

National Chairwoman's Perspectives Report  
to the Plenum of News and Letters Committees  
September 5, 1981

75c

# The Trail in the 1980s for Transforming Reality

(As it is in Fact and as the "New Moments" Marx Discovered  
in His Last Decade Which Created Openings for the 1980s)

by

RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

## CONTENTS

- I. Overview -- Silesia, 1981, Silesia, 1844; Relationship of Movement and Philosophy to "the Book"
- II. The New Federalism: Pax Americana Imposed the World Over, Be it the One-Minute Shoot-out over Libya, or the "Two-and-a-Half Wars" with Neutron Bombs
- III. On the Way to the Holocaust: Capitalist-Imperialist Alliances and World Hunger
- IV. The Revolutionary Dialogue Between Continents (Whether from South Africa or England; Whether from El Salvador or Poland; Whether from Asia or the Other USA)
- V. Historic Moments for Transforming Reality, Beginning with the Movement from Practice, Marked by Theoretic Turning Points (from Marxism and Freedom and Indignant Heart through Archives and Philosophy and Revolution to Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution)

Also includes:

Syllabus for classes in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution)

Summation by Raya Dunayevskaya of Plenum discussion on Perspectives

Published by

NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES, 2832 E. GRAND BLVD., DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48211

7090

PERSPECTIVES REPORT BY NATIONAL CHAIRWOMAN  
TO NATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD MEETING OF  
NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES, September 5, 1981

THE TRAIL IN THE 1980S FOR  
TRANSFORMING REALITY  
(As it is in Fact and as the "New Moments" Marx Discovered  
in his Last Decade Created Openings for the 1980s)

by RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

"I love all men who dive. Any fish can swim  
near the surface, but it takes a great whale  
to go downstairs five miles or more; and if  
he don't attain the bottom, why, all the  
lead in Galena can't fashion the plummet  
that will. I'm not talking of Mr. Emerson  
now -- but of the whole corps of thought-  
divers, that have been diving and coming  
up again with blood-shot eyes since the  
world began."

-- Herman Melville

I. OVERVIEW -- Silesia, 1981, Silesia, 1844; Relationship of  
Movement and Philosophy to "the Book"

Hello. Have you noticed that one of the latest confronta-  
tions between the Polish workers and the Communist bosses has been  
taking place in Silesia? There the masses have gone so far in their  
demands as to, at one and the same time, demand access to the mass  
media and, as miners, say: Yes, we would be willing to work some  
free Saturdays provided it is not you, the State, who will control  
that free production, but we, the workers, who will say what is to  
be produced and how it is to be distributed.

Silesia, Marxist history will tell you, is where, in 1844,  
a revolt inspired Marx to practice what he was working out -- his  
discovery of a new continent of thought and of revolution. In 1844  
they were not miners, but weavers; they weren't asking for workers'  
control of production in so many words. Rather, they were smashing  
the machines that were taking their jobs away -- and they were burn-  
ing the deeds to that property. And it is that little deed, the  
bonfire the weavers made of those deeds, that Marx declared to be a  
higher stage of workers' revolt than the great French Revolution that

had overthrown the feudal regime but had not questioned the property of the bourgeoisie. (All this talk of philosophy of revolution <sup>was what</sup> Marx expounded in letters and in the now famous Humanist Essays in a year when socialist, communist and anarchist tendencies were talking about the "backwardness of the workers" because they were smashing the machines!

Silesia, 1981, is the region where workers at the Huta Katowice steel complex placed a white wheelbarrow in front of the manager's office to let him know he could be carted away; that they wanted to elect the manager. If people think that, because Lech Walensa (who is too close to the Catholic Church) is the one offering the eight free Saturdays, it is just a bargaining point, they would be wise to keep in mind what workers in a workers' state can do. In 1917 in Lenin's Russia the Subbotnik did give free Saturdays most willingly, because the power was theirs.

Much closer to our day -- indeed, this very year -- just consider what has been accomplished in Poland: in a single year they have established a free trade union, Solidarity, which has creative political overtones: they have established a Peasants' Union, another historic first for any state-capitalist country calling itself Communist; and now they have carried on not only a printers' strike but are demanding access to all mass media -- including TV and radio.

Under no circumstances can we forget that the establishment of Solidarity had its political precedent many years before, in the establishment of KOR, a small group of workers and intellectuals, who certainly had visions not only of a free trade union but of a workers' state. Among its leaders from the start were Kuron and Modzelewski. They were the ones who, in 1961, penned an "Open Letter to the Party" in which they declared Poland to be a capitalist state. When the Communist Party threw them in jail they there developed many ideas of how to continue the resistance. They have gone their separate ways since then, but in 1976 they were among the founders of KOR. (We will return to that development towards the end of the Perspectives, when the subject will be "The Revolutionary Dialogue Between Continents.")



What is of immediate concern for 1981 is, at one and the same time, a simple journalistic comparison of "the four Ws" as they appeared in 1844 and in 1981 -- and in 1981 not only as they concern Poland and Solidarity, but Marxist-Humanist perspectives as spelled out in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. Let me elaborate. First, the four Ws: Who did What, Where, When? -- or what happened? where? When? And to that let us add the fifth W -- Why?

In 1844, when the Silesian weavers rebelled and built a bonfire of those deeds, a single "Who" -- Marx -- insisted that it was a higher stage than the French Revolution itself. That "Who" -- a "middle-class" revolutionary intellectual, who had been battling with Prussian censorship, defending the peasants who had engaged in wood theft -- had just broken with the bourgeoisie. At the same time he turned against all other tendencies -- socialist, communist, anarchist -- who had been judging the poor, militant weavers in revolt as "backward." Instead, he evolved a whole philosophy of revolution, reaching from the concept of Alienated Labor to its absolute opposite -- "freely associated labor" -- in the throes of creating a new philosophy he called a "new Humanism" which would unite materialism with idealism, and stand opposed not only to capitalism but to vulgar communism, and stand for totally new human relations.

Let's pause a moment to see how those four Ws which had spelled out philosophy as action, as revolutionary movement, become crucial for transforming reality in the 1980s. That is why I asked to be permitted to start the Perspectives Report this year in a sort of "upside-down" way. That is to say, instead of beginning as usual, with the objective situation, I wish to begin with the end -- an end which you don't know yet, though you have read the Draft Perspectives, because only after the Draft was written did I decide to add a new chapter to the book. It is from that new Chapter XII that we have the title for this Perspectives Report: "The Trail in the 1980s for Transforming Reality" (as it is in Fact and as New Moments for it were Discovered by Marx in the Last Decade of his Life.)

Starting out "upside down" does not mean we will leave out of sight the Armageddon that Reagan-Haig-Weinberger-Kirkpatrick are



getting ready to unleash. A week ago none would have thought that Haig could possibly have been pictured as "soft" on so-called Communism, but Weinberger has succeeded in doing exactly that. If this super-hawk finds any way of having a "pre-emptive strike" against Russia, and that means unleashing the nuclear holocaust, Kirkpatrick, who is busy glorifying the genocidal war in El Salvador as "mere authoritarianism," will certainly not stop his hand. She was not moved one iota by the loss of 20,000 lives in El Salvador in the past 18 months.

With such Hot War rhetoric in a Cold War situation, it may seem that we are on Cloud Nine to try to get our heads straight first with theory in such "abstract" realms as a book, rooted as it is in what Marx elaborated in the last years of his life -- but it is, in truth, that ground, that theoretical ground that was established, which will disclose a revolutionary trail to the 1981-82 Perspectives.

Take, for example, the title of Chapter XII: "The Last Writings of Marx Point a Trail to the 1980s." The first section, on "Post-Marx Marxists, Beginning with Frederick Engels," takes issue with all -- Mehring, Ryazanov, Lukacs, Korsch, Luxemburg, Lenin until 1914, Trotsky. And the second section, which on the whole we do know since it was originally the third section of Chapter XI, has had new paragraphs added to direct it to today's Women's Liberation Movement. The new third section is entitled: "New Moments of the Revolutionary Philosophic-Historic Concepts Discovered by Marx in the Last Decade."

