

National Chairwoman's Perspectives Report
to the Convention of News and Letters Committees
August 30, 1980

Price: 75¢

TODAY

AND

TOMORROW

BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

PART ONE: U.S. CAPITALISM-IMPERIALISM, AT HOME AND ABROAD,
especially in the Middle East and Latin America

- I. Missiles, Missiles, Missiles -- But What About Jobs?
- II. U.S. Imperialism's Tentacles: From Iran to South Korea, And from El Salvador to Iraq; Also Relations with Other Capitalist Imperialisms
 - 1) Iran
 - 2) South Korea
 - 3) Latin America, El Salvador especially
 - 4) Iraq
 - 5) Is West European Capitalism Different?
- III. Religion in General and Jerusalem in Particular in this State-Capitalist Age

PART TWO: LONG MARCH OF REVOLT, LONG MARCH OF PHILOSOPHY:
Imperative Need for New Relationship of
Practice to Theory

- I. All Roads Lead to Gdansk, Poland, And...
The Road to the Black Ghetto, USA
- II. "Today's Tasks and A Brief Glance at
25 Years of Marxist-Humanism"

PLUS: THE RELATIONSHIP OF LEADERSHIP TO PHILOSOPHY

ALSO:

"THEORY AND OUR
ARCHIVES"
by Olga Domanski,
National Organizer,
News and Letters
Committees

"ON ORGANIZATION"
by Michael Connolly,
Co-National Organizer,
News and Letters
Committees

6245

Published by:
NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES
2832 E GRAND BLVD
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48211

National Chairwoman's Report to Convention
of News and Letters Committees, Aug. 30, 1980

TODAY AND TOMORROW

by Raya Dunayevskaya

PART ONE: U.S. CAPITALISM-IMPERIALISM, AT HOME AND ABROAD,
especially in the Middle East and Latin America

I. Missiles, Missiles, Missiles -- But What About Jobs?

This August, the TV subjected us to the hollow spectacles of the quadrennial circus acts of the two dominant capitalist parties -- the Republicans and Democrats -- called National Presidential Nominating Conventions. One thing, however, neither the wholesale psychedelic ballooning of red, white, and blue nor the totality of the hypocrisy could cover up -- the overriding law of this state-capitalist age -- joblessness.

That which Marx, a century back, had called "the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation" -- the unemployed army -- unimpaired capitalism has transformed to such extremism that the unemployed army, from being a sometime feature of capitalism in crisis, became its permanent state. Even at these elitist conventions it dominated all questions, all speeches, all platforms, all motions, and so disrobed capitalism that it stood stark naked.

In a word, what everyone saw and heard were not the unctuous speeches, but their exploitative, racist, sexist, militaristic, decadent character. Which didn't stop the politicians from transforming that question into something that could bring us to the brink of nuclear holocaust.

The politicians this August, thinking that Aug. 4, the outbreak of the First World War, was but the beginning and that that's what they should be celebrating, brought out their biggest guns, Defense (read: War) Secretary Harold Brown, to talk of missiles, missiles, missiles. Just follow this sequence:

First (last?) it was the Neutron bomb that aimed at destroying people and leaving intact military and production facilities. (They didn't tell us who will run them.)

-2-

Next, the MX missile. That was supposed to be something Carter was against but, as is characteristic of the Milquetoast in the White House, the degree of being "against" didn't take priority over trying to get votes -- this time for SALT II. He not only didn't get the votes; he withdrew SALT II from consideration -- and appended his signature to MX, too. So much for "leadership" and principles!

And now we get a fantastically new "change" (except that War Secretary Brown, in the interview with Cronkite, stressed that it wasn't so much change as an addition to the others) called "military targeting" that would go out for killing "military" targets -- and leaders -- of the enemy. "Ours," however, the very "leaders" that had brought on the holocaust, would be safeguarded! Such callousness about humanity brought about such a great outcry against such callousness toward all the rest of humanity that they denied the truth about the type of shelters that would protect "the leaders"!

What they play up as the "star" of Presidential Directives 59, 58, and 53 that would indeed eclipse the ICBMs are these tactical missiles that are "so smart they will change the face of warfare and supply the equalizer for outnumbered U.S. forces in any military showdown with the Soviet Union." Business Week (Aug. 11, 1980) continues: Their "deadly one-shot accuracy" is so perfect that they have been nicknamed "fire and forget."

For once, the initials M.A.D., mad -- Mutual Assured Destruction -- is the right word for it. And for once, Russia is right when it fires back the phrase "nuclear adventurism" at all these new revelations. The only trouble is they are busy doing the same thing. Indeed, the whole world is now spending \$600 billion annually on militarization!

Nothing less than the absolutely fantastic sum of \$1 trillion during the next five years is scheduled to be spent by Carter on missiles, missiles, and more missiles! Whereupon President Carter still has the gall to send a message to the UN-sponsored conference meeting then (Aug. 13, 1980) to study the Non-Proliferation Treaty: "The acquisition of nuclear explosives by additional states would decrease the security of the state acquiring them, decrease the stability of the region in which they are located, and increase the risk of nuclear conflict."

6247

-3-

As if that weren't sufficient enough to scare us out of our wits, all of this was done in such a hurry and so secretly that even the Secretary of State, Muskie, knew absolutely nothing about it -- until he read it in the newspapers. Very obviously, the only ones deserving of knowledge -- and protection of their lives -- are the War Secretary they call "Defense," Harold Brown, and the biggest war hawk of them all, the National Security Director Brzezinski, their two Deputy Undersecretaries, and the Air Force General, Jasper A. Welch, who co-ordinates the military policy of the White House, and who supposedly told the President -- at least he got his signature.

Without blushing, they are busy revealing one other fairy tale we're supposed to believe. All this insanity on missiles was supposed to have "evolved" out of Carter when he first took office, when he asked Harold Brown whether we could reduce the strategic arsenal from 1,800 long-range missiles to about 200. Not worrying about any dialectical transition from how a request to reduce could be transformed into its opposite -- the senseless running after more, more, more -- what is imposed on us is nothing short of plans for "Mutual Assured Destruction," and a trillion/^{dollars} in cost which our great, great grandchildren will have to pay off, if they ever are born.

What hadn't been done in such a big hurry -- in fact, it took over two years before we even found out about it, and then only if you read select papers -- is the story of how "The U.S. Failed War Test for Europe" (Washington Post, Aug. 3, 1980). This, too, had a fancy name -- "Nifty Nugget" -- and it failed totally. But back in October, 1978 when they were on this military maneuver they found: "No reserves were called up. No tanks were put on ships. In fact, no one knew about the exercise except for about 2,500 officers..." It was a total failure in both the shortage of weapons and reservists, not to mention being totally void of any brains in military heads planning and managing these "war games."

There was no co-ordination whatever. No wonder that West Europe began to doubt the capability of this super nuclear giant to defend it. No wonder that West Europe decided to go its own way, and while it's hardly any smarter than tailonding the U.S., it is "independent" of the U.S. and genuflecting before the Middle East oil potentates and their alleged "star" -- the PLO -- as well as

6248

flirting with the other nuclear giant, Russia, whether it's a question of trade or the Olympic Games or soft-pedaling Russia's invasion of Afghanistan. And when they aren't "independent" of the U.S. they are "independent" of each other, as witness France's latest supplying a nuclear reactor to Iraq. What matters to us is that the class enemy is always at home -- it is the crisis here, the unconscionable unemployment, the runaway inflation, the two nations right here -- separate and unequal -- Black and white.

If you haven't been able to picture what a trillion looks like, you might ask Carter how he can allot that inconceivable sum for missiles, but think that \$12 billion for a jobs program for the millions unemployed is "inflationary." Very clearly, "flexibility" applies only to refusing a pittance for the life of the masses and spending like crazy for destruction of the masses.

There is hardly a day that passes that doesn't have some outbreak of Black youth revolt, and it isn't only South. The press can't deny that whether it's the South Bronx or the 15-year-old Watts rebellion in Los Angeles, where exactly nothing has been done, it is all ready to explode again -- even if no one can name the exact date. All the hypocrisies at both the Democratic and Republican conventions testifying to the contrary will not cover up the totality of the crises we are now in.

On the other hand, the fact that even the Democratic Party (at its Aug. 12 session) refused to bow to Carter's appeal for "flexibility," that is to say, not to specify the sum of \$12 billion for making jobs a priority, but roared its approval of it, shows not only how very broad, deep, omni-present is the question of unemployment (reaching up to 30 percent among Black youth) but how even so select a group as delegates to the Democratic convention couldn't keep from revealing how very scared they all are of the undercurrent of revolt that will face them in the realities outside the convention hall.

It is this undercurrent of revolt -- and not only among the unemployed but also the employed thoroughly disgusted with their conditions of speeded-up labor called "higher productivity" and "higher quality product"; and not only jobs and joblessness but Youth refusing to become cannon fodder for World War III; and not only Labor, Black and Youth forces as Reason but also Women's Libera-

-5-

tionists. The last word will not be in the voting booth but masses in motion against this decrepit society.

II. U.S. Imperialism's Tentacles: From Iran to South Korea, and from El Salvador to Iraq: Also Relations with Other Capitalist Imperialisms

1) Iran

No one needs to delude him/herself by thinking that because Carter's imperialist intrusion into the Iranian desert was such a failure as well as fiasco that, "therefore," he won't try again something even more ominous. Nor need one think that all those all-seeing, all-knowing missiles "against the Soviet Union" are all aimed only at the Soviet Union.

Consider all the shifting about of the Sixth Fleet in the Middle East.

Consider all the threats; they weren't made for naught. The fact that there was such great opposition -- and not only from Iran, and not only from U.S. allies, but from the masses of American people, especially the youth who know very well that they would be the ones sent there, draft or no draft -- that it had, publicly, to be called off does not mean that it's in fact called off. Trial balloons are no joke any more than was Carter's request, that 1,800 long-range missiles be reduced to 200, anything but sheer hypocrisy -- the pretense he was saving lives when in fact he was playing with them, lulling us to sleep while mapping a monster plan for missiles, missiles, missiles costing a trillion.

Nor should one think that because so much demagogery will spill out from the Democrats to distinguish them from the more hawkish-still Reagan, (not to mention Nixon), that it isn't a Democratic Nixon-type who is actually writing the scenario for World War III, even if that spells the end of civilization as we know it. It will be instructive to take a quick look at Nixon's The Real War to see what these monstrous minds are planning. And don't be taken aback by the fact that Nixon, now that he's out of power and has no responsibilities to the public (here or abroad), declares that already "we are at war." The point is that, just like the fact that the truth may out when

6250

-6-

thieves fall out, so when one is not in actual power, he does let the cat out of the bag.

Nixon openly states that the "real war," that is, World War III, began before World War II ended, thus extending the Cold War indefinitely -- well, until the hot war finally arrives. I'm sure no youth who had to fight Nixon to stop the Vietnam war will be surprised to hear Nixon say that "The Vietnam war was not lost on the battlefield but in the classrooms of great universities." Except that even in that last phrase he lies -- it happened not in the classrooms, but in the streets, on the campuses, where they found that they didn't need to go to the battlefield to meet death at the hands of home-grown capitalist rulers, as witness Kent, Ohio, Jackson, Mississippi, and Augusta, Georgia, or, for that matter, just in fighting for civil rights.

The reason we've called attention to Nixon's book was not only its "in the distance" affinity to what we have been discussing on missiles -- but that right now, the actual fact about Middle East policy as formulated by Nixon-Kissinger is what Carter-Brzezinski carried out, including the fawning before the Shah, as they made him "guardian of the West" to "protect" its Oil. And it is that attempt to control the Gulf oil region which the Carter Administration is still trying to recoup, whether it is through Iran, or via the Egypt-Israeli treaties -- or just outright invasion.

For that matter, it isn't only the Middle East; it is the whole world, and it isn't only from the flirtation with China against Russia that we see this. We see this most dangerously right this minute in counter-revolutionary, militaristic, neo-fascist South Korea.

2) South Korea

Nothing tells more clearly and sharply how very precisely, consistently, and without letup U.S. imperialism is looking for still one more Shah like General Chon.

First and foremost, let us be under no illusion that it's only the South Korean neo-fascist Gen. Chon that is acting in such a counter-revolutionary manner against his own people. From the very first, there was no doubt at all

6251

about the commander of the U.S. forces, Gen. John A. Wickham, who assisted Gen. Chon and who said, "We will support him because that, of course, is what the Korean people want" (NY Times, Aug. 9, 1980). Gen. Wickham is not that ignorant of U.S. politics, even if at the moment the State Department here claims that he is not representing its "line".

