

MAR 20 1984

Feb. 2, 1984

DIALECTICS, DIALECTICS, DIALECTICS: HEGEL, MARX,  
LENIN, AND MARXIST-HUMANISM

by Raya Dunayevskaya

[Transcription not edited or corrected by the author RD]

So ominous a year is 1984, not only because Reagan is rushing headlong to make Orwell's 1984 worse yet, by including and rushing to an actual nuclear confrontation with the other nuclear superpower, so that we have the holocaust and not only Big Brother—he will also disappear. But what is worse and more ominous still is that the latest, horrific imperialist invasion of little Grenada—a revolutionary Grenada—was paved for by something within the revolution itself. The murder of Bishop was done not by Reagan, but for Reagan, by his co-leaders Austin and Coard. *file down*

When something that monstrous as a counter-revolution comes from within the revolution itself, it becomes imperative for us to not just say, "Down with Reagan—and definitely see that the occupation does not remain, and continue the fight—but also ask, "How could it possibly happen that there are so many loose fittings within the Left?" For that reason we can't just say 'down with'; we have to take a very big dive so deep—140 years dive—into Marx's Marxism, when he first, in 1844, discovered a new continent of thought and of revolution. It isn't for the past; it is for the todayness of Marx. And the todayness especially in the Black world can be seen not only from what we have produced in Marxist-Humanism, but from what has come precisely also on the Black question—Frantz Fanon.

Here is a great revolutionary, who likewise called his philosophy Humanism, the new Humanism, and who saw that even though he gave up his French citizenship—all that the West and all that capitalism and all that intellectuals meant when they were looking for a career—nevertheless something is wrong with leadership, with the leaders of this great new series of revolutions in Africa, just as it was with the whites in the West. He had, in The Wretched of the Earth, in announcing his Humanism, in being for the Blacks but wanting to be not just for color but in order to make sure that philosophy and revolution do not get separated, called attention to the fact that something is wrong when instead of having a philosophy of revolution with the actual revolutions unite, you have a leadership saying: well, it's a question of whether I'm the leader, or she's the leader, or he's the leader.

To try to substitute for a philosophy of revolution a certain type of leadership, we get this horror when suddenly not only the leadership itself is the counter-revolution, but they don't even seem to know what is facing them. Everybody's been talking about the fact that that's exactly what Reagan is waiting for.

When we dig deep into the past, we want to see what has happened at each historic period, and why it is that it is that comprehensive and yet it is not finished. You have to constantly rework it and reorganize it on the basis of what is today, and how we wish to concretize it, which means that from below, there is a great movement from practice to theory, as well as from theory to practice. In fact, it is that movement from practice which shows you that the todayness of Marxism was, in a certain sense, before Marx.

16175

I've brought the very first edition of Marxism and Freedom. The reason I brought it is two-fold. First, is what do we mean when we make a new category? Certainly Marx knew that not only had he transformed Hegel's revolution in philosophy, by bringing in the contradictions and the realities and the development through those contradictions and not through additions--transformed that revolution in philosophy into a philosophy of revolution. But when did it become a category? It became with us. The whole structure of Marxism and Freedom is built on this new category: the movement from practice. It goes through from 1776 all the way to our age.

"From 1776" there was no Marx. There wasn't even a French Revolution. There was our revolution. Why is it that I bring it in? It's the age of revolutions, of industrial revolutions, of intellectual revolutions, of political revolutions, of going towards democracy even if it's bourgeois democracy. And it is because of all those activities from below, whether it was the Committees of Correspondence challenging George V, to today. You want to see what happened first, and what did the philosophers think about it. The specific philosopher, the greatest bourgeois philosopher, was Hegel. It's his dialectics, his view of the development of humanity through contradiction, through the fact that you have somebody you want to throw off your back...

The second reason I brought this edition is that this is the only edition that has Marx at the beginning. This is the first translation of Marx's Humanist Essays, the 1844 Economic-Philosophic Mss., the first translation of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks. We want to deal with dialectics as it was in Hegel; as it was with Marx and dialectics of liberation, instead of just of thought; as it was with Lenin, which meant the First World War--and we'll deal with the First World War and the Second World War--and what became concretized, and what had developed later.

In the first instance, we begin with the question of labor. It's always a question of what you do; the Bible notwithstanding, the first was not the word, the first was the deed. And it's in the specific deed, the work, the labor, whether it was slave at one time, whether it was feudalism, or what we're concerned with which is capitalist labor. We will consider how it happens that labor determines everything, and how it happens that in that type of determination you nevertheless both change and have a great deal to do with what happens in your specific period.

The very first of Marx's Essays showed that in denying this racist, sexist, capitalistic, exploitative, imperialist society, he was choosing certain revolutionary forces, not by saying, 'I want you', but by saying what it is they did. Hegel's idea of philosophy coming at the end of an activity, at the end of a revolution, is true for the bourgeois philosophers, and he was the greatest. He said you can only decide what had happened after it has happened. Marx's idea of revolution was to anticipate and not just to decide after it has happened.

The idea, however, of why Hegel is so great, is that what had happened in his specific period was the French Revolution. It was the French Revolution that not only overthrew aristocracy and not only established the bourgeois revolution, but there were certain types of forces--the sans culottes, the proletariat before it was even a full proletariat--and their activity. Democracy

didn't come because a lot of great people decided there should be democracy. It was the sans culottes remaining in Parliament and saying 'I'm not going home even though I sit in the gallery and you are the ones that are making all the decisions. I am staying here.' The activity is not of "inventing" but deciding that they will have something to say about what is being invented for them.

