

Report to the meeting of the Expanded Resident Editorial Board of
News and Letters Committees, Jan. 3, 1987
by Raya Dunayevskaya, National Chairwoman

T H E Y E A R O F O N L Y 8 M O N T H S

- I. Star Wars from the Skies.
- II. A New Philosophic Moment of Development: The Marxist-Humanist Significance of Location/Local; "Not by Practice Alone."
- III. New Perceptions of Lenin's Philosophic Ambivalence as they Developed during the Preparatory Work for the Biweekly News & Letters.
- IV. The Single Dialectic of Philosophy (A Body of Ideas) and Organization: Marx's Humanism, and the Marxist-Humanist Tasks for 1987.

*

*

*

Two philosophic letters to non-Marxist Hegelian scholars will be sent out, one to each local:

(1) "The Idea of Cognition," (the penultimate chapter of Science of Logic) is key both to our changed perceptions of Lenin's philosophic ambivalence and of Hegel himself and his different projections of theory/practice in Science of Logic and in its abbreviated version in the Encyclopedia.

(2) The letter on Hegel's Third Attitude to Objectivity in the Smaller Logic, the 1827-30 edition holds the key to the 1980s retrogressionism.

Finally, with the eyes of 1987, I will write a New Introduction to the reprint of my 1960 "Notes on Hegel's Phenomenology of Mind," to be ready in June.

I. Star Wars from the Skies

In mid-January, watch out for an abstruse announcement, that "foreign participants" in the space station project have been informed about a postponement of a meeting; it will be issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Don't think it doesn't concern you, much less that it isn't a total reversal of space exploration for so-called peaceful purposes. The real truth is that Reagan does not consider his regression completed until he has established superiority in nuclear missiles -- and that includes in outer space. Reagan has been pushing for "going it alone"; Pax Americana is now to occupy outer space, and that means excluding NATO from any joint participation in "scientific research."

The reason this whole story sounds so abstruse is that this horrific trial balloon is deliberately not attributable to a designated responsible person. The article was written by a John Noble Wilford in the NYT of 12/20/86. No follow-up article was scheduled, or has appeared since, though the writer held-- and not as an individual's opinion only -- that the "decision threatened to jeopardize delicate negotiations to arrange broad international cooperation in the project." Clearly, Western Europe, Japan and Canada had "agreed to provide financial support for the \$8 billion station. The Pentagon has now asked NASA to postpone further talks ..."

The ominousness of the situation cannot be exaggerated, though it is impossible to follow through because everyone is mired on the level of "who knew what, when," as they wallow in the details of the U.S.-Iran-Nicaragua contra arms scandal. As if the "Presidency" were the question, rather than the specific President, Ronald Reagan, the media as well as Congress itself are looking for a way to let this specific imperial presidency -- Ronald Reagan's -- off with, at most, a slap on the wrist. This is true also for the West European Allies, who said virtually nothing when Reagan abandoned the SALT II treaty last month, without consulting them, though they had shown great opposition when abandoning SALT II was first sent out as a trial balloon. Again, they evidently plan to say nothing as the space station for "peaceful purposes" is perverted into a platform for Star Wars missiles.

Finally, don't hold your breath for the State of the Union message that Reagan gives in late January every year. No doubt he will again feature NASA's space station as the

centerpiece of "technology," rather than weapons, and do the exact opposite. Indeed, one such statement was attributable recently to Col. Gerald May, director of space for the National Security Council, in Aviation Week (12/22/86): "We must keep our options open for the conduct of national security experiments on board." Anything from Khomeini/hostages/arms/North passes as "national security."

There are still two years to go in this imperial presidency. There is no place for illusions that all the scandals and crises befalling the retrogressionist Reagan will bring him down. He is the one, after all, who has unloosed a Col. North as a Rambo-on-the-loose all over the globe, from the imperialist invasion of Grenada in 1983 to the latest 1986 Iran-Contra arms scheme. Reagan is the one who called North the day he supposedly fired him, to designate him a "national hero."

