

YOUTH DISCUSSION

CONTENTS

1. A 1980s View of Youth as a Revolutionary Category. Peter, L.A.
2. Report on Youth to the Resident Editorial Board. Diane, Chicago
3. Youth and the Marxist-Humanist Body of Ideas. Gary, Los Angeles
4. Has a New Generation of Revolutionaries Been Born? A Note from the Archives. Erica, Chicago
5. On Youth Reaching for the Future. Laurie, Detroit
6. A Note from Roy. Roy, Bay Area
7. A Critical Evaluation of the Youth Pages of News & Letters 1981-85, and a Look Ahead to the Coming Year. Sheila, Chicago

Internationalist Marxist-Humanist Youth Committees

59 East Van Buren, Room 707

Chicago, IL 60605

August 1985

50¢
10306

A 1980's VIEW OF YOUTH AS A REVOLUTIONARY CATEGORY

by Peter, L.A.

One of the things that makes the publication of Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future so exciting, is that it challenges Marxist-Humanists to connect the dialectics of thought and of revolution to each force of liberation. Though that opens many new doors for us this year, the one task I wish to concentrate upon here is concretizing Youth as a revolutionary category.

What makes this task so crucial, is that when Youth move as masses in motion towards revolution, their desire for freedom, their "subjectivity", displays a passion for fully transforming the objectively real. It signifies that in order to meet the challenges posed by objective reality, we must root ourselves in the Subject of revolution and its Reason, Marxist-Humanism. In other words, concretizing Youth as a revolutionary category compels us to connect our body of ideas to youth through a critical confrontation with the objective situation.

In this essay, I want to see how WL&DOR gives us direction for concretizing Youth as a revolutionary category, by looking at the question posed in the June issue of News & Letters--'Has a New Generation of Revolutionaries Been Born?'

I. How Can Meeting the Objective Situation with Projection of the Dialectics of Revolution Help us Concretize Youth as a Revolutionary Category?

Though 1985 may not seem the most propitious moment for concretizing Youth as a revolutionary category, the depth of today's crises as well as ongoing freedom ferment from below demands we plunge deeply into that effort. The June issue of News & Letters brought that concept to our attention in jamming together activity reports from the divestiture movement with Raya's letter on the challenge of Youth to become thought divers, all under the heading "Has a New Generation of Revolutionaries Been Born?". As exciting as some of the recent demonstrations were, however, we could hardly concretize Youth as a revolutionary category were we to think they conclusively prove the birth of a new generation of revolutionaries. For the the divestiture movement has yet to issue the kind of massive outpouring and release of revolutionary energy so characteristic of new stages of youth revolt--not to mention the fact that for new stages of revolt to become new beginnings, new beginnings in thought are also needed. Until we can discern youth revolt as masses in motion showing themselves not alone as force but as

Youth as Revolutionary Category, page 2

Reason of revolution, we cannot jump to conclusions about the birth of a new generation of revolutionaries. I cite this to show that were we to confront the objective situation without the unique Marxist-Humanist concept of Youth, we could miss what the objective situation is telling us and thereby skip over the specific contributions demanded from Marxist-Humanists.

Facing reality with the "six moments" of the dialectics of revolution, on the other hand, can not only help us "face" reality, but transform it. That begins by searching for those youth whose hunger for freedom displays what is unique about the post-world war II world--that masses of people desire a total uprooting, beginning with uprooting the division of mental and manual labor. Just as Raya begins the Introduction/Overview to WL&DOR by situating women's liberation in the context of the age's movement from practice that is itself a form of theory, so our job is to find the voices, the visions of youth who in searching for a total uprooting, characterize what is new about our era. It is only then that we have the ground for answering the question, 'has a new generation of revolutionaries been born?'

A crucial determination in that effort is the Black dimension, not only because "in general" Black Masses are Vanguard, but because Reagan's retrogression affects Black youth most of all, and in response has sparked some new questioning of this society. In Los Angeles we recently got a sense of that when Karl, Gene and myself attended a meeting with a group of Black high school youth trying to organize a group against racism in education. After reading Ida Fuller's column from the June issue, one youth asked, "if a peace group can practice racism, it shows you need a different view. How do you get a view that has totality in it?". Another youth who recently broke away from SCLC's attempt to corral the youth into their legislative agenda said "the trouble with all these organizations is that they want to use youth for their programs. They don't care what we think." Whether we can establish a relation with them remains to be seen, but there is no doubt that very much depends on having them see News & Letters Committees as the place where their questioning can most fully flower.