We want in each case to see not only what was labor then and what Marx described labor to be, but to consider todayness also in our age. Therefore I want first of all to show our 30 years: the 1949-50 miners general strike, which had begun the question of 'what kind of labor should man do? What does this damn new machine, automation, do to us? Why is there such a big division between mental and manual labor?' And I want to show that we are not only criticizing others but also ourselves. [supplemental report here]

The point of 'what kind of labor' is not whether you're skilled or unskilled. The point of what kind of labor is, why is there a division between mental and manual. What Marx wanted to reconnect is the human being, who both thinks and who works and who aspires to freedom and who will fight for it. If you only look at labor and think, 'I'm not a worker' or 'I'm not in a factory', you are at once not in Marx's concept of labor as human activity. The reason these Economic-Philosophic Mss. that he first published are so important was that right with labor, it wasn't only industrial labor but peasant. (I'll come back to that in a moment); it wasn't only Man but Women; it wasn't only the question of what is happening now, but what do you see as the future. The anticipation of the 1848 revolutions from the 1844 weavers strike was what is so amazing. Suddenly someone gets up and says to the world, 'I challenge all of you. All capitalism is going to fall down, whereas what is really coming is this totally new society.' The same one who speaks about something as simple as your five senses, begins to show that it's very different--your smell, your feeling, your loving, your passion--when it is a proletariat that does it, when it is a woman that does it, etc. than when it is the bourgeoisie, the rulers.

The three different parts that we're concerned with today--and that's where the talk breaks down, and what we mean by dialectics--is that after this Introduction, we have the significance of the structure--learn that word structure, because it will be the same thing as method--of Marxism and Freedom. We have the question of, what is a movement from practice? How does it become a form of theory itself? And why did it take all the way to our age before we added those three little words, a form of theory itself? Marx certainly was based on that. It depends on the maturity of the historic age we are dealing with. I will show you both what Marxist-Humanism did and what others did.

The second part that we're going to discuss are the two World Wars, and the two Great Divides within Marxism. What did World War I do and why was there a collapse of what was Marxism then, the Second International, and the creation of a new one, and was it sufficient in World War II, now that we had seen the breakdown and the Great Divide that Lenin made in Marxism, not just by being a revolutionary as against those who betrayed, but by returning to Hegel to see what is it in the dialectic that suddenly means so much in relationship to reconstructing the world altogether. He singled out the transformation into opposite which, again, was not only transformation into opposite of

capitalism into imperialism that is the enemy to begin with, but transformation into opposite within labor, the aristocracy of labor, the one who betrayed. Not as openly because they were ordered to fight by their leadership, but nevertheless suddenly seeing that transformation has to be a double. There is not just the opposition to what is, but the opposition to what first appears to be opposite, and how that deepens and develops. Therefore the question will arise with Philosophy and Revolution: was it really sufficient just to be against World War II at the juncture of the Hitler-Stalin pact?

The third part will return us to the beginning, because Marx's new moments in the very last decade of his life have left a trail to the 1980s, both because of the emergence of what we call the Third World--what he called the Asiatic Mode of Production--and what is our still unfinished tasks. The return to the beginning isn't what someone thinks, remembrance of things past. The return to the beginning is after it has been enriched by all the passions, all the live forces, all the historic periods and what actually happened.

You take the question of the proletariat. In the very first chapter on this, there is a very early footnote, no.5. Footnotes are extremely important. First of all, they indicate the next book, or some idea that somebody should develop something else. Secondly, they show you not just the scholarship or what books you should read, but an indication as to what does dialectics mean, what is development. This particular footnote no.5 reads:

Frederick Engels, in his Peasant Wars in Germany, has pointed out that the sixteenth century German Reformation betrayed the peasant revolts by not giving them the land and, as a result, the country itself "disappeared for three centuries from the ranks of countries playing an independent part in history."

He's showing that at the period that the peasants believed now that Catholicism is not going to be around, and now that Luther is here, and now that they will not be able to buy their freedom from their sins, in fact Luther betrayed them. The minute he won, he went back with the bourgeoisie, the actual civilization of Germany went back. I then add:

The question of land and the peasant as the prerequisite for a successful revolution was brought home to us in the Civil War. We suffer still from this incomplete revolution in the South where the Negro did not get his "40 acres and a mule." To deal with it here, however, is out of the scope of the present work.

Well, it isn't out of the scope of 1982. What I'm trying to show is if you know what dialectical methodology is, if you know the particular point that is developed--this is our country and we insist that it is the other America; it isn't the rulers that we are concerned with--you see that at once, once you had abolished slavery, what was the good if you're going to be the sharecropper for the very people who were your masters before? What had to follow was their demand for "40 acres and a mule". Once you didn't get that, it was an unfinished revolution. You will have altogether too many unfinished revolutions...

I just want to point out two more footnotes very early which I didn't take up or develop then, but get developed in another period, and that happens

to be footnote 49. David Walker's Appeal: now think of it. It's before the Civil War. It's when there's still slavery. David Walker, a Black man, a rag picker who has escaped to Boston, issues not only an appeal for the Blacks to revolt, but a challenge to nobody less than Thomas Jefferson. He's the President, and he's the Declaration of Independence, but he has slaves. Obviously, the independence was independence of the white man and not Black. This challenge says, 'you say that it's unfortunate that my color is Black? I'll tell you what. We will yet wipe you off the face of the earth, because freedom is the real color, and you made a complete abstraction of it on all men are created equal. You only meant man and not woman, and then you didn't mean all men, you mean all white men.'

I call attention in that many of the movements from below appear and inspire the theoretician. Yet the theoretician is able to make a new category of it, whereby you fight on a different level. Without that unity of theory and practice you won't get there. But this was 1829. Marx was a little boy. But the point of the Black world appearing in the other America shows that in the whole development of freedom, he was both the touchstone and the vanguard in this country and remains so in the fight against Reagan.