Two more years of Reagan are not needed to understand why it is none too soon to start a biweekly N&L. Just look at the three issues since the Convention. The four months during which I was to ^{have} been "away," working on the book, were months when the objective crises of the changed world demanded that we act as if we were ready for a biweekly, indeed, a weekly if only we could afford it. The Dec. N&L had to cover the events of the illicit U.S.-Iran liaison within the week of its revelation. And at the same time, that issue also carried much that was written by revolutionaries around the world, as witness the Lead dictated by the South African writer, Jongilizwe, the same week.

Later, we will go into greater detail on the months of preparatory work for N&L as biweekly. What is more immediate at this point is the fact that our preoccupation with the extra labor needed for the biweekly must not subordinate what is integral to that -- the urgent need for organizational growth.

Indeed, therein lies the significance of the whole concept of location, which characterizes this year's expanded REB focus on locals, specifically the local at the Center, meaning, however, all locals.

II. A New Philosophic Moment of Development: The Marxist-Humanist
Significance of Location/Local: "Not by Practice Alone"

The truth of the question of location emerged first way back in 1947, after the trip to France, where I debated the Trotskyists on state-capitalism and met the Camerounian with no "Party." Upon my return to the U.S., I refused to remain a New Yorker, chose, instead, an industrial region -- Pittsburgh/West Virginia, steel/coal. By the time the Johnson-Forest Tendency finally broke fully with Trotskyism (1951), the dominating subject for all became finding an industrial location where we would start a new kind of paper.

Retrospectively, I now see that the whole question of an industrial center for U.S. Marxism was Chicago, because simultaneously, Marxism as both the Labor and the Black dimensions came about as an aftermath of World War I and the Russian Revolution, which had produced the great migration from the South to the North, rooting both Marxism and Garveyism in Chicago in the early 1920s.

The historic "coincidence" of location/local held true also in the absolutely opposite direction in the late '20s with Stalin's victory over all post-Lenin tendencies in Russia, ordering U.S. Communists to make New York, not Chicago, the center. We, the youth then, called the move the abandoning of labor for "the CCNY boys." I proposed the return to Chicago when the State-Capitalist Tendency broke fully with Trotskyism. The decision to make Detroit the industrial Midwest center was made on the basis that Detroit was both industrial (home of the CIO) and that we had two revolutionary proletarians there -- John Zupan and Charles Denby. (Denby was, however, not made Editor until we had separated from C.L.R. James, and until, at our very first conference, I proposed that Denby become Co-Editor with Zupan. He soon became sole Editor and remained so throughout his lifetime.)

With the breakup of Johnson-Forest, the philosophic-theoretic continuation of Marxism for our age was finally no longer in doubt. It was first then worked out in a comprehensive form in its American Labor/Black roots as well as its Humanist world concepts, with the publication of Marxism and Freedom ... from 1776 Until Today in 1957. Marxist-Humanist growth, organizationally as well as theoretically, opened the forum for workers not only in N&L but also in the many pamphlets. At the same time, we heaved out totally new philosophic roads with Philosophy and Revolution, from Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao, published in 1973. Before the '70s ended, we had the book, Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal.

Finally, with the decade of the '80s, we had completed what we called the "trilogy of revolution," readying for the Marx Centenary Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution, in 1982, which threw out the challenge to all post-Marx Marxism, now that the Ethnological Notebooks made possible grasping Marx's Marxism as a totality.

Had we moved to Chicago in 1983, when Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution was in hand for the Marx Centenary, I don't believe there would have emerged the seeming gap between local/center, theory/practice, philosophy/revolution, that we seem to have experienced when we moved to Chicago in 1984.

Let's stop for a moment here to see what happened by the end of that year, 1984, specifically 12/30/84. 1984 had become for us, not just physically the "Big Move" to Chicago, not just the return to where my roots were, but the Actuality of the early 1920s with both Marxist history and the Black dimension integral to it. This concept was the idea of location and local as inseparable from a new philosophic moment of development.