The truth is that that's what the Korean War (1950-53) was about -- to keep South Korea as the U.S.'s outpost in the East. The truth is that it was the U.S. that imposed the tyrant, Syngman Rhee, on the Korean people. The truth is that the Korean people struggled for a whole decade to topple that reactionary, and they no sooner achieved victory than they were saddled with Park Chung Hee. The fact is that so great was the dissatisfaction with that dictator that his own secret police assassinated him.

All Carter's rhetoric about "human rights" can't possibly hide these facts: 1) The U.S. had done nothing whatever when Kim Dae Jung, back in 1971, had obviously won the election against Park, and fraudulently Park took office. 2) They did nothing again when, in 1973, Park abducted Kim Dae Jung, who was then in Japan, intending to murder him. It was the international outcry that stopped that attempted murder. 3) And now it is Chon who is staging a kangaroo court trial to make the premeditated murder of Kim "judicial". 4) Above all, the U.S., nearly 30 years after the Korean War ended, is keeping 40,000 troops in South Korea, with many, many more ready to fly there to keep the neo-fascist South Korean government in power.

The U.S. has yet to join even so mild a group as the Liason Committee to Save Kim Dae Jung, which has grown up in Japan. For once, the Beijing Review (Aug. 4, 1980) is right when it writes that the attempt to railroad Kim Dae Jung to death itself "is a diabolical move to effectively silence the political opposition..."

As we see, U.S. imperialism's tentacles don't stop either at planning attacks on Iran, or at pretending to keep their distance but allowing Chon Too Hwan to complete the counter-revolution. Those tentacles have been ceaseless -- and, indeed, before the U.S. was fully an imperialist land, they extended to Latin America. More precisely put, it is the war with Latin America that made the U.S. an imperialist land, and that early Black masses proved their vanguard

nature. They were the very first and only to organize an Anti-Imperialist League to oppose the war with Spain for Latin America.

3) Latin America, El Salvador especially

Neither space nor time will permit me to go into that long imperialist history. Nor can we begin in the immediate post-World War II period, except to say that when, in 1954, the U.S.-engineered coup in Guatemala took place, we at once singled out two factors, which remain to this day the ones that characterize the U.S.'s role all through Latin America. In attacking Dulles' CIA, we said that U.S. imperialism learned all too fast from Russian totalitarianism how to "take over" a country. We stressed that what U.S. imperialism was doing, under the guise of "saving Latin America from Communism," was destroying the genuine, indigenous revolution which began in 1954. It was not Communism that U.S. imperialism was fighting; but any kind of democratic agrarian reform. Finally, they were installing the type of dictatorship that couldn't lead to anything but neo-fascist regimes which is exactly what Latin America is suffering from wherever there is U.S. backing.

What we see presently there from the "regular" militarist actions, the "irregular" death squads, to the outright butchery at the Embassy of Spain, is not just a logical conclusion to what had been started in 1954. We singled out Guatemala not just to show its "history" since 1954, but because in 1980, it is helping the El Salvador military in its genocide.

El Salvador is a country where the U.S. could still stop the genocide of a whole nation, but won't. Here is a country that has, even according to bourgeois scholars, "the most rigid class structure and worse inequality in all Latin America" (Foreign Affairs, Summer, 1980). Here is a country with so minute a landed elite as to be openly called "los catorce" (the "fourteen families") which plus the military owns 60 percent of the farmland, the entire banking system, most of the nation's industries, and 50 percent of the whole national income -- while 200,000 peasants are totally landless!

They have only one fear, one they have never forgotten -- the massive peasant uprising in 1932. And they haven't forgotten that they crushed that with no less than 30,000 dead. On the contrary. That's exactly what they're

doing now with these new death squads that by now are so dehumanized that they're not satisfied with endless murders but proceed to mutilate the bodies in the most unspeakable ways.

The White Warriors Union, the White Hand and the Phalange specialize in murdering not only revolutionaries, workers and youth, but the Jesuits. In fact, it's only when (June, 1977) they announced they would kill "all the Jesuits in the country" and at once began assassinating some, that the U.S. vetoed, temporarily, a \$19 million Inter-American Bank loan. The murders may have stopped for one day, whereupon the U.S. approved the loan. Thereupon not only did the murders resume, but the most Draconian "Law for the Defense and Guarantee of Public Order" was enacted.

As the NY Times (May 8, 1978) reported it, U.S. Ambassador Frank G. Devine, speaking to the Salvadoran Chamber of Commerce, endorsed the right of the government to do "whatever is necessary to maintain public order."

The death squads resumed their assassinations. The Carter Administration in the spring added \$6 million to the other sum of military aid, and \$50 million in economic aid. And they did that despite Archbishop Romero's personal appeal to Pres. Carter that aid would only "sharpen the repression." Could anyone doubt that when one knows that the El Salvador Army killed more than 3,000 this year alone? This, too, didn't stop Carter from giving the aid, and the death squads then proceeded, in cold blood, to murder Archbishop Romero this April.

The U.S. now has a new Ambassador; the name is different and he's supposed to be a "liberal" -- Robert White. But just yesterday (Aug. 15, 1980) he spoke on TV to tell us how order was kept, despite all "provocations" from the Left! The "provocations" from the Left were 1) a general strike; there are, after all, no less than 30,000 unemployed, and runaway inflation. 2) There are three guerrilla forces -- the Popular Forces of Liberation were founded in 1970, but where, at best, they have 3,000 people under arms, the Salvadoran Army not only has 15,000, but all those death squads. 3) What now worries both the oligarchy-military and U.S. imperialism is that there is a very new, most indigenous and exciting revolutionary force -- the Indians. And they have succeeded in some regions like Quiche to try to initiate some reform.

That U.S. imperialism's nature is as reactionary as it is, is a surprise to no one. What is new is the pretense of being for "human rights." Carter isn't the first one to play around with the word "conceptual." Kissinger was the one to introduce it at the very moment when the bloodiest of all counter-revolutions was being helped by the U.S. -- Chile. By no stretch of imagination could these rulers accuse the Left of "conceptual weakness." Carter's fantasy, as Reagan's, is equally hollow. It's the Left's task to complete the unfinished state of the Latin American revolutions. And they have remained unfinished, whether we look at Bolivia in 1952 or Nicaragua in 1979. What we ^{wrote} in the Political-Philosophic Letter of May 15, 1978, "The Latin American Unfinished Revolutions," is more than ever true in 1980. Study also, please (in the Appendix to that Letter), how Silvio Frondizi was caught in the Cuba illusion.

The whole of Latin America is a tinderbox. No one is more hated, not even their own oligarchic military oppressors, than Yankee imperialism. We express our solidarity with them on that. And we feel it imperative to say that unless a new banner like Marxist-Humanism, which expresses what you're for and not only what you're against, is unfurled, we will once again face another barbaric counter-revolution.

4) Iraq

At the moment, U.S. imperialism is more preoccupied, however, with the Middle East. The latest flirtation is with Iraq. It would be easy to say that that proves their desperation, since Iraq ever since the 1967 Arab-Israeli war has broken off relations with the U.S., is the staunchest anti-Israel, and if they don't call for a "holy war" against Israel, it is only because they are supposedly secular leaders -- and would rather have a nuclear war. But unfortunately, it is "correct" for the U.S. imperialists to flirt with Iraq just now, because what unites them presently -- anti-Iran -- is solid enough for the many crooked alliances the rulers on both sides indulge in.

That, too, does not tell the whole story. The full truth, the class truth, the irreversible affinity begins with the counter-revolution against the very first and genuine anti-imperialist revolution in Iraq. It was 1958. It did nothing short of undermining the whole structure of U.S. imperialism in the

Middle East and, indeed, shake up the whole global structure of U.S. imperialism. What was known as the Baghdad Pact was overthrown. This world-shaking event took place, moreover, under a leader unaligned either with Nasser or Ba'th. Under Kassim, the 1958 revolution proceeded to take some acts of social revolution such as throwing the landed aristocracy out of power as well as initiating reforms both in relationship to higher worker wages and considerable housing. Moreover, as a child of a Sunni-Shi'ite marriage, he did gain support of the Shi'ite poor.

At the same time that he opposed U.S. imperialism, and the ruling class within Iraq, since he did not want to subordinate himself to either Nasser or Ba'thism, the Ba'th Party and the CIA collaborated in trying to overthrow Kassim. At first they did not succeed. A Ba'th ruler then, Ali Salih Al Saadi, admitted: "We rode into Baghdad on a CIA train." That coup was short-lived, falling in the same year, 1963. But it was time enough for the CIA to have provided lists of names of the Communist Party who had collaborated with Kassim and the Ba'th revenge squads murdered many whom, in 1968, they returned -- and are in power still.

One other thing of a revolutionary nature must be stated. The beginnings of revolutionary fervor in Iraq go back to the break-up of the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Revolution, especially the latter. Think of it -- and all you Luxemburgites, be happy -- the very first group of Marxists in Iraq, in 1919, dates itself back to a member of Spartacus.

There were actually three different tendencies of Marxists in the early 1920s, and again, in 1935, when they were first engaged in anti-imperialist work. None of this, however, is in any way whatever reflected in Hussein, whose anti-imperialism is as fake as Khomeini's, and whose ambitions are as great. He wants to be the leader of all of the Arabs of all of the Middle East. Right at this moment -- and that's what I was referring to in the early part of my talk -- he is engaged not only in being an oil potentate and in suppressing all opposition, hanging everyone from Jews to Communists, but in trying to enter the exclusive nuclear club.

5) Is West European Capitalism Different?

It isn't, of course, only U.S. imperialism's tentacles but those of the whole capitalist world, private or state. For France, please read carefully on De Gaulle France both the 1958 and 1962-63 sections of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S.: A 25 Year History. Nor is it only France that is extending itself to Iraq -- and let's not forget Djibouti and Africa.

West Germany, as the main economic power in West Europe, holds the key. It is all the more ironic that West European capitalism is acting as if the economic crisis is only in America, and only it is indecisive. The way West Europe has been "escaping" from U.S. capitalism's "indecisiveness", be it on Afghanistan or the Middle East, is to bow before the Middle East potentates while looking for every opportunity to gain money from trade, whether it be supplying arms, nuclear reactors, or grain.

Take Le Monde's analysis, which has to admit that the crisis is not just of this year; in fact, they entitled the series of articles "The Crisis: Year 7 and Stagflation as Before." It is also clear now that "prosperous West Germany" is by no means without crises, or unemployment, just because its inflation is on a much lower level than the other countries. It keeps explaining its restrictive policies as necessary to combat inflation. Whereupon the U.S. says that whereas it's necessary to fight inflation, it "is not valid to follow such policies simply to cut their balance of payments deficits." The Undersecretary of State, Richard N. Cooper, said, "If Germany thinks that it can eliminate its deficit in an era of \$100 billion deficits, it is exporting its problem. That would be an anti-social act" (Business Week, June 23, 1980).

The latest "World Development Report, 1980", issued by the World Bank, is predicting a global economic decline, not just this year but for the next five years. And while it has to admit that it is Africa and South Asia that will experience "absolute poverty," that in fact Sub-Sahara will be worse off in 1990 than in 1980, it is also showing that there is very nearly zero growth in all industrialized countries. Up front screaming for ever more, not so much production but "labor productivity," is Prime Minister Thatcher, that reactionary who openly claims credit (!) for the worst unemployment -- 9 percent --

since the Depression. The reason she is so proud of her record turns out to be that supposedly there is no other way to fight inflation; the workers must produce more and more and get paid less and less and less. She relies on her two gods -- profits and militarization -- to save her from the wrath of the British proletariat who knew how to rid themselves ^{even} of Churchill -- a British lesson she better learn.

In all industrialized countries the rulers are talking of "revitalizing industry", which includes getting rid of as much living labor as possible, making do with "robots" -- ever speeding up that production line -- and getting state subsidies, as so-called private industry has done ever since its gory, primitive birth to its gorier imperialist extension from its super-exploitation of the national proletariat.

What the ruler-exploiters don't know -- the one thing they should have learned from Marx who long ago discerned capitalism's law of motion: the "absolute general law of accumulation" -- is that that unemployed army brings with it also not only a decline in the rate of profit (no matter how big the mass of profit), but the gravediggers of capitalism when masses in motion sign its death warrant.

III. Religion in General and Jerusalem in Particular in this State-Capitalist Age

Israel has been moving so steadily to the Right that no reactionary action should surprise anyone. Nevertheless, the world -- and this includes Pres. Carter who is still pretending that the so-called Peace Treaty he engineered between Egypt and Israel will bring real peace to the whole of the Middle East -- was shocked by the timing, if nothing else, of the "sudden" fiat from the Knesset that Jerusalem, East and West, that is, Arab as well as Jewish, was "one", was "indivisible," indeed, was the "eternal" capital of Israel, as if really its order extended into the eons of time.

