

12th 1977
P. 99
new/PA
Bl. Dima
Ser

on Marxist-Humanism as a Body of Ideas

ICS OF REVOLUTION

ts and World Humanist Concepts

- Raya Dunayevskaya, "Dialectics of Revolution and of Women's Liberation"
- Charles Denby, "In Memoriam" from *News & Letters*, by Raya Dunayevskaya
- Eugene Walker, "*News & Letters* as Theory/Practice"
- Michael Connolly, "When Archives are not Past, but are Living"
- Olga Domanski, "Women's Liberation in Search of a Theory"



Published by

News and Letters Committees
59 E. Van Buren #707
Chicago, IL 60605

\$1.00

16520

Dialectics of Revolution

American Roots and World Humanist Concepts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Raya Dunayevskaya. "Dialectics of Revolution and of Women's Liberation"	
Introduction and Part I: <u>Marx's</u> Marxism: Lenin's Marxism	1
Part II: Re-establishing the Link of Continuity with <u>Marx's</u> Marxism and the Development of the Body of Ideas of Marxist-Humanism	4
A. Vicissitudes of State-Capitalism, the Black Dimension, and the Birth of Marxist-Humanism: <i>Marxism and Freedom: From 1776 until Today: The Voices from Below of the 1960s</i>	5
B. Return to Hegel and Our Dialectical Discoveries: <i>Philosophy and Revolution: From Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao</i>	7
C. The Marx Centenary: <i>Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution</i>	7
D. Unchaining the Dialectic Through 35 Years of Marxist-Humanist Writings Which Trace the Dialectics of Revolution in a New Work on Women's Liberation	8
Charles Denby. "In Memoriam" by Raya Dunayevskaya	11
Eugene Walker. "News & Letters as Theory/Practice"	16
Michael Connolly. "When Archives are not Past, but are Living"	25
Olga Domanski. "Women's Liberation in Search of a Theory"	34

Dialectics of Revolution and of Women's Liberation*

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Introduction and Part I: Marx's Marxism; Lenin's Marxism

Let's go adventuring to some Historic-Turning-Points that have un-chained the dialectic: in Marx's age, in Lenin's, and in our post-World War II age.

Let's begin with 1843-44 when Marx broke with capitalism, having discovered a whole new continent of thought and of revolution that he called "a new Humanism."

Hegel's dialectic methodology had created a revolution in philosophy. Marx criticized it precisely because the structure of Hegel's *Phenomenology of Mind* was everywhere interpreted as a revolution in Thought only. Marx's "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" took issue with Hegel also for holding that a philosopher can know the dialectic of revolution (the French Revolution in Hegel's case) only after the revolution has taken place. Marx re-created it as a dialectic of Reality in need of transformation. He named the Subject—the revolutionary force who could achieve this—as the Proletariat.

Put briefly, Marx transformed Hegel's revolution in philosophy into a philosophy of revolution. This will be further developed throughout this talk. For the moment, our focus must develop Marx's first "new moment"—i.e., discovery—the birth of what he called "a new Humanism."

It is that which characterized Marx's whole life from his break with capitalism until the day of his death, 1843-1883. It included two actual revolutions—1848 and 1871. The defeat of the 1848 revolutions produced a new need for a continuing revolution, a "Revolution in Permanence"; and Marx concluded from 1871, which created the Paris Commune, that the bourgeois state needs to be totally destroyed, and he called for a non-state form of workers' rule like the Paris Commune.

A 31-year lapse followed before a single post-Marx Marxist—Lenin—felt compelled to have a revolutionary encounter with the Hegelian dialectic. That Historic Turning Point followed when, in the objective world, the Second International collapsed at the outbreak of World War I. The shocking betrayal by the Second International served as the compulsion to Lenin to return to Marx's origin in the Hegelian dialectic with his own study of Hegel's *Science of Logic*. This marked the Great Divide in post-Marx Marxism. Lenin's grappling with the Hegelian-Marxian dialectic continued through the final decade of his life, from 1914 to 1924.

What resulted from this revolutionary encounter was a reunification of philosophy with revolution. We must see what Lenin specifically singled out to help him answer the Historic task facing him, and how he reconnected with Marx's Marxism. The dialectical principle he singled out from Hegel was transformation into opposite. Everything he worked out from then on—from *Imperialism to State and Revolution*—demonstrates that.

The main focus here is on the significance of what a revolutionary concretizes to answer the challenge of a new age. In the case of Lenin it was the dialectic principle of transformation into opposite that he held to characterize both capitalism's development into imperialism

* A lecture delivered in Chicago January 27/February 3, 1985

1902-03.

The very fact that the Great Divide continued within the Bolshevik movement— in great revolutionaries like Bukharin and Rosa Luxemburg—speaks volumes about the unacknowledged missing link of philosophy. Thus, the one who was accepted as the greatest theoretician—Bukharin—sharply disagreed with Lenin on his relationship to the national liberation movements, specifically the Irish Revolution. It led Lenin to use as divisive a class designation of Bukharin's position as "imperialist economism"! Lenin did not sum up his attitude to Bukharin, directly relating it to dialectics, until his *Will*. There Lenin (who by then had Bukharin's *Economics of the Transition Period*) wrote that Bukharin's views could "only with the very greatest doubt be regarded as fully Marxian, for...he never fully understood the dialectic."

