

Nov. 14, 1986

(Talking to myself in relationship to all the people -- Eugene, Kevin, Peter, Cyrus, Mike, and probably others though at this moment I don't have those others available because it is probably contained in letters rather than actual summations separated from the topic assigned -- I find that there is no doubt that Eugene was first involved, did absolutely most and, indeed, the beginning of what is not an assignment from me, at least not directly, but his discussion for the pre-convention of 1980 bulletin called "Marx's Concept of Organization". But I will not now follow it in chronological order and probably not use 1980 until the very end, but begin with his note to me on Sept. 11, 1986 when he submitted his summation of the two articles by Cunliffe and Johnston because it is at that point that I had finally come to the conclusion that the Dialectic was not so much necessary on organization or at least the priority had to be on the Dialectic of philosophy rather than of organization. This is when he realized, evidently suddenly, that the business of putting that "and philosophy" in the title really meant that all he had been working on was supposedly valueless. That, of course, is ridiculous. Form of Organization will continue to be, whether it had priority over philosophy or not, central to the whole book. So, let us look at his 2 summations.)

The article by Johnston is from 1967, Socialist Register and the one from Cunliffe is from History of Political Thought, June 1981 (Vol. II, no. 2).

Eugene says that he is putting those 2 articles together because "that gives us introduction to some sources to follow up ... which is much more than can be said for John Moynaux's Marxism and the Party". E. praises J's critique of some people like Rubel. It doesn't stop him that J. clings to the fact that KM and FE are one, especially on the question of the party, and J. therefore examines the so-called "major models" in the development of the work, 47-52, the 50s and early 60s when "the Party" had no organization; the 1st International (64-72), the German Social Democracy 70s, 80s and ^{early} 90s; the broad National Labor Party in GB and USA, 1880s and early 90s based on the Chartist models. The best seems to be ... E. quotes Johnston quoting Engels, 1892, "two independent currents"; on the one hand 'a pure workers' movement' and, on the other, 'a theoretically movement, stemming from the disintegration of Hegelian philosophy' associated predominately with Marx. 'The Communist Manifesto of 1848,' he goes on, 'marks the fusion of both currents'" (p. 123) -- on which E. notes that quotes from the CM "I would think we might want to consider ourselves returning to look at CM anew on question of organization." (my emphasis)

as pure
Really?

10800

E. refers to the reconstituted Central Committee in March 1850 where he made that famous Address and comments: "What is interesting here is that J. hits out at Bernstein's and Lichtheim for describing the Address as Blanquist" and then points to the fact that J. also deals with Marx's expression, "the party in the great historical sense" in the Freilegung letter of 1860, which evidently shows again that J. does appreciate the fusion of theory and practice in socialist organization and concludes "In the next section on first international, though Johnstone calls attention to fact that Marx worked from '64 and Engels only from '70, he makes no category out of this."

When it comes to John Gulliffe, the claim is made by JC: "There is no uniform concept of the 'party' in the writings of Marx and Engels; not merely because the issue was one of the many which they failed to develop through a lack of time, but more significantly because there is no place for one within the general corpus of their work." (p. 349) JC, following not a chronological order but a concept of the party sequence, introduces it in 4 stages, nevertheless: 1) "The first and most extended usage is where 'party' is to be interpreted in 'the great historical sense.' In this sense, 'party' simply designates what was termed the 'real' or 'spontaneous' working-class movement, including each and every instance of political organization considered a manifestation of it." The other 3 stages are: 2) the aspiration for conquest of political power; 3) the organization of a national party; 4) is more like the 1st and designates a "more or less coherent group aspiring to a more or less adequate understanding of Marxian theory." His (JC's) point seems to be that "the term 'Party' was becoming associated with organization rather than movement." JC then goes into the question of tendency within the 1st International.

E. says that evidently at this section (p. 357) "you have a lot of notations about looking up footnotes which refer to a book by R. Hunt, The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels that JC refers to. He advises that pp. 360-361 should be looked at rather than summarized, and he summarizes p. 362."

10801

-3-

99

"Cunliffe certainly realizes that Party is not other from theory, but of course he doesn't go to philosophy." Finally he quotes what JC ends with: "There could be no theory of the 'party' as an immutable organization form because there was no place for one given the principle of the self-emancipation of the class and the rejection of sectarianism."