There was one other thing I want you always to recognize in relationship to how important todayness is, whether it's theory or practice. This book was going to press and Mao made a very important speech. It cost me a lot of money just to add the footnote, because the publisher didn't want to accept any more additions. This great speech was "on contradiction", on suddenly there is contradiction among the people instead of contradiction between capital and labor, and you have to consider that it was something that presaged new divisions within the so-called Communist world. Let me read part of footnote 17: "The lowest of all today's sophists is the head of the Chinese Communist Party and State, Mao Tse-Tung, who recently" gave this speech. I show how contradiction has gone through the various stages. First, it meant what it always means, real contradiction, that is, a class contradiction: it was against Chiang Kai-shek. Suddenly now it comes between the people, so he can challenge Russia on the other hand. Here is the way I prove that that is what it really means, even though I cannot develop it at this point. I'm saying that

By June 18, 1957, after editing with a heavy hand the speech he delivered on February 27th to the Supreme State Conference, he reduced the struggle of class against class to a contradiction among "the people" while he became the champion, at one and the same time, of the philosophy of a hundred flowers blooming and one, and only one Party, the Chinese Communist Party ruling. Outside of the exploitative class relations themselves, nothing so clearly exposes the new Chinese ruling class as their threadbare philosophy.

In each case, when we come to the two Great Divides within Marxism as to how it happened, unless you really are Marx's Humanism and Marxist-Humanist, you will fall back into being tailender for the society that is. In this particular case that we have, we want to remember that the reason both the movement from practice that is Marxist-Humanism today, and the movement from theory as it developed in different historic periods, has to be reinterpreted on the concrete level.

What happened in all those developments of the totality? You have to remember when it's in origin, but is in embryo, and totality, because those 1844

Economic-Philosophic Mss. were not only a question of class struggle, were not only a question of breaking with the bourgeoisie, but were a question of raising what is human relationships, what is Man/Woman relationships, what is peasant labor as well as industrial labor, and what is the relationship of theory to practice. You achieve certain developments. There is a Marx and he dies. He who died left much that is not only not known, but is degraded, because they do not know how to interpret it concretely. The thing that happened that showed they do not mean to interpret it as a new society altogether was World War I.

Everybody who was a Marxist was saying that if the bourgeoisie dares to tell us to go and shoot someone across the national boundaries, we will tell them no. When it came, far from them telling them no, they sent the workers across the boundaries. What, therefore, did the dialectic, instead of just development through contradiction, mean to Lenin? There were plenty of revolutionaries who didn't betray. But they say simply, we're not going to be in the war, or this is an imperialist war. Lenin suddenly realized that it is not only an imperialist war. Something is wrong in general that I, Lenin, could have thought that this is my leader, Kautsky, and if Marx arose from Hegel's philosophy, the dialectics of development, we better look into that, instead of just saying Marx did it so we don't have anything to do.

He singled out a new category. The new category was transformation into opposite. He said, of all the categories of these contradictions, the fact is that it's not only capitalism that has been transformed into its opposite, imperialism, and it's starting this war, but a part of the working class, the aristocracy of labor, has gained from this new imperialist stage. The crumbs, perhaps, but it has gained something, and it has turned against us. So this transformation into opposite, therefore, means that we must not only overthrow capitalist society, but see that the development of a new society involves two negatives. That new unity is the relationship of theory to practice, because that's the key word--the relationship. What was it, and how was philosophy and revolution united at this stage?

At this stage meant World War II. What was going to emerge that finally pushed you not only to say Russia is a state-capitalist society, but to see something new in relation to the forces as Reason? The 'something new' was the emergence of a Third World. Again the Black world, and this time the Latin American world, etc. What we want to develop is that suddenly you see what Hegel called the Self-Thinking Idea, what Marx meant by the Self-Bringing Forth of Liberty, the masses achieving their own emancipation provided that along with achieving that emancipation, the revolutionary intellectuals know how to reunite theory and practice on a new level. To see that when you reach the ultimate, that's not ultimate; it's first then you're looking for a new beginning. You've reached the ultimate and now what will be the new beginning as Subject; which forces of revolution have now arisen, and what do we have to do?

Now, on Philosophy and Revolution: I want to point to one other thing that will give you an indication. It was where no one had before gone. In the case of Marxism and Freedom, as a Marxist-Humanist body of ideas, as a movement from practice as a category, as a form of theory itself, it was the 1950s when we began questioning, and the proletariat began questioning in relationship to industrialism and automation, as to what kind of labor. In re-

relationship to Philosophy and Revolution, you return to Hegel and say he, Lenin, stopped at the transformation into opposite, to show that these have betrayed and we have to start on a new level. We're starting with the ultimate, but that ultimate is only as a new beginning. In this question, I take up all the works of Hegel: Phenomenology of Mind, Philosophy of Mind, and the end in the Encyclopaedia. Here is what I say as a new subheading: "The Philosophy of Mind: A Movement From Practice?" That sounds fantastic and totally opposite. How, when I finally get to the self-development of ideas and it meant such and such in these periods; when I come to the height of where Hegel certainly thought he ended--it all ended with Mind--I say, does that mean that it's actually a new stage for Mind because it was a new stage in practice?

What is now involved, therefore, is what has happened in our world. We came from the 1950s, when we were all supposed to be the "beat generation", and actually new developments had arisen, both the movement from practice in East Europe against Communism, the Black world both in Africa and the Black Revolution here, the new youth, the anti-Viet Nam war movement. All these forces, all these new passions--why did we lose again? Didn't everybody think 1968 is "it"? We're going to make it now. Thousands in Paris on strike, and the youth is not beat, and all we have to do is do more and more activity. All those old fogies--forget them. No--it collapsed. You had to return to which stage, and what new relationship now is there between Mind and theory and practice and the actual forces that have arisen? What is it that is new in that now? In this question we reach the third section in what we mean by new moments in Marx, his very last decade, the ones we didn't know until the 1970s: the Ethnological Notebooks.