The principle Lenin singled out in the dialectic, as we noted, was the transformation into opposite, which he related both to capitalism and to a section of the proletariat, but not to his concept of the "Party-to-lead." But while he failed to submit "the Party" to the Absolute Method of the dialectic of second negativity—that remained his untouchable "private enclave," the one that remains the noose around us all—Lenin did unstintingly hold to the dialectic principle that the imperative to re-transform the opposite into the positive cannot be done without the creativity of a new revolutionary force. The fact that you could prove betrayal would amount to nothing unless you could point to a new force like the Irish Revolution.

It was this which led him to attack what he called Luxemburg's "half-way dialectic." Here was a revolutionary who, before anyone else, including Lenin, had called attention to the opportunism of the Second International and had pinpointed, before the actual outbreak of World War I, the International's opportunistic attitude to German capitalism's plunge into imperialism, and to the suffering of the colonial masses. Unfortunately, however, she saw the "root cause" not in the Second International alone, but in the defects of Marx's theory of Accumulation of Capital. This resulted in her developing one more form of underconsumptionism. Her failure to recognize the colonial mass opposition as what Lenin called "the bacillus of proletarian revolution" led her to continue her opposition to Lenin's position on the "National Question." That is what Lenin called the "half-way dialectic."

He, on the contrary, related the dialectic to everything he wrote from then on—from *Imperialism* and *State and Revolution* to his Letter to the Editors of *Under the Banner of Marxism* about the need to study the Hegelian dialectic in Hegel's own words. His death created a philosophic void none of his co-leaders, Trotsky included, could fill. That remained the task for a new age.

Part II: Re-establishing the Link of Continuity with Marx's Marxism and the Development of the Body of Ideas of Marxist-Humanism

After a decade of world Depression and the rise of facism came the greatest shocker, the Hitler-Stalin Pact, that signalled the timing of World War II. It was high time to recognize the startling fact that, though November 1917 was the greatest revolution, the counter-revolution came, not from an outside imperialism, but from within. Trotsky could not, did not, face that reality, much less work out the new dialectic.

It took a whole decade of digging into what happened after the revolution had conquered power, to discover how it was transformed into its opposite—a workers' state into a state-capitalist society—through the Five Year Plans as well as the objective situation in the private capitalist world. Let's look into the two stages of that decade: first, straight state-capitalist theory; and finally, the birth of Marxist-Humanism.

Should have referred to P.P.K. & P.H. M.K.M.

but
every
Dialectic
Process
Party
Labor

A. Vicissitudes of State-Capitalism, the Black Dimension, and the Birth of Marxist-Humanism: *Marxism and Freedom: From 1776 until Today; The Voices from Below of the 1960s*

Marxism and Freedom: From 1776 until Today is the first of the three books which Marxist-Humanism refers to as our "trilogy of revolution." The first edition contained two Appendices. One is the first published English translation of Marx's "Private Property and Communism" and "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" from what has come to be called Marx's 1844 *Humanist Essays*. The second is the first English translation of Lenin's "Abstract of Hegel's *Science of Logic*."

Some elements of Humanism were present in our development as early as 1941 in the essay on "Labor and Society," which was the very first section of my analysis of "The Nature of the Russian Economy." That essay was rejected for publication by the Trotskyists (the Workers Party) when they accepted the strictly economic analysis of the Five Year Plans from Russian sources.

The vicissitudes of state-capitalism would show that only when the philosophic structure is fully developed can one present the theory of state-capitalism in a way that would answer the quest for universality and what Marxist-Humanism called "the movement from practice." Which is why I prefer the way my 1941 study of the nature of the Russian economy was presented in *Marxism and Freedom: From 1776 until Today* in 1957, in Part V, "The Problem of our Age: State-Capitalism vs. Freedom."

Marxists and non-Marxists alike have always rejected even the attempt to give a philosophic structure to concrete events. Take the question of the Black Dimension. No one could deny what new stage had been reached in the 1960s, and whether you called it a revolution or just a new stage of the struggle for civil rights, there was no denying the stormy nature of the 1960s. But the truth is that this could be seen not only in the '60s, but beginning with the Montgomery Bus Boycott—and not only as a new beginning but in terms of the whole philosophic structure for the following decade. Here is what I singled out from that event in *Marxism and Freedom*: 1) the daily meetings; 2) the way in which the Black rank-and-file organized their own transportation (indeed, Rev. King admitted that the whole movement started without him); 3) the fact that, whether it was the meetings or the transportation that the masses took into their own hands, the Boycott's greatest achievement was "its own working existence"—the very phrase *Marxism and Freedom* had also pointed to in another section, as the way Marx had written of the Paris Commune.

We could take the same 35 years we have taken in our new, fourth book where we show the development of the dialectics of revolution on Women's Liberation, and show that development on the Black Dimension. The same is true for Youth, as when we take the three new pages of freedom in *Marxism and Freedom* on the Hungarian Revolution, where I point to the revolutionary Youth getting ever younger, as witness the 12-year-old Hungarian Freedom Fighter. And of course the same would be true of Labor. That, indeed, begins in the French Revolution of 1789-93, when there was no industrial proletariat and the *enragés*, the *sans culottes*, the artisans, were the great revolutionaries who spelled out the same masses in motion.

Masses in motion have marked every Historic Turning Point. This is articulated by going beyond every national boundary. In our age it can be seen whether we are looking at the Afro-Asian Revolutions or the Latin American Revolutions, and it is reflected both in our activity and in our publications. It was seen in the very early years of News and Letters Committees in the way in which the revolution in Cuba brought about our very first *Weekly Political Letter*. More recently, it is seen in the bi-lingual pamphlet on *Latin America's Revolutions, in Reality and in Thought*. And you will soon see it in the new book in the way the early correspondence with Silvio Frondizi attains a new significance.