Other works that Eugene summarizes, but I'm not absolutely sure that it is his summation, since it has neither a date nor a name, so check with him:

Class and Party by Rosseena Rossanda, which is the 1970 publication of Socialist Register that I made very important for us to study and reject and that I wanted others' views. This says that ~~RR~~ RR introduces the question of Marx on organization after Holy Family and German Ideology, quoting her as adding to what separates Marx from Lenin as ~~Party being essentially a practical matter~~, "The organization expresses the revolution, but does not precede it; even less does it anticipate its objectives and its actions." I'm so disinterested now in RR's views (not that I ever was interested except insofar as she was a Maoist and made JPS say that if there were only such great people as RR in France he would have joined the CP). Somehow I'm thinking this was not when I was thinking of the Dialectic of Philosophy and Organization, at least not as book, but that it was on how she misused RL's expression about Thales, the eternal sea, especially on the question of leadership, saying:

The condemnation had profound organizational consequences, for theory always surrounds a practical kernel, namely the question of leadership. When that is to say, the subject is located outside the class (however great the complexity may be between being and consciousness), the political organization, the party, appears as a simple instrument, always liable to control. When, on the contrary, the subject is embodied in the external political vanguard, the latter bears within itself a principle of legitimacy and self-regulation, and requires the class to submit to it." Rossanda argues Lenin understood this, made a "leap between the theory of the seizure of power and the theory of revolution, in the sense that the subject of the former would be the political vanguard, and that of the latter the class." (p226)

10802

Chapter 6 on VIL's "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back", as well as LT's "Our Political Tasks" and RL's ~~Organization~~ "Organization Question" -- but on the whole I will say that Chapters 7 and 8, when he loudly declares that philosophy has nothing to do with it, i.e. that he can say with ~~agreement~~ ^{agreement} though they are at opposite poles on philosophy, because politics have nothing to do with it, only shows that before 1914 Lenin himself was a vulgar materialist and that therefore, what ~~EE~~ is called "On Philosophy and on the Soviets" (pp. 1430/46) has anything to do with dialectical philosophy, and that actually Dialectic was so abstract that by shifting it off to epistemology they left out the whole question of any direct relationship of philosophy to revolution, i.e. they left it all in academic knowledge.

Chapter 9, which is called "For the Good of the Cause", and is on the 5th Party Congress of 1907, is what I want to very nearly dismiss as totally unserious, but I do want to quote the way Eugene summarizes both Service and Lenin:

"Service does not catch any of the points that RD develops in her discussion of this Congress in RIWLKM. Service comments on Lenin's concept of party as follows, also quoting Lenin: He believed that a political group's numerical weakness in a period of political repression had only limited significance for the future. a revolutionary exploitation was to be expected. And political parties would be made great not by virtue of having build up a large organization before the revolution. Greatness would accrue rather to those which, in the course of the revolution itself, had programmes and policies which corresponded with the interests of particular social classes. Lenin declared: 'Individual parties can hide in the underground ...'" (pt. 173-174)

Actually, I now believe that the fact that the 1980 Pre-Conv. Disc. Bulletin 4 by Eugene on "Marx's Concept of Organization" which was noted as Part I and stopped in 1852 ~~did~~ did not produce so far as I know a Parts 2 or 3. And the Summer of 1985 produced a Ten Year Perspectives summation which had quite a bit of Eugene, not RD, idea of form for it, the result of the accumulation of little things between 83 and 85 that contained tensions which didn't make him feel free to have carried through his 1980 intention to produce a 3-part,

10804

FROM CYRUS

First to start with the last, 10/23/86, it turns out that the book on the GSD was 1864-72 by Roger Morgan, published in 1965. (The question I asked about; could there have been a GSD which I thought came with Karl Kautsky's Erfurt Program is not answered directly, but I have found out that the Eisenachists were called German Social Democrats, which means I must go further into the elder Leib^knecht. The 1st time Marx met Leibknecht was in 1850 when he arrived in London after Wilhelm was released from a Swiss prison. There is no other reference from this which is on p. 95 in Rubel's book, all the way to p. 168 where Marx is working on the Vogt affair.)

The work by Morgan has hardly anything on Marx, though this is the period of the 1st International and dares to ridicule Marx's view of German revolutionaries, referring to KM as "contemplating the situation from England", "isolated", and it is clear he is for Lassalle as the "true socialist", but he does draw a line between Marx and Leibknecht. All the reference to Marx insofar as there are any is in appendix 3 entitled "Correspondence Between Marx and Engels", in which he claims that the 1913 edition "suppressed" any material that would show Marx "misunderstood or despised Lassalle". The only phrase that I consider important is that the GSD preserved "the legend that Leibknecht enjoyed the confidence of Marx" and that does deserve looking up, pp. 248-252.