The first of the three moments was, of course, the French edition of Capital, in which he expanded those magnificent sections on the concentration and centralization of capital. To us, it had become the ground for a theory of state-capitalism. In concrete terms it meant that, far from accepting the Hitler-Stalin pact as any act of a "degenerated workers' state," we were fighting both against Russia and against Nazi Germany as well as imperialist USA. In a word, "neither Washington nor Moscow." Only a revolutionary fight can bring genuine peace. Otherwise, capitalism only puts up markers for the next war: two Germanies, two Koreas, two Vietnams.

You see why I'm taking this "upside-down" way of coming to the objective situation today. It is the need to be well grounded in Marx's own dialectic. In the first moment -- the additions in "Accumulation of Capital" -- Marx actually laid the ground for both the theory of state capitalism and our refusal to tailend Stalinism, as did the Trotskyists with their slogan of "defense of the Soviet Union" which, with the Hitler-Stalin Pact, had actually given the signal for World War II.

The second moment brings us close to the movement from practice as the Hungarian Revolutionaries in 1956 brought the Humanist Essays onto the historic stage. This time, though, I'm not referring only to the 1844 Essays, but to the 1875 elaboration by Marx of the Fetishism of Commodities, after the Paris Commune clarified the form of workers' rule, as freely associated labor in a non-state abolished fetishism.

third -- the  
And now we come to the totally new element of those three new moments, which we have first discovered with the book on Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. Engels had omitted it from the English translation. Yet it is nothing short of the question of colonialism as not only characterizing "The So-Called Primitive Accumulation of Capital," but rather appearing in the latest stage of industrialization -- that which we now call imperialism and which Marx described as "foreign trade began to take precedence over internal trade; where the world market annexed for itself vast lands in the New World, in Asia and in Australia..." Nor did Marx stop with that "objective description" -- as witness his last trip to Algiers, the last year of his life, supposedly just for his health. Instead, as Lafargue put it: "Marx has come back with his head full of Africa and the Arabs."

Marx had become so enthusiastic about "Mohamet's sons," that he wrote both about their dignity and their hostility to the West; he studied both their oppression and their resistance: "Their dress -- even when ragged -- is elegant and graceful.... Even the poorest Moor excels the greatest European actor in the art de se draper in his cloak and in keeping a natural, graceful and dignified

bearing...."

Further, Marx noted that "Moslems in fact recognize no subordination; they are neither subjects, nor administrative objects recognizing no authority." The admiration for the Moslems, however, led to no glorification of them. Quite the contrary. Marx concluded thusly: "Nevertheless, they will go to the devil without a revolutionary movement."

Nothing could be more relevant for today, although it is Iran rather than Algiers I have in mind. All that needs to be added is: a revolution has to be rooted in a philosophy of revolution. Otherwise it is going to slide fast down a counter-revolutionary abyss. When that happened with Kerensky in July, 1917, it wasn't that you couldn't at once turn the tide back to revolution. But, while some revolutionaries took chances with prison, none took chances with the firing squad. Lenin left for Finland -- which is where he wrote State and Revolution. Then, and only then, as State and Revolution was circulated to the Bolsheviks, did they also work out the taking of power on November 7.

On the other hand, Rosa Luxemburg, who decided she had to "follow" the proletarian vanguard which wanted revolution today, not tomorrow, earned martyrdom. And that did not bring on a German November. Instead, the German revolution was beheaded by the predecessors of fascism.

As for Marx's "new moments" that have created the openings for the 1980s, they were all unfolding when, according to his heirs, he was undergoing "a slow death" and was "incapable" of creative writing. It is when he was, at one and the same time, working out the Ethnological Notebooks and, in the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto, projecting the possibility of revolution in Russia ahead of the West. This Overview, then, is not all that "upside-down", is it?

\* \* \*



II. THE NEW FEDERALISM: Pax Americana Imposed One World Over, Be it the One-Minute Shoot-Out over Libya, or the "Two-and-a-Half Wars" with Neutron Bombs

One look at the \$1.5 trillion (if you can imagine such a sum) nuclear budget over the next five years leaves no shadow of a doubt that the New Federalism, far from either taking the government off our backs or coinciding with any promised balanced budget, is, at one and the same time, saddling us with ever-deeper deficits, and planning a holocaust. The capitalist state, no matter who has been the ruler, has always gone into deeper and deeper deficits. But Reagan is outdoing all, despite the rhetoric about cutting government expenditures. The \$35.2 billion that he cut was cut from the social programs, and a great deal more than that went into military build up. He doesn't expect to have less than \$42.5 billion deficit, which they already admit may need to be overdrawn by no less than fifteen billion dollars. That deficit by fiscal 1982 will need another \$10 billion; and another \$30 billion in 1983 -- and on and on.

As the retrogression is proceeding in the country, with everything from union-busting to unemployment to cutting wages as well as cutting relief to the marrow of our bones, the Third World is likewise getting the short end of the stick. And there is outright genocidal war in El Salvador, which U.S. imperialism is proping up. There is the one-minute shoot-out with Libya, which is by no means limited to the new macho image of the Reagan Administration with Libya being made the guinea pig for that image. That piracy on the high seas in the Mediterranean actually relates to both the Reagan Administration's rejection of the agreement reached on the Law of the Sea, and to the whole stratospheric militarization presently being carried out. And let's never forget that there is nothing in all the pile-up of the myriad crises and contradictions where the ruling class and its exploitation of the people doesn't shine forth as the determinant for everything else.

Take what isn't obvious on the surface from that one-minute shoot-out in the Gulf of Sidra. It wasn't only a matter of bringing Qaddafi down to size, with macho cowboy politics determin-

ing the size. Rather, the show of military muscle extended also to the question of "Law of the Sea" where billions and billions of a cornucopia of untold wealth are waiting for those who will exploit the wealth that is supposed to belong to all "mankind" and for which the UN, especially, the Third World in the UN, have been struggling for a decade. In 1970, the General Assembly of the UN declared the oceans to be "the common heritage of mankind." By 1980 and UNCLOS III (the third UN Conference on Law of the Sea), the U.S. finally did sign an agreement (and it was a Republican, Elliot Richardson, who had been named by the Carter Administration for this job). But since the Reagan Administration has taken over, they are talking about a "sea grab" by the Third World nations -- for it is by no means only Libya which has staked out a 200 mile zone; so have 89 of the 120 coastal nations.

Suddenly Reagan has named a nuclear specialist, James Malone, for this area of work; the lawyer, Richardson, has been dismissed. Malone has only one order: stonewall it. The Third World countries, who are again being left out in the cold, suspect that the big industrial nations who have the technology for seabed mining will conclude a so-called "mini-treaty" among themselves. They have established OTEC (Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion), and even the scientist-journalist, Harlan Cleveland, has concluded: "What actually happens will be decided in the board rooms of the great international companies. They have to think about investing a billion dollars per mining operation..." (Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 21, 1981) Is it necessary to add that they will reap astronomical figures, even if that will not begin for 20 years? Who is supposed to believe that a nuclear specialist will help the oceans become "the common heritage of mankind"?

One look at the nuclear preparedness that Reagan-Weinberger Haig-Kirkpatrick are planning far beyond the one-minute shoot-out over the Gulf of Sidra will give the answer. The U.S. has no less than five new weapons-building programs:

- 1- Trident missile-launching submarines
- 2- New warheads for the land-based Minuteman III missiles
- 3- New strategic and tactical nuclear bombs
- 4- New long-range air-launched Cruise missiles
- 5- The MX

The militarized brain of Reagan is preoccupied with trying to brainwash us and making the "unthinkable" thinkable, as the General Staff makes its "contingency plans" in their "game rooms" -- as if they are playing with toys! Those so-called "contingency plans" reveal that the Army has what is called an "integrated battlefield" plan, which means it could fight with conventional as well as nuclear and chemical weapons simultaneously.

