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January is the month of the brutal murder of Rosa Luxemburg, revolutionary theoretician, by the German Social Democratic Party (SPD) after the abortive 1919 Berlin revolution. Luxemburg was a leading figure in the international socialist movement, known for her contributions to Marxist theory and her advocacy for the working class. Despite her tragic death at the hands of the SPD, Luxemburg's ideas and legacy continue to inspire revolutionaries around the world.

Rosa Luxemburg
1910

In Paraguay, rumors of the sexual abuse of peasant girls, aged 8 to 14, in a house maintained and used by the Peruvian government, have been confirmed. The women who exposed this horror was herself imprisoned and tortured but escaped to the U.S. last year. Fortunately, she has provided a haven for Nati war criminals during his 23 years in power, and yet has received over $6 million a year in U.S. aid.

In Rome on Dec. 10. 5,000 women demonstrated to demand the right to free choice in having abortions in Italy. Speakers at a rally called for a referendum on the issue. Pro-life groups charged that the downturn of the government last year ...*

Over 4,000 women demonstrated in Keren, Eritrea on Nov. 1 to protest being treated as property and to demand freedom. The women seized the nation's struggle for independence from Ethiopia.

Marlene Roos Engel, a young Oglala Sioux woman who has been charged with murder for killing her husband while he was beating her, has been acquitted on the grounds of self-defense.

In the 59 years since, Luxemburg has been relegated to martyrdom by Marxists, and stripped of her sex by feminists who ignore her because she supposedly didn't to martyrdom by Marxists, and stripped of her sex by feminists who ignore her because she supposedly didn't...
Supervisors often have the job of juggling with the pressure of the production line to keep workers from striking or demanding better working conditions. The question of a new society turns on the question of association. The crisis of treasures is the strike question. The operators are demanding that they have the right to strike to defend their lives and their health. The safety problem won't be solved by the doctors. The question of this new world isn't going to be solved by the safety of the company itself. The answer by both labor representatives and the labor movement is bound by the contract language, and it says that disputes are to be solved through the grievance procedure.

The lifeblood of the labor movement has always been the wildcat strike. All unions, and especially those that are affiliated with the labor movement, need to make sure that the strong provisions in the contract to prohibit strikes and picketing are protected. With each passing day the struggle grows more intense. The miners are making this demand because the operators literally ignored their grievances and the grievances were ignored by the miners themselves. The miners refused to return to work until the grievances were addressed. They were not going to go back to work until they received a new contract that would protect their rights.

The miners have made this demand because the operators have ignored their grievances and the grievances are not being addressed. The miners refuse to return to work until the grievances are addressed. They were not going to go back to work until they received a new contract that would protect their rights. The miners are demanding that the company hire qualified workers to do the job and that the company take the necessary steps to ensure that the workers are protected.

The miners are demanding that the company hire qualified workers to do the job and that the company take the necessary steps to ensure that the workers are protected. The miners are demanding that the company hire qualified workers to do the job and that the company take the necessary steps to ensure that the workers are protected.
Detroit community demands Nazis out now!

Many people in the neighborhood have asked why the city administration has done nothing to get the Nazis out. When the Mayor and City Council were inaugurated on Jan. 4, we went to raise that question to them. The Jewish Labor Committee, and an organization of Welfare Activists, brought large groups to picket. And people going in said they supported our demands.

While people with their banners inside we unfurled a large banner reading "DETOUR WANTS NAZIS OUT NOW!" and chanted loudly just as Mayor Young began his first council meeting.

Anyone who watched the news that night, on any station, saw and heard their demand. They also heard the mayor say, "If you keep up, I'm going to want you out." The mayor still has not said or done anything about getting the Nazis out, despite his reputation for opposing racism as Detroit's first Black mayor.

The city administration and both newspapers have acted as if this racism is "unavoidable." The Detroit Evening News and Free Press, TV station, Channel 56, offered the Nazis a half hour of "public access," and only kept them off when they "violated guidelines" by giving their solution to racial problems: "We will either ship them back to Africa or plant them." They tried it both ways.

Those of us who have demonstrated, and the people we talk to in the neighborhood and around the city, are not confused and are not surprised that the Nazis are still in our neighborhood. As we go to press, News and Letters Committees and many other groups and individuals will demonstrate, showing the mayor and the city administration that the eviction notice will come due. We want the Nazis out now!

—Bob McGuire

University's fake senility

East Lansing, Mich.—The meaninglessness in the capitalist's idea of giving workers "seniority" has really become clear to me now as I started off my third year as a work-study student at Michigan State.

Their first consideration is your "level"—one, two, three. They would have you work three times as long as your neighbor getting the same pay. If a student works 100 hours or more in a term with a satisfactory "merit rating," he or she will be given a one-hour raise. I started out at M.S.U. at level one, (the lowest), and I am still a level one worker.

My first year, I worked at Brody (the largest non-military cafeteria in the U.S.), and I managed to get a 5 cent per hour raise. My sophomore year, I worked at the wine and cheese room and managed to get 10 cents in raises. This year, I am working in the Main Library as a shelfer. I would have had to start out at level one, but my raises during my first year put me over the base wage for a level one worker.

Upon receiving my first paycheck, I noticed I was earning the level one base wage ($2.25 per hour). I pointed this out to the director of libraries, and she responded, "Our workers are very much better off than your cafeteria work does not provide you with any relevant background experience."