Marx suddenly discovered--because anthropology had just arisen and developed on primitive communism, the ancient societies--that whereas there is, so to speak, a higher stage with capitalism in relationship to industrialization, it simply isn't true that primitive communism was no good. What was new in the old, what was old in the new? What was it in the artisan, what did he think about? What do we mean by the Absolute Movement of Becoming? Why are we always changing and always developing ourselves? What was important was the very five senses that he had raised from the very first in 1844, showing that there is a difference between the proletariat and the ruling class in attitude and in reason in all your five senses, and not only in the class struggle. It became a question now that it isn't true that primitive communism was all backward. There is a duality in every single society, in every single historic period, in every single individual as you develop into a higher stage. With primitive communism, whereas it's not just that we want to put in technology and we're going to have a new society, there is, however, the communal form. The property form was communal and had different relations with each other.

We suddenly find that the relationship, say, of the Iroquois women was higher than what we have now. Marx brings out in relationship to studying ancient society, reading Ancient Society for the first time, what we had before. Look at the Iroquois woman. You think she's backward, but she had more freedom than we have now. She could even veto a decision to go to war. Now it is true that after she vetoed it, the men went back and said, these awful women, they're not going to fight our war and we better find some other tribe to fight. Nevertheless, it was a very very much higher stage to be able to actually have the decision, and that early in life.

Feb. 2, 1984

Lecture 1

-8-

Then what about the peasantry, the relation both to the land and the relation to what they think is going to be a question of a new world? All of these forms meant that Marx had now a multilinear view of human development. Don't ever forget that. He sees now, and he compares and relates this to what had happened in all these previous developments. He sees, therefore, that what we have in the Asiatic Mode of Production isn't 'here is backward, and here is advanced', but that in each particular society as the development occurred, there was a duality. Whether it's an open class struggle--he says all of history is the history of class struggles, and it doesn't mean labor and capital, it doesn't mean rulers and the ruled--it means what is all of your development, how do you develop as a human being, how do you reunite theory and practice and become a whole human being? In each case, there comes a return to the beginning. Return, in Hegelian terms as I said before, is not a remembrance of things past; it is that kind of remembrance which has been enriched when you go to the beginning. Specifically speaking, let's give you two examples, and at this time we come to the third work, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

In 1844, the very first Essay on challenging capitalism and saying we are the new ones, the proletariats, Marx had mentioned other forces as Reason: Man/Woman, youth, Asiatic or Black or whatever particular racial minority had been. In that you had an indication, an anticipation of something that would happen, something in embryo. And the two points in embryo are the 1844 Essays and 1850. The 1844 Essay is in relation to the Man/Woman relationship, 1850 is in relation to the "revolution in permanence." Let's see what happened to those at certain stages.

When he first mentioned it, Marx was saying this is such an alienated frustrating, horrible society--capitalism--that even if you didn't take any of my analysis of economic laws of capitalism and how awful this all is, if you just looked at your relationship of yourself to your wife or your lover or someone you really love--if you treat her so badly all the time, shouldn't you hate this society in any case? Why the heck is she always under your foot and subordinate? People disregarded it. After all, it's only one paragraph in the 1844 Essays. What happens when at a stage in history--like, for example, ours--the freedom for women, the equality of women, the Reason of women, is not only a question of an Idea--it's a movement? What do they present?

Luxemburg was a great revolutionary, a great thinker, and a very original character. She certainly wasn't going to stand for all that nonsense about how woman was supposed to be second class. She was theoretician, she was an agitational person, she had her own way of living with her man or without her man. But in that period, even though she lived a very original life, she wasn't making a category of women's liberation. She was tolerating the most horrible male chauvinism within the GSD. She was tolerating it because she was stagifying, saying the first thing we have to do is overthrow capitalism, the second thing we'll get around to women's liberation. That's a lot of baloney.

What was great in both her personal life and in the questions she raised, was that she suddenly began saying, now wait a minute. You think you're so superior because you're a good organizer and I hate organization. I'll let you organize. What did she find in an actual revolution? The 7½ people she had became 20,000 overnight, and her lover, who was the great organizer, wasn't the

16182

one that brought it about. It was the revolution, the masses from below. She raised the question of organization and the continued democracy that is necessary for you to develop your mind and your ideas and your relations: proletarian democracy. She began raising the questions that are the most urgent in the actual 1917 Revolution as well. She, however, did not return to the dialectic. What is the specific dialectic feature that we must now develop with organization? I come to the second example, 1850, and the "revolution in permanence."

The 1848 revolutions are lost and Marx, instead of saying now we've lost the revolutions, says: now we cannot be just against the bourgeoisie. We have to continue the revolution in permanence. That is, continuous. It is only the first stage, we accepted the bourgeoisie because we're against feudalism, but let's not merge. He proposed to the Communist Leagues that had just led the revolutions, that what their future should be is to develop and to see that the revolution doesn't stop just by the overthrow of what is. You have to develop it further.

What happens in 1875? 25 years have passed. He has now witnessed not only the 1848 revolutions, and they were lost, but the greatest event in his life, the Paris Commune. He has seen now new forms of relations altogether, a non-state form, the proletariat, and women's liberation--and there was a great women's liberation; it wasn't called that but it was a women's movement, the women incendiaries, in the Paris Commune. It all developed into those four little words, "its own working existence". You have to look at what was the Paris Commune. "Its own working existence" meant not only they didn't have a state, but whatever they did, whether it was carrying a gun and defending themselves against Versailles, or whether it was being a nurse and seeing that you didn't die just because you were wounded, or trying to develop what is: decision making, was at the end of each day, each one said I did this, this is what I'm getting, and this is what I should get, etc. So this workers' control didn't only mean that you made decisions before, but after, and you constantly check it.