In the five-part CBS program on the so-called "Defense of the U.S." (June 14 to 18, 1981), here is what was revealed, as described in The Nation (July 25 - Aug. 1, 1981): The U.S. has 9000 strategic nuclear warheads pointed at Russia. More than half of them could be delivered in 30 minutes. Russia has about 6000 aimed at the U.S. Consider what were the results of the simulated 15-second nuclear explosions. (These were considered "conservative" estimates.) That 15-second explosion, at Bellvue, Nebraska, two miles from Offutt Air Force Base (i.e. SAC headquarters) and 13 miles from Omaha, would have resulted in 200,000 seriously injured -- and 200,000 have never been conceived as all being injured in one place. Those injured would die, and those who died at once would number two million -- from this single, 50-megaton bomb!

Now imagine that multiplied by the thousands that are stockpiled. Frank Church -- former Democratic Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported that "official estimates are that between 70 million and 160 million Americans would die in a full-scale nuclear exchange." (NYT, Aug. 23, 1981) In the same article, Frank Church also refers to the old Cold War era: "During the 1950s and early 1960s, our Government based its defense planning on a 'two and a half wars' policy: The United States might have to fight the Soviet Union, China and some smaller country (the 'half war') simultaneously..." The error he makes in citing this is to think they are trying to prepare all over again to fight World War II. The truth, however, is that McCarthyism, with its hawkishness on fighting both Russia and China, and allowing for some other "half" war, pales by comparison with Weinberger's call for initiating



"many, many wars," as he put it recently to a war veterans' convention: "We have to be prepared to launch counter-offensives in other regions..." (He was referring first to Afghanistan and now he wants other regions.) "We must be prepared," he continued, "for waging a conventional war that may extend to many parts of the globe."

For such life-destroying weapons, there seems to be no end of enough money. It keeps inspiring this Administration to cut more and more money from the bare necessities of life for the masses in order to have no less than the mind-boggling sum of \$1.5 trillion for nuclear weaponry during the next five years. That may be an impossible sum for ordinary people to imagine -- especially those living below the poverty level, where Reagan is preparing to further strip food stamps, hot lunches for children, and social security -- not to mention turning the clock backwards on affirmative action and anything else that could possibly be dreamed up by anti-woman racists like Jesse Helms and Strom Thurmond. And, of course, they're not planning to do anything to assuage world hunger.

### III. ON THE WAY TO THE HOLOCAUST: Capitalist-Imperialist Alliances and World Hunger

The so-called "two track" NATO decision which U.S. imperialism sold its Western and Japanese Allies, is supposed to be "proof" that the Reagan Administration wouldn't endlessly continue with its military build-up and one-track ideology that Russia alone is responsible for all the ills in the world, and that the U.S. would definitely begin to negotiate with Russia. It is seen as just a smoke-screen for the build-up.

What are any of the powers doing about world hunger? Any, from Russia, on the one hand, to Socialist Mitterand, on the other? Mitterand surely sticks close to the U.S. Titan and the concept of "Russia as Enemy Number One." He has engaged in some reforms in France itself (what liberal wouldn't have done that after so many

years of DeGaullism?), but they all follow the Churchillian "armed, to parley" ideology. And that warhawk, <sup>Churchill,</sup> even during the World War II holocaust, wished to begin World War III -- and instead of opening a European "second front" to relieve the Nazi attack, wanted Russia to bleed to death. It is this mailed fist type of talk of "armed to parley" that Reagan-Haig-Weinberger-Kirkpatrick are now following.

Here is the way this works out insofar as continuing World Hunger. By most estimates, more than 500 million people -- roughly one out of every nine -- suffers from serious malnutrition today, compared with 100 to 200 million (one out of every 14 to 25) in the 1950s. It is clear that about half a billion individuals are still crippled by hunger, and one billion are below minimum nutrition. No less than 80 percent are women and children. This means that some 100,000 children every year become blind because of lack of Vitamin A. From 10 to 50 percent of women in South America, Africa and Asia are anemic.

The poorest nation in the world this year is Somalia, where more than a million refugees huddle in 33 camps. Those who are less visible are those in Asia, but they are just as undernourished in India, Bangladesh, the Philippines, Cambodia, Pakistan, Indonesia. Those six countries along with Brazil, Zaire, and Ethiopia account for two-thirds of the world's starvation. Worst of all is sub-Sahara Africa, where the food supply is so limited that fully 70 percent of the population is not getting enough to eat.

Matching the African starvation are countries in Latin America such as Bolivia, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic and Haiti. And where Kirkpatrick holds that "authoritarianism is the lesser evil" --referring to El Salvador and Honduras -- Jacobo Timerman \* puts it bluntly: "The 'lesser evil' in Latin America is fascism."

Which is why the most telling of the world Hunger statistics is the one that shows how little of the arable land is actually under cultivation -- less than 40 percent of the potentially arable land in Latin America and Africa. What is completely false is the talk of the "Green Revolution" as if that's a new find, and as if we haven't learned that the people who actually gained from that

\*I want to recommend that everyone read this imprisoned Argentinian editor's book, Prisoner Without a Name, Cell Without a Number

revolution were the "haves" all over again. The profits kept going to those who could take advantage of the new seeds and fertilizers, and raise yields of corn, wheat and rice between 30 and 50 percent, but the millions of dollars of profits put absolutely nothing into the empty stomachs of the poor.

In the Caribbean in the mid-1970s, half of the agricultural land was used to produce cattle and crops for export, or for the domestic elite, rather than for the basic staple, food. But even a bourgeois journalist like Ann Crittenden<sup>had</sup> to report, in her series in the New York Times in August: "The pattern changed after the revolution in Nicaragua, where the new government has put the old cotton plantations into bean production."

And what is new in today's anti-nuke movement is that they have connected with the hungry of the world, the unemployed youth in their own countries especially. In a special feature on "European Youth in Ferment" (Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 4, 1981), one activist in the CND, Jenny Edwards, is quoted as pointing out that world hunger is not limited to the Third World. Every country has a fourth world of the hungry within it, she points out.

The U.S., though the most unconscionable of the imperialists, is by no means the only guilty one. Even when, for the moment, you do not consider the other nuclear Titan, Russia, or the one Nixon was so ready to accept as a superpower, China, the smaller capitalist lands (and Mexico is only a small example) in one way or another all express the decadent state of the capitalist world.

But U.S. imperialism has no peers when it comes to militarization, and that in spite of the fact that Reagan is trying to make it appear that he has to embark on this because Russia has won the race. There is no doubt that, for 30 long years, Russia and the U.S. have each squandered no less than over \$1 trillion stockpiling weapons. The U.S. has now the largest arms build-up in the whole of American history, and the proposed military outlays will double over the next five years.

Even Reagan's ideological twin, Prime Minister Thatcher, who is following that same ruinous way of supply-side economics,



is reducing the Navy. Even within NATO the U.S. is the only one embarked on a massive rearmament program in the Navy as in all other facets. Frank Church described the new U.S. foreign policy as a collision course, not so much with the enemies, but with political reality and America's greatest allies. This is especially true in the way the decision to produce neutron bombs was announced without informing anybody ahead of time, including Helmut Schmidt -- who, in Dec. 1979, had to approve the NATO decision to place Pershing II and Cruise missiles in West Germany in 1983. (Schmidt, in turn, is hitting Reagan with the biggest deal ever proposed between the capitalist and so-called Communist world -- a partnership of no less than \$9.5 billion <sup>for a</sup> gas pipeline with Russia. The negotiating deal that has been going on since 1978 is opposed by the U.S. not only as a lush trade deal, but as one that would make West Europe dependent for energy on Russia as this gas would be pumped from the frozen wastes of Siberia more than 3000 miles to the Bavarian frontier.)

Frank Church doesn't mention this collision with reality, but here are those he does list:

1) Despite the fact that the war in El Salvador is called by Reagan-Haig "a textbook case" about Soviet interference, there is absolutely no one who believes it, either in Latin America (Mexico and Venezuela speak loudly against any such interpretation) or in Western Europe. The latest and most important breakaway with any part of the Reagan-Haig lie is the recognition by France and Mexico of the Guerrilla Movement in El Salvador as a "representative political force."