The three-fold goal of *Marxism and Freedom* was: 1) to establish the American roots of Marxism, not where the orthodox cite it (if they cite it at all) in the General Congress of Labor at Baltimore (1866), but in the Abolitionist Movement and the slave revolts which led

Inade-
quate
S-C
insuff-
ficient
and
esp.
You
1950

1st of MTH thought that called so
 led was reflected in masses
 motion creating ground for thought
 & these connects the ~~philosophy~~ & ~~theory~~

B. Return to Hegel and Our Dialectical Discoveries: *Philosophy and Revolution: From Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao*

By the end of the 1960s, when the climax of all the activity had resulted only in an aborted revolution, we could no longer avoid the strictly philosophic new digging into Hegel to see what concretely related to our age. The return to all of Hegel's major works—especially the final syllogism Hegel had added to the *Philosophy of Mind*—finally resulted in our second major philosophic-theoretical work, *Philosophy and Revolution*. That new return and concentration on those final syllogisms was comprehensive in the way it re-examined not only Hegel and Marx and Lenin (which constituted Part I, "Why Hegel? Why Now?"), but the Alternatives that considered themselves revolutionary—Trotsky, Mao, and one "outsider looking in," Sartre (which constituted Part II). This time the vicissitudes of state-capitalism were not restricted to those who called themselves Communists, but included altogether new lands, new struggles, as well as a new African, Asian, Third World socialism. (Part III dealt with East Europe, Africa, and the New Passions and Forces.)

But it doesn't stop there. What finally summed up the new challenges, new passions, new forces—all those new relations against the objective situation—was the return to Hegel "in and for himself," by which I mean his major philosophic works: *Phenomenology of Mind*, *Science of Logic*, and *Philosophy of Mind* from the *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*.

Let's begin at the end of Chapter 1 of *Philosophy and Revolution*, "Absolute Negativity as New Beginning: The Ceaseless Movement of Ideas and of History," where I concentrate on the three final syllogisms of Hegel's *Philosophy of Mind*, Para. 575, 576, 577. The very listing of the books of the *Encyclopedia*—Logic, Nature, Mind (Para. 575)—discloses a new reality, and that is that Logic is not as important as Nature, since Nature is the middle, which is the mediation, which is of the essence. The second syllogism (Para. 576) discloses that the mediation comes from Mind itself and Logic becomes less crucial. What is Absolute is Absolute Negativity, and it is that which replaces Logic altogether. What Hegel is saying is that the movement is ceaseless and therefore he can no longer limit himself to a syllogism. The "Self-Thinking Idea" has replaced the syllogistic presentation in Para. 577.

When I jammed up this conclusion of Hegel's from my first chapter of *Philosophy and Revolution* with what I worked out when I summed up the final Chapter 9 on what flowed from the movement from practice (what I called "New Passions and New Forces"), here is how I expressed it:

The reality is stifling. The transformation of reality has a dialectic all its own. It demands a unity of the struggles for freedom with a philosophy of liberation. Only then does the elemental revolt release new sensibilities, new passions, and new forces—a whole new human dimension.

Ours is the age that can meet the challenge of the times when we work out so new a relationship of theory to practice that the proof of the unity is in the Subject's own self-development. Philosophy and revolution will first then liberate the innate talents of men and women who will become whole. Whether or not we recognize that this is the task history has "assigned" to our epoch, it is a task that remains to be done.

—*Philosophy and Revolution*, p. 292

C. The Marx Centenary: *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*

The Marx Centenary created the opportunity for us, when we also had a third major philosophic work, *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution* (which completed what we call the "trilogy of revolution"), to stress how total the uprooting of the system must be. It is not only that there can be no "private enclaves" that are free from the dialectics of revolution—that which Hegel called "second negativity" and what we consider the Absolute Method, the road to the Absolute Idea. It is that the crucial

1950
 Events
 1953
 both
 v. 22
 + Ref
 AI
 AI
 15

discontinuity is not a revision of, but a continuation with, the original New Moment when there are all sorts of new voices and listening to them is quintessential.

It is only after the new world stage of practice is recognized that we get to that new revolutionary force of Women's Liberation, which has named the culprit—male chauvinism—as characterizing the revolutionary movement itself. That is to say, it is not only characteristic of capitalism, and not only of this epoch, but has existed throughout history. The point is not to stop there. But in order not to stop there, you have to recognize Women's Liberation as a force that is Reason and not just force—and that means a total uprooting of this society, and the creation of totally new human relations. Which is why Marx was not exclusively a feminist but a "new Humanist." The fact that feminism is part of Humanism and not the other way around does not mean that Women's Liberation becomes subordinate. It means only that philosophy will not again be separated from revolution, or Reason separated from force. Even Absolute Method becomes only the "road to" Absolute Idea, Absolute Mind.

Let me end, then, with the final paragraph from the Introduction and Overview of our new, fourth book:

The Absolute Method allows for no "private enclaves"—i.e., exceptions to the principle of Marx's Dialectics, whether on the theoretical or the organizational questions. As Marx insisted from the very beginning, nothing can be a private enclave: neither any part of life, nor organization, nor even science. In his *Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts*, he proclaimed that: "To have one basis for life and another for science is *a priori* a lie."

