

5 5 7 4

THE POLITICAL-PHILOSOPHIC LETTERS OF RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

News & Letters, 1900 E. Jefferson,

Detroit, MI 48207

Price: 50c

May 15, 1978

THE LATIN AMERICAN UNFINISHED REVOLUTIONS

Dear Friends,

Of the more than two dozen talks I gave on this spring's lecture tour -- ranging from "Gramsci's Philosophy of Praxis vs. Eurocommunism" to "Frantz Fanon, Soweto and American Black Thought"; and from "Rosa Luxemburg and Today's Women's Liberation Movement" to "Today's Global Crisis, Marx's Capital and the Epigones Who Try To Truncate It" -- the talk that produced the most probing discussion was the one given at California State University on "The Latin American Unfinished Revolutions: Where To Next?" This was due to the fact that the discussion on it transformed the question, "Where To Next?", from one of "programs and tactics," as was the case heretofore, to one of methodology and a philosophy of revolution.

The Cuban Revolution Before and After Russia's Entry

In the 1960s the discussions around the New Divide -- the Cuban Revolution -- were nearly totally uncritical both because of the great enthusiasm over its success against both Batista and that goliath 90 miles from its shore, U.S. imperialism, and because of the hope that it would initiate a new age of revolutions on no less than a tri-continental Third World range. But the new question posed in the 1970s was: How could it be that Cuba -- which made its revolution by its own force and its own Reason which Fidel had declared to be "humanist" (1) -- was now so blatantly tailendist to Russia, globally, as to declare Ethiopia a "land going toward socialism" and oppose the Eritrean liberation struggle Fidel had so long championed?

This is not to say that those now asking that question had opposed the Cuban Revolution when it first took place. Quite the contrary. They had opposed any who dared question a single aspect of it, whether that was the transformation of guerrilla warfare into the universal for uprooting any and all

5514

class societies, or Cuba's relationship to Russian Communism. But now one African called the Cubans "mercenaries," and I strongly objected to the designation, explaining that, no doubt if I were Eritrean, I could easily sound as Maoist as those who declare Russia to be "Enemy No. 1," but that choosing the "lesser evil" has always brought to the fore the greater evil, be it U.S. imperialism or Russian.

The young man replied that, first, he was not Eritrean, but Ethiopian; and that a genuine social revolution is exactly what the liberation struggles within Ethiopia aimed at, as against Col. Mengistu. But, continued the young man, the truth is always concrete, and, concretely, the Cubans are not revolutionaries but counter-revolutionaries in Ethiopia. (2)

#### Third World-ism and "Dependency Theories"

Where, in the 1960s and early '70s, discussions in the Left centered around "Dependency Theories," (3) today discussion is around the unfinished nature of all Third World revolutions. That is to say, previously U.S. imperialism alone was held to be the enemy, its tentacles so massive that, it was concluded, there was no substantive native capitalist class, and therefore the class struggle road to revolution was inapplicable in the underdeveloped countries. Today, Third World-ism is declared to be sheer "euphoria." (4)

This particular aspect of the discussions was induced by Gérard Chaliand's Revolution in the Third World. It is by no means a work by some reactionary outsider, but a Left "participant-observer" as he rightly designates himself. It is true he is not a Marxist, and is so anti-Leninist as to often hyphenate Lenin's name with Stalin's. Moreover, he disregards totally the global extension of the theory of revolution to the Orient by "non-party masses," developed by Lenin in the Theses on the National Question at the 1920 Communist International Congress, and other writings that flowed from it. (5) When Chaliand does speak of the relevance of Lenin's view to the underdeveloped countries of our era, he seems to skip a near half-century of fundamental changes in the world, especially Mao's transformation of Lenin's concept of proletarian and peasant revolution into guerrilla wars, that Mao designated as "people's wars" in which he accepted

"patriotic" capitalist nationalists. To cap it all, Chaliand entitles the crucial section "The Leninist Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy: China Since the Cultural Revolution"!