2) Despite the fact that Haig just recently (August 25) gave a lengthy interview to the Christian Science Monitor in which he said that on the whole the world reaction to the U.S. action against Libya was "fully supportive" of the U.S., the truth is that even such friends as Saudi Arabia called it "cowboy politics" and Jordan said it was "a unique form of piracy, previously carried out only by organized criminals." Even where the opposition is not as outspoken as Jordan, there is no doubt whatever that even before the Libyan incident, Haig did not succeed in getting what he claimed:

"consensus of strategic concern." That is to say, even where Russia

is considered a threat, it is not considered the main enemy. That is true throughout the Middle East. For example, Saudi Arabia, which talks a great deal against Russia, acts and also emphasizes in rhetoric that not Russia, but Israel, is the enemy. For that matter, Israel, which is the loudest against Russia and keeps proclaiming that loudly for America's ears, is, in fact, after the Arab lands. Begin's view of "Eretz Israel" is as deeply imperialistic as is Russia's in East Europe, U.S.'s in Latin America, China's in Tibet or over-reaching into Russia. And that is just contiguous lands.

3) As for South Asia, Church sees the U.S. making the same mistakes it did 20 years ago, when the U.S. armed Pakistan to fight against Russia, and Pakistan turned around to use the arms to fight India. At this very moment, the new militarization pact the U.S. has offered has brought U.S. relations with India to its lowest level, and Kirkpatrick is there to further muddy the waters. Just as Henry Kissinger tilted to Pakistan at the very moment when it was trying to destroy the new state of Bangladesh trying to be born, so Kirkpatrick is keeping that same tilt now, because, again, <sup>the</sup> U.S. wants an alliance with China (or more precisely, seeks any and all anti-Russia alliances).

The fact that it doesn't want to let go of Taiwan doesn't mean that Taiwan, too, couldn't turn to Russia, if the latter is all-out against China. We haven't heard the last of the double-crosses since the Hitler-Stalin Pact in WWII.

4) As for South Africa, nothing could be more chummy than the U.S.'s relationship with that apartheid country. Even where the former Administration did vote against South Africa's illegal holding on to Namibia, Reagan is now reneging -- all under the alleged attempt to get South Africa to "grant" Namibia its freedom. Where the world knows SWAPO as an indigenous force, and knows South Africa as the enemy, Reagan is still trying to make Russia the enemy there. If any proof be needed that South Africa's apartheid nature doesn't stop at its own borders, the world has been witness to all its imperialist incursions into Angola, into Zimbabwe (where it has just gunned down Joe Gqabi, leader of the ANC, in his own house in Salisbury), into independent Mozambique in hot pursuit of dissidents or

just in support of its mercenary army, UNITA, which tries to usurp an independence movement. Whereupon U.S. imperialism shamelessly refuses to vote what the UN unanimously desires -- at least a condemnation of South Africa.

IV. THE REVOLUTIONARY DIALOGUE BETWEEN CONTINENTS  
(Whether from South Africa or England; from El Salvador or Poland; from Asia or the Other USA)

As against what capitalism, private or state, considers "One World" -- how to dominate it -- the revolutionary dialogue between continents is expressing itself in freedom struggles. They are seen in South Africa, where the revolts have been ceaseless; and in England, where they were waged as the most exciting, elemental revolt of youth, Black and white. They are seen in El Salvador, where, despite the genocidal war and a whole half century of military oppression propped up by U.S. imperialism, the Salvadoran masses are continuing their battles; and in West Germany, where the anti-Americanism as well as the struggle against their own government (despite the Berlin Wall of East Germany which they hate as much) is expressing itself in a massive anti-nuclear movement. They are seen in Italy, where despite a vicious anti-abortion campaign waged by both the Government and the Pope, and despite the attempt on the Pope's life which produced great sympathy for him, the Women's Liberation Movement nevertheless won its struggle for abortion rights; and in Poland, where the most historic type of revolt from under Communist totalitarianism has continued to develop. The revolutionary dialogue in each country has actually become a dialogue leading to revolution across Western borders, as well as class solidarity which has proven its internationalism.

Returning to apartheid South Africa, this time within its own borders, we confront a monstrous regime which disgorged a fascistic regime long before fascism was heard of in the West. A new stage began when the resistance movement, after a half-century of moderate, peaceful protest, saw the ANC forced to go underground in 1960. At that moment, even that peaceful movement revealed a



military facet -- Umkonto se Swize (Spear of the Nation). The 1960 massacre in Sharpeville, on the one hand, and the rise of independent states in West and East Africa, on the other hand, could not help but give birth to a new form of revolt -- the Pan African Congress. By the time of the murder of Steve Biko, we were faced with a still more audacious movement, the Black Consciousness Movement.

Those tremendous movements, no matter how many times they are massacred, keep arising from the ashes. The latest events are a combination of internal guerrillas and explosions, on the one hand, and, for the first time ever, a massive trade union organization in East London, a port on the Indian Ocean, and in the Port Elizabeth area. It is called the South African Allied Workers Union (SAAWU) and now has 16,000 members, despite a union-busting campaign and despite the fact that 2000 have been fired for having joined. It has aroused sufficient sympathy within the white parliamentary opposition that it has been legally recognized, although constantly undercut. They continue to grow, along with the squatters, who are constantly being driven back to their so-called "homelands", only to spring up in another place. They confront a fascist regime that, with the help of the U.S. and Israel, stands the chance of being the next nuclear power!

In a word, what Jacobo Timmerman said of Latin American neo-fascism holds for the entire trend of world capitalism -- but nowhere more than in South Africa. That is why those revolts point to the only way out -- and that way is through tying the revolts integrally to a philosophy of revolution.

At the very start of the African Revolutions, Frantz Fanon dialectically, profoundly, analyzed the revolutionary nature of the national freedom movements against imperialism, declaring: "The natives' challenge to the colonial world is not a rational confrontation of points of view. It is not a treatise on the universal, but the untidy affirmation of an original idea propounded as an absolute." And yet he also spoke of "The Pitfalls of National Consciousness" which does not extend itself to internationalism as well as to a new philosophy for that class-less society he (and

we) called "NEW HUMANISM."

It is still the determinant, and not just for the freedom struggles in Africa, but throughout the world. It was in East Europe that the whole movement from practice to theory that was itself a form of theory brought Marx's Humanism onto the historic stage in the mid-1950s. The struggle has been ceaseless there ever since. That is why it is so disturbing to hear, in the 1980s, talk of a "self-limiting revolution." It becomes necessary to return to what we began in Part I of the Perspectives when I mentioned Kuron and Modzelewski only in passing, promising to return to that subject when we discussed the whole question of revolution's necessity to be grounded in a philosophy of revolution, which manifests itself so sharply in Poland. It is also tied to what form of organization best expresses the movement of revolt, and how complicated that becomes when an overly-large role is played by the Catholic Church.

Ironically or otherwise, what is occurring at this very moment is that the Catholic Church is helping the Communists in attempting to see that the masses don't go "out of bounds" at the very moment when the masses, specifically the printers, are going, not only out of bounds of the Church, but out of bounds of the Solidarity leadership.

Let us take another look at what I began with in the Perspectives Report when, in speaking of Silesia, I mentioned a different sort of beginning -- i.e., in the 1960s Kuron and Modzelewski had surfaced as the first serious dissidents to develop a theory rooted in Marxian economics, and thus close to state-capitalism. They held that neither Poland nor Russia could be considered socialist states, but were capitalist. Their "Open Letter to the Party" (of which they were then members) caused their expulsion and sent them to prison. That was in the 60s, and whereas their economics and politics were very good, philosophy was definitely missing. In any case, they, in turn, split with each other.

The second stage was the 1970s-- and while they had taken different theoretical positions, with Kuron declaring that he had gone "beyond Marxism," they both were instrumental in establishing KOR. In a word, they were looking for a new form of organization

and did want a relationship between intellectual and worker, with the aim of an independent union and a workers' state. It is clear from the latest strike events that Modzelewski is far to the Left, saying: "We must not take over responsibility for government." He was at Gdansk, and in a debate of leadership, he was most specific in establishing the fact of opposing the Yugoslav and Hungarian style of so-called "workers' self-management," because he definitely would not want to be part of the State. He stresses that the only way that would count is through genuine workers' councils elected by the workers. "We cannot be a trade union and at the same time any kind of administrator. The self-management movement must remain independent from Solidarity."