1984 had, indeed, become a Turning Point for the body of ideas of Marxist-Humanism. From the 1984 emphasis on "Not by Practice Alone" had flowed the 1985 concept of a biweekly and integral to it, the need for organizational growth. Olga reminded me of all this when we were discussing the carrying out of the 1986 Convention Perspectives, where the organization had voted for the biweekly -- I had raised the point a year earlier, before the 1985 Plenum. It is "Not by Practice Alone" that has been the ground for the biweekly as well as for the book, and for organizational growth.

Take the way Dialectics manifests itself at the present Turning Point in our development on the biweekly, on the one hand, and collectivity both in the local and in the leadership, on the other hand. I tried to do that again in the Sept. 21, 1986 letter to the new members of the National Editorial Board, Gene and Jane. We related the letter to our past as a body of ideas, i.e. the historic birth of Marxist-Humanism in the 1950s was made most integral to the actual objective movements that we had designated as a movement from practice that is itself a form of theory AND theory, which is itself a form of philosophy, articulating itself in Dialectic Methodology.

It is clear from the letter of Sept. 21 to Gene and Jane that when we talk of the Absolute, we see "in the Absolute,

not a system, not a hierarchy, but new beginnings, new beginnings of such phenomenal importance as to become the determinant of the end -- an end that will only come to the future when masses-in-motion become Reason."

What happened with the Dialectic itself when it came to the 1980s? The Marx Centenary was not only the great year for us that had opened new doors in the Black Dimension, in Women's Liberation, in Youth, but we had the opportunity to project post-Marx Marxism as a pejorative in all fields. It was also the year of the U.S. imperialist invasion of Grenada, when the success of "doing it" (the Grenada Revolution) without a philosophy of revolution ended with one faction (Coard's) murdering the other (Bishop). It made the invasion by the U.S. easier, the U.S. having had its eye on Grenada from the moment that the revolution without a philosophy of revolution was "completed."

Pause for a moment and look at just the two words we added to Absolute Idea -- as "New Beginnings." Do you recognize how new, historically/philosophically new, those two words are, when they are appended to the words, "Absolute Idea"? Do you recognize what a great breakthrough that was in all of post-Marx Marxism, that, in truth, it was a concretization of what Marx himself had achieved when he transformed the Hegelian Dialectic into a new continent of thought and of revolution? Don't strip it naked of its historic-philosophic roots and turn "new beginnings" into a bare abstraction.

Finally, do you realize that where Marx paused in the "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic," promising to return to the specific section in the Encyclopedia of Philosophic Sciences, that "intermission" lasted 40 years? Those 40 years spelled out great achievements of the actual revolutions of 1848 and 1871, as well as the Grundrisse, where the Absolute was spelled out as the "Absolute movement of becoming." Only then came the monumental, historical work, Capital, followed by the unpublished Ethnological Notebooks, i.e. the discovery of the Third World, and with it still other forms of revolution.

Once a form of counter-revolution in Grenada came out of that revolution, it became imperative once again to talk of philosophy of revolution, not as some sort of abstraction, but most concretely. That is why the 1984 Perspectives of "Not by Practice Alone," as well as the 1985 concept of bi-weekly, integral to which is the need for organizational growth, continue to be burning questions. Relating the question of location/local to those concepts and perspectives brings us to today. That is to say, to the TEST of this new year that has but 8 months until we reach the Plenum.

III. New Perceptions of Lenin's Philosophic Ambivalence as they
Developed during the Preparatory Work for the Biweekly News
& Letters

Each one of our activities, whether it's a question of writing or of circulating, or whether it's a question of being part of others' mass activities, has as a goal nothing short of the transformation of reality. The plunge into that Gargantuan task comes at a time when we are trying to simultaneously produce a biweekly that meets the challenge from the objective situation, as well as create an in-person dialogue with as many subscribers and friends in the movement as we can.

