

II- REPORT BY RAYA on Relationship of Marx's Philosophy of Revolution to his Concept of Organization":

I- Opening: Opening is the word that I wish everyone to use instead of either Prologue, Preface or Prolegomena, because, whereas in the other three words there is always the feeling of mere introduction, and you first have to wait for "the main course", opening is the word that shows what it is that Hegel, Marx and indeed other revolutionaries, when they really reach a turning point, mean by a new beginning, a beginning that will first determine the end. In a word, you at once see not a prologue to a new chapter but an actual opening, and the specific great opening I'm thinking of is the opening to Marx's new continent of thought. It is for this reason that the new part on Marx begins, not with 1843 when he broke with bourgeois society (and all of Marxism begins with that year) but with 1841 when Marx was working on his doctoral thesis, the difference between Democritus and Epicurus. Here was Marx who had still not broken with bourgeois society, who was still so Hegelian as to assure the university that Hegel had, of course, already dealt in a grand manner with those philosophers, but his view of philosophy was so total that Hegel had no time for details, and that was what Marx was going to contribute: some details on those two philosophers. In truth, it turned out to be a very different analysis of the two. You see, if you look at the very massive preparatory notebooks Marx was, despite his erudition on ancient philosophy, preoccupied with the present, 15253

Expanded REB, Jan. 3, 1981

-5-

that is to say, with what new beginnings, on what new foundations, could something new possibly arise when some philosophy, like the Hegelian, was so comprehensive, so total that there was no room in it for a new reality to find its expression? The new beginning that Marx was on the threshold of discovering and that he had already specified in his notes, if not in his thesis, was that unity of theory and practice which Hegel claimed to have conceived with his dialectic was only in thought; and that there were two contradictory totalities -- that of philosophy and that of reality -- facing each other, and both must be attacked by "realizing" the philosophy of freedom in reality by transforming reality. What of the notes seeped into the thesis was: 1) the attraction to Epicurus as an "atheist" who relegated the gods to the intermundia -- the interstices of space -- and that it was up to humanity to solve its own problems; 2) somehow Epicurus' analysis of the atom revealed motion; and 3) whereas Epicurus and Democritus could not compare in stature with Plato and Aristotle, they did become the ground, the new beginning for the Romans who conquered Greece. In a word, there was no death; there was a new beginning for a new reality.

(Raya then related the fact that P'eng, the head of the Trotskyists in China, reported to the 1951 Congress of the Fourth International in Switzerland that every single thing that happened with Mao's victory was the exact opposite of what they had predicted regarding the peasantry's inability to win power, regarding Mao's Stalinism to gain victory based on this peasantry, etc. But P'eng managed to turn this around and say it wasn't really the Permanent Revolution that was wrong, it was the way they had projected it. What Raya was asking was: Why cannot Marx's philosophy of revolution inspire Marxists to have that "faith" that the party-to-lead does?)

One word before turning to the four months since the Convention that we are summing up today: 1) Marx's living universe, whether you take it from 1841 or 1843 and concentration of the 40 years, 1843-1883, is what will have to be both ground and reference point as well as projection of the future for everything we will be considering today. 2) The concentration on Luxemburg and the 20 years 1899-1919 will stress the fact that, as against all other works which still argue the question of revolution vs. reform, we will concentrate on revolutionaries only -- Lenin, Trotsky -- and ask whether even so great a revolutionary as Luxemburg left us a legacy that was "total" when it revealed that there was a gap in philosophy. 3) We must admit that Lenin, who was the only one who did reorganize himself philosophically in 1914, and whose every writing in the period 1914-1924, be it on the National Question, on State and Revolution, on world revolution starting from Peking if not Berlin, did not -- did not -- carry that dialectic to the question of the party, despite all the modifications he introduced on that subject. And 4) Trotsky who was the one who came up with the theory of permanent revolution, 1905-07, had not rooted it in Marx's theory and burdened it so much with the wrong concept of the role of the peasantry, not to mention that he never developed it but instead tried to claim the 1917 revolution as the realization of his theory, even as the defeated 1925-27 Chinese Revolution was the negative proof. The result was that when he and he alone, after Lenin's death, fought Stalin, without reorganizing himself philosophically, as had Lenin in 1914, he left us nothing in those four critical years, 1935-1939 for our theoretical preparation for revolution against World War II. Which is why the Fourth

International was a stillbirth.

II-Four Months plus 25 Years: The Perspectives set at our Convention, 1980, were concretized first and foremost in the 12 page N&L; secondly, in the new classes which were new because, for the first time, they would be on our own 25 year history as well as combine Political-Philosophic Letters; in a word, they would not be on a book but on current events with history itself, though a quarter of a century, being so current that we did not even finish the 25 year history, which was to be written by the Convention itself. You may not have been conscious of that, but in fact, that's how Part IV was written after the Convention. You would have been conscious of it if you were daily realizing the third of the concrete parts that flowed from Perspectives: the creation of a philosophic cadre. The fact, as you heard from both Mike and Eugene, that the outside responded more enthusiastically, as well as contributing heavily financially, on the basis of that 25 year history, shows that we had not grasped the book, by which I mean that we did not grasp the very uniqueness of our 40 year history, and that new continent of thought, Marxist-Humanism. Perhaps the following will illuminate just exactly how unique we are. The Second International, and I do not mean those that betray or those that waffled, but the real revolutionaries in the Second Int'l, were ENGELSIAN: NOT FULLY MARXIAN PHILOSOPHICALLY. In 1914, one and only one, Lenin, grasped the indispensability of the dialectic of thought as well as revolution, but he kept it to himself, and that did not extend to the Party. In a word, his magnificent reorganization philosophically did not reorganize the 1902 concept of the vanguard party, despite his modifications. Not only that, no one bothered to connect Marx's philosophy of revolution with Marx's concept of organization and yet Marx was so organizational that he at once organized correspondence committees, which proclaimed revolution so loudly that long before he broke with Proudhon, and when he was still inviting him to join the correspondence committee, Proudhon answered that it was a good idea to have international correspondence committees, but Marx was yelling revolution too loudly. These committees as well as what became the Communist League had their international congress, and it was that one that assigned Marx to pronounce their perspectives. It turned out to be the Communist Manifesto, which anticipated the 1848-49 Revolutions in which all of them were active.

Why was Marx's 1850 Address on the Permanent Revolution after the defeat of the 1848-49 revolution not made ground for the revolutionaries of the 20th century, though the Communist Manifesto itself and the journalistic writings during the revolution did indeed become ground for 1905-06 Russian Revolution? Rosa Luxemburg practiced revolution both in 1905-06 and 1919. Rosa Luxemburg had a greater appreciation than anyone else for the spontaneity of the masses, and yet had made a fetish enough about "the Party" that she criticized so severely because she did discern their opportunism -- again, ahead of anyone else including Lenin, and seriously enough to break with Kautsky in 1910-11. And again it was Luxemburg who had such sensitivity and prescience about imperialism as not alone to attack the leadership on what they called the "Morocco Incident" but to plunge herself into the most serious, most original theoretical work of her whole lifetime, and yet, just as spontaneity did not relieve her of

Expanded RBE, Jan. 3, 1981

-7-

the fetishism of the Party, so her opposition to imperialism did not free her from her opposition to the self-determination of nations as a revolutionary force. Why such great contradictions? It all related to, and cannot be separated from, and explains why I wanted an entire Part for -- Marx's philosophy of revolution.

Reread the penultimate paragraph to our 25 year history on p. 26: "The critical question for today's 'birth-time of history' is this: If there is a movement from practice that is itself a form of theory, and if there is a movement from theory that is itself a form of philosophy, it is necessary, rigorously and comprehensively, to dig out the single dialectic that emerges from actuality as well as from thought."

Raya then singled out three periods of the 25 years to show not just our uniqueness, but the imperativeness of the "subjective" as both anticipation of revolt and theoretic preparation for revolution under the compulsion of the objective conditions, even when that must be done under the whip of the counter-revolution: 1) 1955, my singling out Karpushin in Marxism and Freedom as the main enemy of Marx's humanism under the guise of asking that Marx's Humanist Essays be published, to prove the need to separate the young from the old Marx. In 1980 we meet Karpushin--the head of the whole Philosophic Academy, who ^{has} withdrawn a work on Marx's Ethnological Notebooks-- as the very one who caused the exile of the author with whom I have been corresponding.

2) The 1960s have a three-fold significance: a) first, the movement from practice both here and in Africa, with its Black dimension, for which we were prepared from the very start with a Black production worker as our editor, extends itself to 1980 with "Black Thought and Black Reality"; b) 1962-63, where we encounter both the missile crisis over Cuba and the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, initiates another new in our development and participation in all struggles -- and that is the Weekly Political Letters, as well as the whole history of American Civilization on Trial; c) The 60s end by, unfortunately at one and the same time, the near-revolutions in 1968 and the counter-revolution, so that, while 1969 is not 1968, a new force of revolution was born in the WL movement, which again we had anticipated from our very start in 1955.

3) The Sino-Soviet Conflict, which began as an ideological challenge to Russia's "internationalism" and which, with the Vietnam War in 1965, shows itself to be no more than nationalist state-capitalism, becomes by 1970 a red carpet for Nixon. We, on the other hand, began and by 1973 completed Philosophy and Revolution. It is the end of the 1970s which make imperative "the book" -- Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, not as three individual parts but that single dialectic of philosophy and revolution, which created the ground for the extension of the paper, for the creation of a philosophic cadre, and for a new type of consciousness of organization which once and for all will put an end to the division between philosophy and organization.

III-Methodology and Organization, in Marx's time and in Our Age: You now have (or will have when it is given out at the end of this meeting) all three sections of Chapter 10. The totally new

15256

Expanded REB, Jan. 3, 1981

-8-

begins in 1875 and it is only this year that we have discovered still one other proof of Marx's anticipation of imperialism in a paragraph left out from the French edition (see Pelican edition, p. 786). -- 1875 is also the year of the Critique of the Gotha Program which/ even though it gained its greatest theoretical and actual realization (along with the Paris Commune) in Lenin's State and Revolution -- had been approached theoretically only, and not as "an organization document". And yet that's exactly what it was: "Marginal Notes" on the program of what was to unite the Lassalleans and the Eisenachists into a supposedly Marxist organization. And 1875 was the reproduction by Marx of his Address on Permanent Revolution as an Appendix to the Revelations of the Cologne Trials.

The mid-1870s was what still kept Marx optimistic both about revolution and about the possibility of an independent workers' party in the U.S., based on all the great class struggles in the U.S. at that time. They ended with Marx's renewed interest in primitive communism, both as it appeared in Morgan's Ancient Society and on so totally new a ground differing from Morgan that, suddenly, it was clear that Engels was no Marx, be it on women's liberation or on permanent revolution. It is that depth of difference from all post-Marx Marxists, beginning with Engels, which will once again bring out our uniqueness and create new ground for world revolution. (Raya read the last page of Chapter 10.)

15257