If, however, we take a second, objective look at that phrase, "if nothing else," we will see that it is, precisely, the timing, the provocative timing, which is the logical conclusion to the extremist imperialist moves ever since Menachem Begin came to power, and that very week visited and approved a controversial new

-14-

Jewish settlement in Arab land. It has gone on and expanded ever since. It is necessary, however, to limit ourselves to this year.

In March, 1980 the ^{government} of Israel announced it would be taking 1,000 acres of mostly Arab-owned land. It was the first such major expropriation in a decade, and the second largest ever since the victorious 1967 war. Indeed, by the mid-1970s, Israel priced 30 percent of East Jerusalem from Arab ownership. Could anyone doubt when the biggest war hawk of them all, Geula Cohen, was chosen to bring in a draft for the new status of Jerusalem that it would be anything but what is was?

That the neo-fascist religious fanatics called Gush Emunim have no intention whatever of stopping was clear enough from the prevailing terrorism -- not from the PLO this time, but from that reactionary, religious, Zionist group who bombed the cars of two Arab mayors, maiming Mayor Bassan Shaka of Nabulus and Mayor Kerim Khalaf of Ramallah.

Worse still, Menachem Begin is stonewalling the investigation. The correspondent of the Washington Star, David Halovy, asked: how did it happen that the Shin Bet (the Israeli FBI-CIA combined), that has an 85 percent success rate in probing such terrorist acts, did not produce even a suspect? and wasn't it true that the head of that secret police organization resigned because Menachem Begin wasn't giving him a free hand? Whereupon Menachem Begin enters the fray with all the hypocritical hyperboles at his command: "...Never was a calumny so odious as that dispatch." Despite Begin's demagogic rhetoric and the fact that he also got Avraham Achitov, the head of Shin Bet, likewise to say that his resignation was "in no way" connected to soft-pedaling, that that was a "total lie," the general feeling throughout Israel is that both the Shin Bet head and the former terrorist turned Prime Minister doth protest too much.

What is new -- and it is by no means limited to Zionism -- is the new politicized forms of religion. Nor is it a question of whether you listen to the money-wise electronic "evangelists," or you follow the Old or New Testament -- or the Koran, and quote Muhammad, who is supposed to have said: "Whoever goes on a pilgrimage to the Jerusalem sanctuary shall be forgiven all his sins."

The point, rather, is why this rush to power. One need not go abroad to

6259

see it is so. All one has to do is look right here at the New Right, the Christian Religious Right. We saw what they did at the Reagan convention. And it is clear that, though they now are settling for Reagan, they, no more than the KKK and the Nazis, will stop there, any more than Solzhenitsyn stopped when he got religion and returned to the Greek Orthodox Church.

The biggest bluff of all in modern Russian literature is contained in Solzhenitsyn's voluminous writings, be it in the rewriting of the history of the Russian Revolution, Lenin especially, or the so-called return to the simple life of the Dark Middle Ages which he has now baptized as model, and, lo and behold, they have become the Enlightened Middle Ages. The truth, however, is always concrete, and what is concrete in Solzhenitsyn's life (outside of flirting with the Nazis during World War II) is what happened between 1956, when Khrushchev permitted the publication of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich when Solzhenitsyn was trying so hard to get out of Russia that he aligned with the Jewish dissidents -- not something the Greek Orthodox Church had been associated with, either in the Middle Ages or the Tsarist Black Hundreds practicing the worst pogroms -- and last week's praise of the new women's liberation movement in Russia by this male chauvinist calling himself women's liberationist. Just as Khomeini knew how to use technology, especially of tapes, and hypocritical embrace of shoras when they fought against the Shah, not against him, so Solzhenitsyn knows how to use the mass media, not to mention the ideology of the military brass about Russia as Satan, Enemy No. 1.

The real point is this: the totality of the crises, especially since 1973-74 -- by no means only on the Arab-Israeli war, but the economic crisis that resulted from the oil embargo -- has shown that the undercurrent of revolt may -- and in some cases, did -- lead to revolution. It is this, especially as it is evolving in the last year, which has led the capitalist rulers to flirt with nazism and occultism all over again.

Occultism has ever been the escape from reality, and since it doesn't have quite as obnoxious an odor as nazism, non-taxable dollars are spent on that electronic miracle to bring the message to the public. In any case, the New Religious Right, as in Begin's Israel or in Khomeini's Iran, or the Christian Right here, even when they get masses to follow them, by no means signifies that

what the masses want, and what the leaders are striving for -- power -- has the same motivation. Which is why Karl Marx made so sharp a distinction between the religion of the oppressed and that of the oppressor. The whole theory of alienation started there. Follow the majestic historic sweep of Marx's goal: "To unmask human self-alienation in its secular form now that it has been unmasked in its sacred form." Marx goes on:

"Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of men, is a demand for their real happiness...

"Religion is only the illusory sun about which man revolves so long as he does not revolve about himself...

"Man makes religion; religion does not make man. Religion is indeed man's self-consciousness and self-awareness so long as he has not found himself or has lost himself again. But man is not an abstract being, squatting outside the world. Man is the human world, state, society." (Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right)

Nor was it only religion that Marx called "the opium of the people." The same was true of science. 130 years before over the atom was split, and out of which came, not the most constructive new energy force, but the most destructive atomic bomb, Marx wrote: "To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie."

We have been living this lie altogether too long. State-capitalism has reincarnated both Religion and Science as moves away from real human needs and new human relations. The turning of the clock backwards must be stopped and will be stopped when we stop separating the philosophy of revolution from social revolution.

* * * * *

PART TWO: LONG MARCH OF REVOLT, LONG MARCH OF PHILOSOPHY:
IMPERATIVE NEED FOR A NEW RELATIONSHIP OF PRACTICE
TO THEORY

Nothing is either conceived or known in its truth except in so far as it is completely subject to method.

--Hegel, Science of Logic, Vol.2, p.468

...cause is the highest stage in which the concrete Notion as beginning has an immediate existence in the sphere of necessity; but it is not yet a subject which, as such, preserves itself also in its actual realization.

--Hegel, Science of Logic, Vol.2, p.472

The objective situation, when one looks, is not only the totality of the myriad crises, brought on by decadent capitalism, in all their goriness that we have just examined, but the great pages of freedom being written by the insurgent Polish proletariat, carving out a new revolutionary form in the period when, in the U.S., "the little shorties" -- the 11, 12 and 13-year-old Black youth in Miami -- are participating both in the revolt against the police state and helping the adults reject the established Black leadership, looking only at themselves to bring forth liberty.

These two events will make the defining of our organizational-philosophic-newspaper tasks easy, whether we grapple with our 25-year history or just work out the tasks for the year. Let us turn at once to the breath of fresh air and inspiration coming from masses in motion.

I. All Roads Lead to Gdansk, Poland, And...

The most exciting new form of freedom in the world today is being created in Poland. Every day brings news of unprecedented acts of rebellion by the Polish workers. What started out as the occupation of the Lenin Shipyards in Gdansk and became 17,000 strikers in three other cities soon snowballed and had no less than 50,000 other workers join them, and 200 factories were shut down.

What seemed at one place to be just opposition to high meat prices and at another place just a strike in opposition to the firing of Mrs. Anne Walcynowicz who had been active in the 1970 strike and who was fired a few months short of being entitled to receive a pension, so broadened and widened the participation that we now have a general strike, including other industrial units from aircraft and textile plants, to city garbage collectors and bus drivers. What started out as demands for a rise in wages became, at one and the same time, a demand for free trade unions as well as free speech, free press, free TV communications.

Indeed, the shipyard strike everyone was talking about as the first occurred in fact after six full weeks of non-stop labor unrest that had begun with 3,000 railway men who insisted on nominating independent candidates for workers' council elections. This report (by Eric Bourne in the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 13, 1980) is indeed borne out not only by other reports in the daily press, but by what we hear from within Poland by the strikers and intellectual dissidents.

Indeed, what worries the Communist rulers more than anything is the fact that a small dissident group of mainly intellectuals called the Workers' Social Self-Defense Committee (KOR) which was established in the mid-1970s from those who had been fired or imprisoned (whose spokesman is Jacek Kuron), has expressed more than solidarity with these workers, by establishing a co-ordinating committee that, at one and the same time, tells workers of strikes in other regions and tells the Western press the actual situation in contradiction to what the official press carries. As Kuron, who is once again in prison, put it: "It is a solidarity strike, and has a political character. It is a step toward a free trade union -- a very important step. These committees create an absolutely new situation."

By now (NY Times, Aug. 28, 1980) the shipyard workers of Gdansk have truly established "a world apart," and right within a totalitarian land at that. Their occupation -- occupation, not just strike -- they are not only fanning out across the whole country and have international representatives of labor from France, Norway and Austria, but they established their own system of internal broadcasting over loudspeakers so that every word of the negotiating sessions with government

representatives is piped out to workers lounging on the grass or clustered in discussions! 800 delegates from other factories are in the conference hall and they tape-record the sessions for the workers in their districts.

The exhilaration of producing their own newspaper -- Solidarity -- is catching on with even some government journalists there. And a dissident spokesman -- Western TV cameramen who concentrate so on pictures of the Pope on the shipyard gate, do note: -- criticized Cardinal Wyszynski's statement, saying "The workers will disregard it. They are too determined." And they -- the workers -- now number no less than 300,000.

Whether the Communist totalitarian government will attempt to put it down bloodily, though the workers thus far have not used any arms, it is absolutely impossible to dim the penetrating illumination cast by this great revolt, both of conditions in state-capitalist lands calling themselves Communist, and the burning desire for freedom. Poland especially has been the place of revolt ever since 1943-44 when, as we wrote then, "All Roads Lead to Warsaw," when the Jewish ghetto was the first to revolt till death and then when Stalin's Red Army stayed outside of Warsaw as the Nazis put the city to the torch after the uprising.

In 1956, Poland again was the stimulus which led to the great Hungarian Revolution -- and its bringing onto the historic stage Marx's Humanist Essays. These discussions lasted longer and were broader in Poland, so much so that not just the dissidents were calling for a new humanism, but the official philosopher, Adam Schaff, likewise had to make a gesture toward Marx's Humanism.

The 1960s revealed still another facet -- the politicalization of the struggles and the analysis, using well-known Marxist categories, in the "Open Letter to the Party" by the young Kuron and Modzolewski, whose analysis of Poland was as state-capitalist.*

In 1970 the spontaneous upsurge of Polish workers** again inspired the

* This letter was published as a separate pamphlet by International Socialism in England, in 1966.

** We reproduced the 1970 minutes of the shipyard workers' meeting, smuggled out of Poland, as a separate pamphlet.

whole world (and also was the very ground on which Chapter 8 of Philosophy and Revolution, "State Capitalism and the East European Revolts," was created. Be sure to reread it -- it deals not only with the strike but "The Movement From Practice Is Itself a Form of Theory" as well as "Once Again, Praxis and the Quest for Universality.")

What we have now in the 1980 general strike is, at one and the same time, a 40-year-long struggle for freedom and one that will not be silenced either on the front of struggles or the front of political economy or that of philosophy. Once such a flare is set up, it lights up the world.

...The Road to the Black Ghetto, USA

The maturity of our age is seen also in every act of opposition to the powers-that-be even when there is no revolution and even where it seems to be as isolated as the Black ghetto of Miami.

For one thing, when at the beginning I mentioned that 30 percent of the Black youth are unemployed, I was just quoting the NAACP report which, while higher than what the government reports, is, in fact, completely untrue. In the Black ghettos of the North as well as the South, and specifically in Liberty City of Miami, 8 out of every 10 Black youths are out of work. And so filthy are the living conditions there, that so-called Liberty City is referred to as "Germ City."

The Miami Courier, a Black biweekly, revealed one other fact that is quite exciting. It is about "the little shorties." The little shorties refers to some of the most militant Blacks in that revolt who were no more than 11, 12, and 13 years old, and who obviously are best at throwing bottles and stones at every passing white motorist. And when an adult, Homer Brennan (who is 27) spoke up, he said, "You know, a lot of us aren't scared of dying no more." He was referring to the fact that he was a Vietnam veteran and he hasn't found conditions now in his hometown any better. Insofar as the Miami Blacks are concerned, they struck not only at the Government, but the established Black leadership in or out of the NAACP, Urban League, SCLC. "No need for bullets," said another, "Unemployment and inflation are killing us."

At one of the public housing projects (the James E. Scott), the reporters were being chased away and then someone yelled at them: "And one more thing. Tell those old Black leaders to stop jumping in front of the television cameras, giving interviews, because they do not speak for us." The most serious lesson to learn from the Miami uprising which few are even listening to is the complete rejection of leadership. And that, the rebellious made clear, applies most sharply to the Black leaders who think that what they did in the 1960s entitles them to leadership evermore whereas, in fact, insofar as they are concerned, it is all a period of "broken promises." The new revolts will not stop, and neither will the search for a philosophy of freedom.