Nevertheless, for today's Left, Chaliand speaks as an "insider," a Leftist who had been a prominent exponent of Third World-ism and who lived with revolutionaries in the field -- in Latin America, in the Palestinian Resistance Movement, and in the jungles of Africa. It is this that makes Chaliand's book a serious contribution to the present discussion of what to do now that the revolutions in the Third World have remained unfinished.

He answers unequivocally with what he calls "Guerrilla Inflation: The Foco Theory as a Theory of Failure." He shows that, first, the only peasant and urban guerrillas that had any success were those that were social as well as national struggles, that is to say, class battles. (6) Secondly, he now acknowledges that "the most important weakness is the conceptual" (p.179). In a word, where in the 1960s and early '70s, activism was about the only guideline -- whether that concerned Cuba, Africa, and the Middle East, or whether that related to the industrialized countries, especially France, May 1968 -- Chaliand concludes that, both to understand what happened and to see the direction we are heading, objectively and subjectively, we can no longer evade the "conceptual."

#### The Theoretic Void and Trotskyism in Latin America

Unfortunately, far from drawing the "conceptual" to a logical conclusion as a total philosophy of liberation, Chaliand himself reduces it to "social and political terrain," which is hardly more than Trotskyist paraphernalia, though he rejects Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution. As for the claimant, J. Posadas, saying he is the "real" Fourth International, by twisting the theory of permanent revolution not only to give "primacy" to the colonial revolutions, but actually elevating that as the "World Development of Permanent Revolution," it all adds up to the theoretic void in the Movement, be it on the part of the "New Left" or the Trotskyists, and whether they be new claimants or "orthodox." (7)

Thus, though Posadas' position was rejected by the "orthodox" Trotskyists, or what is now called the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, there certainly were no fundamental differences in the uncritical hailing of the Cuban Revolution, not just as a magnificent blow to U.S. imperialism, but as nothing short of "the rampart of the world revolution."

This statement by their present specialist on Latin America, Livio Maitan, was not part of the euphoria of the 1960s, but came eight long years after the 1962 Cuban missile crisis which made it clear that it was not only Kennedy but Khrushchev who was carrying on a global-national imperialism without any regard for Cuba.

Maitan's statement, moreover, was made two years after the "orthodox" Trotskyists had rejected the Latin American deviant Trotskyist Hugo Gonzales Moscoso when he proclaimed: "But the guerrilla struggle in Bolivia, in spite of the death of Commandante Guevara, in spite of the blows, continued to be the only way out of the economic and political crisis of this country. It is the duty of revolutionaries in Bolivia and Latin America, as the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (POR) sees it, to support the present guerrilla struggle, strengthening it, making it come out of its isolation, joining it to the movement of the masses in the cities and in the mines, and bringing about the participation of the peasantry as the fighting force." (8)

Maitan's rhetoric was uttered Jan. 30, 1970, whereupon now Maitan's "Balance Sheet" (9) fails to mention one word of the United Secretariat's unprincipled shifting generalization -- from Cuba being "rampart" to Cuba being tailender to Russia -- during the 15 years (1963-1978) he is "balancing out" on Latin America in general and Cuba in particular. And yet no topic demands a more critical balance sheet than the Trotskyists' responsibility for the unfinished nature of Latin American revolutions. After all, as far back as 1952, Bolivia had a national and social revolution, in which the Trotskyists played a leading role. They have learned little from their popular frontism, which only paved the way for retrogression. That the failure to face that question assures the repetition of laying the ground for even more tragic failures was seen as recently as 1971, when the new euphoria over Allende's victory led them to issue the call for a "Single Marxist Party of the Masses" through the merger of the Socialist, Communist, and Trotskyist Parties.

Even now, when they blame Fidel for not having been critical enough of Allende's reformism, not to mention totally tailending Russian Communism in Africa, the Trotskyists can find nothing sharper to accuse Fidel of than "empiricism on the question of Stalinism."

It is not empiricism that is the question. It is the critical determinant -- the class nature, the capitalist class nature, of Stalinism, which is, after all, but the Russian name for the world phenomenon of our age: state-capitalism.