When Marx finishes, that great revolution is likewise ended, and he is making new developments in relationship to what now is "revolution in permanence", not only not stopping the revolution at the overthrow, but in relationship to the type of organization you have. It was the revolution in permanence as the ground also for organization. Not only can't you divide mental and manual labor. Not only can't you not stop at one section of negativity, but your very form of organization has to likewise be related to this revolution in permanence, the continuous self-development.

I want to say only two other things in relationship to where we want to stop. It becomes necessary to take a second and deeper look at something. That something is Marx's Marxism, not anyone else's--what it was in origin--but the origin, when I say to return to the beginning, is not just the "root cause" but the totality, even if that totality is only in embryo as I showed in 1844. If you're going to look at that origin, not as only "root cause"; not as even your final--that is, you're going to skip all the way to the end, 'I want a socialist society and to heck with all the rest'--that is not it. The goal is what you will be after you have developed all these new passions and new forces, after it has been enriched by all that arose from below, and what it is, so that the movement that has arisen both from practice and theory has changed at every historic period, and the movement from practice is itself

a form of theory. It's the totality, it's the substance when it is Subject. It's the whole, not just origin, not just process, not skipping. When it reaches that whole, when you've developed so many things, now what are you going to do: order around? Now you have to see what the living human being has achieved in his own development.

What we had found on these new moments, when Marx suddenly returned, and suddenly began talking about Asiatic mode of production, and suddenly saw what we call now the Third World, was that whether it's a question of human relations, whether it's a question of relations in organization, whether it's a question of what stage are we in and how to develop it, you have to do it for yourselves. Nobody can do it for you. He categorically refused to give you a blueprint for the future. It's impossible. But if you get to the absolute method as new beginning--not as the ultimate and you stop there, but that's when you first begin--then you will see that no book is really finished. At least we never finish our books. In addition to the fact that you have to go through all of these if you want to, I made many new additions. I want to end with one of the new paragraphs that no one yet has, and connect it with what I had put in earlier, because I cannot develop post-Marx Marxists here:

What Marx, in the Grundrisse, had defined as "the absolute movement of becoming" had matured in the last decade of his life as new moments--a multilinear view of human development as well as a dialectic duality within each formation... As against Marx's multilinear view which kept Marx from attempting any blueprint for future generations, Engels' unilinear view led him to mechanical positivism. By no accident whatever, such one-dimensionality kept him from seeing either the communal form under "Oriental despotism" or the duality in "primitive communism"...

So we do have the Iroquois women, but we also have it going back to the men. It is for this reason that I not only added this at a certain stage. But from the very first, in the Preface, instead of having you wait for the last chapter to find out that I'm challenging all post-Marx Marxists, I immediately pointed to that idea of why we are studying Marxist-Humanism as a body of ideas, and why it is the return has to be to Marx's Marxism and to Marxist-Humanism.

\* \* \*

In the discussion. Raya: I think that Neda raised an extremely important point about other tendencies. [microphone moved]... the Frankfurt School. To them, it was the "death of the dialectic" when Hitler came to power. Now, why should you think, therefore, that the ruling class, having become as horrible as that, would signify the "death of the dialectic", instead of you finding what extraordinary contradictions are now? What are the new contradictions with Hitler coming to power? The new contradiction was the fact you not only had to overcome that monstrosity, but you had to listen to what came from new forces.

For example, in World War 2 as it was drawing to a close, you already had the Black Revolution--I mean not only in America, but in the Camerouns. It happened that I was in Paris, and the Camerounian was raising the question: Now we won, why should we allow the French to return to rule over us just because they were on the side militarily that won us against the fascists? They were raising the question about what happens to us now, not only in order to get rid of the French if it was possible--they began all these movements from below--but also what type of organization. Who's involved in these forces? Is it the masses as a whole? All of Yaounde had come out.

I said, now where is the "death of the dialectic"? You [Frankfurt School] are very tired old men. It was Adorno who said that you can't sing anymore after Auschwitz. I'm sure you can't but that's exactly the point, of seeing there

16184

lute method as new beginning--not as the ultimate and you stop there, but that's when you first begin--then you will see that no book is really finished. At least we never finish our books. In addition to the fact that you have to go through all of these if you want to, I made many new additions. I want to end with one of the new paragraphs that no one yet has, and connect it with what I had put in earlier, because I cannot develop post-Marx Marxists here;

What Marx, in the Grundrisse, had defined as "the absolute movement of becoming" had matured in the last decade of his life as new moments--amultilinear view of human development as well as a dialectic duality within each formation...As against Marx's multilinear view which kept Marx from attempting any blueprint for future generations, Engels' unilinear view led him to mechanical positivism. By no accident whatever, such one-dimensionality kept him from seeing either the communal form under "Oriental despotism" or the duality in "primitive communism"...

So we do have the Iroquoiswomen, but we also have it going back to the men. It is for this reason that I not only added this at a certain stage. But from the very first, in the Preface, instead of having you wait for the last chapter to find out that I'm challenging all post-Marx Marxists, I immediately pointed to that idea of why we are studying Marxist-Humanism as a body of ideas, and why it is the return has to be to Marx's Marxism and to Marxist-Humanism.

\* \* \*

In the discussion. Raya: I think that Neda raised an extremely important point about other tendencies. [microphone moved]...the Frankfurt School. To them, it was the "death of the dialectic" when Hitler came to power. Now, why should you think, therefore, that the ruling class, having become as horrible as that, would signify the "death of the dialectic", instead of you finding what extraordinary contradictions are now? What are the new contradictions with Hitler coming to power? The new contradiction was the fact you not only had to overcome that monstrosity, but you had to listen to what came from new forces.

For example, in World War 2 as it was drawing to a close, you already had the Black Revolution--I mean not only in America, but in the Camerouns. It happened that I was in Paris, and the Camerounian was raising the question: Now we won, why should we allow the French to return to rule over us just because they were on the side militarily that won us against the fascists? They were raising the question about what happens to us now, not only in order to get rid of the French if it was possible--they began all these movements from below--but also what type of organization. Who's involved in these forces? Is it the masses as a whole? All of Yaounde had come out.