II. Our Tasks

Now, then, you can view with new eyes how the six organizational ramifications we saw looming ahead in the Draft Perspectives, Tomorrow is Now, have gained an ever greater urgency, whether these focus on the expansion of News & Letters to a 12-pager and the \$35,000 Fund needed to assure that and other work, including expanded participation in mass activities of Blacks, Youth, Labor, employed and unemployed, and Women's Liberation, or the completion of the book, Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

This year, as we are getting ready to appear with the 12-pager as the regular format of News & Letters and to finish the book, we do have, accidentally or otherwise, the advantage of looking at our 25-year history. In many respects, the first five years were the most difficult and the most fundamental, as they laid the ground, philosophically, politically, organizationally for the existence of Marxist-Humanism on U.S. soil.

First and foremost is that which characterized us from our birth. We, at one and the same time, listened to new voices from below and singled out new revolutionary forces whose movement from practice was itself a form of theory, as well as taking on the responsibility of filling the theoretic void in the movement since Lenin's death, and transcending it, that is to say, restating Marxism for our own age. There we stress that listening to the new voices does not free the intellectuals from their responsibility of what Hegel called Absolute Method, or "Self-Thinking Idea," it is also manifest that the Idea cannot itself think

-22-

without human beings thinking it.

We continued to dig deep for American roots, not only when we first started, but as a constant characteristic, so that in the mid-1970s, we also produced, first, America's First Unfinished Revolution, and then The First (1877) General Strike in the U.S.: Then and Now, and most recently, "American Black Thought and Black Reality" you'll be discussing under Organizational Reports. It is this type of theoretical working out what is, as relevant for history as for method, i.e. dialectics of analysis of current events, which now that we are transforming the paper, needs to become a regular feature. For this, we need a whole nucleus of "philosophers," or political analysts, if you insist.

Outside of "praxis," nothing is less understood, though most often repeated, hardly more than as if it were a cliché, than the words "method", "dialectics". Where these are not reduced to a "means" or a tool, they are used as a mere substitute for dynamism. Dynamic vs. static is about as far as vulgar materialists permit themselves to go. That is not what dialectics -- that development through not only contradiction but absolute negativity -- means. Therefore, let me point to at least a few events of our own past to show how the analysis of one period can indeed show the method for analyzing a current event. You saw what I did with the analysis of Guatemala in 1954, or rather, with U.S. imperialism's counter-revolution in Guatemala in 1954, in order to analyze the dialectic of developments there right now.

And I dare say that if I had tried to use China as an example, it would be too easy since I analyzed Mao in 1949-50, in 1954-55, and again in 1957-59, 1965-68, and finally talked of Mao's Last Hurrah when he was still alive and had suppressed the Sheng Wu-lion / ^{--but it is that movement,} as witness also Wang Xizhe's "For a Return to Genuine Marxism in China" (the title in Chinese is "Struggle for a Class Dictatorship of the Proletariat") which is alive and growing while Mao really is dead -- and not only physically, but philosophically, be it the alleged Great Leap Forward, or the so-called Cultural Revolution.

For that matter, take the Iranian Revolution of our time which was born out of the greatest, most powerful, and sustained mass mobilizations for months on end before the three-day insurrection of Feb. 9-12. At the same time, the

6267

workers who had been out on general strike had refused to turn over their guns even when the Ayatollah commanded them. All sorts of spontaneous organizations arose, by no means limited to former guerrilla groups. Quite the contrary. There were shoras, women's liberationists, there were workers' councils, there were ajumenis.

And in all of them youth was dominant. There was also no end to the freedom of the press and the great attraction for the student youth of new Marxist translations and of those Marxist groups, the most eagerly sought after were those who were independent of any state power. The most persistent fighters for self-determination were also the most organized, and it was not only the Kurds but the Arabs. Because they were all part of the mass revolutionary outburst which overthrew the Shah, they felt confident in continuing the fights for genuine self-determination, even as the Women's Liberation Movement aimed at opening up a second chapter of the revolution as they were involved for five days in continuous marches under the banner, "We made the revolution for freedom and got unfreedom."

But it is Khomeini who is in the saddle, trying to roll it all backward. He, on the one hand, and Begin, on the other, are every bit as reactionary as the two dominant nuclear powers -- the U.S. and Russia. Imperative, therefore, is the question that preoccupies us this year: responsibilities of intellectuals who are Marxists. If you will look back into the Archives, you will see that on April 30, 1962, the Weekly Political Letter was entitled, "Theoreticians at the Crossroads, Or Towards a New Formulation of the Relation of Theory to Practice." And I wrote, not to those who never tried to fill the theoretic void since Lenin's death, but as a challenge directed to the new African leaders:

We now see added to the patchwork of "African socialism" and "communcracy" and "African personality" and "Nogritude", not to mention Toure's "Toward Full Re-Africanization", something called "Nkrumahism" which runs the gamut of "uniting" Gandhi and Lenin, and CND and Pan-Africanism, and just plain Osagyefo-ism.

Now, look at the very latest appearance of the new Religious Right right here, and know that I warned against it when it first manifested itself in the late 1950s as "Moral Rearmament" which tried flirting with Azikwo. Which is why I analyzed it in the pamphlet with that long name, Nationalism, Communism,

Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions in order to stress that the battle of ideas is every bit as important as the revolutions themselves.

What I'm trying to articulate is that when you witness some phenomenon that seems to have arisen clear out of the blue, don't despair. It isn't all that new. You will find one or another form of it in the Marxist-Humanist "Archives", whether that be on Marx's "Economics", as in my 1944 Outline of Marx's Capital, or as in the 1974-5 global crisis and the need to battle also with Ernest Mandel and Tony Cliff; or for that matter, the Black Dimension, whether back in 1943 when I fought both the bourgeois Myrdal and the Black intellectuals who capitulated to him -- and this year you will also have "American Black Thought and Black Reality." In a word, it isn't history "as such"; it is dialectics which is the method to judge the new.

For example, by 1966, when Mao launched the so-called Cultural Revolution which so befuddled the Left, in Japan, too, even those who talked of state-capitalism kept their distance from "philosophy" which, though they used it as an abstraction, was in fact Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, not to mention our extension of it. It became clear then that we alone could work out Philosophy and Revolution, even as it is clear today that we alone can work out Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation; and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

It was no accident (nor only related to the objective situation of Carter's drive for war) that we posed the question of expansion of News & Letters. The more fundamental reason was the imperativeness of philosophy as action, and the need, therefore, of a philosophic nucleus, whether that be every Marxist-Humanist philosopher, or as a sort of thought-exuding nucleus. It goes without saying that it's needed most if we are fully to comprehend why the Rosa Luxemburg book has the title it has.

Nor do I mean that the three parts -- Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution -- are of equal newness. I mean that never before has Marx's philosophy of revolution been fully presented; at best, it was a theory of proletarian revolution that was strictly political.

I mean also that it could not have been presented in full, because we did not have all of his works until recently. It is for this reason that I consider

it also no accident that we started publishing the book not with Chapter 1, "Two Turning Points in Rosa Luxemburg's Life," but with Marx's Ethnological Notebooks, or more precisely put, "The Relationship of Philosophy and Revolution to Women's Liberation: Marx's and Engels' Studies Contrasted." That is to say, just as the question of Women's Liberation could not fully be understood as a Marxist when thinking that Marx and Engels were one, so Marx's total philosophy of revolution could not be as fully worked out as it will be in this book because we do finally have nearly the whole of Marx's writings.

It is there, i.e. in the Ethnological Notebooks, where Marx returns to the question he first posed in 1844 -- the Man/Woman relationship as the manifestation of the whole of human relationships -- and in the Grundrisse, 1857, where he described the human relationship as "the absolute movement of becoming."

The relationship of theory to practice is not the easiest problematic to work out, as it changes with every historic period in every historic culture, with every different country, and above all, in the relationship between the mass movement when it is in motion, and the counter-revolution and its strength. Not to mention the whole world context.

The overriding question is this: since it is only now -- 100 years from the last writing of Marx (and through the Ethnological Notebooks, see also with new eyes that 1881 Preface to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto) -- that we can grapple with nearly all the writings of this founder of a whole new continent of thought, this presents a new challenge to the whole Marxist movement and the need to face not only the relationship of philosophy and revolution, but also philosophy of revolution.

One of the many new things in the 25-year history of Marxist-Humanism -- and nearly 40 years since the state-capitalist theory -- is a fact we didn't fully grasp when we first worked out the latter theory. It is this: if state-capitalist theory does not extend itself to Marxist-Humanism, there is nowhere for theoreticians of state capitalism to go. Once they disclose what is and what they are against, without working out what they are for, they will once again land in the mire of tailending new state powers, as was shown by CLRJ's tail-ending Castro -- he even rewrote, that is, gave it a new twist in a fantastic

new preface to Black Jacobins -- Nkrumah plus "the bewildering profundities of Mao" (Radical America, November, 1971). (And I might add the state-capitalist theoreticians like Tony Cliff who weren't part of the Johnson-Forest Tendency -- indeed, refused so much as to vote for us at the Fourth International conference since he was going to wait to complete his purely economist analysis, looking for something called "cause" rather than Subject -- haven't fared any better either on vanguard "party to lead", or on attitude to state-capitalist societies calling themselves Communism.)

We, on the other hand, were working-out, with the new forces of revolution -- Rank-and-File Labor, Black, Youth, Women's Liberation -- as well as the Self-Thinking Idea, that is to say, the self-determination of the Idea of Freedom, Marxist-Humanism for our age.

Thus, whether it was with the Black masses as vanguard, which produced everything from Freedom Riders Sneak For Themselves and American Civilization on Trial to Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal, or with the section of the Zengakuren that had broken from Communism and were rethinking Marx's Humanist Essays; whether collaborating with the Free Speech Movement where, again, it was not only activity but speaking on "The Theory of Alienation: Marx's Debt to Hegel"; or with the East European dissidents who could be said to have been the co-authors of Chapter 8 of Philosophy and Revolution; whether it was the Sheng Wu-lien's Whither China? that we reproduced and included in Philosophy and Revolution, or what is presently manifesting itself in the new dissident manifesto, "For a Return to Genuine Marxism in China," by Wang Xizhe, and as we are now expanding News & Letters and finishing the Rosa Luxemburg book, it is clear that the ceaseless work on theory is every bit as hard as manual labor: by no means can Theory and Practice be separated and still achieve a successful revolution.

There is no way of separating doing from being without losing the multidimensionality of the human being, that is to say, its Universality -- the struggle for, and achievement of total freedom.

Put differently, be it the long march of revolt, or the long march of philosophy -- but I don't mean the 2,500 years Hegel kept in view, but "only" the 200 years since the age of revolutions -- industrial, political, social,

intellectual, opened by the American-French Revolutions of the late 18th century -- it is in those dialectics of liberation that the relationship of theory and practice is worked out in such a totally new way that full freedom comes to be.

-- Raya Dunayevskaya, Aug. 30, 1980

* * *

Toward that end, it may be valuable to add here the core of what I said on the relationship of philosophy to leadership. *

"...It is the nature of the fact, the notion, which causes the movement and development, yet this same movement is equally the action of cognition."

--Hegel, Philosophy of Mind, para. 577

Prolegomena

I've put this seemingly pretentious heading, instead of writing simply Preface, or introductory remarks, in order to stress that, instead of "Elections" being merely a naming, or fight for, "positions", not to mention a lot of factionalism, our executive session has always been a matter of summing up the convention, in the sense of seeing what and if the Perspectives have been modified so that the leadership elected to carry out those Perspectives measure up to the Individualism "purified", as Hegel put it, "of all that interferes with its Universalism, i.e. freedom," Both the tasks of this year -- from expansion of paper to completion of the new book, and from mass activity to classes on our Political-Philosophic Letters and our History -- and the preparation for the next plenum must be creatively worked out in a way that we have both continuity with the Marxism of Marx, as well as our original contributions for our age, tested in the objective world. In a word, because of the crucial importance of philosophy, I call this introduction Prolegomena.

Therefore, let us take a look, no matter how briefly it must of necessity be, at what organizational problematic has meant to Karl Marx, to V.I. Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Antonio Gramsci, Leon Trotsky, and those who broke from the latter in order to analyze the putrid reality of Stalinism and World War II.