The direction is to establish an affinity with them so that they want to become part of the new continent of thought and revolution that is Marxist-Humanism. That will be the task also of the book-to-be. Central to the Dialectics of Organization and Philosophy will be self-critique, a fundamental part of which touches on new perceptions of Lenin's philosophic ambivalence.

In the changed world since our September Convention as reflected in the Oct., Nov., and Dec. issues of News & Letters, whether we examine Gorbachev's shift East -- Japan and the Pacific generally as well as the Third World -- or everything falling apart for both nuclear Behemoths in Iceland, we cannot, must not leave our own self-critique at the wayside. It begins with the Resident Editorial Board Minutes of 12/1/86.

In trying to be brief about the relationship of the book-to-be -- which is very much in its initial stages -- and the needs of the moment, that is to say, the biweekly and organizational growth, a certain looseness of expression crept in. It appeared in reference to Lenin, and asserted that he "didn't grasp the dialectic in thought." That abbreviation of what was said is wrong both factually and conceptually.

From the first, whether it be only the translation of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks in ¹⁹⁴⁸⁻⁴⁹ or the 1953 Letters on the Absolute Idea, where I separated myself not only from Lenin's rejection of the last half-paragraph of Hegel's Absolute Idea, but from his impatience when he reached the Absolute, I was always precise on the points of divergence. As I put it back in the letter of May 12, 1953: "I am shaking all over for we have come to where we part from Lenin. I

mentioned before that, although in the approach to the Absolute Idea Lenin had mentioned that man's cognition not only reflects the objective world but creates it, but that within the chapter he never developed it."

He then began quoting the Smaller Logic; and now I see what I didn't see then in Lenin's brief contents page of that work. That is to say, Lenin's outline of the Smaller Logic first begins with Being, which is p. 103 of Hegel's book. Lenin had entirely left out Attitudes to Objectivity as well as the Introduction. Yet these are the very sections added to the Smaller Logic after the Larger Logic was written -- a full decade after. Add to this new discovery, my latest exchange of letters with non-Marxist intellectuals, as well as reports and discussions at the REB itself. The fact that our critique of Lenin becomes very much sharper than it had been, does not in any way lead to such abbreviated, if not careless recordings, which cloud the meaning of what is new.

Here is why critique is so important:

(1) The Dialectic of Organization has so many facets that I must have two years to complete the book. It is clear that Reagan is not about to give them to me. That is to say, there are so many objective crises which make it imperative for N&L not just to be on top of the situation dialectically, but always to express philosophy as action, that it is inevitable that hurrying philosophic reports of progress can only produce such imprecision.

(2) The exact phase we are facing now insofar as Lenin and the Party is concerned is this: we had rejected the elitist party so many years before we ever started developing philosophy in any concrete sense that it led too many times to taking that question for granted, as though the Organization question were "solved." The result is that when it comes to the rigors of philosophy, you begin using the word, "dialectic," as if you were already in the Absolute. The dialectic as second negativity doesn't appear fully until the Absolute itself.

(3) The nub of the question is that the discussion on what new discoveries I had made dealt with the dialectic in the Doctrine of the Notion, specifically the final two chapters -- the Theory of Cognition, being on the threshold, on the threshold only, of the Absolute, and the Absolute Idea itself.

I must repeat, at that Dec. 1 REB meeting, both in my talk and in the discussion of the REB members, the expression used wasn't that Lenin didn't grasp the dialectic in thought in general. It was that he hadn't grasped the dialectic in the Doctrine of the Notion, specifically in the final chapters that we were most excited about, and that we are working so hard to concretize for our age.

I should also add that by this I mean further that Hegel's Philosophy of Mind -- which Lenin didn't touch at all, especially its final three syllogisms -- and all the prefaces, introductions, attitudes to objectivity of the Smaller Logic, were written after the Science of Logic had already been completed and Hegel was re-examining his whole life's work. Thus, the 1830-31 writings of Hegel are as critical as those of Marx's last decade.

