

5 7 4 7
Report to the National Editorial Board
Meeting of News & Letters Committees,
Sept. 4, 1977

National Organizer's Report :

POLITICALIZATION, BATTLE OF IDEAS
AND ORGANIZATIONAL GROWTH

by

OLGA DOMANSKI

POST-PLENUM BULLETIN NO. II

SEPTEMBER, 1977

NEWS & LETTERS

1900 E. Jefferson

Detroit, Mich. 48207

Price: 35¢

5749

National Organizer's Report to
News & Letters National Editorial
Board Meeting, Sept. 4, 1977

POLITICALIZATION, BATTLE OF IDEAS
AND ORGANIZATIONAL GROWTH

Politicalization -- as the act, the action, the activity of making philosophy, our philosophy, Marxist-Humanism, concrete, living, meaningful, challenging, to ourselves and to others -- is what this whole Plenum revolves about. It is politicalization of that kind that has been demonstrated from the moment this meeting was convened, from the Welcome, through the Perspectives Report -- and I mean the mediating kind of "through" -- to the International and Black Thought discussions. So the discussion on organization, which is what politicalization to us is all about, really began the moment this Plenum convened.

Politicalization is what Marx was acting out when he broke off his Philosophic Essays in 1844 -- where his new continent of thought was born in the "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" -- and translated his new philosophy, the Marxian dialectic, into the Communist Manifesto that changed all of world history. It was what Lenin acted out -- after the collapse of the Second International drove him to return to Hegel and he broke with his own past and, philosophically, with "vanguardism" -- when he translated his Philosophic Notebooks first into Imperialism, and then into State and Revolution, and then into the slogan "All Power to the Soviets" that changed world history for his age.

And politicalization is what Raya acted out when she broke through on the Absolute Idea in 1953 and translated those head-breaking first and second syllogisms into "worker as editor" on the one hand, and Marxism and Freedom on the other -- and later translated the third syllogism into Philosophy and Revolution. Now, we may not have changed world history for our age yet. But the very title of our Draft Perspectives -- "Time is Running Out" -- shows that that is exactly what we aim to do, not as some elitist vanguard that thinks a tiny handful can "lead the masses", but as a viable and thoroughly historic organization of workers and intellectuals and youth, women and men, Black and white and yellow and red, each one of whom represents some objective force in this world, determined to be part of the sweeping movements out to uproot this stinking society, and working daily -- the only organization in the world that does -- to unify the struggles for freedom with a philosophy of liberation, which is the only thing that can make sure that the time that is running out is for capitalism and not for humanity.

Let's take a look at just what was the daily activity of our committees, collectively, since our Convention last year when politicalization was first spelled out as the missing link between our philosophy and organizational growth. I doubt that any organization on earth, even one many times our size, did so much, and so much that was brand new. We certainly went out and met the objective movements and participated, explicitly as Marxist-Humanists, with every force of revolution we could find. We attended every conference we heard about, from AMEX in Toronto, where even a blizzard couldn't keep us from getting there; to NOW here, where we took our ARF release and intervened in the Native American session; to the Flint UAW celebration that "forgot" the women until we refreshed their memories; to a Black Directions Conference, the first time we participated in something like that, both as Black and as Marxist-Humanists, taking the floor and selling lit. John Alan gave three talks -- at Cal State, at UCLA, and in S.F. with significant audiences. When Mashinini, the student leader from South