Unless you recognize Marxism as a whole new continent of thought, you cannot but divide Marx up into economics, politics, a little bit of

*This presentation was given to the Executive Session of the Convention, Aug. 31.

philosophy and "no theory of the party." Now, whereas it is true he had no theory of the party as we know it since Lenin's 'What Is To Be Done?', what Marx thought of as "party" was organization as tendency -- political-philosophic tendency so that the class nature of a workers' organization moves from spontaneity to a "party of their own", which becomes what he described communists to be. That is, though an integral part of the workingclass, communists, in Marx's view, have a view of the class struggle as a whole, and not just of the immediate demands; and they are internationalist and not nationalists.

After Marx unfurled that great historic, class and international banner in the Communist Manifesto, and participated in both the 1848 Revolution and the greatest revolution of his day, the 1871 Paris Commune, he criticized unflinchingly the 1875 Social Democratic Party. Only Lenin measured up to Marx's Critique of the Gotha Program, and not with "Party" but with State and Revolution; and only Lenin measured up to 1881 with his 1920 Thesis on the National and Colonial Questions -- yes, indeed, if not through Berlin, then perhaps through Peking!

Let's not forget that, though we reject the "vanguard party to lead", even in that 1903 program, Lenin did underpin it with "there can be no successful revolution without a theory of revolution." Which is something the latest British book on Marxism and the Party by John Molyneux surely fails to do. And Lenin did criticize himself as soon as the 1905 revolution broke out. The British SWP sees that without making as many changes in their 1980 concept as Lenin did in 1905. When Molyneux does get to mention Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, he has next to nothing to say, excusing himself on the ground that he'll discuss philosophy when he deals with Gramsci, but then he deals with Gramsci's philosophy, not Lenin's.

The great Italian revolutionary Antonio Gramsci, while imprisoned in Mussolini's jail, was the one revolutionary in the late 1920s and early 1930s who was working out precisely the problem of the relationship of theory to practice, of philosophy to revolution. As he put it in his Problems of Marxism:

"The philosophy of praxis is consciousness full of contradictions in which the philosopher himself, understood both individually and as an entire social group, not merely grasps the contradictions, but posits himself as an element of the contradictions and elevates this element to a principle of knowledge and therefore of action." *

-- Selections From the Prison Notebooks

* But what Gramsci called "hegemony" -- be it in winning over intellectuals to the revolutionary proletariat, or the worker who has a comprehensive conception of the objective world and the battle of ideas as well as the class struggle -- could, in the end, be won only by the "party."

Contrast this to Lenin's singling out from Hegel: "Cognition not only reflects the world, but creates it." It doesn't even enter the Tony Cliff mentality of Molyneux that that is exactly where the great tragedy comes in -- that whereas Lenin reorganized himself on dialectic, on State and Revolution, on Imperialism, on the National and Colonial Questions, and in the Will regarding Bukharin, he stopped short of reorganizing himself on the concept of the party. (If Molyneux had just paid attention to that single word, dialectic, he would have gone a great deal further than the whole 188 pages of his book.)

Molyneux 's full Trotskyism comes out when he deals with Rosa Luxemburg. He is so happy that, though a vanguardist, he can now appear to be for spontaneity, that he doesn't even know that he is economist, as Trotsky was. He steps right back into vanguardism as he attributes all Luxemburg's mistakes to her not having appreciated unevenness of development. Ah well, he isn't important. What is is the fact that Lenin stopped short of reorganizing his concept of the party, no matter how fundamentally he did modify it, especially after 1905. And that is what is most relevant today, so let's go to Marxist-Humanism, instead.

Have you recently reread my letters on the Absolute Idea? Read the last part where I begin arguing with Lenin because he said that the last half of the last paragraph (Larger Logic, II, p. 485; Lenin's Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 234) of Hegel's Science of Logic is unimportant. He stopped, instead, at the first half of that paragraph, at the word, "Nature". Lenin says that Hegel here "brings one within a hand's grasp of materialism ... This is not the last sentence of the Logic, but what comes after is unimportant." My argument was that Lenin hadn't lived through what we had suffered -- thirty years of Stalinism.

What Hegel was telling us in that last paragraph was that he was not through when the Idea had a form of Nature, that there was still a long way to go through the Philosophy of Nature and Philosophy of Mind, and only then, when you've gone through the whole of the Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences would you know what else was in store. In truth, he wasn't even satisfied with that ending, and in the year before he died, he added the three syllogisms. These reveal that he 1) does nothing short of throwing out the Logic ; 2) does not really construct a "system", as is seen in the third syllogism which isn't a syllogism. Instead, Hegel practices the unity of theory and practice, of objective and subjective, because once you have reached Subject you need no

"system"; the other two forms -- Nature, Mind -- are where "it" is manifested. Now all that remains is Method, Absolute Method. In a word, Self-Motion as Method is all a Subject needs.

As I discussed it with the REB when we took up the question of leadership, Johnson found in Absolute Idea what he already had^{as} presupposition, which he had expressed as early as 1944 in his "Education, Propaganda, Agitation." What seemed as a glorification of masses from below was, in fact, just pointing to one truth -- the workers acting spontaneously, in order to hide the greater truth -- that he, like Shachtman, would saddle the workers with responsibility for what we had to answer to history for -- our responsibility. Do we or don't we have an historic right to exist?

It was not only opportunism, much less outright betrayal, that impelled Johnson to those positions. The drive to that end came from "not completing" the objectivity of the theory of state-capitalism with the indispensable subjectivity -- not of Leader Numero Uno, but of Marxist-Humanist philosophy.

It is too easy to go from Marx's Humanism to Marxist-Humanism, so permit me a detour via Hegel, and George Armstrong-Kelly, who criticized Philosophy and Revolution precisely at the point on Method which is leadership responsibility, i.e. Absolute Method. First, let us listen to Hegel:

"In the absolute method, however, the universal does not mean the merely abstract but the objectively universal, that is, that which is in itself the concrete totality, but not as posited or for itself ... The progress is therefore not a kind of overflow..."
(Science of Logic, Vol.II, p.471)

Now George Armstrong-Kelly accused me of "baptising" an unchained dialectic as Absolute Method, and quoted me about "the cogency of the dialectic of negativity for a period of proletarian revolution as well as for the birth-time of history" when he knew very well: 1) that Absolute Method was Hegel's expression, not mine; and 2) what I called "unchained dialectic" was what Hegel called "absolute negativity", and what Marx (and I, borrowing from Marx) called "new passions and forces" for reconstructing society on Humanist beginnings.

In a word, the point of difference was not philosophy "in general" but the Humanism of Marxism, which Marx drew both from "negation of the negation" and actual live human beings taking destiny into their own hands.

That is why I chose the quote from Hegel's Philosophy of Mind with which I began this section: "... it is ^{the} nature of the fact, the notion, which causes the movement and development, yet this same movement is equally the action of cognition."

Do you realize that it is 100 years since the Ethnological Notebooks were written and since that amazing 1881 Preface to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto, and that it is only in our age that we finally have seen those "Notebooks" of Marx and can truly say that we have his complete works and can sum up Marx's philosophy of revolution as "From a Critic of Hegel, to the Author of Capital and the Theorist of the Permanent Revolution, " not just of 1850, but 1881?

It's exactly that, that is, philosophy as leadership, that distinguishes us from all others, and, moreover, it distinguishes us not because we are in any ivory towers, but because philosophy which is leadership, is also action.

-- Raya Dunayevskaya, Aug. 31, 1980

6 2 7 1

A Subreport to the Perspectives Discussion
on "Theory and our Archives", Aug. 30, 1980.

THE PHILOSOPHIC-ORGANIZATIONAL STORY OF MARXIST-HUMANISM

Today -- alive -- serious: those are the three words the REB wanted this Convention to keep as our focus while we discuss "Theory and Our Archives" as a continuation of our Perspectives Discussion this afternoon.

Now, if you mean by "today" all the crises of this degenerate state-capitalist world, through which we were taken on a tour this morning in the Perspectives Report, "today" surely is spelled out as such an old, rotting decadence that the new face of "religion" looks almost like the old face of the Inquisition, until you see that it is new, and therefore much worse. But if you mean by "today" the new forces and passions for a truly human world that we are out to create, then today means a Perspectives for 1980-81 in which our "archives" are not only "alive and well" but constantly being transformed anew.

The truth is that there is nothing more NEW for this Convention -- whether you see it just as literature, or as true ground for the whole new stage of the 12-page theoretical-practical N&L -- than the new history of our 25 years of Marxist-Humanism. It is so new that it cannot even be finished until this Convention is over, for we are writing, this weekend, the concluding pages to what then will first begin that whole new stage -- not only in the actual pages of the next three issues of N&L, but as what will be presented to the Wayne State University Collection in January for a new volume, tied tightly together with the completed chapters of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

Nothing better dispels the dusty idea that the word "Archives" conjures up than to grasp that what we are talking about is not "archives" but the philosophic-organizational story of Marxist-Humanism. And this kind of history is a work of theory, itself. It is not a chronicle of facts. It is a recreation of the selected moments of a living movement that reveals what Hegel meant by "facts", when he insisted that "fact emerges out of ground"; that "when all the conditions of Fact are present, it enters into existence"; that "the Fact is before it exists." That is the true dialectic of the development of the theory and the practice of Marxist-Humanism. Above all, what our history concretely demonstrates is that a theory which is rooted in Marx's philosophy of revolution is absolutely inseparable from objective world developments, on the one hand, and our organizational development, on the other.

Nothing shows that better than the fact that this new history we are writing was itself the result of a surprising dialectic. Raya certainly had no intention of sitting down, in the very midst of pre-convention preparations, to write the full 25-year history this turned out to be. But "something funny happened on the way to the Convention this year" -- between the time the Draft Introduction was written where we announced that this was our 25th anniversary -- and sitting down to write what was then conceived to be a brief introduction to the reprinted First Conference Bulletin of 1955.

May 4, 1980 was the catalyst. And that lecture, in turn -- on viewing a celebration of Marx's May 5 birthday in terms of the historic birth of Marx's new continent of thought in 1843 -- was given in order to have us see the whole of the new book, though it could not be completed until after the Convention.

The truth is that the whole past year is a "chronicle" of all the concrete ways the work on the new book "informed" our activities -- whether that is the way Chapter I on "Before and After the Russian Revolution of 1905" illuminates:

6277

the Iranian Revolutions, not only of 1906-09, but of 1979-80; or the way that work resulted in the invitation to Columbia University for a talk on the 75th anniversary of the 1905 Russian Revolution through the eyes of today -- which attracted to it new participants in an anti-draft rally held that same day on that campus; whether it is the way the new book "informed" Neda's creative new Farsi pamphlet on Women's Liberation or inspired the letter to the Youth on Marx's revolutionary journalism when it was recalled that so much did Marx feel he was working out theory for the workers to share and help develop further, that he had written "Wage Labor and Capital" directly for his newspaper.

There is not a single chapter that did not have some direct organizational conclusions -- and none more so than the chapter that is not yet written, but was presented in lecture form at that May 4 meeting. It was in viewing the whole 40 years of Marx's work, which only our age has been able to do, that you could see not only the totality of the whole, but the totality within each period, and within each work. The power of seeing Marx as a whole new continent of thought was equalled only by the power of realizing that that is a unique concept which is ours alone. So that this History is yet one more proof of how profoundly 1980 informed the new book, and how the new book informed 1980.

Let's consider what it means, for example, that in stopping to celebrate an anniversary in 1980, the emphasis this time was on the need to start with 1955, and not a day before. We've stopped at several other moments to view our birth through the new eyes of whatever "today" we happened to be in. We have gone back to the very birth of the State-Capitalist Tendency in 1941, and certainly often to the breakthrough on the Absolute Idea in 1953.

Indeed, the insistence that this time the essay on our birth had to begin with 1955 -- far from leading to an ignoring of what 1953 meant -- was precisely what made it necessary to write an entirely separate, wholly different, and wholly new essay on that breakthrough -- which then turned out to be not on 1953 but on the whole period 1949 through to 1954, because it had become clear that not only was the first divergence between the two co-founders of the State-Capitalist Tendency not over the Beria Purge, or Stalin's death before that, or even the Letters on the Absolute Idea, but that it had emerged, unnoticed at the time, all the way back in the 1949-50 letters on Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks.

And now, it suddenly became obvious that it was all related to the new stage of production that had been born -- Automation -- and the revolt against it, that demanded a new stage of cognition. How could it be that it was not until this year, 1980, that Automation was seen as being as important in the development of Marxist-Humanism and objectively what eventually entailed the break with Johnson, as World War II had been in the development of State-Capitalist theory which had entailed the break with Trotsky?

Isn't it the work on the new book that has given us such a new appreciation of what continuity and discontinuity means that all these roots of our birth, important as they are, are presented this time as Prologue? And that Part I does not start until we actually begin News & Letters as totally new kind of paper, and N&L organization as totally new kind of organization?