Cyrus has not found what I asked him to try to find -- Marx's sharp critique of Mehring's so-called "History of the GSD". And there is no doubt that RM hasn't moved one inch away from the "great source" on the GSD -- Mehring's book.

P. 2 of Cyrus' letter is more valuable, because it's around Marx's "Critique of the Gotha Program", which contained Kautsky's article in late September 1881. Cyrus says: "Engels, Kautsky, and Bernstein were at this time all thinking they are fighting Lassalleanism. And they were. But that didn't mean they were also continuing Marx. Engels thought he was paying attentions to Marx's GGP, first against Lieb^knecht saying Gotha had outlived its usefulness, as if Marx ever agreed with it. Then when Kautsky published GGP, and upon adoption of program written by Kautsky, Engels calls it a complete victory, "even the last trace of Lassalleanism

10805

has been removed," despite the fact that he calls the practical demands (i.e. the second part of Erfurt) as 'philastins.' (Engels to Sorge, Oct. 24, 1891)."

The only thing really relevant for my study is the fact that Cyrus has xeroxed pp. 309-311 of Bukharin's Historical Materialism, which shows, all over again, not only vulgar materialism but "The Classless Society of the Future," and the absolute uselessness of "erudition" and how all post-Marx Marxists in this case, VII prior to 1914 included, which permitted them to regard Bukharin as a great scholar.

*

Cyrus also has some notes on Marx-Lassalle correspondence 1857-59.

10806

FROM PETER -- no signature and no date, but it was either the last week of October or 1st week of November, 1936. Two on Pannekoek and Mattick.

Pannekoek and the Workers' Councils by Serge Bricianor.

V.E. is the fact that Pannekoek, who came to Marxism in 1896, "discovered" Dietzgen, who was evidently the "unifying thread" for the Dutch Left Marxists and very influential upon Roland-Holst!!!!!! All this appears in the Preface to the work Peter is summarizing and was written by John Gerber. Pannekoek's 1st book, Philosophy from Kant to Marxism (1901), states: "Dietzgen raised philosophy to the position of a national science, the same as Marx did with history" (p. 6). He further quotes that D. not Engels (NB -- the 1906 Dietzgen book, which was copyrighted by Kerr in 1928, has a 30 page Introduction by Pannekoek written in Dec. 1902. Since he was still alive it must have been his unchanged view that Mattick took over without being that vulgar in his "appreciation" of D., or maybe more correctly to his dismissal of philosophy.) ~~developed~~ "developed the framework for a real Marxist dialectic." (p. 16)

Pannekoek and the Dutch were the 1st to break organizationally from opportunism in 1909 but remained members of the 2nd International, which certainly explains why there were no Bolsheviks anywhere in Europe except Russia. THAT IS TO SAY, "THE LEFT" WHETHER IT WAS THE DUTCH OR RL, OR FOR THAT MATTER KARL RADEK, DEVELOPED A FORM OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE REVOLUTIONARY VIEW WITHIN CSD.--rd. So that, the "unity" of the Party had priority over revolution vs. reform.

Pannekoek continues with his ~~separation~~ separation from, not VII at that point, but AGAINST THE PROLETARIAT. See his 1909 work, Tactical Differences Within the Workers, where he explains the role of organization to be "to unify these disparate wills into a single will." He brings in Hegel's Dialectic as being the way "Marx was able to elucidate completely the nature of capitalism" (p. 84).

The 1911-14 dispute with Kautsky on the spontaneity of the workers did focus on the importance of shop-floor organization, but that was because it was "most effective" (p. 124), so that 1914, which he opposed is ~~used~~ mainly to show how the ~~bourgeois~~ "bourgeois patriotism" penetrated the proletariat because of its "organizational and spiritual weakness of the workers' movement." (p. 138).

10807

It was then that they did break with the GSD and the 2nd International and also criticized RL, but that included criticizing the Spartacus League in April 1917 for "keeping to the old leadership structure". They did, however, hail the Russian Revolution in October, including its agrarian program as against RL's difference on the agrarian question. It was then he comes to be completely for Marx's Paris Commune and the smashing of the State and probably also influenced by Lenin's State and Revolution (pp. 160-167) None criticized the concept of vanguard party. In our view a party's mission is to enlighten ... to propagate the idea of unions as an organizational basis of a system of councils" (p. 171). It's only in 1921 that he calls the RR bourgeois, using bourgeois means.