And it is the blindness to this reality which assures continued Trotskyist tailending of Communism. To repeat it more succinctly: the "orthodox" Trotskyist rhetoric about Cuba being "the rampart of world revolution" was uttered three years after the death of Ché revealed that more serious than the failure of foco-ism or "the party to lead" was the total isolation from the masses. Ché himself expressed it this way in his diary: "not one peasant has yet joined the guerrilla group."

Marx's Theory of Revolution, and Silvio Frondizi

It is this, just this, which makes imperative the return to Marx's theory of revolution as masses in motion demanding new human relationships, beginning with a new relationship of theory to practice rooted in the movement from practice. The specific terrain of Latin America brought to my mind the development of the Argentinian revolutionary, Silvio Frondizi. On the eve of the first revolts from under Russian totalitarianism -- the June 1953 uprising in East Germany -- Frondizi began a new type of digging into the origins of Marx's new continent of thought he called a "new Humanism." Frondizi wrote:

"The recent publication of the Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and of The German Ideology serves to illuminate many important aspects of dialectical materialism, making urgent and indispensable a new study of theory that would take into account the humanism in them and in The Holy Family, The Jewish Question, the introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, as well as the later economic works that, far from contradicting the philosophical principles affirmed in the early works ... illuminate and enrich them."

Silvio Frondizi was a serious Marxist, an activist. In a land where the Left confusedly hoped after World War II that Peron might be an effective force against U.S. imperialism, Frondizi had instead, by the 1950s, organized a group to seriously study dialectics and print Marxist studies in Argentina.

In the early 1960s, Frondizi moved toward accepting the theory of state-capitalism. (I append part of my correspondence with him when he was translating Marxism and Freedom. (10) ) It is true that the pull of

the Cuban Revolution was too much for Frondizi to resist; he took an uncritical position towards that revolution. By 1968, the most tragic aspect, globally, of Cuba's moving away from revolution, was Cuba's tailending Stalinism in the approval of Russia's counter-revolutionary crushing of Prague Spring, 1968. For that matter, independent tendencies, like Trotskyism, that did, "on their own," support Czech resistance, were keeping quiet at the Tricontinental Congress on that very question, as if East Europe was on a different planet.

Moreover, it wasn't only the Third World countries that remained cold to "socialism with a human face" in 1968. So sure was the revolutionary youth movement in France that they could "make it" (a social revolution) without any digging deep in order to work out a new relationship of theory to practice, maintaining that theory, as Cohn-Bendit had put it, could be picked up "en route," that Czechoslovakia was left bleeding alone. Not only that. Cuba remained very much unblemished to the "New Left"; indeed, the attitude to sharp revolutionary criticism of Cuba in those years was as if the critics were pariahs who are never there "when the revolution needs them."

What the 1970s brought forth that was new is by no means limited to the question raised by the Ethiopian student at California State University on Cuba's role in Ethiopia. Quite the contrary. What is new are the new groups that are appearing from the Left, who want to see with eyes of today the past two decades that would not separate the Latin American struggles from those in East Europe, or the Black Revolution in the U.S. from the present struggle in South Africa, or new class struggles in West Europe from the so-called "ultra-Lefts" in China, much less allow Women's Liberation to be relegated to "the day after" the revolution. The new is that the struggles must be considered as a totality, and as a totality from which would emerge new beginnings.

It is on this question, precisely, that Frondizi still has a great deal to contribute. The Argentinian fascists who murdered Silvio Frondizi on Sept. 27, 1974 could not kill those new beginnings. (11) New dialogues have been opened which must be continued, whether it be on the question of a total philosophy of liberation that would not allow philosophy and revolution to be separated, much less be taken out of global context, or whether it be on the strategy of foco-ism, or genuine proletarian revolution. I trust that this is but the beginning of a dialogue with the new Latin American revolutionaries.

