --and so the lack of time in fully discussing what you call "the nature, preparations and proceedings of the meeting" of what you euphemistically designate as "welcome Raya" can in no way be blamed on the abbreviated time we had in Tokyo.

Naturally none of the above is to be taken to mean that our discussion has come to a complete stop. If you do seriously base yourself on the need to struggle against "imperialism and Stalinism" West and East; if you do oppose the Stalinist distortions of Marxism, and if you do seek to work out a common basis for the anti-Stalinist movement on a world scale, then, inevitably, you will be part of the international discussants. Not only will our exchange of press continue with you, but these will expand to include bulletins, and whatever results in international activity, whether in anti-war struggles or theoretical works, will continue. But at this moment they better continue in written form only. I hope this will contribute to your seeing defects where you see none now. Comradely yours,
Raya Dunayevskaya
National Chairman. NEWS & LETTERS

Jan. 2, 1965

Dear Coms. Tsushima and Yukiwama:

CABLE ADDRESS:
"UNISERCEN"

UNIVERSITIES SERVICE CENTER

TEL. 830241-3

I thought I might have been right by summarizing both the meeting with you ^{ISSA ROAD STREET} ^{90, YEAH} ^{30TH, HONG KONG}, on a different level, the ones with NC on the 31st, continuing into today with those in Menshin who are translating "State Capitalist and World Revolution. One of the reasons for the summation of our discussion is that I took a second look at Tony Cliff (Krukowa left the new 1960's ed. of "Russia: A Marxist Analysis") and it is unbelievably bad; dishonesty towards my position—the good Orwellian "1984" attitude of "unperson"—hurts his position a great deal more than mine. That is to say, if he had not pretended I did not exist and had not made the state capitalist analysis nearly 15 years before he published his analysis, then: (1) he would have had to tackle Sukharin's "Economics of the Transition Period" not as if it were the last word in Marxism, but with the knowledge that Lenin had considered it ^{Economist}, undialectical work that completely disregarded the worker as self-developing subject, not mere substance. (2) could not have given credit to a bourgeois magazine—American Economic Review—for having recognized what a total revision of Marxism was the 1943 change in the law of value as if it could have possibly been seen by any other than a Marxist. In a word, Cliff would have been forced to connect law of value, not as an economist dealing with "anarchic" production (in a state capitalist planned society at that!), but one facing alienated labor, a new high stage of consciousness, as well as a break in the dialectic structure of Capital. Since he disregards this analysis of mine, he goes his own merry way in 1955 as totally Trotskyist as you can possibly be when you claim to be a state capitalist while Trotsky is a workers' statist. No wonder the greatest criticism he can find to sum up his "attack" on Trotsky is to say that LT had "a conservative attachment to formalism...subordinates form to content." (3) Above all, had he not attributed state capitalism primarily to Russian backwardness and not to the new world stage of economic development, he would not have been such a vulgar underconsumptionist on the question of crises "of overproduction." Or perhaps I should have put this criticism the other way around: had he not been such an ingrained underconsumptionist, he could have, perhaps, seen what is new in world capitalist development, beginning with the 1929 crash and the rise of the State Plan. But, having been what he is, he does help us come directly to the new features of modern capitalism—not only its state form, but its automated production.

Thus, the new forms of crises when one is faced both with Keynesianism and militarization of economy; the new element of

9694

having to help the UNIVERSITIES SERVICE CENTER instead of getting from them
CABLE ADDRESS: "UNISECO" SURPLUS PROFITS OLD FASHIONED STATE CAPITALISM WAS ABLE TO EXTRACT.
KOWLOON, HONG KONG TEL. 030241.3

Above all, however, are the new forces of revolt, the new human forces and passions for reconstruction of society that comes with the struggles for Humanism as an element of Workers Councils in the Hungarian Revolution.