The point now is that Lenin's statement in his Testament -- that Bukharin, though he was a great theoretician, hadn't fully understood the dialectic* -- couldn't remain anything but an abstraction. Instead of ever publishing his Philosophic Notebooks, Lenin republished his old vulgarly materialist, Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, even as, instead of developing all the individual critiques in his essay Twelve Years, regarding the 1903 concept of the Party, he had What Is To Be Done? republished.

This question first manifested itself, mysteriously enough, at Lenin's very highest political-philosophic achievement on the eve of Nov. 1917, in State and Revolution, by the absence of a Dialectic of Organization, the Party. Instead What Is To Be Done? became very nearly a Bible.

The most difficult of all tasks that confronts us,

* Because Lenin kept his Hegelian writings private, the first time that philosophy appears openly in the movement is in Germany in 1919 and the early 1920s -- first, with Lukacs using the Hegelian dialectic as a revolutionary element vs. Social Democratic economic determinism; second, with Korsch. Both unfortunately capitulated organizationally, one to Stalinism, the other out of the movement. We have nothing original from them by the 1930s when Marx's Humanist Essays were published in Germany.

indeed, that has confronted all post-Marx Marxists who have tried to get out from under some form of statification -- and none more so than those like us who have been hewing a road back to Marx's Marxism -- is to project that it is not the Party or the leader or leadership, but philosophy, the body of ideas, the dialectic of ideas and organization, as against the party as well as distinct from forms of organization born out of spontaneity. While these, of course, are correct, as against the elitism and ossification of the Party, the truth is that these forms also search for an organization different from their own in the sense that they want to be sure that there is a totality of theory and practice against the establishment of a power that has stopped dead with its conquest of state power -- in short, altogether new beginnings.

The burning question of the day remains: What happens the day after? How can we continue Marx's unchaining of the Dialectic organizationally, with the principles he outlined in his Critique of the Gotha Program?

The question of "What happens after?" gains crucial importance because of what it signals in self-development and self-flowering -- "revolution in permanence." No one knows what it is, or can touch it, or decide upon it before it appears. It is not the task that can be fulfilled in just one generation. That is why it remains so elusive, and why the abolition of the division between mental and manual labor sounds utopian. It has the future written all over it.

IV. The Single Dialectic of Philosophy (A Body of Ideas) and Organization: Marx's Humanism and the Marxist-Humanist Tasks for 1987

The fact that we cannot give a blueprint does not absolve us from the task. It only makes it more difficult. What we are trying to do with this book-to-be is to so deeply root this task historically and philosophically that both we and all whom we can reach on the outside will want to hew out these uncharted roads.

1987 is the year of the test. It isn't the test of preparing for something to do; it is the test of doing. There are only 8 months to our type of year -- i.e. to the Plenum of September 4-6, when the entire organization will want an accounting, not just of the four months of preparation for the biweekly, but of the eight months of actual carrying out of this intensified practice, plus how we made it integral to organizational growth.

Moreover, this is to be done as we have sufficiently advanced in our book-to-be so that the dialectics of philosophy, too, are inseparable from the dialectics of organization. It is this that is prompting me to share with you two of the letters to non-Marxist Hegelians on the new in my perceptions of Lenin's philosophic ambivalence. It also involves a new view of Hegel's Dialectic, as the letters show.

Let's now take another look at Marx's "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic." Please do read it in the original U.S. translation in the 1957 Marxism and Freedom, the only edition that has my translation. I am quoting from pages 313-319. The first quotation reads: "The truth of uniting this (materialism and idealism) is capable of grasping the act of world history." We must not forget that even in showing his indebtedness to Hegel's theory of alienation, Marx had reconstructed it both phenomenologically* and in actuality, both as capital/labor, and the Man/woman relationship, as well

* Marx considered the Phenomenology of Mind the most creative of all of Hegel's works, the work of genius. It became the center of his "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic." It proved to be the essence of how he de-mystified Hegel, holding that the mysticism was due to Hegel's de-humanizing the Idea as mere stages of consciousness, instead of human beings thinking. Put differently, he was attacking the structure of the Phenomenology of Mind, its stages of consciousness. We need to see my notes of 12/12/60 with eyes of 1987, and that is what I intend to do in the New Introduction for the reprint of these Notes, as I work on the Dialectics of Organization and

as philosophically. That is to say, it is Historic transcendence of both materialism and idealism. History-in-the-making marked the transcendence.

