

Dear Kevin:

Since I really do not have a free moment, this will have to be read as if it ~~meant~~ said either all I really meant, with the recognition that I take for granted that the critique is because I consider your review very good, but methodologically, whether for this subject or very nearly any other writing, "the way of methodology" requires great meticulousness with language so that the dialectic can emerge free and easy. Take the simple question on the sequence in some of the sentences on p.1., final par when you come to the 1940s:

a) the "worked together with J&G", should come ahead of coming in contact with Frankfurt School not only because factually that is correct but, above all, because "developing Marxism as dial.phil." sounds as if we were all bound in same direction, which we were NOT, while cutting out those 6 words, you do keep "delving into Hegel" etc. Moreover, when you there place also mtg. Frankfurt School that definitely helps put many differing views of Hegel so that when the break finally comes with CLRJ, it isn't just what they may think "politics". This would permit you to stop in the last sentence of that par. at the word, "mid-1950s", and INSTEAD, TRANSPOSE HERE, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ i.e. go direct to mid-p.2, "She dates her formulation of her new concept of dialectic both what came from practice in the 1950s miners strike... (ADD(ING her breakthrough on AI, which she ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ writes: so that you can then mention M&F, 1957, not just because chronologically that is where M-H is announced along with roots in Abolition, so that when you say RD "found what she termed M-H" on p.p it means something, concrete events people can identify with instead of just a term.

pp.3-to mid-p.4 I found nothing to criticize, and the only in the rest of p.4 I thought could be made clearer is that when you mention RL's Mass Strike which this generation would hardly at once identify as 1905 revolution, but instead think of a strike in which masses participated, perhaps even union led, you should at once say that the Mass Strike pamphlet is an analysis of the 1905 revolution, what she developed all she is so famous for: SPONTANEITY.

Also do not in the ME PAR. RELATE to break with Jogiches; he was sitting in prison still; they broke after he came out and there are so many different gossips on the why that it is best to start a new par. so that though the break occurred during the same period. And instead of at once going to Q from me, you ~~may~~ insert either a whole new sentence, or even just a half, something like this, "Whether the 1905 revolution itself in which both were active participants-- he was still in prison and she managed to be freed earlier-- or just as she herself put it after she ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ spoke of the break as "I...", Dunayevskaya concludes: & ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Q from me.

Let me emphasize, before the 2 other ~~things~~ comments I want to make, that I know you probably have already sent it off--and, of course, you should never ask my advice the day before it is to be submitted; never, never, never; it is best just to send it off, you are good enough for doing it on your own, but to ask me, horrors!-- but the ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ LOGY as it is expressed in SEQUENCE

16441

of this article will make it YOUR task for others.

So, to get to p.5, before you start on Part III --and all of RLWLKM should have been either abbreviated, or made dependent upon, or hinted at, or in some way have reader anticipate the **TOTALLY, TOTALLY NEW--Ch.12**, 1st because that will be **THE CHALLENGE NOT ONLY TO ALL "MARXISTS" BUT TO ACADEMIA AND ABOVE ALL, LABOR.** You know that, whether it is a simple journalistic article, a Letter of the Week just for M-H-ist or a weighted tome on ANY subject, ask "WHAT IS NEW?" It isn't that I have any illusions that every time one takes pen to paper, one must "FOUND" a new continent of thought & of rev. It is that saying just to oneself: what am I saying that they couldn't have heard from a dozen others on same topic, makes it one's task to relate to audience, to history, to DIALECTICS. In this specific case, to make post-Marx Marxists a pejorative is not just a separation from all other Marxists, it is taking all spots, whether it be on Labor, or on 3rd world, or on perspectives, future, next year, now, etc.etc. is **THE challenge that immediately involves the reader as participant.** And because Krader wasn't the least interested in that, much less in WL, or KM's EN on which he spent no less than a decade deciphering, but only in himself, his discovery, his APPLICATION IN POL. ECO. FOR ANTHROPOLOGY of political eco., very nearly only I could understand the great achievement OF MARX'S NEW MOMENTS.