One indication of the pathway to achieve that is contained in Raya's response to the 1955-6 Montgomery Bus Boycott, when she singled out its highpoint as "its own working existence", comparing the revolt to the Paris Commune as Marx analyzed it. Jamming together the new coming from below with a "new moment" of Marx concrete for the objective situation brought out the Reason of that generation of revolutionaries. Such pinpointing that elicits the

Reason of Youth unseparated from re-creating Marx's Humanism as Marxist-Humanism is important in our work today as well. I believe this is related to how the first chapter in Part I of WL&DOR consists of a 1969 essay that first presented the category "Women as Reason" and that first introduced the difference between Marx and Engels on primitive communism. The Ethnological Notebooks weren't even out yet, but Raya's attentiveness to the Grundrisse and the objective situation enabled her to project the distinctiveness of Marx's Marxism in a way that elicited the depth of women's liberations challenge to all existing society. What "new moments" of Marx can we now single out to illuminate the Reason of Black youth?

One youth at the meeting I just mentioned made this question most concrete when he asked us what we thought about Hegel, since someone told him Hegel had less-than-complimentary things to say about Africa. We responded that whatever Hegel said about Africa, that wasn't what Marx took from him, but rather his dialectical method, which enabled Marx to pinpoint the Humanism of subjects of revolution, Black included, as the alternative to both capitalism and vulgar communism. Whatever the merits of that response, I can't say they rushed at us with more questions on Marxist-Humanism, though they are anxious for a dialogue, which I am confident Gene's column in this issue of N&L will help begin.

What does concern me, is that perhaps we could have elicited even more affinity from them, had we been more concrete in our response, i.e., if we said that Marx's concretization of dialectics gave him such deep sensitivity to the Black struggle, that in his first decade he attacked how capitalist education dehumanizes even language in confusing the word Black with that of slave, and how in his last decade he hit out against the "blockhead Englishmen" for thinking they were smarter than the Aborigines. That kind of response would have given us the chance to point to the new book where it is more fully developed (p. 269) and say that Marxist-Humanism's re-creation of dialectics has given us the sensitivity to spell out Black Masses as Vanguard of American history.

I'm not raising this in order to find some formula for presenting method, nor to see how we could start a study group. Rather, it is to show that we need to present "new moments" in Marx in such a way that it articulates the feelings of Black youth and conveys the importance of Marxist-Humanism at one and the same time. Doing that, has absolute method become pathway to concretizing the goal, Marxist-Humanism. Isn't this why the Call says "Marx's new continent of thought needs a great deal of further development and discussion"?

There is no doubt that youth show themselves as force and as Reason most fully when they move as masses in motion in actual revolution, which is why searching for the youth dimension in ongoing revolutions is key, whether it be South Africa or the Philippines--or South Korea. This search for youth's participation in actual revolution is what we call genuine internationalism. It is precisely here that projection of the philosophic distinctiveness of Marxist-Humanism becomes most concrete, for as history shows, when revolutions fail to connect with what our age hungers for in the Hegelian-Marxian dialectic, it is all too easy for youth to fall into the traps set by the various state powers out "to lead".

The failure of the near-revolutions of 1968 to make it to actual revolution no doubt come to mind here, but precisely because I think we do understand that negative "proof" of what happens when philosophy and revolution fail to meet, I instead what to look at a moment when ground was laid for their joining--the period of the 1950's.

When you look through the Archives, you see Raya engaged in a search for youth as revolutionary as early as the 1940's, whether in Africa in her discussions with the Camerounian in 1947, or France, or Trieste, where after the war the children took to the streets. As we know from The Miner's General Strike of 1949-50 and the Birth of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S., these and other freedom struggles helped a Promethean vision reach into Hegel's Absolutes to find new beginnings for our age. That there is the closest relation between the 1953 breakthrough on the Absolute Idea and Youth as revolutionary was touched upon in the Dec. 30 thesis on Responsibility for Marxist-Humanism in the Historic Mirror when Raya took up youth and how she began her commentary on Hegel's Philosophy of Mind where Marx left his off in the very same paragraph. That philosophic breakthrough of 1953 saw in the Absolute Idea no abstraction, but "the absolutely universal" which "divides itself" into Mind (the movement from theory) and Nature (the movement from practice). It enabled theoreticians to see that the movements from practice "implicitly contain the Idea" (as Hegel put it), i.e., the unity of theory/practice, mental/manual, objective/subjective. The movements from practice could then be seen as forms of theory. This philosophic breakthrough thus enabled Youth to be singled out as a revolutionary category in our 1958 Constitution. This gave us eyes to see a new generation of revolutionaries even in the so-called "beat generation", perhaps best summed up by the 16 year-old in Workers Battle Automation who wrote, "I don't want to wait until I am 21 until I become a human being".