Here we are -- 143 years later -- and post-Marx Marxism has yet to grasp the full depth of Marx's Great Leap to the future, to his concept of "new Humanism": "Only by the transcendence of this mediation does there arise positive Humanism, beginning from itself."

We are the only ones who speak of philosophy not merely in general, not as if it were only theoretical rather than inseparable from practice, not as something that has no relationship to "program," but as Dialectics "in and for itself," so that we can work it out as dialectics of revolution and dialectics of organization as a single dialectic rather than as "the Party, the Party, the Party."

In a word, as opposed to the Party, we put forth a body of ideas that spells out the second negativity which continues the revolution in permanence after victory. The principle of revolution in permanence doesn't stop with a victory over capitalism; indeed, it doesn't stop until the full abolition of any division between mental and manual labor. Full self-development of Man/Woman that leads to truly new human relationships remains the goal.

The fact that Lenin didn't even know about the 1844 Manuscripts proves all over again that it wasn't only after Marx's death that what was projected by orthodox Marxism wasn't Marx's Marxism. It was Engelsian Marxism. Whether we knew it or not, we were all raised that way. What drove Lenin to finally go to Marx's true origin in the Hegelian Dialectic was the objective situation of his day -- the simultaneous outbreak of World War I and the betrayal of what all, revolutionaries as well as reformists, held to be orthodox Marxism.

We had to face the realities of World War II and post-World War II, especially the early 1950s. We saw it as a "movement from practice"; we concretized it further by calling that movement a "form of theory itself." That was the most fundamental breakthrough on the Absolute Idea. The ramification of that, however, was burdened by a certain inadequacy: we had all become so enamoured with the great opening to the future of the new reality that we very nearly subordinated the second half of that declaration.

Philosophy. I hope it can be mimeoed by June -- in any case, that it will be ready for the Plenum on Labor Day.

It is necessary not to forget that that breakthrough to the Absolute had not -- had not -- been limited to a movement from practice. It stated specifically that it was the unity of the movement from practice and that from theory which had produced the Absolute. In a word, inherent in the Absolute was both the movement from practice and the movement from theory. The unity of the two had also signalled Marx's historic transformation of the Hegelian Dialectic of a revolution in philosophy into Marx's philosophy of revolution. Which is how the 1880s laid a trail to the 1980s with its "revolution in permanence."

Finally, we need to return to the months of the preparatory work we have been engaged in with the biweekly plus the year's Perspectives, which now has only 8 months until next Plenum. You can sense the enormity of the task for the smallness of our organization. Were you not a dialectician, you would be a pessimist. But Dialectic, beginning with so simple a fact as that we are less than 100 but our paper has a press run of 7,000 -- many, many thousands who read it and think of it identify with the ideas -- gives a different view. On an international scope, it manifests the leaps you get when you have a forum both for the voices from below and for the projection of Marxist-Humanism, both concretely and Universally as a never-ending self-development.

Now then, let's get down to the immediate problem -- how can one simultaneously take on all the extras that come with being a biweekly instead of a monthly and yet concentrate at least one day a week on growth through in-person contacting or through participation in other movements and in all the creative ways we can think of?

The answer is simple. The very method of distribution twice a month gives you that much more contact with the outside, while the actual writing is, in a certain sense, less-- that is to say, in relation to columnists, in relation to the PTC, as they get divided between who is assigned to what. Not only that, creativity means abolishing the distinction between "us" and "them" and between the objective and subjective. Brevity becomes the key -- not merely because we now have only 8 pages instead of 12 pages. No, it is the key because it demands clarity in philosophic projection.