I said, now where is the "death of the dialectic"? You [Frankfurt School] are very tired old men. It was Adorno who said that you can't sing anymore after Auschwitz. I'm sure you can't but that's exactly the point, of seeing there should be no more Auschwitzs. At each time, if you think that you don't have a new door--in his case to say "the Absolute is dead" and the "death of the dialectic"...

And yet since you [Marcuse] are a revolutionary, the minute the 1960s had arisen (not the minute because it took him a long time--first it was One-Dimensional Man--but in the mid-60s) then he accepted anything and did not return to what I call the beginning in Marxist-Humanism. Whether it was Angela Davis, who was a Communist, everybody suddenly became...[tape turned over here]

aesthetics, the word he hasas new--that's his last book--and how it ended, even the laughter at me. He said, 'I can just see you [RD] laughing at me: haven't you [HM] got anything better to do?'

So ominous a year is 1984, not only because Reagan is rushing headlong to make Orwell's 1984 worse yet, by rushing to actual nuclear confrontation with the other nuclear super-power, but what is worse yet is that the latest horrific imperialist invasion of little Grenada was paved for by something within the revolution itself. The murder of Bishop was not by Reagan, but for Reagan by Bishops' co-leaders, Austin and Coard. When something that monstrous as a counter-revolution comes from within the revolution itself, it becomes imperative for us, not just to say "Down with Reagan", but to ask how it could possibly happen that there are so many loose fittings within the Left. For that we have to take a deep dive -- 140 years dive into Marx's Marxism, since he first in 1844 discovered a new continent of thought and revolution. It isn't for the past, but for the todayness of Marx. And the todayness, especially in the Black world, is seen not only in what we have produced in Marxist Humanism, but from what has come from Frantz Fanon.

Here is a great revolutionary who also called his philosophy a new Humanism, and gave up his French citizenship and all that intellectuals seek when looking for a career, and nevertheless saw something is wrong with leadership in Africa just as it was with the whites. In the Wretched of the Earth, and in being for the Blacks but wanting to make sure philosophy and revolution did not get separated, he called attention to the fact that something is wrong when all the concern is with who is the leader, and the substitution of the question of type of leader instead of philosophy of the revolution.

When we dig deep into the past we want to see what has happened at each historic period, and why it is <sup>so</sup> comprehensive and yet not finished. It has to be reworked and reorganized on the basis of today, and how we with to concretize it. It means that from below there is a great movement

16186

from practice to theory, as well as from theory to practice, which shows you the todayness of Marxism that comes in a sense from before Marx.

I brought the very first edition of M&F, for 2 reasons. The first is to show what we mean by making a new category. Marx knew that not only had he transformed Hegel's revolution in philosophy (by bringing in the contradictions and realities and dev. through those contradictions) to a philosophy of revolution. But when did it become a category? With us. The whole structure of M&F is built on this new category. Movement from practice goes through from 1776 all the way to our age. From before there was a Marx. 1776 means the age of revolutions, industrial, intellectual, political. And it is because of all those activities from below, whether the Committees of Correspondence challenging the King or today. We want to see what happened first and what the philosophers think about it. The greatest bourgeois philosopher was Hegel, and it's his dialectic, his view of the dev. of humanity through contradiction, though wanting to throw your oppressor off your back, that brought that.

The second reason is that this is the only edition that has Marx at the beginning. This is the first translation of Marx's Humanist Essays 1844 Economic-Phil. Mss. and the first translation of Lenin's Phil. Notebooks. So we want to deal with dialectics as it was with Hegel, with Marx and dialectics of liberation ~~and~~ and not just thought, as it was with Lenin in first WW and what became second WW and what developed later.

We begin with the question of labor. It's always a question of what you do, the bible notwithstanding, first was not the word, but the deed. The specific work or deed, whether slavery or feudalism of what we are concerned with, capitalist labor.

16187

We will consider how it is that labor determines everything and how you nevertheless both have a lot to do with what happens in your specific period. The very first of his Essays showed that in denying this racist, sexist, exploitative, imperialistic society, he was choosing certain revolutionary forces by showing what they did. Hegel's idea of thinking coming at the end of a revolution is true for the bourgeois philosophers. But Marx's idea of revolution was to anticipate. So ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ what was so great was that what had happened in his specific period was the French Revolution, which not only overthrew the aristocracy and established the bourgeois revolution but in the sans culottes we saw certain forces -- the prol before it was a prol. -- which in their activity of remaining in the gallery instead of going home invented democracy. In each case we want to see not only what labor was in each case, but what Marx described and to consider also what it is today in our age.

So first I want to show our 30 years: the 49-50 Miners' General Strike which had begun the question of what kind of labor should man do? What is automation doing to us? Why is there such a big division between ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ mental and manual labor? And to criticize not only others, but ourselves.

(Bob's report)

The point of what kind of labor? is not whether it is skilled or unskilled, but why is there a division between mental and manual? If you look at labor and think only "I'm not a worker I'm not in factory" you at once miss Marx's concept of labor as human activity.

because in his first essays, right with labor, it wasn't only  
industrial worker, but peasant, not only man, but woman, not only  
the question of now but what do you see in the future. The anticipation  
of the 1848 revolutions from 1844 weaver's strike is amazing. Someone  
gets up and says to the world: "I challenge all of you, you are all  
going to fall down and what is coming is a totally new society."

The same one who speaks about something as simple as your  
five senses shows it is different when a proletariat does it and  
when the bourgeoisie does it.

So the three parts we're concerned with today, after this  
Introduction, is the significance of the STRUCTURE of M&F (it will  
mean the same thing as "dialectics")  
of what is a MOVEMENT FROM PRACTICE,  
I how does it become a FORM OF THEORY ITSELF? And why did it take  
all the way to our age before we added those three little words?  
(Marx did that, but it depends on the maturity of our age to see it)

II Second is the ~~the~~ Two World Wars and the Two Great Divides  
in Marxism. And was it sufficient in WWI -- when Lenin returned to  
dialectics and singled out transformation into opposite, not only  
monopoly  
as capitalism into imperialism but within labor. It is not only  
the opposition to what is, but how that deepens and develops.  
With P&R the question arises whether it was sufficient to just  
be against WWII at the juncture of the Hitler-Stalin Pact?

III The third will return us to the beginning because of what  
Marx knew and in his last decade of life left a trail to the 1980s  
both because of what we call 3rd world and he called Asiatic Mode  
of Production and WHAT IS OUR STILL UNFISHED TASK. Return to the  
beginning is not remembrance of things past, but after it has been

16189

been enriched with all the live forces and all the actual periods.

Take the question of the proletariat. In the very first chapter there is a ftn. 5 -- very important are ftns, because they indicate the next book, and show you not just scholarship but an indication of what deve. and dialectics means. Ftn. 5: "FE and peasant wars...The 40 acres and a mule..." Points to unfinished revolution, and we'll have all too many of those.

Two more ftns. that don't get developed until another time. #49  
1829  
~~1842~~ David Walker's Appeal. challenges nobody less than Thoms Jefferson.  
I call attention to how the movement from below inspires the theoretician and then the theor. can make a new category of it. And without that unity of theory and practice you won't get there.

(Black dimension has been the vanguard and remains so today against Reagan).

# 17 on Contradiction  
Now ftn. on Mao's speech -- costs \$50 to add this ftn. because  
felt it presaged new divisions within the communist world

The m from pr and mo fr th as it appeared in different period has to be interpreted on the concrete level. In origin it is in embryo --  
The 1844 mss. were not only a question of class struggle and breaking with the bourgeoisie but of raising what were human relationships, man/woman, peasant as well as industril labor, and the rel. of theory to practice.

You achieve certain developments. There is a Marx and he dies. He leaves much that is not only not known but is degraded because they do not know how to interpret it concretely. And what showed they didn't mean to interpret it as a new society altogether was WWI.

All were saying when it comes to telling us to shoot across boundaries we will tell them no. But when it came to telling them that, they sent the workers across the boundaries. What did dialectics mean to Lenin? He wasn't the only rev'ly who didn't betray. But Lenin said something wrong with him that he couldn't see Kautsky would betray. And if Hegel's philosophy was Marx's ground he would look into that, instead of just thinking that if Marx did it, he didn't have anything further to do. He singled out a new category = transformation into opposite. Not only cap'ism into imper'ism, but a part of the working class, the aristocracy of labor....

(tape runs out)

...the something new was the emergence of a 3rd world, this time the Latin American world. So what we want to dev. is that suddenly you see that what Hegel called "self-thinking Idea", what Marx meant by "self-bringing forth of liberty", the masses bringin forth provided the intellectuals know how to reunite with practice on a new level. To see that reaching the ultimate is not the ultimate. From the first day you are looking for a new beginning, as Subject -- i.e. which force of revolution do we have now.

On P&R we went where nobody had before gone. In M&F it  
the movement from practice as a category, it was the 50s, when  
labor began questioning "what kind of labor?"

In P&R we return to Hegel, where Lenin stopped at transf. into opposite, and we are starting with the ultimate, but only as a new beginning. We take up all of Hegel's works -- Peh., EM Logic, Phil of Mind -- Here is my new subheading: "Phil of Mind -- A Movement from Practice?"

That sounds fantastic, totally opposite. Here Hegel reaches the climax and I ask does that mean a new stage of ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ <sup>mind</sup> BECAUSE it's a new stage in practice. What is now involved, therefore, is what has happened in our world. The new movement in EE, in the Black world in Africa and U.S., the new youth of antiwar m., all these new forces and passions. Why did we lose again? Didn't we think we would make it now. It collapses. So that you had to what was the new stage between mind and theory and the actual forces in practice,

Third

In this ~~EEK~~ section we reached what are the new moments in Marx, ones we didn't know until the 70s, Marx's EN. He suddenly developed (anthrop. had just developed) that whereas there is a ~~HE~~ higher stage with capitalism in rel. to industrialization it isn't true the other was no good. What was new in the old and old in the new? What did the artisan bring about? What is the Absolute Movement of Becoming. What was important was that the very 5 sense he had first raised to show the difference in attitude between the pool and the ruling class becomes a question now that it isn't true it is all backward. There is a duality in every single historic period, in every single individual. So that Primitive Communism doesn't mean putting in technology and getting the new society but seeing that in the communal form there were certain things, say in the Iroquois women, that are higher than what we have now. Or take the peasantry. It all means he had now a multilinear view of human dev. He sees the duality in each society, as it developed, whether it was open class struggle, of whether it means all of your development and how you reunite theory and practice to become a whole human being. In each case there comes a return to the beginning, so enriched a "re-rememberance" that now you have a new beginning. Specifically, 2 examples:

16192

We come to the 3rd work -- RLWLKM. In 1844 he mentioned other forces and as Reason. It is an anticipation, something in embryo. The ~~1844~~ 1844 is in rel. to Man/Woman; the 1850 in rel. to revn in permanence. Let's see what happened to those at other stages.

When he first mentioned Man/Woman he was saying this is so horrible and alienating a society, that even if you don't agree with me on class struggle, and just look at your wife... and see how badly you treat her, shouldn't you hate this society. People disregarded it. It's only one para. What happens when at a stage in history like ours WL is not only an Idea but a Movement? What do they present? RL a great rev'y AND a very original character. She was not going to stand for woman being 2nd place. She was a theoretician, agitator, her own way of living with or without her man. But in that period she wasn't making a category of WL, and was tolerating the GSD's male chauvinism, because she was stagifying. But suddenly in her life found in actual revn though she hated organizational things she raised the question of org'n and emocracy continuing. ~~1844~~ but didn't return to the dialectic.