Thus, we must, instead, turn to the difference between the 1946 Varga controversy over crises being obviated by the new element of state planning, and the 1955 Humanist controversy throughout Eastern Europe. (I do not consider it accidental that 1955 was the year which Cliff finally chose to acknowledge the existence of state-capitalism after as I pointed out, he attacked my position in 1947 when he considered himself much closer to Trotskyism not only in the analysis of state capitalism, but also the denial of the pre-revolutionary situation existing in Europe then.) In 1946 Stalin refused to face the Cold War ^{results} ~~being~~ ^{bound} by any analysis of the "new state capitalism" being capable of planning avoiding economic crises, and even resisting colonial revolts. ^{we know} ~~the~~ ^{renaming} ~~the~~ ^{of} ~~revolts~~ ^{of} ~~he~~ ^{of} ~~ordered~~ ^{of} in Southeast Asia, ~~the~~ ^{of} ~~the~~ ^{of} ~~E. S. countries~~ ^{of} as "people's republics", etc. etc. and by the time he got Varga and the Institute of World Economy to capitulate he faced Truman's "Point 4" program for underdeveloped countries and the propping up of Greek capitalism (It was on this basis, incidentally, that I had written my article, "Militarization of the Economy.")

As against this level of discussion of economic problems, came the new forms of revolt signalled by the Humanist debate, and soon to be followed in Africa on an entirely different level, yet all spontaneously "calling upon" the Humanism of Marxism to answer their problem: could they industrialize and yet "skip capitalism?" One element I forgot to bring to your attention is that Herbert Marcuse and those academic Marxists who comprehend the philosophic implications of alienated labor, but fail to tackle statecapitalism (and hence half apologize for Russia), have grabbed on Marx's Grundrisse, trying to say that since ~~Marx~~ ^{there} speaks of "abolition of labor", then it means that with automation, labor will truly become unnecessary, and therefore Marx's prediction of a revolutionary role for labor has outlived its time. Where they look I don't know, but it is definitely not toward "the new forces, the new passions", the "lower and deeper" strata of the population, much less the national revolutions, Irish or African.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"UNISERVEN"

It's fantastical to deny the proletariat its role. In the discussion with the others, during the discussion of value, we again were confronted with: wasn't Luxemburg's criticism of Russian Revolution right, and wasn't she correct also in her espousal of spontaneity as against Lenin's vanguard party? I showed that, though Luxemburg talked a great deal of spontaneity and certainly had been for the 1905 general strike, when she herself was confronted with a spontaneous form of workers revolt--the Shop Stewards Movement--she failed to recognize and work with them whereas Lenin, who supposedly saw only the vanguard party, hailed the workers' own creation--soviets--and called for "all power to the soviets".

Be that as it might, it is the new forms of revolt, the new forces and new youth and new Negro Revolution and all else that the 1960's brought to the fore that will help us a great deal more in understanding class war and statistics. and yet we must deal with the statistics very carefully if we are to place the world economy today in the philosophic context not as "peacefully co-existing", but as dialectically, pushing to a human revolution.

Finally, Zenshin, ^(NG) all was peace and harmony and, in the spirit of new year, further collaboration worked out, including my contribution to the int. ed. of Zenshin sometime in near future, and they trying to shake up the intellectual Left in Japan by compelling some reviews of my Philosophical Essays and the Afro-Asian Revolutions. Each of the pamphlets to be sent for review to some selected academicians will carry a note by me, stating that my discussions with them, I trust, mean the beginning, not the end, of discussions among independent Marxists, & therefore I trust they themselves will review these essays, etc. etc. And when I came to discuss with those who were translating State Capitalism document (which should be signed The State Capitalist Tendency and not by my name) the discussion was most objective. I may be exaggerating but I feel that the discussions over the past few weeks, and particularly because I refused to divide the discussion of state capitalism from the philosophic discussions of Marx's Humanism, will first bear fruit after my departure; and I predict many who will accept that position. Even the strictly Hegelian discussion with Hirota went smoothly; obviously good will prevails and I trust it will last beyond the new year.

Yours, *K. J.*