O.K./ for a single sentence as you finish Part II & approach Part III & EN, something like this should have been inserted after 1844 Essays. As we see, it isn't really a question of Marx in 1844; it is of us in the ~~1844~~ modern world, before & after WWII, for all the contradictions that Labor would encounter in the post-WWII world, and the new that has arise with a new, 3rd world, & Women who were being driven out of the factories they were lured into who are now asking: What is new for me. Igt is indeed for this reason RD decided that ~~THE QUES.~~ CANNOT be answered on WL, whether that includes RL or not, but the Marx's Marxism as a totality. As was ~~in Ch.12~~, the final ch. she both issues a challenge to/all Marxists as well as by showing that only our world can fully understand the real Marx as a Humanist who, not just in 1844 but in 1882 laid the trail for us of rev. 1st not in technologically ADVANCED LANDS, BUT IN BACKWARD,

Thus, the final par. on p.5 you could add to 1st sentence about E not being KM a direct reference to another American, Lewis's Ancient Society and the Indians.

I made no notes on WLDOR to which you should have come a good deal earlier than p.6, so that latest book is so that it is a concretisation of Ch/12, though it turns back 35 years, and has everything on Labor from Miners' Wives to Khomeini.

Enuf!

16442

Raya Dunayevskaya, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1982, 234 pp.

Raya Dunayevskaya, Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future, Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1985, 302 xx pp.

reviewed by Kevin Anderson

From her childhood in Russia during the revolution to her thirty year collaboration in Detroit with Black auto worker Charles Denby, author of Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal, Raya Dunayevskaya has been a committed intellectual - both as thinker and as activist. Born in Russia, she became active as a teenager in the 1920's in the Communist Party in Chicago, especially in the Black Marxist movement and its paper The Negro Champion. (It is a sad commentary on ~~the~~ the state of historical archives on Black America that no complete set of this pre-Stalinist weekly paper exists in any archive or library.)

Her early break with Stalinism took her into the Trotskyist movement, where she eventually became a secretary to Leon Trotsky in Mexico during ~~the~~ the Moscow Trials, only to break with him as well in 1939 over his critical support of the Hitler-Stalin Pact. In the 1940's she developed a theory ~~of~~ of state capitalism, coming into contact with the Frankfurt School, and worked together with CLR James and Grace Lee (Boggs) ~~to develop Marxism as~~ <sup>to develop Marxism as</sup> dialectical philosophy, delving into ~~the~~ Hegel's, into Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks, and into Marx's 1844 Humanist Essays. This "Johnson-Forest Tendency" (Johnson was the pen name of James and ~~Forest~~ Forest that of Dunayevskaya) ~~is~~ came to see Blacks as an independent revolutionary force, and made some penetrating critiques of the nascent labor bureaucracy growing inside the CIO. In the mid-1950's, <sup>however</sup> ~~the~~ Dunayevskaya broke with James and Lee as well, <sup>both on the analysis of the 1950's as well as</sup> to found what she was to term "Marxist-Humanism".

Since 1957 in her Marxism and Freedom, Raya Dunayevskaya has sought to

reconstruct Marxism on Hegelian and humanist lines. She has not hesitated, as in her Philosophy and Revolution (1973) ~~to~~ to critically appropriate the culmination of Hegel's "system", his absolutes, turning it into what she terms 'absolute negativity as new beginning' and writing:

In Hegel's Absolutes there is embedded, though in abstract form, ~~the~~ the fully ~~developed~~ developed 'social individual', to use Marx's phrase, and what Hegel called individuality "purified of all that interfered with its universalism, i.e. freedom itself." Freedom, to Hegel, was not only his ~~point~~ point of departure; it was also his point of return. This was the bridge not only to Marx and Lenin but ~~to~~ to the freedom struggles of our day.\*

This concept of dialectic has in fact grounded her thinking since the 1950's. Absolute negativity as new beginning, she argues, can enable Marxists to respond creatively to the new social movements such as Black and women's liberation which have emerged so <sup>dramatically</sup> ~~creatively~~ since World War II.