5519

Raya Dunayevskaya  
Detroit, Michigan

FOOTNOTES

- (1) See Fidel's speech, summer 1959:

"Standing between the two political and economic ideologies or positions being debated in the world, we are holding our own positions. We have named it humanism.... The tremendous problem faced by the world is that it has been placed in a position where it must choose between capitalism, which starves people, and communism, which resolves economic problems but suppresses the liberties so greatly cherished by man. Both Cubans and Latin Americans cherish and foster a revolution that may meet their material needs without sacrificing those liberties .... this is a humanistic revolution, because it does not deprive man of his essence, but holds him as its basic aim. Capitalism sacrifices man; the Communist state, by its totalitarian concept, sacrifices the rights of man .... this revolution is not red, but olive-green, for olive-green is precisely our color, the color of the revolution brought by the rebel army from the heart of the Sierra Maestra."  
(reproduced in The New Left Review, Jan.-Feb. 1961)

- (2) Granma first revealed Cuba's participation in Ethiopia this March. See also the London Economist report reproduced in the Toronto Globe and Mail, May 6, 1978.

- (3) See Latin American Perspectives, No. 11, Fall 1976, especially the following two articles: "Dependency Theory and Dimensions of Imperialism" by Timothy F. Harding, and "American Underdevelopment: An Interpretive Essay on Historical Change" by Frederick S. Weaver.

- (4) See Revolution in the Third World: Myths and Prospects by Gérard Chaliand (New York: Viking Press, 1977).

- (5) See my analysis of those Theses in relationship to the African Revolutions of our day in Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions.

- (6) See my analysis of Debray, Ché and Castro's foco theory in Part III of Philosophy and Revolution, "Economic Reality and the Dialectics of Liberation," especially pp. 276-278.

For the development of this analysis consult the following articles in News & Letters: "Cuba's Revolution Highlights Mass Unrest in Latin America," (Lead) Feb. 1959; "Cuba Jolts State Department Domination of Latin America," (Lead) Jan. 1960; "The Cuban Revolution: The Year After," (Two Worlds) Dec. 1960; "The Kennedy Administration and Castro's Cuba," (Editorial) May 1961; "Kennedy's Nuclear Spectacular: Testing, Blackmailing, and Brainwashing," (Two Worlds) March 1962; "Kennedy and Khrushchev Bring the World Close to the Point of No Return," (Editorial) and "Ideology and Revolution: A Study in What Happens After..." (Two Worlds) Nov. 1962; as well as the Nov. 1967 Editorial on the death of Ché Guevara and the critique of Debray's Revolution in the Revolution (Two Worlds) March and April, 1968.

See also the following Political Letters: "Preliminary Statement on Crisis Over Cuba," written within hours of hearing news reports of the Bay of Pigs invasion, April 22, 1961; and "Marxist-Humanism vs. the U.S. Blockade of Cuba, the Russian Missile Bases There, Fidel Castro's 'Selective' Party, All Playing with Nuclear Holocaust," Oct. 25, 1962. All of these articles are included in the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection on deposit with the Walter Reuther Library Labor History Archives, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mi. 48202, and available on microfilm.

(7) The innumerable splits in Trotskyism were nowhere more hybrid than in Latin America. See Trotskyism in Latin America by Robert J. Alexander (Stanford: Hoover Institute, 1973), which is a fairly comprehensive record, marred, however, by such<sup>an</sup> empirical approach and a failure to comprehend theoretical divisions that some "facts" just aren't, while other real facts, such as the theory and groupings of state-capitalism, are not recorded at all.

(8) Quoted in Trotskyism in Latin America, p. 150.

(9) See "After the Defeats in Latin America" by Livio Maitan in Intercontinental Press, April 10, 1978.

(10) Now available in Spanish: Marxismo y libertad (México: Juan Pablos, 1976) and Filosofía y revolución (México: Siglo XXI, 1977). In the Special Introduction to the Mexican edition of Marxismo y libertad, I state that:

"The United States revolutionary intellectual cannot but be desirous of showing the other America than that of U.S. capitalism which has so unmitigated an imperial record in Latin America, whether that be the American-Mexican War of 1846-48 which took away so much of Mexico's land, or the occupation of the Panama Canal Zone which U.S. imperialism to this day dares rule in perpetuity, or the neo-fascist coup in Chile which the Nixon Administration, ever since 1970, did so much to finance, arm and inspire ...