Lenin, you know, denied, in the discussions in 1907, that Bolshevism began in 1902-03, because he said they didn't know they were a whole different Tendency then. It was 1905 he dated as their birth because it was the debates over what Marxists should do in the great 1905 textile strikes that first made them conscious of the divergence between the Bolsheviks and all the others. It is always the urgency of the objective situation that makes abstractions suddenly very concrete.

And once it does become concrete, once you are conscious of your continuity and discontinuity -- that is, of how Marx's Marxism has to be spelled out anew for your age -- only then can you first begin to develop it. Only after the break did Marxist-Humanism become a new beginning that could determine the end. That is precisely what the first "chapter" of our story -- the five years from 1955 through 1959 which we call "Laying Theoretic and Practical Foundations and Establishing New International Relations" -- represents.

* * *

I believe that it is the history of Marxist-Humanism that will help us to grasp the concentration of the new book on how philosophy informs your theory and how theory informs your activity. Whether you want to see that as a movement from Universal, through Particular, to Individual, or not -- the truth is that if you view theory as a living force, as an active mediation, you will see that it must both look back at philosophy and forward to practice, and that the process goes in both directions.

Let's take a closer look at what that means in terms of theory as anticipation and theory as intervention -- which is one concrete way of seeing that theory is informed by philosophy and itself informs practice. And let's do it in three different ways: 1) in terms of the latest event on the world objective scene; 2) in terms of one of the chapters in the new book; 3) in terms of our history.

1) The most exciting event of the past week is the magnificent strike of the Polish workers for higher wages and freedom of the press. Raya this morning reminded us that our paths crossed with Poland's as far back as 1943-1944 with the thesis that "All Roads Lead to Warsaw." And the Polish freedom story itself goes back for centuries. So persistent, so intransigent was the Polish resistance to Tsarist oppression, the center-point of European reaction in Marx's day, that it had led Marx to title the Poles "the 20 million heroes" who were "standing between Europe and Asia." And he emphasized the greatness of their revolutionary character again in singling them out for their role in the Paris Commune.

Today the Polish freedom story continues in a new form -- it is one of the most significant elements of the whole East European revolt that began in East Germany on June 17, 1953. And it is one that we have been part of and, indeed, anticipated from our very birth. Take the very Letters on the Absolute Idea that Raya wrote in May of 1953, after the death of Stalin (and after the difference of attitude had emerged in regard to what American Marxists should have to say on that death -- which I will not go into here, it is all there in the Prologue). We all know the story well, that the date of Raya's breakthrough on the Absolute Idea as a movement not only from theory but from practice to theory, actually preceded the outburst of the East German workers against their work norms by six weeks. (That would not have surprised Hegel, I think, who said that the Fact is before it actually exists....)

Even more important, after that revolt was crushed, and the Russian theoreticians came out with an attack on the "idealistic" Hegelian phrase, "negation of the negation", Raya saw in that, not some dogmatic hair-splitting that American so-called philosophers were laughing about, but that the Russians were sensing a new revolution in East Europe; that the revolt was not crushed, but only driven underground. And, sure enough, the very next year came the great Hungarian Revolt.

lution -- which was preceded by the Polish uprising in Posnan with its slogan of "Bread and Freedom." The East European revolt has been ceaseless ever since, and nowhere more than in Poland, where alone it has this mass proletarian base that is writing the glorious new pages of that freedom story today. For, while all of East Europe is often seen as one revolt, each people has had its own special contribution to make. And the truth is that if you will look at your copy of our pamphlet on the Afro-Asian Revolutions, you will find on p. 26 a whole section on what it meant that it was from Poland that humanism had first emerged and inspired the Hungarian Revolution. And that pamphlet was not just theoretical preparation for what eventually became Philosophy and Revolution; it was theoretical and practical intervention in the ongoing revolutions of our day.

You will find, as you read our new philosophic-organization story of Marxist-Humanism that the criss-crossing of all paths, nationally and internationally, will constantly be taking us on the journey from philosophy, through theory, to practice -- so that the Afro-Asian pamphlet (which not so incidentally brought to us our first British collaborators in a new edition of it -- ended by demonstrating that Lenin's new departure in theory that saw that revolutionary initiative is not always with the working class, but that "the road to Berlin may lead to Peking" was no longer theory, but fact -- Hegelian fact.

Nothing was more exciting in the criss-crossing of all these paths than the two letters Raya received while she was still in Africa on her trip in 1962. One was from Tadayuki Tshushima, a Japanese Marxist who had worked out his own theory of state-capitalism while sitting out World War II in Hirohito's prisons, had found the single copy of Marxism and Freedom that had been sent to Japan, and wanted to translate and publish it in his land. And the other letter was from a Czechoslovakian Marxist who had also somehow found a copy (I think there can be no doubt that chapters must have been circulating in samizdat throughout East Europe as soon as it was published) and wanted to devise a correspondence with Marxist-Humanists abroad. He is the revolutionary who, six years later, became the author of "Frague Spring", in our pamphlet on Czechoslovakia: Revolution and Counter-Revolution.

If there are any who doubt the force that ideas have, the power that theory can wield, the active intervention in world events that Marxism and Freedom has represented, the importance of the dialogue that Socialist Humanism produced, or the tremendous significance of the fact that copies of Urszula's Polish translations, including the review of the East European chapter of P&R, are circulating in Poland right now -- let them remember that what the youth of Steve Biko's Black Consciousness movement in Soweto were reading in 1976 was Frantz Fanon's Wretched of the Earth. Philosophy is a force of revolution.

2) Let's turn now to one of the finished chapters in the new book to see theory as anticipation and, as intervention in terms of what was involved in the National Question.

I can tell you that this was one chapter Raya was not looking forward to writing. How could you possibly explain the stubborn refusal of a great revolutionary like Luxemburg to consider the right of nations to self-determination in general, and in particular her opposition to self-determination for Poland, her own birthplace, despite all that Marx had said on that very specific question? And Luxemburg was absolutely intransigent on this question, and had been ever since her first entrance on the Social-Democratic scene in 1896. Lenin had certainly answered Luxemburg more than adequately from the very beginning. And our own

- 5 -

had transformed Lenin's "theory" into "fact", as we have already seen, over and over again since the Easter Rebellion in 1916. What more, exactly, could you say?

But once Raya related Luxemburg's theory to philosophy, or rather to the lack of philosophy; once Raya refused to treat Luxemburg's position as an "aberration" but followed its logic and connected it to precisely the same error that led to her false theory on Accumulation -- namely, her failure to grasp Marxism as a whole new continent of thought and not mere "method of research" or "weapon in the class struggle." -- everything opened up anew. It was then possible to see that Lenin's answer to Luxemburg in 1903 was correct and revolutionary "politics" but not truly "philosophy." You could see the difference in how he answered her after his return to Hegel at the outbreak of WWI and the collapse of the Second International, after his Philosophic Notebooks. When he answered Luxemburg's Junius pamphlet in August 1916, he answered her philosophically. It was there that Lenin called Luxemburg's confidence in the class struggle only "halfway dialectics" -- insisting that civil war against the bourgeoisie is also a form of class struggle. For it was when Lenin saw that the universal of internationalism and proletarian revolution can be made real through the particular of a nationalist struggle for self-determination -- that is, it was when his theory was deeply rooted in Hegelian-Marxian dialectics of masses in motion, on the one hand, and on the other hand, when the question had the urgency of an imperialist war, that Lenin suddenly found himself isolated on the question of self-determination of nations even among the Bolsheviks, among whom there had been no difference on this question before WWI.

It was because Lenin's theory was rooted in philosophy that it proved not only an illumination of the Irish Rebellion, but an intervention for his own revolution; the only successful proletarian revolution the world has ever seen.

In total contrast, it was not because she was stubborn, but because Luxemburg made the universal of internationalism into a fixed particular, that revolution itself became an abstraction, no matter how great a revolutionary she was. And a great one she was, indeed. Nothing, I think, better shows the pitfalls of a theory that is not rooted in philosophy and remains only "politics."

* * *

3) And finally, to take yet one more way to look at the relationship of philosophy, theory and practice, let us come from the lofty heights of the greatest revolution the world has yet seen to our own tiny organization, at the point when we were trying to start a new kind of paper that would be the opposite of the "vanguard party to lead" -- and wound up with the opposite side of the same coin, instead.

I'm referring to the year 1954, when we had finally started to publish Correspondence as a printed paper. We had published it for just over half a year, in fact, and not doing too well, when Johnson suddenly initiated a Special Supplement. It was the April 3 issue, if you want to look it up in the Archives. When you do, you will find there a "Discussion" article called "The Real Trouble: We Solve This or We Fail." And when you read it, you will find that according to Johnson the real trouble with the paper, which wasn't winning flocks of workers to it at once, was that the intellectuals in our organization were still supposed-

ly dominating the workers. Now the intellectual he was talking about, of course, was not himself, but Raya -- and the worker who was being dominated was not a shy "third layer", but our then worker-editor, JZ. The article describes a meeting between RD and JZ in which he said the paper should not concern itself about McCarthyism which was then raging. The workers, he says, are not afraid of McCarthy. And when Raya says (probably in shock) "But it isn't a question of McCarthy as such, there is the whole question of freedom of the press which he is trying to strangle...", JZ says, "The workers are not particularly interested in freedom of the press." Raya (who is defined in the article as "the politically experienced intellectual") is reported to say (at once): "But that is absolutely untrue, and even if it were true, it is the duty of the paper to point out to the workers that freedom of the press is a matter of life and death for the country as a whole and for the workers most of all..." (The Polish workers today would surely understand that language, but Johnson evidently didn't understand a word; he continues in his thesis to declare: "Here is the most dangerous part of the whole business -- in the end, the worker is himself convinced!" And that, to Johnson, was the real trouble!

It did, indeed, take a full break with Johnson to lift that kind of incubus from our heads and backs -- and determine that unity of worker and intellectual, and relationship of theory and practice, means understanding that each by itself is one-sided. You might want to remember this story when you read the history and find that the three different levels on which our attitude to objectivity was tested at our very birth were: (as we put it in Part I of our History: "(1) determining how to fight McCarthyism when war clouds formed; (2) recognizing the movement from practice which was itself a form of theory -- in East Berlin; in Detroit; in Montgomery, Ala.; and (3) testing, in the philosophic sphere, Russia's attack on Marx's Humanist Essays during the undercurrent of proletarian revolts."

So -- what is theory? Theory is not just the generalization of what workers are doing. It is the practice of your philosophy. That is why each pamphlet we produced all through the exciting 1960s can be seen as an extension of Marxism and Freedom, written by participants in the freedom struggles who were also participants in the battles for the minds of humanity. We were not quite so successful in developing extensions of Philosophy and Revolution. But the new book on Marx's Philosophy of Revolution now gives us even newer philosophic ground and creates so new a stage in our organizational development before that book has even been finished that it is already being concretized in the new 12 page N&L in which the appreciation for ideas, the understanding that it is theory which informs all our activities, means that we do grasp that what we are doing is, at one and the same time, in the tradition of Marx's revolutionary journalism and something totally new that none have ever tried before. We cannot appreciate the newness of demanding that all of us become practicing theoreticians unless we do see that the idea was "all there" right at our birth, but that we were not fully concretizing it in our own practice.

The year ahead is sure to put us to the test, as it always has, with each new objective development. But there is nothing we will confront in the year ahead, on either the objective or the subjective front -- whether it is a lead article or an Editorial; a Theoretical Essay or a letter to a correspondent; a leaflet or an organizational question -- for which we will not find both the point of departure and the ground (not just background) in the new book, on the one hand, or in the archives on the other.

-7-

Nothing better proves that than the work Lou Turner did on the Black Thought and Black Reality essay that we will be discussing this afternoon. Nothing also better proves that for us theory does not mean abstract, but the very opposite. The emphasis on writing theoretical essays for N&L does not mean less attention to the voices from below, but more. It does not mean less activity with all the forces of revolution, but more, both before and after writing.

What it means, above all, is that concrete and comprehensive are one and the same thing. It means that we are beginning today to write those new pages of our 25 year history that will spell out a new stage for Marxist-Humanism organizationally. It means that our History is alive in our Perspectives. It means that we are serious about the revolution and the new world we are going to help create.

-- Olga Domanski, Aug. 30, 1980

6283

REPORT ON ORGANIZATION TO NEWS AND LETTERS COMMITTEES CONVENTION 1980

by Michael Connolly, Co-National Organizer

I. OUR WORK WITH THE FORCES OF REVOLUTION: NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

The organizational perspectives we are discussing at this Convention for the year ahead, 1980-81, are surely the most far-reaching in the history of News and Letters Committees. At a time when Carter is vying with Reagan to see who can heat up Carter's new Cold War faster, when the economy is sunk in the deepest recession in post-WWII American history, and when racism both legal and in its open KKK form is sharply resurgent, we have projected a direction that is the absolute opposite of any sort of retrogressionism.

It is this moment that demands both the expansion of N&L into a 12-pager, and the creation of a nucleus of Marxist-Humanists able to write theoretical analyses of burning issues as they happen; both the expansion of our activity with all the forces of revolution in the current struggles, and the raising of a \$35,000 Sustaining-Organizing-Publishing Fund that will allow all of our work to go forward. As ground for all the perspectives, and inseparable from each other, are the completion of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, and the task of bringing the Archives of Marxist-Humanism up-to-date. And all these perspectives will require an even greater re-organization, not only of the Center, but nationally, than the very substantial re-organization we have grappled with all this past year.

In short, what we are projecting in these Perspectives for 1980-81 is a profound deepening of our concept and practice of organization. There is no better way to see that deepening than in the development of our view of "Who We Are" from last year to this. Where last year the discussion on our participation in the anti-nuke struggles meant a full re-writing of the "Who We Are" statement we publish in N&L, this year's pre-convention preparations resulted in a history of the whole last 25 years, and has meant a very new appreciation of what "new kind of member, beginning with ourselves" means.

If there was any doubt that what we correctly called the "year of the book" was also the year of the greatest stress on Marxist-Humanist organization, we have now to confront the fact that for Raya, the month before the Convention -- before Perspectives could be written in its final form -- became the month of writing a 25 year history of News and Letters Committees, re-examining the whole of our work in strict relation to the world events of our age.

What we stressed at our Plenum a year ago was that the 1980 deadline did not mean alone for the completion of the book. Unseparated from that was the projection of a deadline for all of us to begin now the daily organizational practice with all struggles, all subjects of revolution, in such a way that Marxist-Humanist philosophy becomes a fully active force to help all the new beginnings develop.

That those new beginnings spring up constantly is clear not only from the great world events of Poland and South Africa, South Korea and Central America, but as well from the struggles of the Blacks, rank-and-file workers, women and youth this year in the USA. We have been involved in all those battles, whether on the picket lines or in conferences, and not alone the class battles, but the battle of ideas and tendencies within the movement.

Let's look then at the forces of revolution and at the work of News and Letters Committees this year. Let's look at those developments which became genuine transition points to the Perspectives for 1980-81, breakthroughs which we need to keep ongoing. And let's focus first on the U.S. with its resurgent racism and deep recession.

No sooner had last year's Plenum ended than the attack on Black America took an ominous turn in police killings of youth and KKK rallies. We not only immediately joined the protests against police killings in L.A. and N.Y., and against racism in the building trades in Detroit, but sponsored a speaking tour by Charles Denby to California and Michigan, both as editor of N&L and author of IHABWJ. At Compton College, Denby's talk drew an audience of both Black and Iranian students, and established the basis for classes there in ACOT. With the new editions now out of IHABWJ in Britain and in Canada, and with the new edition to appear next Spring in Germany, we can now, not only abroad but right here in the USA, develop more fully the concept of IHABWJ especially Part II as a thorough-going critique of every tendency that falls short of a full view of workers as Person.

Throughout the year, our activity in the Black dimension moved from fighting "poverty conscription" to support for Haitian refugees, and from community organizing in Flint, to breaking into such publications as the Journal of Negro History and the Bibliographic Guide to Black Studies. Especially important was the Black study group that Alan was able to organize in the Bay Area.

But what is evidenced at this convention, and in the work of the whole summer, is the way in which a theoretical work -- in this case Lou's essay "Black Thought/Black Reality" -- can play such an activist role that it opens up new doors and helps establish new relationships, whether with Black women's liberationists disgusted with the way the ERA fight is conducted, or with intellectuals for whom nationalism no longer holds all answers. Raya's suggestion, as soon as the essay was completed, was that it be xeroxed, and circulated immediately, long before the paper deadline, and that we sponsor a mini-tour for Lou to N.Y., Chicago and Detroit. It was that suggestion that has changed so much of our work this summer. What is also clear is that the path to a breakthrough on "BT/BR" included on the one hand the outburst of Black Miami, and on the other, Lou's full year of work and study at the Center.

The impact of the deep recession on rank-and-file workers has been seen in the massive layoffs in industrial production, in the thousands of strikes -- both "official" and wildcat -- and in the raging debate everywhere about both the cause of the crisis and the direction of the movement against it. As the layoffs grew we pointed immediately to the way workers protested inside the plants, offering a forum to workers at Art Steel in N.Y. and Lynch Road in Detroit to tell their stories. We published a new edition of the Unemployment Lines newsletter, and sold Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis outside unemployment offices. We joined the picket lines and helped publish leaflets in strikes by San Francisco hotel workers, Detroit city employees, and N.Y. transit workers. In Britain, we worked with striking steelworkers fighting Thatcher, and with Black women strikers picketing the Chix candy plant. Most surprising of all has been the emergence from that "intellectual center", N.Y., of some of the best workers'

-3-

stories and discussions, stories from out of the lowest-paid layer of that city's sweatshops.

The greatest new point of departure, however, was added through Raya's study of the 1905 revolution in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. There was the way Jon in Wales picked out in chapter 2 Luxemburg's conclusion on 1905, that the "most precious, because lasting thing in this rapid ebb and flow of the wave is its mental sediment: the intellectual, cultural growth of the proletariat", and related it to the kind of review he would write about the new British edition of IHABWJ. And there was Richard in Detroit, who insisted on bringing Lenin's magnificent view of the proletariat in 1905 as reason, which he had read in Chapter 1, to the Detroit city workers' picket lines while he was on strike. Whether we consider the labor page in N&L next year, or the kind of leaflets we write for the new series of classes we are scheduling, there will be many opportunities to develop this work next year.

The women's liberation and youth reports which follow, and which form an integral part of our reports on organization, will also focus on the new ways they have found this year of working with all subjects of revolution. Because we live and struggle in this imperialist bastion of the USA, "forces of revolution" are here spelled out in the American context. But this year, even more than any other in our history, it is impossible to separate the needed American revolution from world events and battles.

This is so first because this is the year of the establishment of the magnificent first British edition of N&L. Dick has reported many of the events that lead to its publication, whether in the struggles against Thatcher's anti-labor, racist government, or in the battle of ideas with Tony Cliff's SWP, for whom all theory has been reduced to "party, party, party". What stands out, from all the new relations with Britain this year (both those who have now joined and those not-yet-members), is how the method by which Marxist-Humanism participated in all American battles--from the Black dimension to abortion rights and from anti-nuke to the shop floor--struck a responsive chord in young British revolutionaries searching for a new form of organization to replace the parties they had quit. They now have great possibilities to follow-up, as seen in more than \$500 in literature sales this year.

That chord, far from being limited to relations between the U.S. and Britain, resounded on every continent and involved all the forces of revolution. We could see it in the way women's liberationists from France, Peru and Iran sought us out to celebrate International Women's Day. We could see it in the way in which David Wolff's first English translation of Luxemburg's Theory and Practice has evoked orders and dialogue from Panama and Japan, Germany and Holland. And nearly all who order request the three draft chapters of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution that we advertise on the last page of Theory and Practice.

Such an urgency to exchange ideas was at the heart of the exciting relations Mary spoke of on her journey to China and Hong Kong, where both the immediate work of women's liberation as our committees practice it, and the history of the 1940s debates between Raya and Ernest Mandel became focal points of discussion.

6286

For all our international relations, a great contribution this year has come from the work of Kevin, who quietly sends to the office nearly every week a digest of world news clippings on events from China to Brazil and from Algeria to Zimbabwe. You have seen the information reflected in the pages of N&L.

But consider one more point on our international relations: the fact that the two languages other than English in which our publications appeared this year were Polish and Farsi.

When we finally published our first bi-lingual Polish-English pamphlet, "Today's Polish Fight for Freedom" in April, we of course had no idea that the dramatic events of the past two weeks would break out on the eve of our Convention. What we did know was that in America there were many who wanted to read what new forms Polish workers had discovered in their struggles, and that in the Polish resistance there were many more anxious to read about the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism. Twenty-five years of experience with the East European revolts and their quest for liberation had taught us that, from Marxism and Freedom being written during Hungary and Poland 1956, to the way Poland 1970-71 helped concretize Philosophy and Revolution's chapter on "State Capitalism and the East European Revolts".

We now know that quite a number of copies of TTTTT have found their way into Poland, in advance of the strikes. We can only imagine the impact they are having now. What we do know, very specifically is that more than 700 copies have been sold right here in the USA, especially by Chicago, especially the translator, Urszula Wislanka. Something of the interrelationship between world events and the needed American revolution can be grasped in the fact that they were sold not alone to Polish-American audiences, but at everything from anti-draft marches to women's liberation meetings; and from the way in which Robotnik's article on May Day in Poland bore such an "American" stamp that we featured it on the Labor Page in our May issue.

In focusing on forces of revolution, nationally and internationally, in the life of our organization last year, what stands out as mediation to the future perspectives is the way Marxist-Humanist analysis of events, Marxist-Humanist vision of revolution, made its concrete impact both on the participants in the struggle, and on the direction for our organization. And nowhere was that more sharply seen than in the Iranian Revolution and its relation to our work in the USA. Let's therefore take a closer look at the dialectic of those events, and our participation.

II. WORLD EVENTS, MARXIST-HUMANIST ANALYSIS AND ORGANIZATIONAL RAMIFICATIONS

So central has the Iranian Revolution been to the objective-subjective world situation, that for the second straight year, we can look at the issues of News & Letters and see Iran as crucial to nearly every issue. Where last year, however, we traced the coverage of Iran in the paper as part of a unified report on paper and organization, this year let's focus not so much directly on the reports and analyses of the Iranian Revolution, as with an eye to the organizational conclusions that flowed out of our analyses.

Take the very first article from last year: "Women and Religion in Iran"; that was created following Neda's talk at the Plenum. At a time when the whole of the Left was turning its back on the implications of religion's

assault on women's liberation, Neda's critique elicited responses from Black American women who saw the all-male religious-political leadership in this country as an obstacle to the freedom struggle. The question that followed critique, however, was then how to present positively, the full liberating philosophy for women's liberation concretely for the Iranian Revolution.

By April we were able to advertise "Women as Reason and as Force of Revolution: A Farsi translation of writings on women's liberation by Raya", with an introduction on "Women in the Iranian Revolution" by Neda. That this magnificent pamphlet in the language of the Iranian revolution was the first time we had ever published a collection of Raya's writings on women's liberation in any language says much about how an actual revolution brings a new urgency, a new appreciation, to theory. Even more, the experience with the pamphlet showed the organizational impact of this very new creation. Whether it was the translator's re-discovery of the footnote to Raya's 1970 article in Notes on Women's Liberation that contrasted Marx and Engels on woman in primitive communism; or whether it was the founding of the Iranian women's liberation study group in L.A., a group that included those who helped with the collating and stapling; or whether it was the way the pamphlet helped transform Detroit's celebration of International Women's Day and set the ground for the pre-convention Women's Liberation meeting; what is sharply underlined is the activist role a theoretical work can seize when we grasp what has been created.

In a very different sense, we had the opportunity to continue the discussion on form of organization projected at last year's plenum with Raha's discussion article in the December N&L, "Iran: Philosophy and Form of Organization". Raha jammed up Marx's 1844 Essays with the problems of organization in Iran, and Raya responded. What, however, will now start us off anew on this question is the 25 year history. And it is for this reason that Raya suggested we have a series of classes around it. It isn't easy to grasp a full quarter century by just reading it.

By the March issue, Iran meant "Carter's Drive to War", though he tried to claim that it was the Russian invasion of Afghanistan that had shocked him. In spelling out the superpower realities in the Persian Gulf, while pointing to the new forces within America sure to rise up in opposition to Carter's grand design, Raya's lead gave a concrete direction to our involvement in all the new youth anti-draft/anti-war activities that followed. Thus our work included the struggle within the movement to support Black America's fight against "poverty conscription". Thus, the description of Carter's Cold War drive as "militarization not only of the economy, but of the mind", forced the youth working inside the anti-draft groups to confront the need for a philosophy to fully liberate the mind, and connected the demonstrations to our classes in Marx's Capital. After one such anti-draft meeting, Jim was to truthfully remark that we had "supported CARD with whips and kicks".

Less than two months later, when Carter's fantastic brinksmanship did take the form of an actual intrusion into the Iranian desert, the Political-Philosophic Letter, "Carter's Intrusion, Khomeini's Holy War" focused on the need to confront the depth and difficulties of the counter-revolution at home in both Iran and the USA. Only in that way could we begin the "forging of relations, revolutionary relations, between the masses in the U.S. and in Iran."