And now that we have both the *Ethnological Notebooks* and the *Mathematical Manuscripts* from Marx's last years, where he singled out the expression "negation of the negation," we can see that that is the very same expression he used in 1844 to explain why Feuerbach was a vulgar materialist in rejecting it, and Hegel was the creative philosopher. As we concluded in the Introduction and Overview to *Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution*, on Marx's 1844 declaration on science and life:

The truth of this statement has never been more immediate and urgent than in our nuclear world, over which hangs nothing short of the threat to the very survival of civilization as we have known it.

News & Letters as Theory/Practice*

by Eugene Walker

The 45 minutes for this report will not allow us to trace the 30 year path of this Marxist-Humanist newspaper, nor even to explore fully the past year. We choose to concentrate on several questions which will indicate how this newspaper has developed both over three decades, and in this year of 1983-84, to thus help us with finding the needed pathways to more fully reach *News & Letters* as theory/practice.

We need to reach a new stage of cognition with regard to our newspaper so that theory/practice is not alone the name of Raya Dunayevskaya's column and the masthead logo, but fully becomes the universal of the paper's articles, make-up and projection, the notion of its distribution and sales, the absolute of its projection in discussions and educational. Only in this manner can the newspaper help us manifest a new stage of organizational praxis.

Part I: How has the Unique Combination of Worker and Intellectual, upon which *News & Letters* was founded, become deepened and expanded so that its fullest expression is Theory/Practice?

"When I first met Denby in 1948," begins Raya's "In Memoriam" to Charles Denby, was "when he had already become a leader of wildcats, a 'politico,' but the talk I heard him give of tenant farming in the South and factory work in the North was far from being a 'political speech.' Listening to him, you felt you were witnessing an individual's life that was somehow universal and that touched you personally." Thus began Raya's and Denby's 35-year-long association. Within it was the germ of what we would later characterize when *News & Letters* newspaper was born as a unique combination of worker and intellectual and a manifestation of what today we call theory/practice. That "In Memoriam" piece traces the intertwining strands of Denby's life, the creation of Marxist-Humanism in the 1950s, the birth and development of News and Letters Committees and its newspaper. Within that unfolding story are moments which tell us of our own development as a tendency in the 1950s to the 1970s, and tell us something of our direction in the 1980s.

Take this expression—"a unique combination of worker/intellectual." It is no simple relationship. What makes a worker overcome the shyness, the modesty, so that he becomes a worker-editor? I do not mean it as a psychological question, but rather a question that is rooted in the struggle to overcome the division between mental and manual labor, between thinking and doing, that has been the hallmark of all class-divided societies. Raya writes of this in the two sections of her "In Memoriam" piece called "A Turning Point in Denby's Life" and "Denby Becomes Editor." Here we see what happened in those 1950s when this Marxist-Humanist philosopher, Raya Dunayevskaya, and this co-worker, Charles Denby, strove to find a form for the presentation of their ideas. Remember Denby had written Part I of his autobiography *Indignant Heart*. And Raya had been writing on state-capitalism, on Marx and Lenin, for a full decade. But it was those political events of the 1950s—Stalin's death, the East German revolt, the continuing wildcats against Automation—which, when discussed by this combination of worker/intellectual, provided both for the concrete presentation of developing Marxist-Humanist ideas so that workers in the U.S. could follow a discussion of the form of workers' control after the revolution in Russia; and at the same time this became a pathway whereby Denby undertook the creative labor of writing "Worker's Journal" and began editorship of *News & Letters*. I want to stress that there is nothing automatic about this combination of worker/intellectual. It is truly a Marxist-Humanist contribution. It meant a column—"Two Worlds"—in which an intellectual disciplined herself to write in the forum of a workers' newspaper, a form demanded by the breakthrough on the Absolute Idea. It meant that Denby as "Worker's Journal" columnist and editor

* Report to the Convention of News and Letters Committees, July 1984

would have in his view not alone workers as force of revolution, but a responsibility to see that other forces were represented in the paper and that freedom ideas were discussed on its pages. *Both*

"I did discuss with Denby the relationship of workers to philosophy," writes Raya, and then describes how the form of presentation of Lenin's *Philosophic Notebooks* in *Marxism and Freedom* came out of discussions with Denby. "Our discussions on philosophy became discussions about concrete actions of workers," she adds, in describing how philosophy and the fact of the East German workers Revolt that broke out against speed-up meant a great deal to Denby. The point here is that this world historic turning point of the revolt against Stalinism, coming at the same time as the world philosophic turning point of the breakthrough on the Absolute Idea, became as well a turning point in Denby's life, because of that unique combination of Marxist-Humanist philosopher and Black worker activist, becoming worker-editor, Marxist-Humanist.

The proof that this combination of worker/intellectual that was born in the period of the early and mid-1950s was not just an isolated act, but a personification of what we mean by theory/practice over 30 years, is found in the years 1982-84. For it is here that we can see that the sickness and loss of our editor did not mean the ending of the relationship of worker/intellectual, but rather a new manifestation of it became expressed in *News & Letters*. Page one of our paper was dramatically changed this year with the addition of "Workshop Talks" and "Black World." The reason I am looking at the years 1982-84 in seeing this change is to show you that it too was not automatic, but meant a great deal of Marxist-Humanist thought. Denby himself helped bring this forth by inviting Felix Martin and Lou Turner to write front page guest columns in "Worker's Journal" in the last period. It was Raya who, in the year before "Workshop Talks" and "Black World" were created, searched for possible forms that would be a manifestation of worker/intellectual, of theory/practice on page one of our paper. It was not automatic. There were a number of possible ideas which were discussed. The point becomes one of seeing the Marxist-Humanist labor, patience and suffering of the negative which has characterized us whether at our inception with worker/intellectual or in our practice in the 1980s with theory/practice. *Why*

As we move our Center to Chicago, with this very different kind of front page to our paper, can we as well have such new manifestations of theory/practice created by each of us in our work—in writing for this newspaper, and in particular projecting these Marxist-Humanist ideas—that in this labor our paper will become a pathway for organizational growth?

Projection, which is a manifestation of the movement from theory to meet the movement from practice, is key. If we look at our paper today we see that the movement from practice is present in a greater richness than ever. That richness has come because there is a fuller presentation within our pages of the movement from theory. It is what allows us to recognize, seek out, and make explicit that movement from practice. Theory/practice is not a movement away from "voices from below"; rather it allows for the most intensive presentation of the voices from below, because it puts them within the theoretical/philosophic framework of a Marxist-Humanist body of ideas. Let's see how that has occurred within the context of what Marxist-Humanism has singled out as the four forces of revolution in the United States. *not only this but what is self-idea*

Part II: The Four Forces of Revolution and Marxist-Humanism's Philosophic Contribution—How the Movement from Theory Joins the Movement from Practice *the latter relate*

The Constitution of News and Letters Committees specifies the forces of revolution which we see as crucial to the American revolution. They are put forth because historically, objectively these forces have represented a revolutionary dimension. At the same time each of these forces has as part of its dimension the specific stamp of Marxist-Humanism. Specific in the sense that Marxist-Humanism over three decades has labored to bring forth the full revolutionary dimension of each force. *in*

EVER SINCE the 1840s, when the working class discovered itself as a class, Marx and then Marxists have recognized the central role of the proletariat in the overthrow of capitalism. But what Marxist-Humanism has done is take Marx's concept of ending the division between mental and manual labor, between thinking and doing, and practice that concept concretely within our organization and newspaper by insisting that workers are not alone sources of information, but are thinkers who need to become writers and editors of our paper. That is what Denby meant in practice, and the unique combination of Denby and Marxist-Humanist ideas which he was a part of and a contributor to, shows what it means to put a Marxist-Humanist stamp upon a force of revolution.

John Marcotte and Felix Martin, of course, have been writing on workers' struggles for several years in our paper. However, we have reached a new level in their contributions with their front page column, "Workshop Talks." It can be a powerful column because of what a revolutionary force the working class has been historically and can be today. But of equal importance is what these two writers bring to the column as Marxist-Humanists which allows the reader to see that revolutionary force of the working class—including contradictions within it—at a particular moment. They as Marxist-Humanists are not an external dimension to the proletariat, not only because they are proletarians themselves but as well because they bring to their writing the Marxist-Humanist methodology whereby a full dimension of labor can be seen: unemployed and employed, immigrant as well as U.S. born, small shop as well as mass production, women as well as men, and most crucially, working people as creativity and mind of revolution.

The writings of other Marxist-Humanist labor activists have been important contributions to the paper this year. We have also had *News & Letters* writers' and labor friends' participant reports on activities ranging from copper miners on strike in Arizona and picket lines in the Bay Area to in-person reports on the coal miners on strike throughout England.

WHILE MARX and the Black World is a crucial part of revolutionary continuity for America, it has not been American Marxists and socialists before our day who have caught it. From the self-styled Marxists of Marx's day who refused to take a side in the Civil War in the U.S., to Eugene V. Debs' refusal to recognize an independent "Negro Question," the division of Black and Red was perpetrated in America. American Communists at the time of World War I, the Russian Revolution and the race riots in the U.S. were miles away from Lenin who did recognize the Black question in America as a national question. The opposite side of this same coin was the Stalinized American Communist Party which a decade later isolated the Negro Question from a relation to the class question by its "Black Belt" thesis.

After the birth of the Civil Rights Movement, there was a recognition of the Black question as a revolutionary one by part of the Left. But what I want to show here is not the failure or partial recognition by the Left of Black as a revolutionary force. Rather, I want to show how Marxist-Humanism from its birth in the 1940s not only recognized Black as a revolutionary force, but has developed a specificity as to what that revolutionary dimension has meant from the 1940s all the way to the 1980s.

Our concepts include: Black masses as vanguard of the American Revolution and not a vanguard party; the two-way road of revolutionary ideas and activities between Africa and America—indeed the triangular trade of revolutionary ideas and action between America, the Caribbean and Africa; the Black question as the touchstone of American civilization, its very Achilles heel; the crucial relationship between class and race in America spelled out in our pamphlet *American Civilization on Trial*, (which, not accidentally, was first published in *News & Letters*); the demonstration of the American roots of Marxism within Marx's *Capital*, written under the impact of the American Civil War, which we have now extended to a view of Marx and the Black world. All these concepts were worked out as part of a Marxist-Humanist body of ideas.

Thus, when we say Black as a revolutionary force, it most certainly is grounded in the great revolutionary history of the Black dimension worldwide. But its revolutionary

specificity is brought forth at the same time within what Marxist-Humanism has done with its "labor, patience and suffering of the negative" on the Black question. And we have done so much within the pages of *News & Letters* in our columns, not only Denby but Ethel Dunbar and John Allison, and then John Alan and now also Lou Turner, "Black-Red" and "Black World."

"Black-Red" and "Black World" are Marxist-Humanist expressions of the internationalism of the national question. Look this past year at John Alan's "Language, Consciousness and Freedom in Azania" and Lou Turner's "Miami and Black America" and ask yourself how this Marxist-Humanist body of ideas helps to create ground for a leap within the Black movement. Look at Alan's article on Black anti-imperialism at the end of the 19th century, and at Lou Turner's review of the Garvey Papers which set the ground for his mini-tour to several cities, and see how these Marxist-Humanist Black writers put a stamp on the Black struggles of history not as past, but as prologue for a revolutionary future. Other writers, including Gene in Los Angeles and Diane in Chicago, have contributed to a Marxist-Humanist Black view in the paper this year. Gwen from Alabama, while not a Marxist-Humanist, has given us a look at the Black South. We need the continued contributions from all these as well as the renewed contributions of those who have contributed much in the past such as Tommie, Ray and Karl.

THOUGH TODAY'S Women's Liberation Movement only emerged in the late 1960s to early 1970s, it cannot be an accident that within the pages of *News & Letters* we had women columnists, such as Angela Terrano and Ethel Dunbar, from very early on, and that they were columnists who brought to their writing the dimensions of labor and of Black as well as of women. We will not here take the time to discuss the fact that Raya Dunayevskaya, the founder of the Marxist-Humanist tendency and the Chairwoman of the National Editorial Board, is a woman. But think of just a few of her contributions specifically on the Women's Movement in the last decade, ones such as the six lectures on "Women as Thinkers and as Revolutionaries" in 1975, the collection of a few of her writings put out as *Woman as Reason and as Force of Revolution*, the last of the trilogy of revolution, *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*, followed by the *Praxis* article on "Marx's 'New Humanism' and the Dialectics of Women's Liberation in Primitive and Modern Societies." All of these give us points of departure for Marxist-Humanism's specific philosophic contribution to women as a revolutionary force. The reviews of our Women's Liberation archival material by Olga last year and by Susan this year give us an indication of some of our contributions.

The specificity of that Marxist-Humanist contribution comes to the fore not alone in the Black and proletarian dimensions that we insist be part of today's movement, but in that these in turn are unseparated from the concept we have of women as thinkers and as revolutionaries which we bring forth in our very original view of Rosa Luxemburg as feminist, as revolutionary, and with how we pose Women's Liberation's interconnectedness with Marx, and most decidedly not with Engels.

If we have all these specifically Marxist-Humanist contributions as to how we spell out woman as one of four forces of revolution, why then have we not been able to articulate this in a consistent manner on the Women's Liberation page? I do not mean to say that it is absent: we have had important columns this past year which do show our view, such as Terry Moon's essay article on Eleanor Marx, and the welcome re-appearance on our pages of the Native American woman Shainape Shcapwe.

But what if I told you that I think that Eleanor Marx is speaking most of all to ourselves? Look at how she came to America and spoke "American"—more than many of the revolutionaries who lived there—on labor, on women, on the necessity of breaking divisions between immigrant America and native born Americans, on the necessity for non-sectarian support for the anarchists after Haymarket. Why could she do so? Because her language was Marx's philosophy of revolution. She as individual was able to be the universal in the particular of her tour of America. That kind of concept of Individual/Universal is

9/ see Archives
at

When Archives are not Past, but are Living

The Direct Relationship of Marxist-Humanist Archives to Marx's Humanism,
which Created "Revolution in Permanence" as Ground for Organization*

by Michael Connolly

Introductory Note

We have one title for these final two classes in the Marxist-Humanist Body of Ideas: "Marx's Revolution in Permanence as ground for organization and self-development of each individual as universal freedom." The readings for the classes include the culminations of all three works in the Marxist-Humanist trilogy of revolution—the last chapters of *Marxism and Freedom* and *Philosophy and Revolution*, and the crucial penultimate chapter of *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*. But please keep in mind that for Hegel, for Marx and for Marxist-Humanism, every genuine culmination is both summation of all that has gone before and point of departure for new beginnings.

We will be tracing the self-determination of an idea—the idea of "revolution in permanence"—from its birth and development by Marx, through its long night of neglect, to its re-creation and development by Marxist-Humanism in our own age. And precisely because we cannot be satisfied with conclusions alone, and now want to practice methodology for today's freedom struggles, we want to take that journey with the aid of the Marxist-Humanist Archives, *The Raya Dunayevskaya Collection*,** housed here at Wayne State University in Detroit.

Listen to Marx in 1844, at the moment of birth of his "new continent of thought":

The whole movement of history is, on the one hand, the actual act of creation—the act by which its empirical being was born; on the other hand, for its thinking consciousness, it is the realized and recognized process of development.

—Private Property and Communism

It is no accident that Marx returns to this precise point in his greatest theoretical work, *Capital*, in the chapter on "Machinery and Large-Scale Industry," as he critiques both those who fail to see the material basis for life in production, and those who fail to see the weak points in "abstract materialism" as it excludes what he calls "history and its process." Nor is it any accident that in each of the three works of Marxist-Humanism we have studied in these classes, Raya returns to this same passage in *Capital*, yet each return uncovers a fuller view of Marx's Marxism. In the chapter in *Marxism and Freedom* on "Automation and the New Humanism," it is concerned with "Different Attitudes to Automation," as the autoworkers and miners wildcatted, while union leaders and radical intellectuals viewed the new technology as "progress." In *Philosophy and Revolution*, it illuminates Marx's early and sharp critique of Darwin, and underlines the great distance between their perspectives on human development. In *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution* "history and its process" opens the section on Marx's *Ethnological Notebooks*, in which we see how Marx's determination to hold fast to the "ever-developing Subject," the human forces of revolution, disclosed not only his differences with bourgeois anthropologists, but how his philosophy of revolution diverged from that of his closest collaborator, Engels.

Marx's magnificent 1844 description of the movement of history as the *act of creation* and the *process of development*, is thus not alone something for Marx's day. It points as well to Marxist-Humanism's act of creation, its process of development, from the 1941 birth of

*A talk delivered at Wayne State University, Detroit, March 22, 1984

***The Raya Dunayevskaya Collection: Marxist-Humanism, Its Origin and Development in the U.S. from 1941 to Today* is available on microfilm from the Wayne State University Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs, Detroit, MI 48202, for \$60.00. The Guide to the Collection is available from News & Letters.

the theory of state-capitalism to *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution* and beyond. It is that methodology that I hope to illuminate here.

Part I: Marx's Philosophy of "Revolution in Permanence" and its Disappearance in Post-Marx Marxism

"From Critic of Hegel to Author of *Capital* and Theorist of 'Revolution in Permanence'" is how Raya titles Part III of *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*, and in beginning with the nearly unknown Marx of 1841 we are given the opportunity to see how Marx's earliest critique of Hegel is sharpest when he discovers a division between Reality and Reason. "Totality" in Hegel, he says, consists of two hostile worlds, "each side utterly opposed to the other." In turning against this alienated world, Marx comes to argue that not only the product of labor has been alienated, but the activity of the human being. By the time we reach Marx's 1844 *Humanist Essays*, Marx is not only involved with actual workers' struggles, but subjecting the whole basis of all human relations, including those of Man/Woman, to ruthless criticism. Marx's break from Hegel becomes as well a return to the Hegelian dialectic—"the dialectic of negativity as the moving and creative principle." Marx sought, and discovered, human Subjects to transform reality, bearers of that dialectic.

Thus, the path to permanent revolution for Marx meant both singling out "negation of the negation" as key to all dialectic, and a singling out of human Subjects of revolution. This is the context in which Marx's first reference to "permanent revolution" appears—in his 1843 article "On the Jewish Question." Far from simply endorsing "civil rights" Marx there demonstrates how total an uprooting is needed to establish human relations for all. Throughout this whole period of the birth of Marx's "new continent of thought," the critique of the old is never separated from the projection of the new society as the "self-development of each individual as universal freedom." Thus the 1848 *Communist Manifesto* is not only a history of class struggle, but the projection of "an association in which the free development of each is the precondition for the free development of all."

As Marx summed up the 1848 revolutions he wrote his 1850 *Address to the Communist League* which ends with the appeal to the proletariat: "Their battle cry must be: The Revolution in Permanence!" He was posing that: 1) the struggle would never again be fought with the bourgeoisie; independent proletarian organization was demanded; 2) the workers needed to seek new allies, beginning with the peasantry. Above all, what stood out was the method—that the next stage of revolution takes as its point of departure the highest point reached in the last, and that was true in thought as well as in activity.

Yet to many in the Communist League, permanent revolution seemed to mean only a short-hand way of justifying precisely the endless insurrection conspiracies Marx opposed. By 1852, the Communist League disbanded at Marx's insistence, and eight years later, when Marx writes to a friend, "I had in mind the party in the eminent historical sense," he actually belongs to no party at all. By the time Marx writes the *Critique of the Gotha Program* in 1875, he is even willing to put his own great International Workingmen's Association behind him when he says it was "no longer realizable in its first historical form after the fall of the Paris Commune."

The key is that whether it was the Communist League after 1848-50, or the International Workingmen's Association after the 1871 Paris Commune, Marx's relation was to revolution as the determinant, and to a form of organization that would now have to arise with the full expression of the highest stage reached. The organization had to encompass all the new Subjects of revolution and act as the bearer of philosophy of revolution, or it would become both fetish and obstacle to further development. Marx's own agenda after 1848 led from the Taiping Revolution to the *Grundrisse's* "absolute movement of becoming." His agenda after 1871, from an examination of Man/Woman relations to a new view of the peasantry, and from the French edition of *Capital* to the *Critique of the Gotha Program's* projection of the inseparability of philosophy and organization, is what we call today "the

attempt to reduce Marx to a single "discipline" (anthropologist, economist, etc.). And it is Engelsian Marxism, whether in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* as covering up Marx's concept of Man/Woman, or in *Anti-Dühring* as reducing the Marxian dialectic to a form of positivism, that is seen as crippling all movements.

Precisely because the revolutions of the 1970s raised such new questions on forms of organization and on the relationship of theory to practice which that stunted Marxism could not answer, Raya concludes:

We must return to Marx—the whole of Marx. Without his philosophy of revolution, neither Women's Liberationists nor the whole of humanity will have discovered the ground that will assure the success of the revolution.

—Rosa Luxemburg, *Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*, p. 109

Crucial to that return has been the re-examination of the *Critique of the Gotha Program* as described in the beginning of this talk. We had seen the *Critique* in *Marxism and Freedom*, right within the concluding chapter. There it is posed as the basis of the new society in which labor is liberated from the twin tyrannies of Automation and the Plan and becomes "itself the first necessity of living." In *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*, *Critique of the Gotha Program* is seen as Marx's projection of the need to never divide philosophy from the question of form of organization, beginning with "ending the antithesis between mental and manual labor." One might argue that this is exactly what News and Letters Committees has strived to do from its birth, with our form of organization, our form of newspaper. Yet in grounding ourselves explicitly in Marx's "revolution in permanence" as form of organization, we are now saying something much deeper about the "self-development of the individual" and the relation of each of us to the Marxist-Humanist Archives.