The point is that 1921 saw a split in the Council Movement in Germany on the question of the role of the Party.

In 1978, Pluto Press published Pannekoek and Gorter's Marxism, which was introduced and edited by D. A. Smart. The Introduction considers the whole Left current of both the Dutch and RL -- that is those that broke from the 2nd International after 1914 and in 1921 broke also from the 3rd, this time over the 21 conditions ^{of} the CI and they formed the Communist Workers Party of Germany (KAPD). Smart claims that the roots go back to 1907 when Pannekoek and Gorter established Die Tribunal in Holland vs. opportunism, and in 1909 formed a new party, the SPD of Holland. In any case it was against revisionism; though it was then prefaced by Kautsky, Pannekoek breaks with Kautsky in 1911. On the other hand, they are with VIL against RL on the Junius pamphlet, but then split with VIL later that same year on the National Question.

In 1921 Pannekoek and Gorter denounce the 21 conditions and call Russia state capitalist. (Gorter died in 1927; Pannekoek in 1960) The point is that their attack on the 21 conditions says "A communist party must be small" (p. 164) and stick to its principles but it must not rule alone but do so with factory committees. "The unity of party and 'union' is a dictatorship by the proletariat" (p. 171). This book has only 176 pages.

alone is not necessary
multiple parties
low party with factory committees

10808

1909
5 also
when
Pannekoek
at the
US
from new
party 1909

Marxism: Last Refuge of the Bourgeoisie? by Paul Mattick.

This is Mattick's final writing which he had finished at the time of his death, Feb., 1981. One part is on Marx and bourgeois economics, and the critique of Lenin and the GSD. Though all the superior economics is strictly on economics; "Marxist", and though he admits that inseparable from the collapse of capital was, to Marx, the proletarian revolution, all the failures turn out to be due to the "backwardness" of the proletariat; "Their own demands coincided with those brought forth in their name by their leaders." (p. 147) Though Lenin ^{is} ~~presented~~ ^{as} being only for power for power's sake, the point is he then turns against the PC, saying it was only a "myth" and that "there is really nothing positive to be drawn from it" except the need to overthrow the capitalist state (p. ~~231~~ 231). The ~~Communist Rev'n~~ of 1919 is also called "bourgeois"; "The workers ~~proved~~ proved only too willing to share the leaders' reformist convictions" (p. 278) No wonder there is no actual discussion of the Council Communist Movement, no discussion of any spontaneous action of the workers, so I would say that being for Council Communists is a big lie. The 1930s are also a failure, including the Spanish Revolution.

"What the Bolsheviks did was to actualize the program of the Second International by way of revolution" (p. 291).

The other work by Mattick that was published in 1978 and titled Anti-Bolshevik Communism consists of essays between 1935 and 1967. With everything from an ~~essay~~ essay on ~~Karl Kautsky, from Marx to Hitler~~ "Karl Kautsky, from Marx to Hitler" (1939) to the 1935 essay on "Lenin vs. Luxemburg" (that's the one I sharply critiqued somewhere, when it was clear that as an economist he took Lenin's position on Marx's Accumulation of Capital and not RL's, but because of his politics, he comes to the conclusion that though Lenin was right he was wrong and though RL was wrong he was right.) ^{In} ~~another~~ essay in 1939 on Council Communism -- he argues that: "All forms of labor organization are functioning as an instrument of capitalist society."

In 1949 he has an essay on spontaneity and organization, writing: "Organization is the dilemma of the radical" because the effort to organize the proletariat inevitably leads into bourgeois organizational channels (p. 120).

10809

He concludes that "the end of the old labor movement made the question of spontaneity and organization meaningless." (p. 131)

In 1962 he writes on Karel Korsch, claiming that Marx's ideas were rooted in Hegel because they were based on bourgeois revolutions. Supposedly in its further development (by Mattick?-- rd) ~~Marxist~~ socialist theory does not require the "birthmarks of bourgeois revolutionary theory". He does mention Marx's phrase on permanent revolution but ~~it means~~ it means nothing even as ⁱⁿ his 1965 essay on "Humanism and Socialism" he admits that "for a short time" Marx did express a humanist view but like all things in 1844, it was expressed in a "extremely tortured philosophic form." All I can say of this is that the 60s did ~~force~~ ^{he} force him to pretend to be a Socialist Humanist, for ~~may~~ ^{he} 24 hours, and I remember that this essay appeared in Science and Society, not only without a single mention of me but after he had carried out a most scurrilous attack on me in the Western Socialist after the appearance of M&F.

10810