"Each generation meets the challenge of the times or fades into oblivion. No one can be under the illusion that our epoch marks the type of turning point in history where history fails to turn. On the contrary. Precisely because of the political-philosophic maturity of our age, the movement these past two decades from practice that is itself a form of theory, we can meet this challenge, provided we return to the Humanism of Marxism and the new dialectics of liberation Lenin worked out on the eve of 1917, on the level of the new in our epoch."

(11) See News & Letters, Nov. 1974; both for further quotations from Frondizi, and an "In Memoriam" article which states:

"Having just lost its fascist head, Peron, Argentina now wobbles between open civil war and total fascist barbarism. At present, Mmc. Peron's goon squads are doing in extra-legal fashion what they dare not yet do legally and openly: exterminate their opposition. There is no question that the violence now wracking the southern end of South America, including Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina and Chile, is part of an attempt to prevent the Latin American revolution from completing its links. A pro-fascist combination of military forces, oligarchs, U.S. imperialists and CIA ferret out left-wingers and independents, then torture and assassinate them."

A P P E N D I X

Excerpts from  
AN EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH SILVIO FRONDISI

Buenos Aires  
March 28, 1963

Dear Miss Dunayevskaya:

... I want to tell you that I'm very interested in the Spanish translation of your book because I hope it will turn out a success. I am willing to undertake this and I think the publication may include all the appendices you would decide. Although we have the original of the "Political and Economic Manifesto", and its English, Italian and Spanish translations, I think it is always interesting to consider a new version. We also have the French and Italian editions of the "Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks", but we haven't the Spanish translation of these. Your pamphlet "Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolution" may be included in our publication too.

I'll have all our materials sent to you as soon as possible, except those which are out of print. You will advise that some of them are not in fashion, but you may take the opportunity to know what have we done as yet.

We shall take it our business to do whatever you suggest about this matter and to begin a regular exchange of materials.

I'll be hoping to hear from you soon and I should like to meet you here for in-person discussion between us.

Most truly yours,  
Silvio Frondisi

Detroit  
April 2, 1963

Dear Dr. Frondisi:

... I think it would be an excellent idea to include the pamphlet on the Afro-Asian Revolutions because all of this does apply to Latin America as well as to Africa. I am including herewith one of the letters on Africa that I had written when I was there, plus the pamphlet. Under separate cover we will also send you all of our other publications.

Will you write a special introduction for the Latin American edition? I certainly hope so and I too will wish to write a special preface. I will not comment on the trip because I don't see it as an immediate possibility, unfortunately, because of the cost. No doubt, however, by the time the book has been translated, I hope to be there. Will you please inform me what type of publisher you have in mind? How long do you estimate the translation and the printing will take?

Fraternally yours,  
Naya Dunayevskaya

5522

-10-

Detroit  
May 29, 1963

Dear Com. Frondizi:

Thank you very much for inscribing your LA REALIDAD ARGENTINA to me and forwarding to us your other books as well as those of your collaborators, Marcos Kaplan and Eugenio Werden. It is most exciting to find that in the same two decades -- 1943-1963 -- in which our ideas were formulated, so were yours. While, in its main current, the Marxist-Humanism, internationalism and revolutionary aspirations are on the same level -- or, as you phrase it in "Doce Anos de politica argentina", "que aspira a superar las limitaciones y la antitesis del stalinismo y del trotskismo"-- the different origins and environment of the American and Argentinian Marxist-Humanists should also show themselves.

What is quintessential is that, finally, after a theoretic void begun with the death of Lenin and never ended, a dialogue between us should begin on the serious level of bringing out a Spanish edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM, with, I hope, an Introduction for the Latin American readers by yourself. Naturally, at the same time, I will see that your works get read by our people and, while the situation in this country hardly allows for translation and publication of your works, I shall certainly try to see what I can do.