Evidently, bills are being introduced into the Parliament for what is called "self-management" as in Hungary and Yugoslavia. Modzelewski opposes it, and, as he puts it: Once you're a member of Parliament, you become responsible for running the economy, and all over again are opposed to the workers."

Kuron, on the other hand, thinks that -- since there is also a stirring in the Party, which he calls "the beginning of a revolution" because it is right "inside the Party," and since they have passed over the "critical threshold" -- therefore "Soviet military intervention is possible." The fact that they are part of the Warsaw Pact, he feels, means that the worry to the Soviets is not merely a matter of Solidarity being an attraction to other East European countries, but the "more basic question" of the military alignment.

Does that mean that the opposition must give in because it's no longer a national question? Why choose between either of the two global superpower alignments? Does "beyond Marxism" mean you have given up the class struggle? That couldn't possibly be so, as Kuron surely remains a sparkplug in this new type of trade union, and is also opposed to "sharing power" along lines of the Hungarian model. He insists that one should remain a force for change "from the outside," and not as a part of the Party system. But he remains quite ambiguous on where to go from here, and seems to be trying to



get the printers, who have disobeyed the first call to return to work, to return to work now. The "critical threshold" is here, not in the Warsaw or NATO pacts.

That critical threshold is what has inspired workers throughout the world. Indeed, many have moved from strikes to occupation of factories, and all the way to Scotland, they are wearing SOLIDARITY shirts. But, again, the philosophic rudder of Marx's Humanism is yet to be embraced by the organized working class, though it is certainly involved in massive struggles. Even the bourgeois journalists are beginning to call Thatcher's encounters with labor "trench wars." (You will be hearing in-person reports from England to Poland, and from France to Germany, so I will single out very few points.) As massive as the class struggles are in England, they are quite distant not only from the struggles-to-the-death of Irish prisoners but also from the youth. And it is their magnificent outbursts, with no party or trade union "to lead" that have both initiated a new stage of Black and white struggles and compelled the Iron Lady to at least promise to get some programs going for the unemployed.

It is the mass youth movements against unemployment, and against militarism, especially the anti-nuclear movement in West Germany, in Britain, in the Scandinavian countries, and right here at home, where our activities will be concentrated and where we will have the opportunity to tie the movement to the philosophy of revolution as Marxist-Humanism. It is to this that we will finally turn as we take one more look at the Reaganite retrogressionism against the Black dimension, against labor, against Women's Liberation, against all of humanity.

Reagan's ceaseless attacks on the Black dimension, his turning the clock back on everything from affirmative action to "welfare," is naturally inspiring individual atrocities -- by no means limited to the Ku Klux Klan, but especially centralized in Police Departments everywhere. The latest atrocity has occurred in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, where a young Black worker, finishing a painting job and walking to a store for a snack, was accused of rape.

thrown into a car and, while in police custody, was murdered. Merely to call the murder of an innocent man "police brutality" does not show the dehumanization involved. But this time the mass resistance resulted in a "Coalition for Justice for Ernest Lacy," who died July 9. The 800 who walked through Milwaukee's inner city and demanded the cops' arrest and open trial increased by the thousands since Lacy's death. It is still continuing, and what is most exciting of all is that the leaders of that coalition, Howard Fuller and Michael McGee, did, indeed, cross continents as they hung over their house the Black Liberation flag of black, green and red as against the U.S. flag.

Between Reagan's genocidal war in El Salvador, union-busting in the U.S., racism everywhere -- from favoring the so-called "reverse discrimination" cases to trying to remove the Civil Rights Voting Act -- there <sup>would</sup> seem to be no doubt that all except the very privileged and bloated rich are on to his game and stand opposed. Unfortunately, that is not true. He has not only straight-armed Congress to pass his budget cuts, but even the masses who do see his union-busting have not fully caught the new stage involved in the PATCO strike. Here is a group of people who are certainly conservative, certainly middle-class, certainly well-paid. They surely must rankle people who can't conceive of earning \$30,000 a year. Yet there they are -- on strike, and militantly so. They foreshadow a new militant force you would hardly expect to feel alienated, but they do. They represent the computerized field. A reactionary Administration bent on creating "labor productivity" by firing ever more people and working those computers with supervisors, a few strike-breakers willing to cross picket lines, and more and more machines. These strikers, too, were wearing Solidarity shirts. Whether they will also turn to a philosophy of revolution is another question.

One thing is sure. The feeling of alienation under decadent capitalism is so total that even some of the "affluent" -- and they are <sup>among</sup> the ones who voted for Reagan! -- are looking for a different world. It may not yet be with the genuine forces of revolution -- labor in the production process, Black, WL, Youth -- but neither is it in outer space, computerized or otherwise.

Clearly, our return to the U.S. from the global journey continues to show the revolutionary dialogue between continents. The return to so-called "home" has made it all the more clear that this richest, most militarized nuclear Titan, out for domination over the whole world, is goading the other state-capitalist nuclear giant, Russia, out for the same goal of world domination, toward the ultimate confrontation. It is this absolute evil which must be confronted by a totally opposite absolute -- the freely associated forces of revolutionary humanity hungering for truly new human relations.

The fundamental, theoretic ground for this confrontation is found in the book, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. That is why I began this Perspectives Report in an "upside down" way, which would allow us to look simultaneously at revolts and philosophy as movement.

Take Part One: "Rosa Luxemburg as Theoretician, as Activist, as Internationalist," Luxemburg's name may not be famous to the American masses, but today's masses struggling against our militarized world will find an affinity with Luxemburg in her historic period of 1905 to 1919. The affinity is not only to her anti-militarist revolutionary activities, but to her concern with form of organization -- a preoccupation of our day which permeates the Women's Liberation Movement especially, whether we look at Sheila Rowbotham's narrowing of the WLM to an "organizing idea" or whether we look at Isabel de Carmo's apartidarismo in Portugal. It isn't only as a martyr that Luxemburg shines forth; it is as woman liberationist far beyond what she, herself, was conscious of. And that is how we will project this book.

Or take Part Two: "The Women's Liberation Movement as Revolutionary Force and Reason," and the way in which the Black dimension is presented there. In a single year, 1831, we see for the first time anywhere, as a unit, both Maria Stewart and Nat Turner. Or consider the way the 1848 Revolution and Margaret Fuller are combined. Or go all the way to Marx's last writing in 1880 where we discover both the Iroquois and women in general knowing how to "knock off the horns" of male chauvinists; and then see the



Igbo women's affinity to that kind of "women's war" as they were fighting British imperialism in 1929. We learn that it is not only what you are against, but what you are for that determines the struggles.

To complete the unfinished task for 1981, we turn to Part Three: "Karl Marx -- From a Critic of Hegel to Author of Capital and Theorist of Permanent Revolution." Every single chapter shows that thought-diver called Karl Marx so constantly recreating the revolutionary dialectic in his most original Historical Materialism that it could illuminate everything from the ancient Greek philosopher, Epicurus, who was his subject way back in 1841, to John Brown, who heralded the Civil War in the U.S.; and from the Paris Commune to the Ethnological Notebooks -- and, after illuminating all this, still leave us a trail for the 1980s.

The fact that the tasks for us this year have not been listed quantitatively does not signify a lack of concreteness. It means, rather, that the organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanist ideas, as they have been worked out in the book, will mean a great deal more than classes on it, and surely a great deal more than sales of the book when it is finally off the press. It means that the classes we will have will be preparing us for how to project Marxist-Humanism in every single activity we do. And that actual activity is all directed towards organizational growth.

In a word -- the myriad crises of this state-capitalist age must not be allowed to unloose the holocaust. But to stay the hands from that nuclear button, we have to know how to unfold, not just a banner, but an opening to totally new human relations, to a revolutionary dialogue across continents, not excluding "thought-diving," and with us taking responsibility for Marxist-Humanism.