-2-

Africa was on tour, Lou Turner managed to interview him, and startled him with news of the student occupations in Britain -- he had just left there, but knew nothing about them, though he was on a CP-SWP platform and they surely have more numerous ties with Britain than we; yet it was N&L the students called from within their occupied building. We spoke and led workshops in the persons of Eugene, Deborah, John Alan and Lou Turner at a Social Science Conference in California. We were appealed to to help save the fledgling Michigan Labor History Society from being swallowed by the bureaucrats before it ever got off the ground -- and so far we have succeeded, but next week will write the next chapter. We had lit tables everywhere and got dozens, collectively probably hundreds of names. We got a brand new youth committee at WSU and they now plan to bring the Kent State students to WSU the first week the campus reopens. We broke into the feminist press on a big scale with a review of Working Women For Freedom and with our ARA release and with news of the domestic workers in Portugal. Susan got another letter into kwessne Notes raising the question of the inter-relationship of the Black, Women's and Indian movements. We succeeded in getting a series of five lectures by Raya broadcast over educational radio in prime time -- two of them (one on Trotsky and one on Rosa Luxemburg) recorded right at the U of M in Flint, where Dan succeeded single-handedly in getting a tremendous turnout and in having N&L listed as co-sponsor with the university. We even got on TV with our program on "Women as Force and Reason". In N.Y. we had Kevin and Anne giving courses at the Free Association. Every local, without exception, brought "friends who are not yet members" onto panels and into the paper with us. We were able to sponsor meetings to hear our European travelers report first-hand on the new movements in Italy, Portugal and England. We participated in countless demonstrations and produced fine and creative leaflets.

Yet we have not been overwhelmed with new membership, to say the least. And what we have to answer, what we have been trying to work out all through our pre-plenum discussion is WHY?

Let's make it clear from the beginning that we are not talking about trying to build a mass organization. Nor are we unaware that many seeds that were planted this year, in one form or another, may and some undoubtedly will spring into bloom at some future time. Nor is it a question of being "impatient" to "get results." And it certainly is not a matter of "recruitment mentality".

Organizational growth is not a quantitative question. All you need do is look at the fact that Lassalle was the one who had the numbers, while Marx was calling himself and Engels "the party"; or the fact that Lenin was jealous of the German Social Democracy's "success" -- until 1914; or even the fact that SDS (and this is the 15th anniversary of the Port Huron Statement) which began with a handful in 1960, grew to 800 with the aid of the UAW's gift of \$10,000 by 1962 when they drafted their Statement right here in Michigan, and to over 80,000 by 1969 -- the year it died, because the highpoint of '68 was a missed moment -- all you need do is look at history to see that the kind of organization we are talking about is Marx's type of organization alone, the only one that made philosophy integral to organization.

But when we repeat that Marx called himself and Engels "the party", what we have to understand is that this is not to satisfy ourselves with smallness, but only to stress that Marxist thought is inseparable from activity, and therefore organization. For us, membership is crucial because we do each represent some very objective force in the world, and each one brings something very special and unique to the collectivity that is our organization. It must be

5751

constantly renewed and broadened and deepened if we are to remain viable.

We do know some of the reasons why it has been so difficult to bring new members to us. It is a very serious decision we ask. As someone put it during one of our discussions, we are the very opposite of a "turnstile organization" -- it is precisely because the step is so great that those who take it find so quickly that a true self-development is possible only within such a collectivity. Yet, great as the step is, we all know that there are those ready to become full-time revolutionaries. How can we afford to let them wind up in one of the dozens of vanguard groups, where they either become hard-core elitists in time, or become disillusioned and drop out of living altogether -- revolutionary living, that is, the only kind that means anything for the same reasons that "only that which is an object of freedom can be called an Idea."

And there is another reason for our difficulties we have to consider. Sexism. It is so pervasive it shocks you every once in a while. You can hardly believe your eyes when you see Ernest Mandel calling Raya "Mrs." Dunayevskaya in what is supposed to be a serious exchange over Raya's Trotsky article. Her answer, pinning him on precisely the male chauvinism he exposed, was so telling that the USC simply edited it out in what will appear in print in their special issue of Studies in Comparative Communism. But we printed it in New Essays and we have no intention of letting it pass. Or take Hal Draper, a more friendly adversary than Mandel, who told the woman who came to interview Raya for her book on Trotskyism that Raya's "Russianess" was all a facade and that she probably really came from Brooklyn! Or other Trotskyists who say that being Trotsky's Secretary only meant that she typed for him.

The battle of ideas takes devious forms at times; and the evasion of revolutionary theory takes even more devious one. And we cannot allow it to continue and stifle the movement to freedom.