She dates her formulation of this new concept of dialectic to two key events of the early 1950's: (1) The massive 1949-50 coal miners' strike against automation and against the bureaucratic leadership of John L. Lewis in West Virginia <sup>in which she was a participant</sup>, as recently recorded for the first time in her 1984 pamphlet (with former miner Andy Phillips)\*, The Coal Miners' General Strike/and the Birth of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S. : of 1949-50

(2) The East Berlin workers' uprising of June 1953, coming almost immediately on the heels of Stalin's death, and challenging the totalitarian regime to its foundation. What began in Berlin, she argued in Marxism and Freedom, was nothing less than "the beginning of the end of Russian totalitarianism."

As she wrote on its importance to dialectics in her Philosophy and Revolution:

The revolt that erupted in East Germany in 1953 and came to a climax in the Hungarian Revolution was articulated also in new points of departure in theory...It was as if the "Absolute Universal", instead of being a beyond,

an abstraction, was concrete and everywhere.

As the 1950's and 1960's developed, the open and humanistic Marxism which Raya Dunayevskaya had begun to create deepened her discussion of the new social movements, such as the Black and youth movements of the period. A critique of these movements in a world context is presented in her Philosophy and Revolution. The two more recent books under review here, while certainly developing her general concept of revolutionary dialectics, center concretely on the problematics raised by the women's liberation movement.

Because of its often critical bite, ~~ix~~ its controversial political standpoint even within Marxism, the sheer scope of her endeavor, and her own position outside academia, ~~xxxxx~~ Dunayevskaya's work has just begun to get the ~~xy~~ type of discussion it deserves in radical intellectual circles. More and more people - this writer included - have found her concept of dialectic to be a vantage point from which to assess critically both vulgar and deterministic Marxism as well as "Western Marxism". Some of those who were unwilling to accept either Marcusean one-dimensionality or Althusserian anti-humanism and yet who sought a philosophical foundation for Marxism, ~~xxx~~ have found themselves increasingly drawn to the work of Dunayevskaya in the 1980's. Her work has also gained more attention recently from labor historians, as seen in the extensive exhibit on her life and writings at the Wayne State University labor archives in 1985, covering the period from 1941 on, much of it available on microfilm as The Raya Dunayevskaya Collection.

Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution ~~xxx~~ is a wide-ranging book which ~~has not yet found the U.S. audience it deserves.~~ The first part presents an important critique of Rosa Luxemburg, who is much praised but whose theories have been seldom discussed. Dunayevskaya not only presents a serious critique of Luxemburg's Accumulation of Capital, but also brings the whole theoretical discussion alive for today by connecting Luxemburg to women's liberation, to the

Third World and to Polish and German mass strikes.

While not all readers will be satisfied that Dunayevskaya has uncovered enough empirical evidence to give Rosa Luxemburg a "feminist dimension", to debate only at that level is not really the point, because for Dunayevskaya the whole purpose of bringing in the revolutionary woman theorist Luxemburg is because of what she considers "the need for today's Women's Liberation Movement to absorb Luxemburg's revolutionary dimension, not for history's sake but for their demands of the day, including autonomy." (ix) Dunayevskaya has certainly challenged both previous work by serious Luxemburg scholars such as J.P. Nettl and those feminist theorists - including <sup>those who consider Luxemburg</sup> Marxist feminists - who continue to ignore Luxemburg.

A striking feature of this discussion is the brief chapter entitled "Luxemburg as Feminist, Break with Jogiches", which challenges all previous interpretations by connecting Luxemburg's personal (but not political) break with her former lover and political mentor Leo Jogiches, to the originality of one of Luxemburg's most-discussed works, ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> The Mass Strike (1906), written <sup>of the 1905</sup> ~~just~~ <sup>after that break with Jogiches, *occurred during the Saraj*</sup> It was her first theoretical work which was written without any collaboration by Jogiches. Dunayevskaya writes: "Luxemburg needed to be free, to be independent, to be whole... Her greatest intellectual accomplishments occurred after the break." (92-93) Apparently to underscore the ~~Reform~~ <sup>the break with Jogiches</sup> todayness of this chapter, she places not in the part of the book on Luxemburg, but in the section on today's women's liberation movement, part two.