If you will permit me to call to your attention the method of my book, I believe we will also be able to see wherein the emphasis you have put in your works differ. Your group impresses me as being serious and all intellectual; ours is serious but it is nearly 50 percent proletarian. Hence, while we have theoretical works like MARXISM AND FREEDOM and the pamphlet on the Afro-Asian Revolutions, and presently the National Editorial Board's statement on AMERICAN CIVILIZATION ON TRIAL, we have not only the unique combination of worker and intellectual in the monthly paper, NEWS & LETTERS, but also such pamphlets written by workers and Negro youth as WORKERS BATTLE AUTOMATION, FREEDOM RIDERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES, etc. It is this concentration on letting the workers speak for themselves that has also influenced the writing of the major theoretical work, as you can easily see by the break in style in Section Two on the American Scene of Part B, "The Problem of Our Age: State Capitalism vs. Freedom".

This same concentration on the working class' self-activity explains why the re-establishment of the Humanism of Marxism in the United States dates itself, on the one hand, to the miners' strike against Automation in 1949-50, and the East German revolt against Russian totalitarian "norms of labor" in 1953, on the other.

Your concrete theoretical analysis -- whether your own "La Realidad Argentina", "Doce Anos de politica argentina" and "La Revolucion Cubana", or Marcos Kaplan's "Economia Y Politica del Petroleo Argentino (1939-1956) -- therefore were of greater value to us than the philosophic statements, whether of Rousseau, Locke, or dialectical materialism. This is not because philosophy is not of the essence to us as an organization and to the epoch as an age that must still achieve its revolution. Rather it is because your latter works trace a philosophic development, in and of itself, whereas our philosophic theses relate directly to the present stage of political and proletarian development.

5523

-11-

Let us take, as one example, Humanism. Of course it can be traced from Rousseau and surely we come closer yet to Marx through Feuerbach. And I agree with you that Rudolfo Mondolfo is surely underestimated in Europe and not known at all in the United States. I remember being impressed with his "Marx and Marxismo", especially his attack on the current pretenders to Marxism as against "genuine Marxism which is animated by a deep historical consciousness and the highest demands for freedom." Nevertheless the stress on Feuerbach did not help the Marxism of the late 19th century not to betray nor, which is more important, Lenin be able to find his way back to the Hegelian dialectic as self-development, self-activity, self-movement and the humanism that followed without breaking with the whole philosophic foundation of the Second International, even in its revolutionary internationalist days, of counterposing materialism to idealism instead of seeing them as synthesis.

In any case -- to return to the method of MARXISM AND FREEDOM -- the 1844 Manuscripts are dealt with, not in relationship to either Rousseau or Feuerbach or, for that matter, the dialectic of the Greeks upon which Marx also surely depended, but as they arose in the beginnings of the factory age. That is to say, the Industrial Revolution, on the one hand, stimulated the American Revolution and English classical political economy with its theory of value; and, on the other hand, impelled the great French Revolution, the Hegelian dialectic, and the utopian socialists and vulgar communists. Out of all these forces plus the actual class struggles of the 1830s came Marx's Humanist essays, the anticipation of the 1848 revolution.

The next "break" in Marx comes as a result of the American Civil War, the struggle for the eight-hour day and birth of the First International, and the Paris Commune. These forces help him theoretically break with his former method of presenting his CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY as a dispute among theoreticians, to CAPITAL, as a history, not of theories, but of production relations. The Humanism and Dialectic of CAPITAL re-establishes, therefore, the Humanism of 1844 on a very much higher level, right within his most "economic" work.

To me, Lenin's need to break with his own philosophic past has the most cogent effect on us today, and is seen, not so much in his break with the Second International which betrayed, but with his own Bolshevik colleagues, especially the main theoretician of the party, Nikolai Bukharin, whom he considered suffering from "economism" and not "fully a master of the dialectic." In this Lenin predicted all state planners of today. Naturally he couldn't know them as we who have suffered from Stalinism know them, but the anticipation of state-capitalism and degeneration of Russian Revolution in his last speech have never been mastered by Leon Trotsky. Though he had remained the one symbol of opposition to the Stalinist bureaucracy, it turned out to be no more than a footnote to history, and now the Trotskyists are nothing but left-wing whitewashers of both Russian and Chinese Communism.

Finally, the Humanism gets to the American, East German and Hungarian Revolution scenes and it is on such a need for a new humanism that I end the book. I do not go into the French "resuscitators" of Humanism in the mid-1940s who used it only to whitewash Stalinism -- and later the American state department through "Congress of Cultural Freedom." I do have in a recent Two Worlds column the new spate of books on the Early Essays of Marx, but on the whole I will not argue with those who speak one way when they talk abstractly (as Lefebvre, Merleau-Ponty, let alone that Stalinist apologist Sartre) and act quite differently on the political and organizational front. I would rather then stick with the proletarians and follow their real movement for the reconstruction of society.

5524

Do please let me hear from you as to the actual possibilities of bringing out the Spanish edition this year. As you noted from the various people who introduced the American and Italian editions of my work, they were not co-thinkers. This is why I look forward so much to your introducing the Spanish edition so that both you can say what you feel in it applies to the Latin American scene -- and we get both Praxis and News & Letters Committees as the organizations to whom theory means something of great importance.

Fraternally,  
Raya Dunayevskaya

Buenos Aires  
June 4, 1963

Dear Miss Raya:

I have received all the materials you'd promised to send me; thank you very much. I'm very interested on them, especially on "Marxism and freedom"; it's excellent and I think it will prove very useful in our struggle against rightists and communists.

We have already begun to translate your work, but it will be some time before it is over, because we have many things to do but our political affairs too. I am sure you will be well impressed by our materials.

I should like to continue a regular correspondence with you in the near future. Watching for your reply I am, my dear friend, yours fraternally,

Buenos Aires  
June 14

Yours of May 29 reached me yesterday, but I had written this letter before. Notwithstanding I want to tell you that it's really exciting to find we had both met in the same point around the same time.

According to my opinion there are many possibilities of bringing out the Spanish edition of your work this year, on account of the dynamic conditions of the Argentine affairs; I shall take it my business to introduce the publication and I'll be very pleased to do it.

I cannot explain my opinions about the subject matter of your letter to you now, but I shall do it when I recover my health. On Sunday 9, I was set at liberty after some days being arrested on account of a short course of lectures on neoliberalism, neocatholicism and neomarxism in the Cordoba University. My detention turned out a great success. On Monday of this week, I have retaken the professor's chair in the Buenos Aires University.

Most truly yours,  
Silvio

5525

5 5 2 8  
-13-

Buenos Aires  
19 de Mayo de 1964

Estimada compañera:

De nuevo reintegrado a la tarea en Buenos Aires, me apresuro a escribirle para acusar recibo de sus cartas y el material enviado.

Tengo buenas noticias para nosotros; hemos firmado contrato con una editorial para publicar los trabajos en curso. Esto tiene gran importancia para la situación política del país, que ha comenzado nuevamente a complicarse.

Seguimos con la traducción de su obra, a la que hemos incluido ya en nuestros cursos universitarios. Tendrá además mucha difusión por los cursos y publicaciones que estamos haciendo. He hecho un cursillo sobre catolicismo humanista, y entró en prensa el correspondiente trabajo; allí se cita su interesante obra.

Además, ahora empiezo la segunda parte del cursillo, que versa sobre "La Teoría política del tercer Mundo", cuyo núcleo central será el marxismo humanista, tomando como base su obra "Marxismo y Libertad".

Eso hace que al margen de dicha obra, necesitemos todo trabajo publicado o nota privada sobre el mencionado tema: "El Tercer Mundo".

Entendemos por tal, al margen de los Estados Unidos y sus satélites y de la U.R.S.S. y los suyos, el resto del mundo, que es el que le está dando la dinámica histórica. Por eso agradeceré todo el material que me envié, especialmente el agregado al volumen M. and f., sobre todos The Challenge of Mao-Tse-tung.

Finalmente, mucho le agradeceremos que nos haga llegar Ud. y demás compañeros de ésta, toda sugestión sobre el tema, que cito una vez más: "La teoría política del Tercer Mundo".

Ponemos pasión en este tema, porque nos duele directamente: formamos parte de él.

Reciba un saludo cordial de  
Silvio Frondizi

N.B.: Dentro de algunos días le escribiré sobre los otros temas que me ha planteado. Vale.

5526