

Dunayevskaya Archives

10841

B1

from notes dated Dec. 2, 1986

The most difficult of all tasks that confronts us, indeed that has confronted any post-Marx Marxist who has tried to get out from under some form of statification, and none more so than those like us who have ~~xxxxxxxx~~ been hewing a road back to Marx's Marxism-- is to project that it is not the Party or the leader or the leadership, but philosophy, the body of ideas, the dialectic of ideas and organization, as against the party and ~~xxxx~~ also distinct from forms of organization born out of spontaneity. These, of course, are ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ correct, as against the elitism and ossification of the party. But the truth is that these forms also ~~xxxxxxx~~ search for an organization different from their own in the sense that they want to be sure that there is a totality between theory and practice against the establishment of a power that has stopped dead with its conquest of state power. That is to say, that self-development and self-flowering is revolution-in-premanence. No one knows what it is, or can touch it, or decide upon it before it appears-- and it is the next generation. ~~Rxx~~ That is why it remains so elusive, and why the abolition of the division between mental and manual labor sounds utopian. The fact that ~~xxxxxxxx~~ we cannot give an answer, 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 make ~~xx~~ this task historically and philosophically so ~~xx~~ deeply-rooted that both we and all who we can reach on the outside will be glad to journey these uncharted ~~xxxxxxxx~~ roads. What I want to do at the present is to ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ probe what we all know, and see whether there are new facets we didn't fully see as they happened these past four months:

Task
 Post-Marx
 Marxism =
 to present
 H.P. as phil.
 on the dial
 of negation
 or neg.
 to present
 to present
 to present
 to present

When it
 feels the
 compulsion
 in facing
 phil. he
 creates
 ground for us
 but not only doesn't he face ORG; but
 1/2
 phil.

STIP
 1984
 (STIP)
 (P4)

But first, I want to go into the historic points of never before trodden, beginning with the one who gave us all our ground and reason for being, Marx. We certainly couldn't have been without him, and not only in the fact that he created a whole new continent of thought and of revolution, but because, specifically, on organization ~~his~~ his ~~concept~~ concept is exactly what we have to concretize for our age. Nevertheless, it is likewise a fact that it was so only in general, and it had undergone many, many changes. Take the greatest two appearances in Marx-- the Communist Manifesto and the Critique of the Gotha Program. The Communist Manifesto has everything, not only against capitalism, but against all other contending tendencies. He lists four; bourgeoisie, feudal, petty-bourgeois, communist, ~~bourgeois~~. So clearly it isn't just movement from practice, but from theory, and he distinguished his philosophy from all others. And yet when he comes to distinguishing from the proletariat he chooses only one thing--internationalism. He does make a distinction of the ultimate goal and not just the immediate, and it is indeed in the 1860 Letter to Freiligrath, where it is expressed most succinctly and profoundly, when he says

10954

that when he asks for Freiligrath's signature, because they were ~~hth~~ comrades of the same party, he knows there is no party; he's the one who made the motion to disband the Communist League, and he himself does not belong to any organized grouping. He did not mean it in the ephemereal sense that there is a party as the Communist League, but in the historic sense, and that it will remain as part of history, that you can't re-write history. No one can possibly re-write the history of that ~~Manifesto~~ Manifesto belonging to the League, the Communist Manifesto, EVER.

And of course, in the Critique of the Gotha Program, when he so sharply criticized the "unity" of the ~~Lassalleans~~ Lassalleans and the supposed Marxists, he again re-iterated and this time not only concretized but also for the first time ever ventured to give an idea of ● a new society, where it was clear that unless the organization, the historic Party, or whatever form it finally assumes, stands on principled ground; no unity can be possibly achieved except for a specific action. Now obviously all this unfortunately was merely taken for granted, whereupon "concretely" it got everything from reformism to anarchism to god knows what other tendency--all vanguardists. And that does include the Council Communists. But of course the outstanding

example; so there again we have Reform or Revolution, not philosophy and self-development of human beings as ~~the~~ individualism which lets nothing interfere with its universalism.

The point is that of the years 1924-29, 1929-today, WW II, and all those national revolutions, the rise of a Third World and the endless continuing struggle, and nowhere in sight, not even telescopic sight, is there an answer to the questions, what happens after conquest of power? Why so many aborted revolutions? What type of party or organization? (have the various) What forms of spontaneity--councils, soviets, committees, associations, communes--achieved? And why when they did come close to power, it was the political organizations that didn't take them over so much, as that they themselves looked to be taken over.

"like us" who know that nothing can be done without the masses, and are with them, but they are theoreticians and they always seem to be around too. So, what is the objectivity which explains their presence, as the objectivity explains the spontaneous outburst of the masses? In a word, I was looking for the objectivity of subjectivity.

Now then, it seems to me that in a certain sense we could call it a shock for me to have experienced this year 1987, when a great deal of ~~xxx~~ research was done ~~by~~ ^{by} others -- Eugene, Mike, Peter, Cyrus, Kevin, Sheila, Olga -- on the many ways that spontaneity appeared in the forms of councils, soviets, committees, communes, and so forth, not only to say the generalization: Yes, the party and the forms of organization born from spontaneity are opposites, but they are not absolute opposites. The change in the title to Dialectics of Organization and Philosophy really means that the absolute opposite is philosophy, and that we have not yet worked out organizationally. Because...

Concretely, here is what is involved. Whether we take the Spanish Revolution in 1936-37, or the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, we will find that the great outburst and new ~~xxx~~ forms of organization with workers as decision-makers, with workers as Reason, ~~xxx~~ went as spontaneously to search for the party as the party went to search for them. And even when they were anarchists, they gave in to the

10964

~~particular~~ Single party. (We will go into each one later.)

Or take Pannekoek. The Council Communists were certainly earlier on the scene and directly opposed Lenin in a friendly way, ~~on~~ on the question of a single form of organization, insisting that when it comes to production, the people at the point of production must maintain their power after the revolution. But, ~~did~~ did they ever give up their party? Didn't they think ^{along with} ~~with~~ Rosa Luxemburg, that spontaneity is no substitute for the wholeness of internationalism and theory? On the contrary, they took that for granted. What not only was not taken for granted, but never even approached in any way whatever, unless one calls "approached" a total rejection, was philosophy. Except, except, except...

The except, of course, refers to Lenin. So happy were we that he had felt compelled to go back to Hegel that we acted as if it's only a matter of "not having time to get to" making his Notes public. Indeed, the enthusiasm for Lenin's dive into Science of Logic (LL) didn't question what about Phenomenology, of which there is evidence that he had read before writing Imperialism. ~~There was too much of taking for granted attitude.~~ There was too much of taking for granted attitude. ~~The debates within the movement after the death of Lenin were so~~ The debates within the movement after the death of Lenin were so factionally motivated that there was no reason to pay any attention. The point then became: what has changed in the objective situation, in the theoretic void following the death of Lenin, without ever delving into philosophy.