To embark on this Gargantuan task, members-at-large have the most difficult problem, since, though they do circulate the paper and actually participate in ongoing objective developments and mass movements (as Philadelphia and P-9 bear proof), they have it most difficult when they try to project

the organizational responsibility that comes with workers telling their own stories in a Marxist-Humanist theoretical/practical paper. That becomes especially telling as N&L becomes a biweekly and constant new points of departure are thrown our way by the Objective situation. Take the fact that there hasn't been a single emergence of a revolution anywhere, be it Latin America, the Philippines, Haiti, South Korea, Southern Africa, or the Middle East -- and it didn't matter whether it was the 1970s and the Democrats, or the 1980s and the Republicans -- that you couldn't see what was dominating the world since the end of World War II, and that is those two nuclear Behemoths aiming for single world mastery.

This is the enemy and since we live in the U.S. the enemy is Pax Americana both globally and at home where reigns Reagan the strikebreaker as well as Retrogressionist in all fields from the Black Dimension to Women's Liberation to Youth and Education, unending unemployment, pauperization of the masses and national debt as high as the fantastic nightmarish Star Wars. He must be stopped.

What I am driving at with the biweekly, with the need for organizational growth, with the book-to-be, is, at the same time, the task for all. It is the in-person discussions, collectivity in projecting a relationship to a body of ideas, which requires a corporeal presence, both for feeling that you are not alone and for others feeling that you are not alone.

After all, the need is to fight the ruling class, the media; the need is the overthrow of all the old -- and to find where exactly is all the new. The fact that we are the only ones who do not keep the minutes of the REB meetings restricted to leadership, and you can hand others a copy of these minutes, does not present that corporeal presence. The truth is that we ourselves insist on having at least one national meeting a year so that we can see all of us together at one place and time. First then does one understand that the national, international relations as well as the relationship with non-members makes the Second America a reality. Let's go at it.

*

*

*

It was the concept of "Absolute Idea as New Beginning" that made me go into the roots of Marxism in the U.S. That didn't exist before. Yes, there were individuals, friends of Marx, but they didn't establish Marxism here. As for the Anarchists, we were really jealous of their great beginnings here -- but what did they do with those great beginnings in Chicago? Nothing. Then we saw the Blacks moving to Chicago after WWI -- contrast what we saw in that great move to what McKinney kept talking about -- Blacks used as "scabs." Contrast what Chicago meant as the history of American Blacks, of U.S. Marxism, of U.S. labor, of Garveyism, of the relationship to the Russian Revolution, and to philosophy. Yet it was only when I recognized that I didn't have to be afraid of having it considered a "personal" move back to my roots, that it was not personal but part of objective history, that we reached a new historic moment with our move to Chicago in 1984.

Absolute Idea as New Beginning is what is important; that is what gives everything its meaning this year of the Biweekly. Pessimism comes from not re-

cognizing fully what we represent. We look at others in history and don't see ourselves as having more because they had a revolution and we haven't. So we have to have more oomph from our self-development. Why did I say the discussion was too abstract? What is important for these 8 months is for each one of us to take responsibility. There is no division between REB and local on this. It isn't true that the REB hasn't done a tremendous amount of work in this local. But the emphasis now is that each one have at least one day out -- which does not mean working in the office or in the library, but out.

We will have relations this year with those who are in on-going revolutions, who are swept up with those mass movements. They cannot overwhelm you. Consider how excited Frondizi was about Marxism and Freedom, how he translated it at once into Spanish. But he couldn't resist the pull of the Cuban Revolution.

But watch any revolution and you will see that every spontaneous group does exactly what any party does -- that is, they look for how to have both theory and practice. They look for that because they want to change the whole world. They look for an organization that will give them that unity. No one knows what the future will bring. The most Marx could leave us was his warning never to give up your principles no matter who you might be willing to struggle with on specific questions. The key for organizational growth is organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanism.