

National Chairwoman's Report
to Meeting of Expanded REB,
News and Letters Committees
January 1, 1983

MARXIST-HUMANISM, 1983: THE SUMMATION THAT IS A
NEW BEGINNING, SUBJECTIVELY AND OBJECTIVELY

INTRODUCTION: Where and How to Begin Anew?

- I. THE FOUR NEW MOMENTS IN MARX THAT FORM THE TRAIL TO THE 1980s, *Ever All*
1.2. 1982 R. W. B.
- II. THE UNCHAINED DIALECTIC IN MARX, 1843-1883,
AND IN MARXIST-HUMANISM, 1953-1983
- III. WHY, THEN, ARE THERE STILL BREAKDOWNS BETWEEN
THEORY AND PRACTICE, BETWEEN PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION?
THE GLOBAL NEED FOR "3 BOOKS, NOT 1"
- IV. THE FUTURE IN THE PRESENT, in News & Letters as in all 3 books,
not 1: the Follow-through, Here and Abroad, by the Center
and in each Locality; THE NEW in the "Who We Are and What We
Stand For" Statement, Now that we have, as a Totality,
Marxism and Freedom, From 1776 Until Today; Philosophy and
Revolution: From Hegel to Sartre and From Marx to Mao;
Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of
Revolution as well as American Civilization on Trial: Black
Masses as Vanguard; Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal
and the Political-Philosophic Letters

National Chairwoman's Report
to Meeting of Expanded REB,
News & Letters Committees,
January 1, 1983

Only - 1983
Phil. Brecht 1990
from
1960's
and
90

MARKIST-HUMANISM, 1983: THE SUMMATION THAT IS A
NEW BEGINNING, SUBJECTIVELY AND OBJECTIVELY

INTRODUCTION: Where and How to Begin Anew?

The reason that we begin, not objectively as usual, but subjectively,
is that the "here and now" demands a deeper probing into the creative mind of Marx.

The warp and woof of the Marxian dialectic, the unchained Hegelian dia-
lectic, the dialectic of the revolutionary transformation is, after all, true ob-
jectively and subjectively. Yet Part III of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and
Marx's Philosophy of Revolution begins the probing of Marx before he fully broke
with bourgeois society, when he worked on his doctoral thesis on the "Difference
between Democritus and Epicurus." Thus began his very first critique of Hegel, in
1841, as it appeared in the Notes that were known only to himself. What did appear
in the doctoral thesis itself was what pervaded those Notes, i.e. the question: How
to begin anew?

The reason that question reappears here is not to emphasize how it ante-
dated Marx's discovery of a whole new continent of thought and revolution, but
rather because it reappeared in its true profundity in Marx's own greatest work,
Capital (I'm referring to the definitive French edition, 1875) as well as in the
very last decade of his life, in what we now call Marx's "new moments" of discovery.

Let me rephrase this. The crucial truth is that the question: How to
begin anew? informed the whole of his dialectic methodology -- even after his dis-
covery of a whole new continent of thought, even after the publication of the first
edition of Capital as well as the 1875 edition, after the Paris Commune, when he
he took issue with Mikhailovsky who had written what turned out to be what all post-
Marx Marxists likewise accepted as the climax of the work, that is, the "Historic
Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation" as a universal. Marx, on the other hand, held

I. THE FOUR NEW MOMENTS IN MARX THAT ARE THE 1980s TRAIL

The first new moment that was not grasped by the first post-Marx Marxist generation was due not merely to the fact that Engels had omitted the paragraph from the French edition of Capital, which had been definitively edited by Marx, when Engels transferred Marx's additions to the German. Marx's point in that omitted paragraph on further industrialization (as it covered the whole nation) and, with it, the predomination of foreign over internal trade, was that/though the world market annexed "vast lands" in the New World, in Asia, in Australia," that wouldn't abate the general crisis of capitalism. On the contrary. The new development in capitalism meant that the ten-year cycle he had originally cited as the crisis that regularly follows capitalism's growth would occur more often.

What wasn't grasped by a less creative mind than Marx's was that, far from the climactic "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation" signifying universality for all technological development, it characterized only Western Europe while "the Russians" could choose a different path. Post-Marx Marxists failed to grasp this because they separated economic laws from the dialectics of revolution. For Marx, on the other hand, it was just this concept of revolution which changed everything, including economic laws. He rejected the fact of Western capitalist development as a universal for all, delved into the latest anthropological studies, and then wrote to Vera Zasulich stressing the possibility for revolution to erupt in a technologically backward country like Russia "ahead of the West." In this letter to Zasulich he had made direct reference to the "American" (he was referring to Morgan's Ancient Society) whose studies of pre-capitalist societies, Marx thought, further proved that the peasant commune form of development could lead Russia, if the historic conditions were ripe and it was working with West Europe, as well, to initiate revolution.

To make sure that none misunderstood his concept of revolution and the

When the Russian Revolution did not succeed in extending itself internationally, when world capitalism remained life and Stalin was victorious in a new form of state-capitalism, post-Marx Marxists proved incapable of following Marx's Promethean vision. This failure created a theoretic void: inability to face the new reality of the post-Marx age. Even those who did balk at any support of WWII, refusing to use the rationale of that "Left" which explained its class-collaborationism with the claim that they were not really supporting an imperialist war, but supporting anti-Nazi activities -- and Trotsky and the American Trotskyites certainly did oppose the imperialist war -- nevertheless ended by tailending Stalinism.

We who did fully break with Trotskyism and felt compelled to analyze the new reality of state-capitalism -- and the Johnson-Forest Tendency did represent a great theoretical advance in that respect -- nevertheless failed to work out what the Tendency was for instead of only what it was against. In a word, it had not reached Marxist-Humanism except in the merest embryo form -- rejection of state-capitalism and looking with new eyes at labor's creativity in working out new forms of revolt. Nevertheless, were we to skip over the State-Capitalist Tendency's challenge to Trotskyism, we would leave an historic loophole on the quintessential relationship between philosophy and revolution, between theory and practice, not to mention the search for the link to the absolutely indispensable creative mind of Marx. The historic link must be re-established if we are serious about revolution in our age. That new beginning came before establishment of organization -- News and Letters Committees, 1955.

Before the establishment of the Committees we had, when still a part of the State-Capitalist Tendency, broken through philosophically on the Absolute Idea. That happened in 1953. It is this, just this, catching of the new in our age that laid the ground for seeing the link of continuity with Marx. It becomes necessary to stay a little longer on those two years, 1953 to 1955, to work out, in full, our own contributions, not just as against Trotskyism but also against Johnsonism.

a single issue as I did when I considered how wrong is Lenin's concept of the vanguard party for our age. This time the point of reference is to philosophy itself, which Lenin did finally see as "dialectic proper" but nevertheless stopped his Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic half a paragraph short of the end of the Absolute Idea. It is on that point that I first took issue with his Abstract in the Philosophic Notebooks. It is true that I explained my "daring" as being necessitated by the objective situation which followed his death, so that whereas he saw Stalinism only in embryo, we had to suffer through a whole quarter-century of it. But that had not stopped me from refusing to remain only on the "political" scene. Instead I went on my own to Philosophy of Mind, and afterward discovered that I had also gone past where Marx broke off in his "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic."

Marx, unlike Lenin, had, naturally, not dismissed the rest as inconsequential. The totality of the Hegelian dialectic "in and for itself" had not only been fully inwardized, but Marx had recreated it in the fact that by then he had discovered a whole new continent of thought and of revolution which has remained the ground for Marxists, and will continue to be our ground until we have finally and totally uprooted capitalism.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that our age had to return to Hegel in order to work out that which Marx had not "translated." What had not become concrete for the other age had become imperative and urgent for ours. For our age, however, that philosophical mediation became alive as forces of revolution as Reason rather than needing any further abstract development as that middle which first creates from itself a whole. I'm referring not to the general question of absolute negativity, which Marx had fully worked out as revolution in permanence, but to the specifics of the final three Syllogisms that Hegel himself had worked out only the year before his death. Even more specifically I'm limiting myself to the final paragraph (#577) of Hegel's Philosophy of Mind, which states "it is the nature of

had practiced it was that Marxism and Freedom not only brought out the American roots, brought out Marx's Humanism internationally, and structured the whole work as a movement from practice, be it from the year 1776 to 1789, or Marx's 1843, or ourselves in the 1950s -- but also developed new points of theoretic departures for our age.

For News and Letters Committees, Marxism and Freedom did become ground both for creating a forum for all the new voices from below -- be it in Workers Battle Automation, Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves, or the Free Speech Movement pamphlet. At the same time, we practiced the concretization of theory, be it in the Afro-Asian pamphlet or American Civilization on Trial. But not all, even in our Committees, were fully aware that these mass pamphlets that flowed from us during the turbulent 1960s were not products of the movement from below, that they could come only from so great a philosophic breakthrough as was represented, first in the Letters on the Absolute Idea, and then followed through in Marxism and Freedom, which covered a period of 200 years.

Every time a new historic Turning Point is reached objectively but not worked out subjectively, the impulse is to separate on some "simple, concrete" turn in the road to take. The integrality of Theory/Practice gets pulled asunder. The details of the "simple" get so fragmented that what appears as "skipping over" the generalization, the theory, is in fact a turn backward. Which is why Hegel made the third Attitude to Objectivity not the dialectic, which is never in a straight line in any case, but retrogression. Whether that is called Jacobi or a return to the old, the point is that retrogressionism, counter-revolution from within revolution, is what follows. It is why we totally reject this, not only as counter-revolution, but even as tailending.

After Fanon's death there was no such affinity of ideas as we had hoped would result in Philosophy and Revolution being a collective work. All that was

18416

revealed in the trips to West Europe, to Africa, to Hong Kong and to Japan, was that not a single independent Marxist theoretician was ready to collaborate on a work that would challenge post-Marx Marxism.

There can be no successful revolution without having labored at the theoretic preparation for revolution. We refused, however, to stop theory short of philosophy. Which is precisely why, instead of giving in to a temptation to start Philosophy and Revolution with Chapter 9, the work begins with "Why Hegel? Why Now?", which goes through Marx and Lenin after grappling with Hegel "in and for himself" -- with eyes of today. In that way we reached beyond anything done by any other Marxist. It is this, just this, which, at one and the same time, led us to discover an affinity of ideas with the greatest Third World theorist, Frantz Fanon, and theoretical collaboration with East European revolutionaries.

Philosophy and Revolution, nevertheless, was worked out by us alone; while the independent Japanese Marxists continued to operate on the level only of state-capitalism, we were enabled -- after 1968, in the 1970s when Marx's Ethno-logical Notebooks were finally published -- to see there his "new moments" and thus catch the historic continuity with Marx's Marxism. This prepared the ground for Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution by critically looking at revolutionary Marxists at the highest/turning points -- Lenin in the Russian Revolution and Luxemburg in the German Revolution of 1919 -- as well as the new in our own age, including the newest revolutionary force as Reason, Women's Liberation, not only as Idea whose time has come but as it has itself become a Movement.

Our slogan this year -- "three books, not one" -- demands that we look at Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution not just as a recapitulation of what it meant in the respective historic period, but as that which makes them and the new work a single totality. One of the critical new points in Marxist-

internationally, that there will no longer be "Have Thumb, Will Travel" adventures. It does mean that each one must look at him or herself in the historic mirror of Marxist-Humanism rather than reducing it all to the "lowest common denominator." There is no "lowest common denominator" when each looks in the historic mirror, because what is immediate in activity and what is universal and historic is the future in the present. ¶ It is that which we must draw out in full, precisely at this urgent nuclear moment when civilization itself is threatened with extinction, while the idiocies of the capitalist ideologues are reflected in Time Magazine's choice of a robot as their annual "Man of the Year."

We are proposing that we do not wait a year just because, technically, this September is scheduled as a Plenum year. Instead the REB proposed -- and it is the only motion we are proposing -- that we transform the September 1983 Labor Day gathering into a Constitutional Convention.

IV. THE FUTURE IN THE PRESENT, IN NEWS & LETTERS AS IN "THREE BOOKS, NOT ONE":

THE FOLLOW-THROUGH, HERE AND ABROAD, BY THE CENTER AND EACH LOCALITY; THE

NEW IN THE "Who We Are and What We Stand For" Statement, NOW THAT WE HAVE,

AS A TOTALITY, "3 books, not 1" -- which means Marxism and Freedom, Philosophy and Revolution and Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, as well as all the pamphlets that flowed from them in the concrete: American Civilization on Trial, Frantz Fanon and American Black Thought, Workers Battle Automation, Afro-Asian Revolutions and Part II of Indignant Heart.

The significance of Eugene's report, making one month pivotal to the whole philosophic-organizational-N&L tasks since the Convention, resides in the objective need to show that our theoretical contributions are by no means simply a parallel to the movement from practice. Just as the N&L analysis of the Andropov phenomenon pointed to that truth, so is it true of each of the three books and the pamphlets that succeeded each other. In each decade, the book moved beyond the "au courant" -- that is to say, it anticipated the future in the present, once

15419

SUMMARY BY RAYA FOLLOWING DISCUSSION AT EXPANDED REB, JAN.1, 1983

Both because it is necessary to be brief and because the only two points I am concentrating on -- Peter Mallory's suggestion that, instead of the hieroglyphic "3 books, not 1," we use the expression "Trilogy of Revolution"; and Lou Turner's question about the relationship of Black Dimension to Marx's "new moments"--- need all the time available so we can at once begin practicing them, I shall not comment on the discussion otherwise.

The reason that Mallory's "Trilogy of Revolution" so impressed me was not simply because we are all tired of the hieroglyphic "3 books, not 1," but because we can begin practicing dialectic methodology right here and now by relating that, or rather concretizing it, both to all three works and to News & Letters. Thus, N&L can include a Reader's View on it at once, prominently, which would present the expression to all our readers.

The more serious attitude of appreciation is to show exactly how we can all concretize that slogan. Here is what I did at once, as I listened: I asked myself how could the slogan, as dialectic of revolution, be shown to exist in all three works. Take, first, Marxism and Freedom, and ask yourself what new was manifested there in what we call the movement from practice for our age. Didn't the East Berlin workers, when they demolished the statue of Stalin, actually express not only courage and opposition to state-capitalism but do it in so new a form, right from under totalitarianism, that "Bread and Freedom" gained a new excitement as a form of theory? And wasn't it true that our other new "page of freedom" -- the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which we raised to the same level as the Hungarian Revolution, for which we were sharply criticized -- disclosed how Marx's theory of revolution anticipates the future in the present, whereas no others could see the Black Revolution until five years later, when the youth revolution in the South was born?

By contrast, the theory of state-capitalism, without the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism, in CLRJ's hands, led to the hollowness of Facing Reality -- which faced the new reality so little that they dared to say that, because Emmett Till's murder so aroused the Black com-

munity, it was correct for Correspondence not to pay attention to the Hungarian Revolution. Though they hurried to reprint State-Capitalism and World Revolution (with a whole series of names who had nothing to do with its conception or writing) the new was demoted to a single "new" paragraph on its cover claiming that it proved they were right all along.

Jm [The dialectics of revolution embedded in the expression, "trilogy of revolution", shows our historic-theoretic contributions to Marxism expressed in a still newer form in Philosophy and Revolution. There it begins, not with the movement from practice, but with the movement from theory, starting with Hegel's main works "in and for themselves" so that we can see ^{why} Marx had been rooted in the Hegelian dialectic -- both as a revolution in thought which preoccupied Hegel, and as a point of departure for the Marxian dialectic and his theory of actual revolution. Permit me to skip from that Part I, "Why Hegel? Why Now?", to the final Part, on our age. Didn't that part not just record what was happening in practice but show a new dimension also in the Black revolt, since it was not only activity, but Frantz Fanon's concept of dialectic and his calling his philosophy of liberation "a new Humanism" that brought about an affinity between us? The newness in the Black dimension was ours alone when it came to the question of Women's Liberation, which wasn't one of Fanon's preoccupations in the early 1960s, whereas we, in the early 1970s, could quote that magnificent Black Women's Liberationist who criticized the Cuban revolution and demanded to know her role after revolution, asking whether she would then get a broom shoved into her hands just as under this racist, sexist society?

Jm [Finally, when it comes to the third work, -- when we can look at Marx's works as a totality now that Marx's Ethnological Notebooks have been transcribed -- the "trilogy of revolution" is made alive, with Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, in actual revolutions and new forces of revolution as Reason in Women's Liberation as well as in Youth, and in the totally new concept of revolution as Marx's ground for organization. In a word, dialectics of revolution could be/com-

prehensively presented in philosophy, in politics and in organization as against the elitist "vanguard party-to-lead" that we could issue a challenge to all post-Marx Marxists.

"Trilogy of revolution" can likewise sound, if not like a hieroglyphic, like a cliché if we don't at the same time make sure not to limit our concretization to the books but to carry it through in N&L as paper and News and Letters Committees as organization, as we establish new relations with readers of N&L and even those who have never heard of us before. Which is why I was so impressed with Lou's question: "What I really want to know more about is what is the relationship between what we have said on Black dimension and what we're now saying on Marx's 'new moments'."

A "moment," speaking in terms of Hegelian-Marxian dialectics, is not a moment in time unless it is an historic moment, a new stage in history, a new factor of development, a new stage in the self-determination of Ideas and in the self-development of the Individual reaching Universality. Or, to put it differently, moment is time only when and if we define time as Marx did -- as "space for human development." A new moment, therefore, is one that emerges after a lengthy period of "labor, patience, seriousness and suffering" of the negative. In the case of Marx, these new moments appeared in the last decade of his life, when all others were just recording how ill he was and treating him as very nearly dead. In truth, he was looking anew at everything from what was called "Asiatic mode of production" to the climax of his greatest theoretical work, Capital, -- Accumulation of Capital -- which he suddenly said was not a Universal and that, on the contrary, revolution could occur in technologically backward countries like Russia ahead of the technologically advanced West. At the same time, there was a return to his very first Man/Woman concept as the most fundamental in creating a new society.

Nowhere can those new moments be expressed more eloquently and succinctly than on the Black dimension. And nowhere can we more clearly see the difference between the Marxian dialectic and the half-way dialectic in Rosa Luxemburg, ^{who} certainly did feel for the Black dimension and saw the horrors of imperialism.

greatest theoretical work: "Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded." In fact, this time Marx succeeded in getting the first National Labor Union to practice that as it was initiating the new stage of fighting for the shortening of the working day.

To sum up Marx on the Black dimension, whether it was the question of the Abolitionists he was collaborating with and considering as the real bacilli for civil war before it had even erupted, writing that a new world epoch had begun with John Brown's attack on Harper's Ferry and establishing the First International of working men and women in England, France and Poland to work for the end of slavery; or whether it was the Civil War itself during which he advised Lincoln what a single Black regiment would mean in a war for freedom; or whether it was Capital itself, both theoretically and practically in the organization of labor unions; or whether it was his new look at pre-capitalist societies and seeing the possibility of revolution occurring there first, as well as the visit to Algiers where he admired the Mcors, and not only as a question of "Asiatic mode of production" but the whole question of human development -- it is the totality of Marx's Marxism which we have grappled with in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, as the "new passions and new forces" for the reconstruction of society on totally new, truly human beginnings.

Deleuze & Guattari

I had meant to develop also the question of the difference between phenomenology and philosophy, but all I can say, and all too briefly, is that it is important to remember that phenomenology is not just appearance, it is the philosophy of appearance. Don't dismiss all phenomena. Some may be no more than pure show, but others -- and that is what Hegel deals with in the Phenomenology of Mind -- are the appearance of essence. For, as he puts it: "Essence must appear." It is true that from philosophy of appearance (where the Absolute appears as Absolute Knowledge, which is also, however, inseparable from history) we need to go to that of Essence (or what Hegel refers to as "Science of Logic" where Absolute is now Absolute Idea, the unity of theory and practice), But that, too, does not complete the process of the journey of discovery. We

*It is only in Phen. m. (170) = Knowledge
in "Sci. of Logic" = Idea
+ in "Ph. of Mind" = Mind*

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF EXPANDED REB MEETING, JAN. 1, 1983

PRESENT: In addition to the REB, all of whom were present, NEB members were present from every local

AGENDA: I. Announcements; II. Report by Eugene on Ramifications of the Month of November (25 minutes); III. Report by Raya on "Marxist-Humanism, 1983: Summation as New Beginnings, Subjectively and Objectively (1 hr. 15 min.); Lunch Break; IV. Discussion (3 1/2 hours); V. Summation by Raya; VI. G&W