I cite this history not because the point is to present the 1953 breakthrough on the Absolute Idea every time we talk to some youth, but rather to show that our task isn't to present "the need" for philosophy "in general" as much as to pinpoint what, philosophically, needs articulation given the objective/subjective situation of youth at any given moment. Perhaps this can become more concrete by looking at the 1964-5 Free Speech Movement. That great revolt consisted of much activity and a passion for ideas, reflected in the desire of the students to have Raya speak to them on the theory of alienation. But it wasn't as if Mario Savio wanted to hear about alienation in order to see how grasping the difference of Marx from Hegel on the question gives us direction for transcending the historic barrier, as Jim put it in his essay in Bulletin no.1. Nevertheless, far from leaving her speech to the subject of "alienation", Raya began it stating "Hegel's concept of the Absolute and the international struggles for freedom are not as far apart as would appear on the surface", develops throughout it Marx's relation to Hegel's concept of absolute negativity, and ends it stating that youth face the task of "abolishing the division between philosophy and reality and giving ear to the urgency of realizing philosophy, i.e., making freedom a reality" (See The Free Speech Movement and the Negro Revolution for the actual speech). Whether or not the youth of that generation were ready for such a presentation, the point is that whatever invitation we get, whether for a speech or a dialogue or to join in activity, our task is to concretely present the philosophic distinctiveness of Marxist-Humanism.

Though forging such a new relation of theory to practice becomes a life and death question at the moment of revolution, every movement we work in now is terrain for preparing us for that task. But where we met that test best this year wasn't where there was any movement, but where there is the least of one-- Salt Lake City. That local has truly succeeded in involving a number of youth in its activities because it leaped at the chance to project our body of ideas directly to those on our periphery. As I discovered during my trip there this Spring, that isn't such a simple question: it is a matter of presenting the trilogy of revolution to a particular audience in say, 15 minutes, so that the youth see Marxist-Humanism as the needed mediation in bringing Marx's Humanism alive for today's world. I'm not arguing that such projection will convince everyone: as we saw in Salt Lake City, it actually had some of the not-so-friendly enemies move away from us. Rather, it is that even when some reject us, we make

sure we keep to our ground. One thing we can do to meet this test daily is to get more of a sense of what youth think of the various writings on world events and philosophy which appears in News & Letters every month.

It is keeping to that kind of ground, whether in a mass activity, a support committee, or an actual revolution, that has proven so difficult in the history of youth revolt, and which places a special urgency upon building our committees. That it isn't a question of our subjective concern is shown in the whole development of youth's search for an alternative form of organization. I'm sure none need to be reminded of how the desire for a new organizational form rooted in de-centralization that was so important to the Free Speech Movement and the whole New Left, didn't prove sufficient by the time the activism of the 1960's ended, to prevent plenty of the same youth from returning to the "old" organizational forms of the party-to-lead. Or closer to our day, we need to ask some biting questions about where the anti-nuclear movement has gone, for it did desire non-elitist forms of organization, and yet today the German Greens are falling into the kind of parliamentary squabbling so characteristic of the "old" German Social Democracy. This applies even to those youth who did desire a relation to revolutionary Marxism and actually proletarianized themselves in the 1970's to be with the workers at the point of production: why then have so many of these formerS'ers ended up tail-ending (at best) the union bureaucracy? As the pamphlet on the Miner's Strike and Birth of Marxist-Humanism showed, simply posing "democracy" vs. "bureaucracy" fails to provide "a new foundation for the next generation of revolutionaries" (p. 42).

If our activity and projection doesn't have the re-creation of Marx's Humanism as Marxist-Humanism in it, no "form" of organization will save us. That is why I believe the phrase "organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanist ideas" must not be reduced to a cliché, but demands on our part that we take the youth we meet on a journey through the "new moments" of Marx as developed in Section I of Part IV of WL&DOR and through the kind of engaged dialogue with Marxist-Humanism that is present in Section II of Part IV. Isn't this the reason each one of Raya's letters to the Youth (1982, 1983, 1984) focused on the 1841 "new moment" of Marx? I don't think her raising the Marx of 1841 was restricted to asking us to engage in a one-to-one discussion on 1841, though that is key. Rather, I believe it was to tell us that projecting Marxist-Humanism in the face of objective reality is the pathway we need to take to have our ideas find a point of affinity with youth. It was for this reason that I wanted to see how facing the question 'has a new generation of revolutionaries been born' armed with the "six moments" of the dialectics of revolution could give us some direction in breaking our ideas down for youth.

II. How Can Our Efforts to Concretize Youth as a Revolutionary Category be Different This Year Now that the Dialectics of Revolution has been Singled Out as a Category?

That the need to connect the dialectics of revolution to youth is not "our" concern alone, was spelled out in the events in Grenada, where counter-revolution issued from the revolution once the philosophy underlying the revolution failed to govern its direction. That spells out not so much "their" problem as our concern--to practice philosophy daily. But because I do not want to let that phrase be taken for granted, I would now like to look back at some earlier moments in my effort to work out Youth as revolutionary category, not for the sake of remembrance of things past, but in order to see how having the dialectics of revolution spelled out as a category can open new doors for us this year.

What first drew me to the Movement, was that as a child and youth growing up in the midst of the 1960's, I felt it was concretely possible to transform all of life to allow the latent potential of each individual to flower, whether in uprooting racism, the school system, work, the family, sexism, the war, etc. So in 1972, when I was 16, I joined up with the Trotskyists, hoping to get a chance to work in an organization that would help that perspective of social transformation come alive. I wasn't in very long when I began to express some "confusions", as they put it: first, I couldn't understand why they kept talking about the 1970's as a "deepening radicalization" that will "build the party to lead", as if all that was needed to "bring back the great 1960's" was building the SWP! Second, like most of the youth, I felt stifled by the lack of any serious discussion of ideas, especially, the question of why so many revolutions go sour. I had to go off on my own to explore some of those questions--in fact, I recall having plenty of fights on the way to a Convention in 1973 because I was reading Fromm's Socialist Humanism. At any rate, there is no doubt that during the early 1970's many youth were in search of ideas to express their longings for freedom, and it was seeing that in News & Letters that had me join in 1975.

But it isn't as if the development of ideas ends once one becomes a Marxist-Humanist: that is when you first begin to work out the challenge of projecting ideas so that others see them as of much importance for their lives as I did for mine. The period in which I joined was a

was a very exciting one, for it was shortly after the publication of Philosophy and Revolution. We were discussing many ideas, one of them that the struggles for freedom place us on the threshold of the Absolute Idea, demanding that we work out a new relation of theory to practice by having P&R be our organization builder: otherwise, the freedom struggles would remain unfinished, on the threshold. Or as the 1974-5 Perspectives Thesis put it, though the post-world II period marked a new era, no new world could arise until theory and practice joined.

This was the challenge Jim and I faced as we became co-youth columnists in the late 1970's. I believe there is much in this period that illuminates the questions we face today, since Jim and I were both searching for new beginnings in youth revolt, particularly in writing about the birth of the anti-nuclear and divestiture movements. But in looking back over my columns, it is surprising how rarely projection of ideas related to the protests or the actual objective situation. It's as if there was a certain "self-consciousness" that ideas might not be as "concrete" a ground for projection as some other standpoint.

During the same period the 1977-78 Perspectives Thesis devoted considerable attention to the difference between a new stage of revolt and a new beginning: and the 1979-80 Perspectives Thesis (written after the emergence of such promising beginnings as actual revolution in Iran, Nicaragua, Grenada) asked in its title page, "can we aid the new beginnings develop instead of abort?". Though the youth were very active in this period, from anti-nuclear to solidarity with the Iranian revolution to labor, Black and women's liberation outreach, we have to ask whether we issued the kind of total critique in these activities that would prepare others as well as ourselves for such shocking developments as the transformation of the Iranian revolution into outright counter-revolution.

A new stage in our organizational-philosophic development opened with the 1980's, since the publication of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution issued a challenge to all post-Marx Marxists. There are many aspects of that category, but it was well summed up on p. 165: "The relationship of concrete to universal always remains, with Engels, in two totally separate compartments." RLWLMPR challenged us to take issue with everything standing in the way of re-creating Marx's Humanism for today's realities, which included a challenge to ourselves to project the trilogy of revolution unseparated from the objective situation.