~~But~~ Before she gets to part two, however, she takes up Luxemburg's opposition to German imperialism, especially in Namibia, arguing that it was at the heart of her 1910 break with Kautsky and Bebel's leadership of the Second International, four years ahead of Lenin. It was this crisis which led Luxemburg to write Accumulation of Capital as an inquiry into the causes of imperialism. However, her concept of dialectics and economics in that work and her ~~constant~~ lifelong opposition to all nationalism, even revolutionary nationalism, are sharply

critiqued by Dunayevskaya. On the other hand, Luxemburg's own 1918 critique of the Russian revolution is seen by Dunayevskaya as raising nothing less ~~that~~ than the question of revolutionary democracy after the revolution, and from a vantage point which fully supported that revolution, seeking to extend it into Germany in 1918-19.

Part two, "The Women's Liberation Movement as Revolutionary Force and Reason", ranges over the current women's movement internationally, the earlier movement in the abolitionist period in America, and focuses especially on the creativity of Black and Third World revolutionary women activists as well as Left revolutionaries such as Margaret Fuller in the U.S., Louise Michel in France, and Rosa Luxemburg Bonaparte in East Timor, to name only a few. This section also begins some sharp critiques of Engels' Origin of the Family for what it does say about women --- "the world historic defeat of the female sex" - and of Herbert Marcuse for what he does not mention on Marx's discussion on women in his 1932 pioneering and lengthy essay on Marx's 1844 Humanist Essays.

Part three, which comprises half of the book, is of "Karl Marx - From Critic of Hegel to Author of Capital and Theorist of ~~Permanent~~ 'Revolution in Permanence'". While many topics are discussed here, from Marx's neglected 1841 Doctoral Thesis on Epicurus to his equally neglected <sup>phil.</sup> concept of revolutionary organization, perhaps the most original point is on how Marx's last writings such as his Ethnological Notebooks clarify and deepen the multi-dimensional nature of his dialectics of revolution.

By connecting his Ethnological Notebooks to his writings on Russia in the 1870's and 1880's, Dunayevskaya argues that Engels' preoccupation with the "origin" of the family and of class society <sup>placey something that Marx's</sup> was ~~not~~ Marx's. Marx was looking at non-European society and its communal structure - whether in ~~primitive~~ primitive societies such as the Iroquois or under the sway of the Asiatic mode of production as in India - to explore new pathways to social revolution. Here he was continuing what he had begun in his Grundrisse on the Asiatic mode of production, but this time deepening it both philosophically and as the dialectics of revolution.

*new son that old in the old to get old one the way Marx said*

*It forms the which actually was based on the*

16447

As Dunayevskaya writes on this issue:

One ~~xxix~~ culminating point in this intensive study of primitive communism and in the answer to Vera Zasulich can be seen in the Preface Marx and Engels wrote for the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto, which, without changing a word in the Manifesto itself, projected the idea that Russia could be the ~~first~~ first to have a proletarian revolution ahead of the West. (187)

Marx was also pointing to women as a revolutionary subject, not 10,000 years ago, but in his ~~xxix~~ period. In short, these were multilinear paths of development toward social revolution involving women, peasants, and minorities in addition to the industrial proletariat. To Dunayevskaya, this speaks not only to Russia 1882, but also to today's Third World revolutions, ~~xxx~~ preoccupied with debates over women's liberation and indigenous peoples, and seeking alternatives ~~xx~~ within ~~xxix~~ Marxism to meet today's challenges. ~~xx~~ That may be why this ~~w~~ book has ~~xxxxxx~~ generated wider discussion in Latin America than in the U.S., ever since its 1985 publication in a Spanish edition in Mexico.

Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution ~~(1985)~~: Reaching for the Future (1985) enriches the discussion begun by Rosa Luxemburg. This is a book of 27 essays (three are by colleagues of Dunayevskaya, Olga Domanski(2) and Urszula Wislanka) written since 1950 on women and revolutionary dialectics. The dialectician Dunayevskaya does not, however, allow these 27 pieces to appear in a standard chronological format. Rather, they begin with her 1969 speech on the new women's liberation movement, which warmly supported that new movement, critiqued some of its Left opponents, and gave a Marxist humanist analysis, stressing that, "We can be a catalyst not only for our development as all-round human beings, but also for that of men." (28)

With that historical turning point of the birth of a new movement setting the ground, she can then go back further, to the post World War II world, where ~~(1985)~~ she states in her 1984 introduction to the collection:

What distinguishes the newness and uniqueness of Women's Liberation in our age is the very nature of ~~the~~<sup>our</sup> epoch, which signified, at one and the same time, a new stage of production - Automation - and a new ~~xx~~ stage of cognition. The fact that the movement from ~~xx~~ practice was itself a form of theory was manifested in the Miners' General Strike of 1949-50, during which the miners battling ~~x~~ Automation were focusing not on wages but on a totally new question about the kind of labor man should do, asking why there was such a big gap between thinking and doing. It was also seen in the new kind of activities on the part of the miners' wives, although, in the ~~xxx~~ immediate post-World War II ~~xxxx~~ world, Women's Liberation was only an Idea whose time had come and not yet a recognized Movement. (1)

In this way, she tries ~~xxxx~~ throughout the collection to present a ~~xxx~~ view of women's liberation as a total and an independent movement, and yet viewing it always in relationship to all the

...new forces of revolution - women, Black, peasant, youth, indeed the whole Third World ... (where) A new relationship of practice to theory demanded also ~~xxx~~ that no single force of revolution tower above the others; all new forces of revolution had to be synthesized on the day after as well as the day of revolution. (270-71)

Part one on "Women; ~~x~~ Labor and the Black Dimension" contains interesting essays from the period 1950-1960 on miners' wives, abolitionism and feminism, and on African women, while other essays present aspects of her overall view of the "dialectics of revolution."

Parts two and three analyze mainly international revolutionary developments - from Portugal to Iran and from Latin America to China and to Poland. Perhaps the most interesting here ~~is~~<sup>is</sup> the analysis of the Iranian revolution, which as early as March 1979 hit out sharply at "Khomeini's act<sup>s</sup> of retrogression" which Dunayevskaya dubbed "outright counterrevolution." She concluded, "Let us extend

our solidarity to the embattled revolutionaries - the new generation of revolutionary students as well as workers, Women's Liberations as well as national minorities Kurds especially, fighting for self-determination."(69)

Part four is strictly on dialectical philosophy. Here some of Dunayevskaya's essays on Marx's Ethnological Notebooks and other materials related to the book Rosa Luxemburg are reproduced. Perhaps most ground-breaking here is her 1979 article on the Ethnological Notebooks, "Marx's and Engels' Studies Contrasted: The Relationship of Philosophy and Revolution to Women's Liberation." Other essays include "The Grundrisse and Women's Liberation"(1974), and several ~~written~~ written since Rosa Luxemburg. Of those, the most interesting is her brief series of "additions" to Rosa Luxemburg, called "Answers Raised During the Marx Centenary Lecture on the Book". These sharpen the contrast Dunayevskaya has been drawing in both books between Marx and what she terms "post-Marx Marxists, beginning with Frederick Engels."(267). They also delve into new forms of revolutionary organization to replace outworn elitist forms, not only as a recognition of the creativity of the new social movements, but also because, she argues, "Marx, instead of isolating organization in a separate realm, created the philosophy of revolution as ground also for organization. It is this challenge which post-Marx Marxists have not met."(271) This is a problematic for today which Dunayevskaya is exploring.

Raya Dunayevskaya's two recent books, plus her earlier work, call for nothing less than a total reorganization of Marxist dialectics for today. One can certainly disagree with her overall formulation of the problem or with her specific points, but it is high time that her ideas - an important contribution to Marxist, radical, and feminist social theory and history - were given the serious hearing and discussion they ~~deserve~~ deserve. Her voluminous writings open up many new points of departure for radical historians and social theorists in the 1980's.

Kevin Anderson  
Northern Illinois University

16450