EUGENE began with the two events that occurred in November which he felt revealed "the relationship between the immediate objective situation and our Marxist-Humanist heritage, as well as a sense of what the Center represents when it is the center of a Marxist-Humanist tendency." First was the presentation Raya had given in Detroit on Nov. 7 on the new book just off the press and the REB meeting which followed, in which points of departure were developed for concretizing the book with different audiences. The second event, 72 hours later, proved that the presentation was no simple demonstration of "how to explain the book" but that the praxis Raya had in view was far more comprehensive. The death of Brezhnev and ascendancy of Andropov became a new testing ground for the dialectical methodology presented on Nov. 7. In all the analyses pouring out and fantastic speculations from the "spets" none caught the degeneracy Andropov's ascendancy signified, nor the link between that and Poland's military rule. That new analysis must be seen in the mirror of the whole 40 years of Marxist-Humanist labor that began in the early 1940s with the state-capitalist analysis, which had cleared so much debris from what passed for Marxism, and freed the mind of one Marxist revolutionary to begin her journey into new areas of Marxist thought. Then came the challenge to practice with that freed mind.

The Archives trace the multi-dimensional pathways of that development. Here, Eugene said, he wanted to look briefly at the relationship to Russia and East Europe. (The debate among Russian spets on the nature of the Russian economy in the 1950s became a life and death actuality in the 1950s with the East Europe revolts, and, from the founding of our paper on the second anniversary of the East German revolt in 1953 to Poland today, we have been rooted in that struggle. But that rootedness demands theoretical-philosophic labor before the dialectic appears in life -- and for us it was the breakthrough on the Absolute Idea six weeks before June 17, 1953. It means also the theoretical-philosophic labor done after a high-point in activity in the way Chapter 15 of Marxism and Freedom anticipated the next stage of revolt of the 1950s, and Philosophy and Revolution in Chapter 8 captured points of departure from the 1960s and 1970s. It is this heritage which is the ground for all of us from founding to newest members of our Committees.

Jan. 1, 1983 - Expanded REB -- p. 2

Eugene then looked at the whole period since the Convention to see this same methodology at work:

September saw the objective situation in Lebanon unfolding so fast that instead of excerpting a portion of the Perspectives talk that had just been given, Raya was compelled to write a whole new section beginning with the massacres at Shatila and Sabra, although not a single point of the thesis from the Convention had to be rewritten. At the very same REB meeting where the new additions were presented, she made a presentation on Britain which jammed together Marx on Britain with Marxist Humanism in Britain, with an actual sitter-in from Britain present to work with us for six weeks. The totality is aimed at the establishment of a viable Marxist-Humanist organization there.

October, just when we were struggling to get the new books off the press, Raya undertook a letter to the incoming NEB which became a PPL on "The Battle of Ideas: Philosophic-Theoretic Points of Departure as Political Tendencies Respond to the Objective Situation," which we were asked to study before the book was actually in our hands. We have yet to work out that tracing of our tendency's history through the three books -- this Expanded REB is part of that. While we rightly focus on the new moments in Marx's last decade, it is the new moments in Marxist-Humanism, 1941 to 1983 which has brought out the new moments in Marx that have been lost for 100 years -- not because Marx scholars did not possess those manuscripts, but because until Marxist-Humanism possessed them, possession was a form of "having" rather than a form of being.

Returning to the month of November, Eugene focused on the two events -- our new work off the press and a new ruler in Russia -- in terms of how the relation of objective situation and Marxist-Humanist heritage became manifest in the activities at the Center in that period. The month was special because it proved that even when we had "subjective" problems, and were acutely short-handed, the objective situation does not wait. It was not a question of a single Lead but so powerful a reaching back over the entire 40 year history that the analysis became a whole new PPL. It brought sharply into focus the needed new concentration on the Center which had been involved in the decision to bring Lou to the Center, not just to focus on Black dimension, but on Black dimension at the Center. It has already resulted in an important new relationship with an African intellectual.

We already know how magnificently the locals have carried out "Have Thumb, Will Travel" in regard to the Spring Lecture Tour -- and the truth is that in the period ahead, each local will also be "Center", which will be wherever Raya is during those two months. Finally, Eugene took up "center" in relationship to the newspaper -- and the two new points of departure there as seen in Felix Martin's stay for the entire month of putting out the January/February issue to experience the totality of that to take back with him to West Coast; and in the new types of essays or columns proposed by Raya in December, whether for WL page or letters to be printed in Theory/Practice columns.

The task, he concluded, is the personification of Marxist-Humanist ideas in their most concrete form. The task for each of us -- at Center, in locals, or at large -- is to work out projection as we inwardize, so that it brings about the very needed organizational growth of Marxist-Humanism.

15425

Jan. 1, 1983 -- Expznded REB -- p. 3

RAYA'S REPORT, which was entitled "MARXIST-HUMANISM, 1983: The Summation that is a New Beginning, Subjectively and Objectively" had four Parts, after an Introduction called "Where and How to Begin Anew?" The Parts were entitled: I. The Four New Moments in Marx that Form the Trail to the 1980s; II. The Unchained Dialectic in Marx, 1843-1883, and in Marxist-Humanism, 1953-1983; III. Why then are there still Breakdowns between Theory and Practice, between Philosophy and Revolution? The Global Need for "3 books, not 1"; and IV. The Future in the Present: The Follow-Through, Here and A-broad, by the Center and in each Locality; in News & Letters as in all 3 books not 1; The New in the "Who We Are and What We Stand For" Statement, now that we have, as a Totality, Marxism and Freedom, from 1776 until Today; Philosophy and Revolution, from Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao; Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution; as well as American Civilization on Trial, Black Masses as Vanguard, Indignant Heart, A Black Worker's Journal and the Political-Philosophic Letters. Before she began her presentation Raya pointed to Part IV as the "key" because it is concrete, and asked us to note that it was the first time that the PPL's were included in such a listing.

(The entire presentation has been reproduced and is attached directly to these brief minutes.)

* * *

IN THE DISCUSSION, which followed a brief lunch break, Charles Denby took the floor first to welcome Felix Martin as a true co-editor, contrasting the experience we had had earlier with our first attempt at having as co-editor a skilled worker, JZ, who had left before any such relationship could be developed, and indicating how critical Felix's stay for the month of January would be, both because no matter how intense, the experiences in the locals cannot substitute for the activity at the Center of Marxist-Humanism, and because Felix will take these experiences back with him to the West Coast to develop a new relationship there to the totality of N&L.

Breakdowns & Th/Pr Mike wished to take up especially Part III of Raya's presentation on why there are still "breakdowns" between theory and practice, philosophy and revolution and related this to the kind of letter he was preparing to write to RD centering on the fact that 1983 is not only 100 years since the Ethnological Notebooks were written, but a decade since they were finally transcribed and made available to the world, and yet the prevailing attitude to them has been deafening silence. (His letter will appear in the Th/Pr column of the March special centenary issue of N&L.)

Lou Turner raised as the two most significant objective events of the recent period Andropov's ascendancy on the one hand, and the Miami revolt on the other, saying that what most concerned him was the relationship of Marx's "new moments" to the Black dimension. Contrasting the manner in which Black intellectuals have so often tried to "apply" Marx, with the way in which RD has concentrated on seeing how the Black movement from practice had an impact on Marx and thus developing an organic relationship between Black masses in motion and Marxian thought, he felt that our challenge to post-Marx Marxists on this question lies in the fact that no others except Marxist-Humanists have dealt with Black not just as color, but as philosophy, including Aptheker who has contributed much to the field of Black history -- but sees it only as history, not philosophy.

15426

Jan. 1, 1983 -- Expanded REB -- p. 4

Peter, L.A. pointed out that, at a point when we have in hand "3 books, not 1", to talk about "where and how to begin" seems like a contradiction -- yet this is precisely what we have to answer, because now that we have them as a totality we must find out how to make that "summation" a true "new beginning," and then related this to finding what particular individual points we can develop for different reviews that will nevertheless contain the whole.

Peter Mallory began by making a suggestion for a different phrase than "three books, not one" -- saying that he felt "Trilogy of Revolution" catches this concept of each work being a continuation of the one before and yet of being a true totality. He then reviewed his own becoming a socialist a full 52 years earlier when he realized that everything he had been taught up to then had been a lie and began the search for a philosophy of life that had led him from Socialist party to Trotskyism; and from there to a conclusion that Russia was a capitalist state and the discovery of a Freddie Forest who had worked out such a theory; and finally to the break not only with Trotskyism but with Johnsonism, and the development at last of the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism -- the full articulation of which we now have in hand with which we must now complete the organizational tasks ahead.

Felix Martin spoke of the "alienation inward and outward" that a worker faces in this country today, noting not only the manner in which men and women are literally worked to death in the plants, but the horrifying number of suicides since the layoffs. The task that confronts us is how to bring out the new world that is struggling to be born and that is part of every activity we engage in, from a picket line to an article for the paper.

Andy was struck with another aspect of the "time element" relating to the Nov. 7 meeting on the new book in Detroit -- namely, that it was two days later that the mine workers threw out their Church leadership to vote for Trumka -- and related the kinds of constantly new objective events with how we have to relate the projection of the three books to specific and concrete audiences, and how the series of different brochures we now have available can address this specificity.

Kevin looked both at his own development in the movement in relation to the objective periods when the three books appeared, noting that it was only after the defeat of 1968 that he could move to News & Letters; and at what we are learning from the responses to the new book from various audiences, noting that almost all who bought the book at the Anthropological conference were women, and that it was the supposedly "less advanced" Black hospital workers in one of his classes who bought the work, while one of the supposedly "advanced" students implied nobody could understand it.

Olga felt that the key to membership growth, which is the task from Jan. 1 to Labor Day's Constitutional Convention, was showing not only the creative mind of Marx, but of Marxist-Humanism, in the "three books, not one" as what others will want to become part of. This was related to everything we do -- including the new kinds of letters "on single points" that must nevertheless contain the whole. In her own assignment on the difference between phenomenology and philosophy she felt the real assignment was to show concretely what it means, not for Luxemburg, but for today's WLM. Simply saying RL went wrong because she didn't see "Subject", when she was the best.

Jan. 1, 1983 -- Expanded REB -- p. 6

who have offered help in translating the new work into Spanish, but because what has become clear always is that it is the totality of Marxist-Humanism and not only what specifically pertains to Latin America that they are responding to. The universality of M-Hism can be seen in another way in the fact that to one of our friends, Eugene's article on "Marx and non-capitalist lands" was directly about Russia, while to me it was about Latin America.

Dave Park described some of the work he had been doing around the Lecture tour, contrasting the way one intellectual dismissed the workers as any kind of revolutionary force on the grounds that all you needed to give them was "beer and TV", with a Latino worker who had told him of his early experiences with the CP in Mexico from where he was sent to study in Cuba, and whom Castro wanted to send to Russia -- an offer this worker turned down because he had firmly decided that Cuba was "not the kind of society I wanted to work for."

Jan said she had been struck with the way the Perspectives Report to the 1956 Convention had been entitled "Where to Begin?" and the process from there to the new "Who We Are" statement that we would be putting into the Jan/Feb issue, pointing out how new is the articulation of what each book did concretely and including not only the whole 40 years as Archives available, but that we begin with what we are for, and not only what we are against.

Ted described the Conference of Economists he had just attended and how great it had been as preparation for today's meeting to have read on the plane between the two conferences the Appendix with Luxemburg's speech, in the new book, because you are struck forcefully with what a great continuity with Marx's Marxism is what we were discussing today, and how powerfully it emphasizes that "Human power is its own end."

Neda said that when we talk about Marx's vision of a new Third World we can't leave it at that if we are speaking, especially, to a Middle East audience, because it remains "academic" unless what we follow that through with is our own 30 year development since 1953. What has special urgency for the Iranian Left is what "philosophic preparation" means so that when a new moment does appear on the scene, you can recognize it. It was to this question that she and our other Marxist-Humanist participants would be speaking at the Washington, D.C. conference in April, and what was most significant was that RD had been invited not to give them some more "history" but an analysis of how the movement has reached the the point it has. ^{10/21}

R spoke on the question of "projecting the whole" in relationship to how the "whole" came through so forcefully in RD's lead on Andropov that it aroused the ire of the "spets" on Russia to whom he had spoken at one university, because what this "spets" correctly read in that Lead was the need for revolution in both the U.S. and Russia.

Mary raised the question of the "future in the present" that must be apparent in all of our activities, no matter where it is we are active, relating this to the specific work in the Bay Area, with the "three books not one" and the coming lecture tour.

Erica discussed the experiences of the month of November as it took place in Chicago with the co-National Organizer there, and how that has to be the ground for their own

15428