The 1981-2 Perspectives Thesis spelled this out as "organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanist ideas." By no accident, this thesis was also the first time we heard the expression, 'Marx's new moments as Trail to the 1980's' (chapter 12 of RLWLMPR was written on the eve of the Convention). The discovery of "new moments" in Marx not only set the record straight on Marx, but also enabled us to come to grips with taking organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanist ideas, for it was clear that forging a "trail" from Marx's New Humanism to today could only be done by Marxist-Humanism.

During this period I was now active in Los Angeles, especially at Cal State L.A. In the past five years we have had a truly creative presence at that campus: study groups on every one of the trilogy of revolution; lectures on world events ranging from Africa to Lebanon, Iran to Nicaragua, East Europe to the Black Dimension in the U.S.; and a number of class series on our body of ideas. This work reached a climax this year when we held a three-week class series on the Archives, the first time we had attempted such a thing on a college campus. We were also asked to speak at a number of rallies held at the school, the latest one on South Africa.

And yet despite this exciting experience at projection, we have to ask why didn't we create a cadre of young Marxist-Humanists from this work, though we did win over several students to our ideas. And why didn't we make a breakthrough on the Latino dimension, at a school where Chicano and Latin American Studies is so predominate? I'm not denying that at least part of the reason is that many of the more "activist" youth have fallen back towards defending the "lesser evil" in the face of U.S. imperialism's sabre rattling in Latin America, but it still doesn't answer the question, did our projection or follow-through somehow not convince youth that these ideas are not alone "great ideas" but the absolutely imperative element needed to avoid getting sucked into the cauldron of the superpowers? I believe Lenin's critique speaks to this, when he wrote "human concepts are subjective in their separateness, but objective as a whole, in the process, in the sum-total, in the tendency, in the source."

I raise these questions not to dwell on the past, but rather to show that now that the dialectics of revolution has been singled out as a category in this year of "Not by Practice Alone" new ground exists for concretizing youth as a revolutionary category as against earlier periods. There is no

doubt that throughout the period I have reviewed here, the dialectics of revolution, the integrality of subjective/objective, philosophy/reality, concrete/Universal, was the principle creating all our philosophic-organizational development. There is also no doubt that we didn't always follow Raya in concretizing Marxist-Humanism along the pathway in which it was created. That is why this year's corpus of new material--the first part of the 30 Year History of News & Letters (by no accident entitled The concrete-Universal) the new pamphlet Dialectics of Revolution, the March 21 Archives Lecture, WL&DOR, and much more--becomes the ground of serious re-organization. For all of our work over the past year has driven home the point that Marxist-Humanism is the philosophy that has alone met Marx's challenge to unite philosophy and reality. That is what "Not by Practice Alone" means, the projection of that.

To put it another way, singling out the dialectics of revolution as a category makes it explicit that you cannot meet the challenge of the objective reality of this age unless you are rooted in the Subjects of revolution and their Reason, Marxist-Humanism. It is not a question of jamming Marxist-Humanism up with the objective situation simply for the sake of its analysis--it is that without connecting Marxist-Humanism to the Subject through a critical confrontation with Objectivity there is no way for the masses to live the absolute opposite to this state-capitalist age.

Just think of three recent writings we have to help us meet this task:

1) The Political-Philosophic Notes on Bitburg which became not alone a concrete analysis of a current event, but also a view of the 30 Year Movement from Practice and its antecedents as far back as the Spanish Revolution as well as of the Marxist-Humanist relation to those events, because history shows you cannot pose a positive alternative to state-capitalism without both the movements from practice and from theory. 2) The 30 Year History, which concretely shows the truth of that generalization in relation to the Milan Conference and coming of De Gaulle to power in 1958, and the failure of the near-revolutions of 1968 to make it to full revolution; 3) The 1985-6 Draft Perspectives which, as Olga put it in one of the REB discussions, moves directly from the Objective situation to Our Tasks without the usual "part II".

Everything our organization has produced in this period addresses the challenge of projecting philosophy unseparated from objectivity-subjectivity, i.e., the Idea--Marxist-Humanism. This can open new doors for Youth most of all.

III. How Can Selling the New Book as Founders Help us Concretize Youth as a Revolutionary Category this Year?

What makes me so confident that today's Marxist-Humanist Youth can rise to the challenge of this stage of Marxist-Humanism is a comment Gary made at a local meeting in Los Angeles a few weeks ago. He said, "the formulation of selling the new book as founders is the most difficult but also the most challenging phrase I have heard since I have been in the organization. It looks to me like this is what we'll have to dig into."