D. Living Archives

With apologies to *Philosophy and Revolution*, "Why Archives? Why Now?" In part, I think the answer has come from our experience with the archives of Marx, with what it means to have the totality of his work. We have seen how it took the Russian Revolution to get the 1844 *Humanist Essays*, the Chinese Revolution to get the *Grundrisse*, and our own age of Women's Liberation and Third World revolutions to finally see a transcription of Marx's *Ethnological Notebooks*. But it isn't a question of quantity. Rather it is one of "embryo and process," of what it means to "hear Marx thinking," when you, in a very different age, have to work out new problems he could only see in outline as they first appeared. The movement suffered from not having Marx's archives.

In 1969, when *Philosophy and Revolution* was in draft form, and the revolutions of 1968 had proved the insufficiency of the act alone, Raya didn't confine herself to circulating the chapters and to holding the magnificent Black/Red and Women's Liberation-News and Letters Conferences. She also began the *Raya Dunayevskaya Collection*—our Archives—and insisted that it be made available far and wide. Raya's collection remains to this day the only one with a requirement that it be made available to all who wish to study it, with no restrictions or "proof of scholarly intentions" required. It is now available on microfilm in over 30 libraries across the country, and several overseas. We have added to the Archives three times since, bringing it up to 1981, on the eve of *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*.

Since then, we have had not only the finished work, but all the additions to it made after it was published. We have the new Introductions to *Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions* and *American Civilization on Trial, Marx and the Third World* and the Political-Philosophic Letter on Grenada. We have *Perspectives Theses* from 1981-84 and the new Constitution of News and Letters Committees we adopted last year. And by this spring we will have in our hands the pamphlet on the *The Coal Miners' General Strike of 1949-50 and the Birth of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S.* This year we will

News and Letters Committees can be contacted directly in the following areas:

- Chicago 59 E. Van Buren St., Rm. 707
Chicago, IL 60605 (663-0839)
- Detroit 1249 Washington Blvd., Rm 1740
Detroit, MI 48226 (963-9077)
- San Francisco P.O. Box 77303
San Francisco, CA 94107 (658-1448)
- Los Angeles P.O. Box 29194
Los Angeles, CA 90029
- New York P.O. Box 196
New York, NY 10163 (663-3631)
- Salt Lake City P.O. Box 8251
Salt Lake City, UT 84108
- Flint P.O. Box 3384
Flint, MI 48502
- Washington, D.C. P.O. Box 4463
Arlington, VA 22204

For a free complete list of News & Letters publications write to: News & Letters
59 E. Van Buren St., Rm 707
Chicago, IL 60605

*S-C arose - the rest of it -
just
phil. - by have - it is
of L?*

Objectivity

16534

Dialectics of Revolution and of Women's Liberation*

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Introduction and Part I: Marx's Marxism; Lenin's Marxism

Let's go adventuring to some Historic Turning Points that have unchained the dialectic: in Marx's age, in Lenin's, and in our post-World War II age.

Let's begin with 1843-44 when Marx broke with capitalism, having discovered a whole new continent of thought and of revolution that he called "a new Humanism."

Hegel's dialectic methodology had created a revolution in philosophy. Marx criticized it precisely because the structure of Hegel's *Phenomenology of Mind* was everywhere interpreted as a revolution in Thought only. Marx's "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" took issue with Hegel also for holding that a philosopher can know the dialectic of revolution (the French Revolution in Hegel's case) only after the revolution has taken place. Marx re-created it as a dialectic of Reality in need of transformation. He named the Subject—the revolutionary force who could achieve this—as the Proletariat.

Put briefly, Marx transformed Hegel's revolution in philosophy into a philosophy of revolution. This will be further developed throughout this talk. For the moment, our focus must develop Marx's first "new moment"—i.e., discovery—the birth of what he called "a new Humanism."

It is that which characterized Marx's whole life from his break with capitalism until the day of his death, 1843-1883. It included two actual revolutions—1848 and 1871. The defeat of the 1848 revolutions produced a new need for a continuing revolution, a "Revolution in Permanence"; and Marx concluded from 1871, which created the Paris Commune, that the bourgeois state needs to be totally destroyed, and he called for a non-state form of workers' rule like the Paris Commune.

A 31-year lapse followed before a single post-Marx Marxist—Lenin—felt compelled to have a revolutionary encounter with the Hegelian dialectic. That Historic Turning Point followed when, in the objective world, the Second International collapsed at the outbreak of World War I. The shocking betrayal by the Second International served as the compulsion to Lenin to return to Marx's origin in the Hegelian dialectic with his own study of Hegel's *Science of Logic*. This marked the Great Divide in post-Marx Marxism. Lenin's grappling with the Hegelian-Marxian dialectic continued through the final decade of his life, from 1914 to 1924.

What resulted from this revolutionary encounter was a reunification of philosophy with revolution. We must see what Lenin specifically singled out to help him answer the Historic task facing him, and how he reconnected with Marx's Marxism. The dialectical principle he singled out from Hegel was transformation into opposite. Everything he worked out from then on—from *Imperialism to State and Revolution*—demonstrates that.

The main focus here is on the significance of what a revolutionary concretizes to answer the challenge of a new age. In the case of Lenin it was the dialectic principle of transformation into opposite that he held to characterize both capitalism's development into imperialism

* A lecture delivered in Chicago, January 27/February 3, 1985

16535

Earl I touch Party as Party except ~~diff~~ = only
no reformist = only
12th-13th

Imp.

publ. results
of the
phil. process
of method
that led to
results that
were by way
means
Politics
(43) background
world
State & Rev.
etc.