V. HISTORIC MOMENTS FOR TRANSFORMING REALITY, Beginning with the Movement from Practice, Marked by Theoretic Turning Points (from Marxism and Freedom and Indignant Heart, through the Archives and Philosophy and Revolution, to Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution)

Because the state-capitalist/imperialist world at its most degenerate, racist, sexist apogee as it reaches for the nuclear button must be stopped and reality transformed, not only is it imperative to intensify all struggles, practical and theoretical, but we must also take a backward look at where a truly new, historic stage unfolded with the movement from practice in the mid-1950s. This is why it was so important to begin with Poland: it was in East Europe that this movement from practice that was itself a form of theory arose simultaneously in both the theoretical and practical arenas.

We are on the threshold of the jubilee year of Marx's death, and it is high time to draw a balance sheet of his heirs so that we can measure the needs of this age and, once and for all, meet the totality of the world crisis with the totality of Marx's philosophy of revolution in order to complete the transformation of reality. It is this which imparts a special urgency to the classes we are proposing in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. The urgency arises from the actual activities involved in our work this year -- whether that be in anti-draft, anti-nuclear, anti-militarist movements; or in the Women's Liberation Movement as it fights the so-called "Family Protection" Act; or with Labor struggling against unemployment and recession. Inseparable from all our activities we will be working out our very concrete Marxist-Humanist analyses on the current scene, as they are rooted in the book.

You will recall, for example, that the very first chapter, which takes up a turning point for Luxemburg, revealed also the turning point of the 1905 Revolution's extension into Iran -- and became the ground for our analysis of the Iranian Revolution as it unfolded through 1979-1980. The counter-revolution now has a

strangle-hold on it. But hold in mind 1907 and the London Congress where the revolutionaries still discussed 1905 -- and in that way made it a dress rehearsal for 1917. Lecture #1 in the proposed class schedule\* includes also Chapter II, which has a most unusual section that will surely be worked out and related to our activity with the Women's Liberation Movement. It is the section dealing with the personal break-up of Luxemburg and Jogiches, although they continued their political work together in all areas.

The second lecture, on Luxemburg's theory of the accumulation of capital as against Marx's, will be related to the 1974 economic crises and the critique of Mandel in Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis. There will be new additions to that material on the "restructured economy", from a possible essay on oil by Peter Mallory and other material from N&L. The point is that the classes are not divided from News & Letters itself -- if not as a monthly happening, surely as a perspective, say, four times a year.

The same holds true for the third lecture, because surely the National Question will never leave us until we've reached a socialist world, while the organizational question will at all times be related to and expand on what we mean by organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanist ideas. In that respect, the bilingual pamphlet takes priority over all else both practically and theoretically.

We will "skip" here the next three lectures in the series, because they are so obviously related to the youth and to the Women's Liberation Movement that if we do not take that as exactly the ground for our growth in these two dimensions we will, indeed, be very short on projecting Marxist-Humanism in the concrete book, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Liberation. We have already talked of the European youth; and the importance of the Japanese anti-nuclear movement is evident. Can we co-ordinate globally all the anti-nuclear movements?

The last two lectures are entirely different. By entirely different I mean that, whereas one form of analysis of the Ethnologi-

\*See schedule attached at end of this Report.



cal Notebooks (which were certainly the impulse for the book as a whole) was the very first draft chapter we published, and while it was the first projection of the new book around which we tried to get a dialogue with others in the Women's Liberation Movement, the truth is that it got some high praises, but no consequences. We must start all over again, trying to see to it that the WLM is not lowered to what Sheila Rowbotham thinks it must be -- "an organizing idea" -- instead of making it integral to a philosophy of revolution.

The Overview of the final lecture contains all the new, both as new moments in Marx and the "mere" new of the new chapter, the final Chapter XII, of the book. That is to say, we will be trying to catch that historic link to Marx's Marxism by seeing Marx's "new moments" in the 1880s as a trail to the 1980s. We will be elaborating our own history, whether we concentrate on the 25 years of News and Letters Committees or the 40 years <sup>since</sup> the development of the theory of State-Capitalism. From the very beginning that was never separated from the new forces of revolution of our age -- beginning with the Black dimension and extending to youth and to women's liberation while never departing from rank and file labor. This is the year -- on the threshold of the 100th anniversary of Marx's death -- which will give us both the new book and new editions of Marxism and Freedom and Philosophy and Revolution. That surely creates new openings for organizational growth.

\*                      \*

The Totally New Type of Classes on the New Book, ROSA LUXEMBURG, WOMEN'S  
LIBERATION AND MARX'S PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION for 1981-1982: A Series  
of 3 Sessions Suggested by the Author

What I mean by totally new type of classes is by no means just tied to the fact that the book will be at a single place. Nor is it limited to the fact that the person who will give the first lecture will also be the one to give the summation, even though that aspect of it is, of course, very much more important than the fact that the book is only at one place. What this means is that it cannot be a new person, and preferably it would be an NEB member. And it goes without saying that this person would have responsibility for the entire book -- that is to say, he or she must make notes of every single lecture given, not just to include the essence of the individual lectures in the summary, but rather, to refer back to what the author of the book had in mind for the totality of the book.

I. Luxemburg at Revolutionary Turning Points: Including her Personal Life

Readings: Chapter 1 ("Before and After the 1905 Revolution") and Chapter 2 ("The Break with Kautsky, 1910-1911"), and Appendix ("Luxemburg's Speech at the 1907 Congress").

Please note that, as against Chapter 1, when the two turning points referred to were 1899 and 1905, in the lecture, the 1899 debate against Reformism is to be very nearly disregarded. The concentration instead is to be on 1905 and 1910; the personal break with Jogiches is to be seen as very political and to be stressed.

II. Confrontation with Marx: Different Attitudes to Objectivity

Readings: Chapter 3 ("Marx's and Luxemburg's Theories of Accumulation of Capital"); Chapter 10, Section II ("Capital, Especially 1875 Edition").

It is important to note that, though the entire Chapter 3 is a confrontation with Marx, I very deliberately jumped to Section II of Chapter 10 so that Marx's greatest theoretic work would not be seen only in the context of a polemic, but seen as Marx wrote it and restructured it. It is of the essence that this specific lecture be given by someone who has had experience in discussions of Capital. Under no circumstances should the one responsible for this lecture be one who is giving only a first reaction to the content.

III. Confrontation with Lenin on the National Question: Three Differing Views on Organization

Readings: Chapter 4 ("From the 'National Question' to the Dialectics of Revolution"); Chapter 11, Section I ("Critique of the Gotha Program").

Here, again, the point is to get the views of Marx, not only as seen in a polemic, and one closer to our time, but as Marx developed it in his time.

IV. Anti-Militarism, Revolutions -- German and Russian -- and New Forces of Revolution

Readings: Chapter 5 ("War, Prison, Revolutions, 1914-1919"); Chapter 6 ("The Women's Liberation Movement -- An Overview by way of Introduction"); and Chapter 9, Sections I and II ("A Preliminary Note on the Dialectic:

in Marx of the Early 1840s; in Luxemburg, 1902; in Lenin, 1914", and "Prometheus Bound, 1841-1843.")

Getting acquainted with Marx before he broke fully with bourgeois society is essential for grasping the concept of dialectic as revolutionary in Hegel, and then tracing what it became in Marx.

V. Luxemburg as Revolutionary, as Feminist; and Today's Women's Liberation Movement

Readings: Introduction; Chapter 7 ("Luxemburg as Revolutionary, as Feminist"); Chapter 5 ("The Task That Remains to be Done"); Chapter 9, Section III ("Prometheus Unbound, 1844-1848")

Please read Chapter 9, Section III before Chapter 8, because it is there we can fully grasp why it is that we define Marxism as a whole new continent of thought and revolution.

VI. A Decade of Historic Transformation, Including That of Organization

Readings: Chapter 10, Section I ("Economics": Only Class Struggles, or 'Epochs of Social Revolution?', 1857-1858"); Chapter 11, Section II ("The Theory of Permanent Revolution: from 1843 to 1883"); Afterword to Chapter 11, Section II ("Trotsky's Theory of Permanent Revolution").

In this instance, it is important to include one thing outside of the book -- the new, special bi-lingual pamphlet -- on the question of historic transformations, because both the essay on Bolivia and on El Salvador relate to the whole movement from practice that previously had referred to the revolts in East Europe in 1953 and now refers to Latin America beginning in 1952.

VII. The Last Decade of Marx's Life: A View from the 1980s

Readings: Section III of what is now Chapter 11 ("The Unknown Ethnological Notebooks, the Unread Drafts of Letter to Zasulich, as well as Undigested 1882 Preface to Russian Edition of the Communist Manifesto"), which will now become the core of a new Chapter 12.

It is of the essence that the maturity of Marx's great philosophic discoveries in the last years of his life has opened many new points of departure, from the question of Permanent Revolution to the relationship of organization to spontaneity and to philosophy; from women's liberation to the question of what we now call the "Third World"; and from new anthropological studies that in fact become not just historic narrative but projection for future development.

VIII. An Overview of the Entire Work, its Urgency for Today's Myriad Crises

If I have completed Chapter 12 by the time you reach this last session of the series, that will serve as the ground for the overview of the whole. You can get a feeling of what that new chapter will be, however, from the Subheading I have chosen for the last section of that new chapter: "New Moments in Marx's 1880 Writings that become Ground for the 1980s."



SUMMATION BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA FOLLOWING DISCUSSION OF PERSPECTIVES

I. Philosophic Confrontation with Post-Marx Marxists on Ground of the Mid-1950s Movement from Practice

Since I started the Perspectives "upside down," I'm going to end this Summation upside down -- by which I mean that, although what we have been talking about all day and will continue to talk about until the end of this Plenum is "organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanism," I will discard that expression. The reason is this: unless you understand the historic link of continuity, there is no point to saying "take organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanism." So I want to challenge what you understand as Marx's Humanism and its relationship to Marxist Humanism.

I want you to know that in the beginning, when I said I was opposed to all post-Marx Marxists beginning with Engels, I didn't mean only the gap between Marx's Ethnological Notebooks and Engel's reductionism in Origin of the Family. I am challenging Engels also on nearly all of his interpretations of the dialectic, not because he betrayed; he didn't. He did the best he possibly could. That's the trouble. The best he could wasn't good enough.

You have to begin seeing what it means to be a great genius, a "thought-diver" like Marx. And if you don't grasp the uniqueness of that, loving Marx won't help. All you would then do, as Engels did, would be to popularize him. Anyone who thinks he understands when it is made bite-size doesn't understand what it means to appreciate and work out and recreate the dialectic at every single stage. Sure, six people will get up who will understand you and not understand Marx -- and praise you as the "projector." That doesn't mean Engels had any right to think he was really projecting Marx's whole continent of thought -- Marx's Historical Materialism, Marx's Humanism, Marx's "economics," much less his philosophy.

How many people here think there is nothing greater than Mehring's biography of Marx? It stinks. And not only because he was a Lassalleian, which was bad enough, but because, as an intellectual, he thought he could do better in projecting what Marx "really meant".

Do you realize that the German Social-Democracy didn't even ask Engels -- he was still alive, and much superior to them, including Mehring who was the one writing the History -- for his views of the history of socialist ideas and organizations, a history he had lived through with Marx and with all tendencies who truly made history. Ryazanov, who was known as the greatest Marx scholar, an archivist and analyst of Marxism, had discovered a great store of writings by Marx which had never been published. He introduced them in a scholarly and historic fashion, and that's how we came to know the young Marx. That didn't hold true for the last writings of Marx, which, though he hadn't deciphered nor had a chance to read, he had the gall to characterize as "inexcusable pedantry". This characterization was directed mainly to what we now know as the Ethnological Notebooks. As all the rest of the post-Marx Marxists, he was happy enough with Engels' Origin of the Family, which was supposed to have summarized Marx's 98 pages of notes on Morgan's Ancient Society.

This attitude to Marx's archives, even among the best of the "Marx scholars", who rush to publish their own views instead of publishing Marx's unpublished works, is one of the major reasons it has taken us 100 years to find out all that Marx had worked out. Worse yet, we have been left with the impression that Marx was so ill that he did nothing in the last years of his life. The trip to Algiers at the end of his life was described as if it were only a matter of his health, whereas in fact he studied Africa there and "fell in love" with the Arabs. He had written to his daughters, as we have seen, that, nevertheless, they would all go to the Devil if they didn't have a revolution.

Catching the historic link to Marx is not only a matter of finally seeing all his writings, but of grasping at one and the same time that something had to happen both in the movement from practice and in the movement from theory. I want to depart for a moment from Marx's day to our age, specifically the years 1950 to 1953. It was after the General Strike of the miners in 1949-50 that I felt we had reached a new stage both in Marxism and in proletarian consciousness. I therefor insisted that a worker be present when I gave my next report on what we then called "Marxism and State-Capitalism" and what

became Marxism and Freedom. (Until then, the discussion had been limited to myself, CLR James and Grace Lee.) Clearly, something was stirring in the world. I felt it very strongly after the death of Stalin, which had lifted a heavy incubus from my brain. Before the actual outbreak of the June 17, 1953 revolt in East Germany -- the first ever from under totalitarianism -- I turned to the study of the Absolute Idea, splitting that category into two, i.e. saying that there was not only a unity of theory and practice, but that there was a movement from practice, and not only one from theory.

I no sooner said this than I went to check what Marx had written on Hegel's Philosophy of Mind. I found that where I began with paragraph #385, Marx had left off precisely at paragraph #384 -- saying he would return. But he never got to finish.

What makes somebody, a century after the event, without knowing where Marx had left off, start focusing on the very next paragraph? I don't know. I do know that there are certain creative moments in history when the objective movement and the subjective movement so coincide that the self-determination of ideas and the self-determination of masses readying for revolt explode. Something is in the air, and you catch it. That is, you catch it if you have a clear head, and if you have good ears to hear what is upsurging from below. All this happened May 12 and May 20, six weeks before the actual revolution on June 17 in East Berlin.

That is something very different from just being the first one to translate Marx's Humanist Essays and Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, and publish them as the basis for what we as Marxist-Humanists were doing on the American roots of Marxism, beginning with the Abolitionists and climaxing in the 1949-50 General Strike of the miners. That is to say, you translate because you have already been on the road to working out all these relations in your own country and your own time. Under those circumstances you cannot possibly look at masses in motion and not feel stirred to the marrow of your bones. That is what happened on June 17, 1953, as the German workers destroyed the statue of Stalin and raised the slogan: "Bread and Freedom!" That is what led to the transformation of "Marxism and State-Capitalism", which became Marxism and Freedom by 1957. By then we had become not just a State-Capitalist Tendency, but a Marxist-Humanist group, News and Letters Committees.



II. From Absolute Idea as Movement from Practice as well as from Theory, to the Absolute Idea as New Beginning (1968-1973)

It was different by 1973 and Philosophy and Revolution. Why was it different? Because this time it did not come only from the fact that East Europe had arisen against Russian totalitarianism (and there had been a revolt from within the slave labor camps of Vorkuta, as well). This time it came from the revolts against Western imperialism as well. This time it was the youth the world over, as well as the Black revolution. Unfortunately, all the youth <sup>thought</sup> was needed was more and more activities, dismissing theoretical debates as "factional struggles" and considering that theory was so easy it could be picked up "en route." These were not just "factional struggles" but historic-philosophic tendencies in a very new form, that at one and the same time caught the historic link to Marx and had an original contribution to record. That theory was needed, that there could be no revolution without a philosophy of revolution, was shown by the fact that De Gaulle, without firing a single shot, succeeded in aborting the great 1968 revolt in France. Something had to be done. The youth in revolt had not betrayed; they thought they were very original in rejecting "factional struggles" and insisting, instead, on more and more activity. But they didn't achieve what they were after. So this time we had to find the link from theory, and not only from practice.

Before (1957), we stressed the movement from practice; the split in the Absolute Idea. Now (1973) we were saying Absolute Idea as new beginning, as a totality which is just a beginning for a movement forward. Philosophy and Revolution, then, with its first chapter, "Why Hegel? Why Now?", dug into Hegel as Hegel, as well as into Marx who recreated that dialectic, and as Lenin rediscovered it in 1914, at the outbreak of World War I. All this was measured against the rise/both a whole new Third World and a whole new generation of revolutionaries.

III. 1981: Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution

The point this time is that <sup>in</sup> the work on Rosa Luxemburg, which is also on Women's Liberation, which is also on Marx's work as a totality, which is also on Lenin, and which is also on Trotsky -- I not only take up revolutionaries, but great revolutionaries who were also theoreticians. Nobody was greater than Lenin in Russia in 1917, or greater than Luxemburg both in 1905 and 1919; how could they possibly be inadequate for our day? The point nevertheless is that before we spoke about the theoretic void left by Lenin's death, which had never been filled; now we are speaking about the fact that even Lenin, who had made the great philosophic breakthrough had remained ambivalent. He had philosophically reorganized himself in relationship to Materialism and Idealism, on the nature of the revolution that would not stop at the democratic stage but go all the way to the proletarian and elemental and international revolution. He also was for self-determination of nations as the actual bacillus for proletarian revolution. But, but, but.... he did stop short of reorganizing himself on the Party, though he had introduced many modifications through 1905 and 1917. He was especially great when he threatened to resign from the leadership and "go to the sailors", if the Party did not put the question of the conquest of power on the agenda. And he didn't stop criticizing the new bureaucracy. But when it came to breaking with the Party then, far from "going to the sailors," he was thinking that the Bolshevik layer was so thin that it was them he must trust fully. We certainly could not accept that. We, who have suffered 30 years of Stalinism, the transformation of the workers' state into its total opposite, a state-capitalist society, and have witnessed new revolts from below, will not accept any vanguardism-to-lead; they have done nothing but mislead. In a word, if Lenin had accomplished as great a reorganization of himself on the Party Question as he had done on the Self-Determination of Nations, we might have had some ground for today, but we don't. And when it comes to the Woman Question, I don't believe he ever thought of reorganizing himself. There we have to start totally anew.

As for Trotsky, it is not only that question of vanguard party to lead on which he accepts Lenin's 1903 position, it is also that his theory of permanent revolution, which sounds as though it is Marx's, is not -- is not. Let's stop here a minute. First of all, we must remember that Trotsky did not name his analysis of 1905 as a theory of permanent revolution. It was a Menshevik who so named it, and Trotsky was glad to accept the name, without any reference to Marx's theory whatsoever. He was great, and way ahead of his time, in pointing out that the revolution would not stop at its democratic-bourgeois stage; that once unleashed the proletariat would go all the way. On the other hand, he did not recognize the peasantry as a revolutionary force, nor pay attention to the fact that they were the overwhelming majority in Russia. On that one Lenin was right and Trotsky was wrong -- that is to say, Lenin was right that you cannot consider that a revolution can be successful when it disregards 90 percent of its population. Lenin agreed that the proletariat must be a "leader" but insisted it had to be a "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry." Otherwise, Lenin maintained, it meant "skipping" stages of revolution, playing down its forces. Marx, it is true, spoke of "rural idiocy", but he never forgot that "a second edition of the Peasants' War" was needed to have the proletarian revolution succeed.

Allow me to divert back to Marx's time. Marx first used the expression "permanent revolution" back in 1843 in an Essay on the Jewish Question, that is on the civil rights of a minority, insisting that civil rights was insufficient and that there had to be totally new human relations. The next time he spoke of it was during an actual revolution, 1848. Once that was defeated, Marx, instead of bowing to the defeat, insisted on the need for a "revolution in permanence." His point was that, first, one must remember the highest point achieved by the revolution: it was proletarian independence: "Never again must we go with the bourgeoisie." Secondly, the revolution, to be successful, must have the peasantry with it. Thirdly, indeed above all, Marx was always looking for ever-new live forces to create a new dialectic, not just philosophically, but a new dialectic of revolution. In a word, when he used



the expression, "revolution in permanence", in the Address to the Communist League in 1850, he was talking about continuous revolution in transition to a class-less society.

Two decades later, Marx continued to work out his theory of revolution in permanence, this time in the form of actually predicting the revolution coming first in a backward country, rather than a technologically advanced country. In that letter to Zasulich, praising primitive communism in Morgan's Ancient Society, he neither failed to mention that Morgan's report was government-sponsored, nor stopped at the primitive stage. It is true that the Iroquois women had more power than women under capitalism, and collective property of the tribes could lead to a higher stage. But Marx wasn't recording just facts; he was interested in what the facts signified. Marx had lived through the Paris Commune and a decade later there was nothing on the horizon of that nature, and he was questioning whether a new dialectic of revolution could start within Russia and the Peasant Communes that still existed there. So non-determinist was he, and so open to all new beginnings, that he now held that his "Historical Tendency of the Accumulation of Capital" was not to be made into a universal; that it was a generalization of what had happened in Western Europe but that Russia had the best chance in the world to avoid the monstrosity of Western capitalism.

He was not predicting as a prophet. He was analyzing dialectically the law of motion of capitalist society to its collapse, the live forces of revolution who were recreating the dialectic of revolution in new circumstances. And precisely because his vision was of a new form of society, a class-less society, he didn't stop at any historic stage as the ultimate.

I began by saying that unless Marxist-Humanists fully grasped the historic continuity to Marx's Humanism and worked out the trail to the 1980s on the basis of those new moments in Marx's last decade, the expression, "taking organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanism", would have no meaning. In a word, my "rejection" of that expression meant that the prerequisite for it was, at one and the same time, catching the historic continuity as well as working it out for our age. What I was stressing in Chapter XII of the book was the new <sup>openings</sup> in what Melville had called "abrupt inter-merging" and what we called the "new moments" in Marx's last decade. Be it in the Ethnological Notebooks, both as they concerned Asiatic mode of production and the role of women among the Iroquois and the Irish, and for that matter, what Marx had written of the Paris Commune, or the projection of a revolution in Russia ahead of one in the West. Those new openings are "door openers" to organizational growth, both because the book is a creation whose time has come, and because it illuminates the myriad crises of today. It is here that we get the wherewithal for taking responsibility for Marxist-Humanism, that is to say, it sets the ground for our historic right to be.

The imperative need to fill the philosophic void in post-Marx Marxism is most clearly seen in Leon Trotsky's <sup>reducing</sup> the ground for the Fourth International to a matter of leadership, or, as he put it: "The crisis of the world is the crisis of leadership," as if substitution of good leaders, like Trotsky, instead of bad leaders, like Stalin, would change the course of the world. Instead, as we know, the Fourth International became the still-birth it is. Had he considered, instead, that it was his historic responsibility to fill the philosophic void, he might have found the trail to lead us back to Marx and forward to the transformation of society.

The philosophic concept of leadership became correctly, with us, the projection of Marx's Humanism. That is to say, philosophy of revolution rather than the vanguardist party. It becomes all the more imperative that we project all the new moments in Marx that we did discover, and that is not limited to the new in organizational form -- committee-form against the "party-to-lead" -- that didn't separate theory from practice.

We have all too often stopped at the committee-form of organization rather than the inseparability of that from philosophy. And it is the philosophy that is new, unique, our special historic contribution that enabled us to find historic continuity, the link to Marx's Humanism. It is this which is totally new, not the committee-form of organization, as crucial as that is.

As I put it at the end of the new book: "What is needed is a new unifying principle, on Marx's ground of humanism, that truly alters both human thought and human experience. Marx's Ethnological Notebooks are a historic happening that proves in this jubilee year that Marx's legacy is no mere heirloom, but a live body of ideas and perspectives that is in need of concretization. Every moment of Marx's development as well as the totality of his works spell out the need for 'revolution in permanence.' This is the absolute challenge to our age."