That comment showed recognition that the challenge we face is to present the Marxist-Humanist body of ideas to others in our relation with them this year. Selling the new book as "founders" isn't a quantitative question of "making believe" you as a youth were there from the beginning, nor is it a question of just presenting lists of what we have done. After all, even totality isn't it unless it is as new beginning. The new book shows us that in ending Part IV, not with Section I, "Reality and Philosophy", but instead with Section II, "Facing the Challenge of the Myriad Global Crises". Even the unity of philosophy and reality isn't it unless it is as new beginning too. And that is just the point to selling the new book as founders. It is a question of finding ever-more creative ways to present these body of ideas to others in strict relation to the objective situation and the questions posed by the youth we are working with. There are surely many avenues we can discuss for doing this in the year ahead, but I did want to mention one here--the new classes being proposed on Perspectives Theses and News & Letters. I'm wondering what new ground we can establish at CSULA this year, where Gary will now be working, if we had some meetings on the Archives again, this time, focusing on particular world events that students are discussing there. I am sure there are many more ideas that you have. Working them out, especially in terms of presenting them on the Youth page, is how selling the new book as founders will have us become "bearers" of the dialectics of revolution.

As I began by saying, what makes concretizing Youth as a revolutionary category so exciting, is that when youth move as masses in motion towards revolution, their subjectivity shows itself as a desire to transform world objectivity. If we project Marxist-Humanism as that Subjectivity that as absorbed Objectivity, we will create a concrete basis for affinity with them. It is then that Youth will indeed become, as our Constitution puts it, "a most precious source for our further development."

Report on Youth to the Resident Editorial Board -- July 29, 1985.

Diane, Chicago

The highest stage today of the youth movement has the name -- South Africa. Today, students move out into the streets of the Black townships surrounding Johannesburg and Capetown -- for demonstrations and boycotts; moving from funeral march to funeral march. Saturday night in Soweto it was not a mere march, it was an outpouring of running youth carrying the coffin of one of their comrades who was cut down by the South African butcher armed forces.

To Botha's state of emergency one student spoke to the entire South African condition when he said, "My whole life has been a state of emergency." Such a maturity of thought and action that is the truth of South African youth today can in no way be crushed. And, it may have reached such a new beginning that it will not even be driven underground. The freedom struggle in South Africa, with youth at the forefront, poses the drive and passion toward full social revolution in such comprehensive terms that it literally forces upon the world a dialogue on revolution and counter-revolution.

I want to begin my discussion of youth as a Marxist-Humanist category by looking at how the youth movement in the United States responded to South Africa, had national and international relations, and how Marxist-Humanism in turn, responded to the youth movement here and in Southern Africa. A very high stage in our activity was with the May and June issues which covered the nationwide student anti-apartheid demonstrations that had grown in response to the situation in South Africa. Mandela Hall at Columbia had a multi-racial student participation, not only from Columbia itself, but from other university campuses and from high school students and workers within the city who came to the demonstrations. Steven Biko Plaza in Berkeley was even larger both in the number of students participating and in the support of hundreds of longshoremen who themselves had refused to load S. African cargo earlier in the year. These demonstrations on the two coasts were in daily communication with each other. The naming of the two halls, Biko and Mandela was certainly no accident but part of a recognition of the relationship between a movement in South Africa and one here in the United States. What was exciting in the demonstrations here were the discussions by the students themselves on the nature of the present stage of the student movement. The students wanted everyone to know that their demonstrations were not simply a return to the 1960s, they were striving to be something new, but at the same time not forgetting the history of the Civil Rights Movement and the Free Speech Movement.

In the pages of N&L, we presented these new developments in the movement. But what is equally important is that we did this within a Marxist-Humanist context. In the May issue which had the reports from Columbia and Berkeley was Lou Turner's lead article on the whole process of the revolutionary struggle in South Africa since the Botha regime imposed a new constitution. As well, our reports were within the context of Ida Fuller's youth column which was a review of Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future, one in which she took up the concrete questions youth have raised and how Marxist-Humanism has both heard these questions and at the same time, felt the necessity of critiquing the youth movement. Raya has especially done this on the question of the attraction of empiricism and how it can distort one's view of Marx's philosophy of revolution. The reports in the May issue were also within the context of the Introduction to Volume XI of the Archives, or how Marxist-Humanism viewed, analyzed, participated in the four years 1981-84 -- the same years this new generation of youth came to be active in anti-Reagan movements, from Central American solidarity, to anti-nuke to anti-apartheid.