Thus, as we began the Pre-Convention period and printed our Draft Perspectives in the July N&L, what remained a very central focus, and rightly so, was the Iranian revolution. Yet at the same time, it was precisely our understanding of the genuine revolutionary relation between world events and the struggle at home that made "Black Thought/Black Reality" a key immediate organizational ramification for our work this summer. In the wake of both war clouds abroad and Miami at home, the work on "Black Thought/Black Reality" that Raya had proposed was part of the way we were determined not to let Miami be stopped at just having "shaken things up". Instead, we sought a dialogue with those interested in developing that "shaking up" into philosophic-political reorganization. That this Convention has within its participants both those fighting for a full social revolution in Iran and Black activists who wish to unite thought and reality, is proof enough that the path to new revolutionary relations leads through the labor of the extension and deepening of theory.

If we review world events and the work of our organization, however briefly, over the past year, pivotal dates jump out. November 4, when the hostages were taken in Tehran; and April 26, when Carter launched his reckless intrusion. In a very different way, there is the date that changed everything for us -- February 3rd -- when Raya posed the "Need to Transform the Paper". What stands out at those pivotal dates, and indeed throughout the whole of the year, is the continuing, concrete, organizational intervention by Raya, inseparable from the work on the book. We can in no way do that intervention justice here. But it is important to glimpse, in just two crucial periods, how and where forward movement was created toward the 1980-81 Perspectives.

The truth is that when all the Left viewed the hostage seizures by equating Khomeini with the Iranian Revolution, we ourselves felt something of the impulse to rush to demonstrate without having worked out fully what was new. It was then that Raya's series of letters -- November 26 - December 17 helped set the ground for all our participation in genuine anti-imperialism. The whole movement -- from the November 26th letter on Luxemburg's break with Kautsky and her failure to take full responsibility for a revolutionary tendency, through "Grave Contradictions in the Iranian Revolution", written the very next day, to the December 17 "What is Philosophy? What is Revolution?" can be seen as the anticipation of all our work since then.

Isn't the work on our 25 year history based, in part, on contrasting our organizational life-story, with all tail-endism, exposing the insufficiency of even the most correct political line when it is not grounded in the recreation of the dialectic?

Or take something I experienced myself, some seven months later. After marching against Reagan and trying to sum up that experience for the lead on the Republican Convention, what suddenly seemed to shout itself out to me was Raya's December 17 question: "What new retrogressive stage are we in now, when religion usurps also political power?"

And as soon as 1980 began what immediately took place organizationally was Raya's trip to New York and Detroit, at the moment Carter launched Cold War II. The meetings in New York were great in turnout and spirit, yet we had to face the sober reality that Detroit's small turnout reflected the seriousness of Carter's drive to war.

Thus it was the whole of Raya's work -- both the chapters on the book and the political-philosophic letters -- that were our preparations for what became the transition point of the whole year, the February meetings in New York and Detroit on "The Need to Transform the Paper". What is crucial to see now is the way Raya's proposal to "jump the gun" on the projection of a 12 page N&L and the many assignments for essay articles that accompanied it, was demanded by the threat of Carter's new Cold War. It was that which both gave our decision its great urgency and made us begin to look back in the Archives to our origins in 1955, as we had then launched N&L into the teeth of McCarthyism and Cold War I. Indeed, the reorganization demanded within each of us to carry out the decisions of February 3, had its impact on every facet of our organizational life, and on none more so than on membership growth.

It is true that Raya had insisted, in her December 2 letter to us, that it is "our unique philosophic-political-economic contributions in THEORY, WHICH ALONE CAN BRING ORGANIZATIONAL GROWTH". But never has that truth been as urgent for all members, old as well as new, to grasp as it is now. When before have we seen the actual minutes of a meeting of the REB play such a pivotal role in decisions to ask for membership as they did for Jon in Wales, Johnny in Flint and Richard in Detroit? Nor is it unrelated that for each of them the most telling point was seeing the process by which our organizational direction was set, in sharp contrast to the processes they had seen in their various past organizational experiences.

The fact is that every single one of the new members who joined this year -- whether through women's liberation or the Black movement, through opposition to Carter's war drive or from the Latino struggle -- was attracted to Marxist-Humanist organization as a witness and participant in the extension and deepening of theory.

What is crucial as well is to see the concreteness of "follow-through", Raya's follow-through in the months after February 3. Whether the question was finances or publishing, women's liberation or the youth, never were her letters separated from the concrete organizational activities and the concrete objective developments. Thus in March, when Raya was struck by her rediscovery that Marx's Wage, Labor and Capital was first published in the pages of his daily newspaper, Neue Rheinische Zeitung, she addresses that letter specifically to the youth, then engaged in anti-draft demonstrations. And it is followed immediately by another to women's liberation, right after International Women's Day, that poses all the pre-convention work in the women's liberation movement as tightly tied to the discussion of the chapters of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

At the conclusion of that remarkable period February 3rd to May 5th, during which Raya wrote again and again on the still-unknown whole of Marx's work, whether published or unpublished, came the presentation on "The Todayness of Marx's Philosophy of Revolution". That our re-examination of Marx's philosophy of revolution was in no way "past history", but at the same time a transition to the deepening of today's Marxist-Humanist philosophy of revolution, was clear from the fact that it was at this meeting that Raya first presented, in full, the table of contents for the whole of the book.

It was hard then, when studying the Marxist-Humanist re-creation of Marx's critique of the Hegelian philosophy as something that comes only after the event, not to see the relevance to all the revolutionary tasks of our age. "Giving thought its wings", Raya writes, meant that the "Marxian dialectic was both an anticipation of revolution (whether we are referring to 1843-44 or to 1847 when he completed the Communist Manifesto), as well as participation in revolution when it finally did break out spontaneously, as well as a summation of what had occurred in such a way that even in defeat he could project future revolutions".

These categories of anticipation, participation, summation, are of course not alone for the revolutions of Marx's day. In making them explicit for our age, it is to reveal the historically proved relation of philosophy to revolution, of dialectics to organization. And since we are here not speaking only of preparation for full social revolution, but as well of a method of daily practicing dialectics, in every freedom struggle, let's return with those categories to what we have to anticipate now, the organizational perspectives we have set for the year ahead.

III. DEEPENING OUR CONCEPT AND OUR PRACTICE OF ORGANIZATION

In one very important sense, the "jumping the gun" we began on February 3rd on the transformation and expansion of the paper was not linked solely to the need to deepen revolutionary activity in the face of the new threats of war. "Jumping the gun" was dictated subjectively as well, by the need to practice the new concretization of our revolutionary journalism for a full half year before the Convention.

So it is with all of our Perspectives for 1980-81. One might say that there is nothing we are proposing now that has not been in some way a part of our work -- or at least our perspective -- this year, from the re-organization of the Center, to the study and development of the Marxist-Humanist Archives; and from the need to raise again the size of our Sustaining Fund, through the classes, to the expansion of all our activities, with workers both unemployed and in the shops, with women's liberation, with the Black Masses, with the youth. Most crucially, we can say that we have in our hands four chapters and two appendices of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

The truth is that there is much, not only in the past year, but throughout the 25 years in which News and Letters Committees has been tested by the crises of the state-capitalist age, that we can draw in the year ahead. Yet at the same time it is essential both to recognize what is absolutely new in our Perspectives and to see that making a summation of the year past is a necessary ground from which a new dialectic can be created in response to all the unanticipated events to come.

Where in last year's Organization Report, Olga made clear that the work on the book was to be the centerpoint of all our organizational activities, by pointing to Raya's proposal to print Chapter One -- "Before and After the 1905 Revolution" -- in the January/February N&L; the proposal to immediately follow that printing with a series of classes on Chapter One in all the locals; and the offer by Raya to begin those classes with a lecture on the "Life and Death of Rosa Luxemburg"; this

this year our task is a different one.

What all the concrete proposals demonstrate is that this year, rather than the work on the book as the centerpoint of all our activities, what is needed is the book as ground.

Thus, what is needed next year -- this year, indeed, it should already have been here -- are actual, concrete, profound, regular, month in and month out, reviews or essays -- and some discussions -- that prove that we really know how to practice being, writing, breathing, philosophic nucleus.

Thus, what is needed is to see our intervention in mass activities in a way that shows that Marxist-Humanism is there as not only activists, but thinkers. I hope that it can start right at this Convention today and not only on Black Thought/Black Reality but as all our work results in new members.

Thus, what is needed is such an appreciation for the richness of our 25 years experience that carrying on all our work with Raya really away will be a measure of both our steadiness and our creativity.

All of which is precisely why our responsibility for a regular 12-pager that is qualitatively, and not just quantitatively, different is the practice of deepening our unique concept of organization. Again and again, the work of the 12-pager will bring front and center the work of our new Archives Committee, as we see the Marxist-Humanist Archives as not just "living" -- which they certainly are -- but as they disclose the method and what dialectics is all about both in theory and practice. This year what we will see and project is how dialectics does not just as one day, month or year, but over a full quarter century.

Thus what we are projecting in these perspectives is the vision and concrete need for no difference between Individual and Universal. Individualism must not only be freed from all that interferes with its universalism, but first then does the multi-dimensionality of a person show itself in history as past and as present -- or as Raya's thesis posed it, as "Today and Tomorrow".

It is that vision of what our Perspectives represent that will be so helpful in giving direction to all our activities, and to none more so than to the pivotal proposal to schedule next Spring a lecture tour by Raya to all the locals, after the completion of the draft of Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. One lecture in each local will be devoted to the essay on the 25 year history of News and Letters Committees, which will by then have become our newest pamphlet. We hope it will be possible for each of the locals to arrange the schedules of their classes so that Raya's lecture becomes the local's summation.

What we can do right now, and what will give us all a great head start on our preparation for Raya's tour, is to see the full form of the 1980-81 classes, which Raya has entitled:

"Marxist-Humanism in the Battle of Ideas, in Mass Struggles, especially revolutions, in Philosophic-political analyses of current events, including the latest essays on the Black dimension and the women's liberation movement".

1980-81 Class (to be held for 8 weeks before Raya's April Lecture Tour)

MARKIST-HUMANISM IN THE BATTLE OF IDEAS, IN MASS STRUGGLES, ESPECIALLY
REVOLUTIONS, IN PHILOSOPHIC-POLITICAL ANALYSES OF CURRENT EVENTS,
INCLUDING THE LATEST ESSAYS ON THE BLACK DIMENSION AND THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION
MOVEMENT

- I. PPL #9-10 on Today's Global Crises and Marx's Capital, plus, from Critical Essays of Raya Dunayevskaya in the Battle of Ideas, "'True Rebirth' or wholesale revision of Marxism" (on Ernest Mandel's Marxist Economic Theory, May; June-July, 1970 N&L)
- II. Black Dimension: "Black Thought/ Black Reality" (N&L, 8/9, 1980), and, from the Battle of Ideas, "Instant Marxism and the Black Intellectual" (N&L, July, 1975). Cf special importance to this class is our 1959 pamphlet, Afro-Asian Revolutions. Also Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal, Ch. 17, 19, and 26; and from Perspectives 1980-81, "The Road to the Black Ghetto, USA".
- III. PPL: "Will the Revolution in Portugal Advance?", plus, from the 25 year history, Part I, "Where to Begin: Laying new theoretical and practical foundations and establishing new international relations"
- IV. PPL: "The Latin American Unfinished Revolutions", plus the section on El Salvador in Perspectives 1980-81, and Eugene's essay-to-be on Latin America in the Jan. 1981 N&L.
- V. PPL: "Iran: Unfoldment of, and Contradictions in, Revolution", plus from the 25 year history, the sections on "1962-- a year of confrontations" and "1963-- the power of negativity".
- VI. Women's Liberation Movement: Appendix to Working Women for Freedom, "Women as Thinkers and as Revolutionaries", plus "Women's liberation in search of a theory: the summary of a decade" (N&L, June 1980), and the chapter-to-be in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution on Marx's Ethnological Notebooks, as well as the Farsi WL pamphlet.
- VII. Youth: "The Young Marxist-Humanist" (1963); "France, Spring 1968: Masses in Motion, Ideas in Free Flow"; and, if ready, the new essay on Youth in the 1980's-- and if not, the Prologue, 1949-54, from the 25 year history.
- VIII. "What is Philosophy? What is Revolution?", plus the final section of the 25 year history, "The 1970s: Dialectics of Revolution".

Classes to be concluded in all locals with a summation covering the whole 25 years, by Raya, on lecture tour.

And now that you've heard such exciting prospects for the year to come, we are inviting all of you who have not yet taken organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanism to do so now, by joining with us in News and Letters Committees.