1850 and revn in perm. 1848 revns are lost. Marx says we have to continue it in permanence and never ~~1844~~ again with the bourgeoisie. 25 years later, 1875, has witnessed P.C., and has seen new forms of relations altogether -- prol. WL, = "its own working existence", decision making. Mr. makes new developments on revn in perm on question of type of organization you have. = r in p as ground for organization. = continuous self-development.

Becomes necessary to take a 2nd and deeper look at what Mr was in origin. But origin is not just "root cause", but the totality, even if only in embryo.

Skipping all way to end of socialism you want is not it. It is what you will be after you have developed all these new passions and new forces., enriched by all that is from below, so that the moment from below from practice has changed at every historic period, it is the totality, the substance when it is subject. = the whole, not just origin, and now have to see what the living human being has achieved. So we have to see in these new moments when he began talking about asiatic mode (i.e. the third world) whether it's a quest. of human rel., or a quest. of org'n, or what stage we're in an how to develop it, nobody can do it for you. He refused to give a blueprint for the future. But if you get to the Absolute Method as new beginning, then you will see no book is really finished.

I made many new addtions. Want to end with the new one just run off today:

*ILM's Todayness* *Significance* *M&F* *9/2*  
*RD* *2 main Wars* *28 Great Divide*  
*PrP* THE AMERICA IN INT. STRUGGLES FOR FREEDOM;  
 the BLACK WORLD, viewed in context of THE  
 MARXIST-HUMANIST of Ideas;

THE TRILOGY OF REVOLUTION,  
 1957-1983

Lecture 1 --DIALECTICS--Hegelian, Marxian. VIL's GREAT DIVIDE  
 in MARXISM:

Our Age's--M-H ORIGINAL Contributions--from  
 Movement from Practice, as category to Absolute Negativity as

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \*\*\*\*\*Introductory\*\*\*\*\*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

So forbidding a year is 1984 when, at one and the same time  
 Reagan is rushing to give reality to Orwell's 1984 as well as  
 prepare for nuclear holocaust with other nuclear superpower, Russia,

and the ground for his imperialist inva-  
 sion of Grenada,--that 1st counter-revolutionary act --  
 the ~~starting~~ of revolutionary Grenada, leader-came from within  
 Bisgop's own revolutionary co-leaders--Coard and Austin,

that it becomes IMPERATIVE for all of us  
 far to transform 1984 into its total opposite, ~~which~~

loose IN A WORD, we  
 must dig deep into the/Left and not let it go at recognize  
 only at what is horrid and obvious--CAPITALIST IMPERIALIST RACIST  
 SEXIST EXISTING SOCIETY. If we look only at the obvious horrors,  
 we'll only end up with still one other unfinished revolution; we  
 have had too many aborted one. *Frank's favor for*

WE HAVE TO DIVE DEEP DOWN INTO  
 OUR MARXIAN REVOLUTIONARY SUBSTANCE WHEN MARK FIRST  
 DISCOVERED A WHOLE NEW CONTINENT OF THOUGHT AND OF REVOLUTION  
~~out that~~ REVOLUTION IN PERMANENCE FOR OUR  
 AGE.

*at the very moment*  
*he embraced*  
*the Algerian*  
*Revolution*

*140 yrs*  
*date*

MARK'S TODAYNESS & M-H's 1st  
 WORK M&F MOVEMENT  
 FROM PRACTICE

LABOR'S AGE OF REVOLUTIONS  
 & PHILOSOPHY  
 WHEN MARK TRANSFORMED INTO THE DIALECTICS OF REVOLUTION

*Rev's Supplement*  
*Labn - Critique 49-50*  
*From Rev 10*  
*Marx phil & Rev*  
 16195





AFTER 1980

Hold on to both LABOR & SEE HOW IT GETS 4

FORCES OF REVOLUTION & TO THEORY when its gets FORCE AS REASON.

Handwritten notes: Appendices, New Woman, Footnotes, # 5 1140 acres + a mile, # 49 David Walker's Aff, # 17 Dad's Church

\*\*\*\*\* Part III The TWO WORLD WARS & THE TWO GREAT DIVIDES: \*\*\*\*\* PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION 1982 ed.

~~When~~ DIALECTICS AS METHODOLOGY seemed to be what all Marxists were ~~using~~ <sup>& when</sup> Bernstein asked that the "scaffolding" be removed, all rushed to its defense, even KK whereupon when WWI broke, the whole 2nd Int. collapsed. VIL's return to Hegelian dialectics deepened the GREAT DIVIDE BET. BETRAYERS & REVOLUTIONARIES by concretising, singling out "transformation into opposite" ~~and~~ denying "aristocracy of labor" LABOR STATUS.

THE NEW in our age was totality, absolute itself as NEW BEGINNING. Where none <sup>but Marxist</sup> before had tread--& Marx hadn't concretised INSOFAR AS WE KNEW ~~the~~ <sup>as</sup> Russia too had joined the imperialist war ~~at its worst end~~ <sup>at</sup> ~~the~~ HITLER STALIN

Handwritten notes: M/R, Book of CHI, Has it sufficient just to Oppose VIL, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025

AND YET IT IS precisely Hegel's SELF THINKING IDEA, WHEN CONTINUED IN MARX'S REVOLUTIONARY PRAXIS--SELF BRINGING FORTH OF LIBERTY, that brought about the NEW rel. of TH/PR -- & will make it easy for us to grasp MARX'S NEW MOMENT IN LAST DECADE

Handwritten: III MARX'S NEW MOMENTS IN LAST DECADE & Teil + 1980s

we call ~~it~~ led to the discovery of what and Marx called A.M.F.