For it is that -- that battle of ideas with all and sundry -- that is what has been missing in so much of all the great activity we have engaged in and that winds up with us being "isolated" even though we have met and talked with hundreds of people and introduced them to Marxist-Humanism; have sold great quantities of literature; have produced ten great issues of N&L; have got great stories from the workers and Blacks and women we work with. "Unfinished business" does not mean mere "follow-up", but an "unfinished revolution" in the other person's development and in ours. Follow-through is not just visiting and talking; it is what you talk about that is the key to transforming a "contact" into a "relationship."

As Raya put it bluntly at one of our REB discussions, "When is the last time anyone talked to a contact about Two Worlds?" Yet that is the single article that "sets our line", by which is meant the political-philosophic-historic direction of N&L. And we might also ask ourselves when is the last time we talked to friends about New Essays? Or the Political-Philosophic Letters? Or the Appendix of "Working Women For Freedom"? And talked about them in a way that would concretely present our philosophy as the politics that makes sense out of the insane world we live in because it shows the way out.

Let's take the Political-Philosophic Letters. They were one of our "un-scheduled" publications this year, because, even though they were all written last year, through 1976, we first got the idea to bind them and sell them as a totality when they were all finished. They remain our greatest challenge. I don't think it would be an exaggeration to say that the root of our main weakness this year -- the politicalization of our philosophy -- despite all our great

activity, began with not truly being able to jam up these PPLs with Philosophy and Revolution in the classes we held simultaneously in all the locals. It wasn't that the classes weren't good. It was they they were not the new kind of classes we wanted them to be, with the single important exception of Raya's participation from the floor after the presentations here in Detroit -- and we haven't caught those as yet, either.

We knew from the very beginning of the series what the Letters were supposed to be -- a demonstration of the method whereby we could make Philosophy and Revolution concrete. But method isn't an abstraction, either. Every one of the Letters concentrated on the inseparability of the objective and the subjective -- because it is impossible any longer to say that the objective situation is the "real" world and the subjective is "just an attitude" toward it. The subjective affects the objective situation so critically that it is impossible to discuss any part of the world today without also digging deeply into the Left and asking what are the revolutionary perspectives?

I reread all the Letters as preparation for this Plenum and I was really struck this time with the fantastic footnotes. They are not just "footnotes to history" or "added thoughts". They are illuminating on the question of "battle of ideas" because they so directly connect history and our organization. Let me show you what I mean: Take the first letter on the UN Resolution on Zionism, which takes on new meaning this year, not just on the question of the Middle East but the whole disgusting resurgence of Nazism and fascism and the KKK right here. It demands a confrontation with the entire Left for its share of the responsibility for that. If you reread the 12 footnotes of that Letter, you will find that Raya discusses there, in profound concreteness, the question of nationalism and internationalism and Black Thought. But have we really talked about these Letters when we have gone out to talk with others about our new Black Thought pamphlet?

Another footnote in this very first Letter makes a direct connection to the East European revolutionaries with that magnificent quote from the Czech radio broadcast at the time of Russia's invasion of Czechoslovakia that we also reproduced in Philosophy and Revolution. In fact, the scope of the questions that the Letter begs us to discuss with others is endless.

Or take the second Letter on "Mao's Last Hurrah", that reproduced as "appendix" the article on the Beria Purge Raya wrote in August, 1953. That was not for the sake of history or showing how "smart" Raya was. Let me tell you something about that Beria article. It appeared in the very first issue of the first "workers' paper" we attempted, Correspondence, dated Oct. 3, 1953. Stalin had died in March, and by summer the purges had already begun, and Raya was able to "predict" that Khrushchev, about whom nobody had ever heard at that time, was the "one to watch" because he was the one ruthless enough to fill the shoes. A reporter from the New York Times was wise enough to recognize what Raya's analysis meant and to call to find out "what would happen next" -- but within her own organization the article was blasted by its leader, CLRJames because it "had no place" on the front page of a worker's paper! The second issue of Correspondence carried -- as lead article-- "I Wanted Brooklyn to Win So Bad", plus a full column of "Readers' Views" criticizing the first issue. One, signed as a "Chrysler Worker" said: "I don't think the Beria article belongs on the front page. Political events like that just pass, they don't last." All in bold-face to make sure you didn't miss the point.

The point is that the Beria article was Raya's attempt to act out "politicalization" for our fledgling first paper. The article itself was politicalization -- but so was writing it for a workers' paper. It was attacked by CLRJ precisely because it was so pungent an expression of.

Raya's philosophy, which was not his -- because Raya's conception of a "workers' paper" was one that would not divide practice from theory, or Subject from Idea, or workers' ideas and passions from politics and philosophy. Did anyone ever discuss that in relation to Mao's attitude to objectivity with anyone?

Or take the third Letter on Western Europe and Portugal, with the powerful footnote on Gramsci, where Raya quotes Gramsci's criticism of Bukharin's attempt to "popularize" Marxism: "There is no treatment whatever of the dialectic ... which is degraded from being a doctrine of consciousness and the inner substance of history and the science of politics, into being a subspecies of formal logic and elementary scholasticism... he in fact capitulates before common sense and vulgar thought because he has not posed the problem to himself (but) Marxism is precisely the concrete historicisation of philosophy and its identification with history..." Isn't that exactly the kind of politicalization we are talking about -- and isn't that an illumination of the totally different attitude that is directly connected not only to the counter-revolutionary actions of the Communist Party on women, but to the total inability of the entire Left to hear what comes from below as new theoretic departures?

And jam that up with the next footnote that reveals that it was auto workers in Turin, whom Raya met in 1947, who told her that, during the Resistance, an American merchant marine seaman had brought them her brand new studies on Russia as state-capitalist society, which they translated into Italian at once and used to fight the Communists right in the midst of the Resistance movement against fascism. And then contrast that to the refusal of a Tony Cliff to join with Raya that same year to present a state-capitalist position to the Fourth International because he hadn't worked it out for himself yet! No wonder he winds up 20 years later first discovering it is a world stage.

We could go through each letter and find thoroughly explicit ways of discussing our organization, in just the footnotes alone. We can't do it now, of course -- but I do want to take up just one more, in the Letter on Kissinger's African Safari, which is surely brought to new life today by the sojourns of Andrew Young and the continuous movement of the Soweto youth. Raya mentions in the very second paragraph that apartheid was first projected as so-called "Bantu education" in 1953 -- and then footnotes "1953". Now that date surely rings a bell in every Marxist-Humanist head by now as the date Raya broke through on the Absolute Idea as the movement from practice to theory, and East German workers revolted against Russian totalitarianism six weeks later. Raya doesn't mention "Absolute Idea" once, by name. But that footnote gives us a totally new look at 1953 in relation to Africa, that takes in everything from our publication of People of Kenya Speak for Themselves when nobody was talking or doing anything to aid that revolt, to the first appearance of the Sino-Soviet conflict.

The point is that what we have to learn to do daily, in every activity and in all our "follow-through" is not only bring out all the new voices from below, but challenge all the diversionary ideas that are trying to stifle them. This battle of ideas, this organizational question, is the core of politicalization.

Let's return for just a moment to Marx's Communist Manifesto. He devoted one entire section of it to taking up all other tendencies vying for the attention of the workers in his day. And it is a fact of life that every tendency that is with us today first appeared in embryonic form the very next year in the 1848 revolutions. Or take Lenin's State and Revolution, in which he devotes an entire chapter to the "Vulgarization of Marx by the Opportunists", attacking not so much the anarchists, but more sharply the Russian Plekhanov and the German Kautsky for their total inability to fight the anarchists.

And, above all, take Philosophy and Revolution, which devotes the entire second part to "Alternatives" (Hegel called it "Attitudes to Objectivity") -- because in one form or another all of the diversionary ideas, the "non-dialectical methodologies", the shortcuts that lead only to aborted or transformed revolutions, and not to the new society, are represented there.

Yes, it is true that all the ideas of Marx's new continent of thought were there in 1844 in his Philosophic and Economic Manuscripts. But from the day he wrote the Communist Manifesto to 1883 when he died, Marx was constantly enriching his theory because there was always a new, more concrete, expression of it. Isn't that what Raya is asking us to learn to do? And aren't the different attitudes to objectivity actually different attitudes to philosophy and thus to organization that we have to do battle with for the minds of humankind if we are serious -- and we are.

Let's think over the past year in relationship to that-kind of challenge. Couldn't it have been a real new beginning if, in Detroit, we had known how to answer those vanguardists of all stripes who converged on our meeting to hear the report of the European trip, not on their ground, but on ours?

Wouldn't it have made the West Coast Social Science Conference where we did succeed in so many new things, a real intervention, if we had not refused to take part in the "tactics and strategy" session and thus allowed them to ghettoize us into discussing "philosophy" as if it had nothing to do with "real politics"?

Wouldn't New York have been able to at least try to work out their so much needed collectivity on the new high ground Raya took it to on her tour when the individual talents of each one were elicited with such great results, if any, individually or collectively had really tried to work out "politicalization" for that very, very political city?

And Chicago -- isn't the great accomplishment of winning both an old friend and politico and a brand new friend and feminist in the last month the very direct result of Raya's turning the local completely around when she was there on tour? Isn't that proof that it was sharp confrontation in the battle of ideas that was needed -- and not only with IS or the SWP or Maoists but first with the leadership of the King Coalition, for whom a "little anti-Semitism" wasn't important? While we felt we were learning so much from them, what were they learning from Marxist-Humanism? And what does it say to us that it was Sexism, Politics and Revolution that finally, after a whole year, revealed that the leader of an academic Feminist Criticism group was a "Maoist", not necessarily a card-carrier, but in mentality?

And wasn't it precisely Bess's old Bolshevik incapability of separating philosophy from day-to-day political analysis and from organization that was the real highlight of the European trip? Have you read her latest letter to Italy in your packet? It is a masterpiece and a lesson in methodology for all of us.

The truth is that we have learned plenty from all our magnificent experiences and our successes this year -- and if we can just learn as much from our weaknesses, 1977-78 can truly be a "new beginning."

So let's take up the year ahead, very concretely. We will have three brand new publications to bring out: first, the Black Thought pamphlet that we devoted an entire session to yesterday. It has been the focus for the West Coast last year and from now to April will be a focus for all the locals. That work can bring into new meaning our relationships with friends both old and new, including some of the magnificent correspondence with prisoners that has begun to develop.

We have to discuss what each local can do on that.

Second, there is the joint British-U.S. publication of Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crises. You have in your packets Harry McShane's great new Preface to that work. Harry has been wanting to reproduce those four chapters of Marxism and Freedom ever since 1958, when he first met Marxist-Humanism. Here is a man whose name is synonymous with British Labor History since before the Russian Revolution. He had been editor of the Scottish edition of the Daily Worker, but he broke with the Communists -- and, significantly, not when everyone was tearing up party cards in the wake of the Hungarian Revolution and its crushing by the Russian tanks -- but as early as 1953 when the youth in the party began asking questions and getting expelled, and Harry not only defended them but stood with them -- and suddenly he was out of the Party and in his sixties had to go back to work in the shipyards from where he had come. This is the man who says that he began a whole new life in 1958 when he first read Marxism and Freedom and suddenly saw his break from the Communists as part of a forward movement. And he has been campaigning to get those four chapters he so much loved reproduced separately, for British workers, ever since.

He will finally get those chapters. But this work is not just a reproduction, great as those chapters are, in and of themselves. And I don't think Harry's Preface could have been written before this year, when something made Harry, himself, finally see what it means that Raya is the only one since Marx who understood what the Paris Commune really meant in tearing away the veil from the fetishism of commodities. The organizational impact this pamphlet can have is enormous -- with that Introduction, which is a devastating critique of Mandel's complete perversion of Marxism, and that Appendix which will be a sharp critique of the complete degradation of Lenin by Tony Cliff (who is currently deluding himself that he is building a mass party to rival the Labour Party and the CP combined). It becomes totally new for today's battle of ideas with all those diversionary ideas that keep holding the movement back. The impact it will have in Britain can be great if we can make of it a true political-philosophic-organizational intervention, in this year of such sharp crises there. But it is our task to make it an intervention here, above all. We will have to work out the classes Raya has proposed that we begin this year, in a way that will spell out politicalization as organizational growth.

Third, is the bilingual pamphlet that cannot be separated from all the new internationalization of Philosophy and Revolution, and in which we have the chance to publish the brand new chapter written for those international editions on "Post-Mao China" jammed up with the voices from below. But again, it is here that our work first begins with the Chicano and Puerto Rican forces of revolt right here. There is not a single area, whether L.A. with its great Chicano communities, or New York with its Puerto Rican, or Chicago or Detroit, that will not be able to make the working out of this pamphlet -- that brings together theory and practice for this specific year and this specific audience -- another real link to organizational growth.

The point is to see that every new pamphlet, in the making and after it comes out, is a challenge to work it out for your local, for your shop, for your WL group, for your campus. Let's consider, for example, what we did and didn't do with New Essays last year, and what remains to be done in the coming one. That publication was also "unscheduled", though it had been a "wish" for some time. What gave it urgency was the trip to Europe and Andy succeeded in getting a beautiful edition off the press just in time for Bess, Eugene and Mary to take along with them. Just think of what is in those three essays and

-8-

Appendix. It is battle of ideas all over again and very explicitly so. That is easy to see in the very "New Essay" on Trotsky that is so exquisitely connected to the exchange with today's Trotskyist, Mandel -- you almost wish you didn't have to blame him on poor Trotsky. It is a real lesson in itself to see how, limited though Raya was by the editors, to only a few brief paragraphs in answer to Mandel, she nevertheless managed to pin him precisely on that male-chauvinism that is so directly tied to the evasion of theoretic responsibility and the reason he continues to be so totally wrong.

It isn't hard, either, to see the organizational relationship in the essay on Post-Mao China -- which is prominently dated, I'm sure you noticed, Nov. 1976, which shows at one glance that Raya was able to write this penetrating analysis almost the minute Mao died.

But take something a little harder to see, perhaps -- the HS/ talk on Absolute Idea, where Raya nevertheless saw to it that she singled out absolute negativity (which we read as revolution) as the specifically new beginning which then became an essay on Lenin vs. Adorno -- and brought in everything from East Europe to Frantz Fanon. It is a beautiful demonstration of what you can do politically-philosophically, no matter what your assignment was to begin with.

But what did we do with that pamphlet since it appeared all the way back in March? Well, Felix Martin was one (I leave you to answer how many others) who did not for one moment consider that pamphlet was for "academia" or "for Europe." He took it to his shopmates at GM and sold it widely -- to autoworkers, reporting simply, "The young workers in my plant are very interested in Mao and China. When the time comes, new ideas come up for philosophy and I believe the time is now." He and Tom did the same with the pamphlet on the First General Strike in the U.S. that Raya bent over backwards trying to make sure we saw it as today. It was Tom who reported, "The new 1877 pamphlet has excited not only Felix and me, but some plant workers here. Even one committeeman was so struck by the first chapter that he was compelled to challenge one dictatorial executive union meeting with, 'You, none of you, know anything about real unionism because you know nothing about the St. Louis General Strike!'"

In a different way, and to a different audience Terry and Ron, though Ron was limited to three short minutes at the Illinois Labor History Conference to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the strike, so successfully managed to get across both the historic continuity with Marx and the new for today, that Chicago wound up with a whole list of new friends, including two Puerto Rican intellectuals who have volunteered, and have already started, to translate articles into Spanish for the paper and for any leaflets we wish.

Let's take up the question of leaflets for a minute. Nobody has done better with them than L.A. Raya has called them their "concrete universal"; you have a whole series of them in their discussion bulletin, and the one that unifies American Civilization on Trial, America's First Unfinished Revolution, and the St. Louis General Strike is a beautiful example of how old pamphlets can become new when taken up creatively. Leaflets can become one of our most important weapons in the battle of ideas in the year ahead as we participate in all the new mass movements, working with them and challenging them to self-develop toward the new society we all want. Above all, the anti-nuclear movements must not be allowed to separate their ever-growing activity from the knowledge that revolution is the only alternative to war. And Jan has made an excellent point in her insistence that the separation between the environmental protesters and the workers is not only imposed from without by the capitalists, but is more serious

5757

-9-

where it is self-imposed -- and that the environmentalists who view the world through white middle-class eyes could make a great leap forward if they do not (or if we do not let them) separate their rightful concerns about conditions of the environment from the fundamental living conditions in the inner-cities of this world, or the working conditions in American factories and mines.

One of the most important movements with which we will be active next year will be the Kent students, who have already made one big leap forward over the protesters of 1970 by not separating Black and white. We are anxious to hear from them on their struggles, and to work out with them how also not to separate their revolt from a philosophy of liberation that gives action its direction, Marxist-Humanism. Their interest in bringing Raya to that campus next year to speak is another great leap.

Finally, there is Raya's tour. Whereas the tour last year was not so much for outside audiences as for ourselves, the concentration this year will be on the "outside." Not one to lose a moment's precious time, Bess began to find platforms for Raya the week before she left for the Plenum at the URPE conference in California. Preparation for the tour by every local should begin the minute we return from this meeting to our various localities, not only to obtain the best platforms possible, and to open up new areas for Marxist-Humanism, but to assure that our activity, from today to the day Raya appears on the platform in whatever locality, is the kind that will make those we individually meet and work with -- in Women's Liberation, in the Black revolt, in the shops, at school -- let nothing interfere with the universality of coming to hear the founder of all our ideas. Concentrating the tour this year on the outside instead of the inside does not mean it will not be organizational. The very opposite, if we finally grasp what politicalization means and do it.

In the discussion today we want to hear concretely how WL will be working out politicalization with Sexism, Politics and Revolution and with Working Women For Freedom; how our precious proletarianization can be deepened by it, if not widened in the year ahead; how our youth will work it out with the Kent students, the Black students, the working youth, the high school youth, to spell out "new generation of revolutionaries" concretely.

Politicalization means articulating your philosophy for a particular audience.

Politicalization means a mediation to reach a conclusion in fact.

Politicalization means your philosophy is not just philosophy but can actually influence the course of events.

Politicalization means taking revolutionary responsibilities seriously.

Above all, politicalization is urgent not just for "others" to understand our philosophy, but for us to grasp it fully.

Now -- let's go back to the beginning where we were posing some of the difficulties we face in winning new members to us. There is one more. The very fact that we make no distinction between inside and out -- that our paper is written as much if not more by the outside as the inside -- that we open not only our Conventions but even our Plenums to non-members; indeed, make it a point of concentration to bring as many non-members as possible, not only to listen, but to speak, and with the same time limit -- that we publish our draft perspectives

directly in our paper, something no other revolutionary organization anywhere has done -- that we have no secrets, no privileges -- this conscious breaking down of "outside" and "inside" sometimes makes it difficult to see what is the distinction, then, between joining and not joining. Well, it isn't just the profound distinction that Lenin spelled out when he said you could not be a member just by "agreeing" with the politics, unless you were disciplined by a local, by which he meant that intellectuals could not be revolutionaries "at large" but had to be disciplined by the proletariat. It is all that you gain by that discipline. A whole new dimension that is impossible without the organizational mediation, and that compels you to be active with Marxist-Humanism 24 hours a day because you know it is the road to revolution.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT. We have to ask those whom we have stopped calling "outside" and have begun calling, instead, "not yet members" -- what do you intend to do, when time is running out, if it is not to join with us in working out the revolutionary problems of our age so that the end we face is not the end of humanity, but the end of this stinking society and the creation of a new one.

That is what I am asking everyone here who is "not yet a member." We invite you to join with us this weekend in that great undertaking. Yes, it is true we are not on the threshold of a whole new International yet. But the ground for it has been dug and its roots are in the American experience. In this year of the exciting internationalization of philosophy and revolution we have to start here, right here. I hope the discussion will be full and free and very concrete..

-- Olga Domanski,
National Organizer