Just how much "background experience" does one need in order to read the call number off a Scientific American journal? One hundred of other books and journals? Who are they trying to deceive? Work is work, whether that means doing menial tasks at Brody or running a disk washer in South Complex, or shelving books at the Main Library!

—M.S.U. Student

URPE formulas vs. live revolt

New York, N.Y.—At the recent meeting of the American Economic Association, the Marxist economists of the Union for Radical Political Economics (URPE) fought against the bourgeois economists.

The URPE panel on the current economic crisis, featuring David Gordon and Paul Sweezy, drew several hundred. Unfortunately, they treated Marxist economics as a series of formulas — falling rate of profit, long waves, underconsumption, etc. — over which they argued at a very abstract level.

Later, in a private session, they selected out of a "package" of bourgeois, and that history is not based on attitudes, but on economic relations.

These Marxist economists may be using different formulas than the bourgeois economists, but they are equally far removed both from the living human reality of capitalism and from the humanism of Marxism.

—CUNY student
Among non-Stalinist but leadership-conscious Marxists there is hardly a work that has gained the acclaim accorded to The Making of Marx’s CAPITAL by Roman Rosdolsky. This is partly because it has been brought out by Pluto Press in an English translation for the fantastic sum of $35. It is as if the price were not only a reflection of its contents but set to discourage its purchase, if not also, about the only available lengthy, serious commentary on Marx’s Grundrisse, which has only recently been published in English for the first time.

Roman Rosdolsky, a well-known Marxist theoretician, tells us that ever since 1948, when he obtained one of the first copies of the English translation, he had been studying that “rough draft” of Capital and set himself a two-fold task: (1) to write a commentary, or more precisely, an exposition of the new discovery “mainly in Marx’s own words”; and (2) to “make a scientific evaluation of some of the new findings which it contains.” Both these tasks, he says, comprise Rosdolsky’s original contribution. To it he devoted “The Grundrisse and Seven—Introduction,” mainly, the origin and structure of the work; and “Critical Excursions.” To these 225 pages should really be added some 35 pages (Part Six, “Conclusion”) which summarize what he found in the exposition and commentary of the work.* Since, as he correctly notes, “of all the problems in Marx’s entire system, that most important, that most original and that most neglected has been of his method both in general and, specifically, in relation to Hegel,” methodology is one of the principal sources of his critical excursion, but the reason for writing the whole of the 581 pages. I wish I could report that a genuine contribution to the study of马克思理论 has been made by Rosdolsky. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. If there is anything that is totally missing in his massive study, it is an adequate exposition of Hegel’s philosophy. In his introduction Rosdolsky makes a contribution to the comprehension of the Grundrisse (lots of quotations, especially on money, but no analysis), and sets himself a task which he does not accomplish: “the view of the historical sweep of Marx’s concept of what the totality of his greatest work was to be, or any understanding of Marx nevertheless decided to start everything anew.”

The Missing Dialectic

In his Preface Rosdolsky notes the significance of the Grundrisse, much less to say that “starting anew” meant Marx discarded the validity of the range of the “Rough Outline.” This is not in accord with the series of Letters on the Absolute Idea (She) in Hegel’s philosophy and in particular the concept of the “negation of the negation” a formidable instrument of interpretation of the revolutionary possibilities for our times. And just at the timing of the revolt in East Europe, she finally brought to completion Marxism and Freedom, published in 1958, which contained in the Appendix the first English translation of Hegel’s scientific and Philosophic manuscripts of Marx and the outline of Lenin’s notes on Hegel’s Science of Logic, preceded by an interesting introduction by Marxist Hegelianess.

In any trips abroad the author also entered into contact with the realities of the movement of liberation and the anti-colonial struggle of Africa and the Third World: cultural revolution. From these multiple stimuli he found his most complex and mature work, Philosophy and Revolution (1973) in which he wrote out not only his theory of the dialectic of today’s world revolution but also his personal flow of consciousness, that is, his long activity as theoretician and as militant.

The Book has as subtitle “From Hegel to Sartre and from Sartre to Marx.” Rosdolsky cannot be expected to consider it like the rest of the author’s works, only a book on philosophy or at best on Marxist theory. The subtitle does not mean that the totality of his work, according to which the revolution as a real movement, must have been put aside. Rosdolsky understands the name of the reason we must therefore pursue, according to the directions of the author, a double course: from practice to theory and from theory to practice. The double course is deadly for Rosdolsky, because it is considered a „reflection of materialism“ as well as the Kotzian distinctions of revolutionary “method” (the dialectics) from the Hegelianism with which he wants to be “as close as possible” for her rereading of the philosophy of Hegel, Marx, Lenin, Sartre, etc., offering above all an authentic Hegelianism. Only here is the answer found to the original question: “Why Hegel? Why now?”

There is no doubt that the major new conception for which Rosdolsky is known is his enthusiastic evaluation of Hegel’s philosophy and in particular of his dialectics. This dialectics is mainly Hegelian without having a sign of revision. There are many books of which Dunayevskaya was the first Marxist interpreter to appreciate unconditionally, the identification of the absolute idea with the movement “from subject to theory” of the philosophical identity of the subject and the object of theory and the practice in the revolutionary process. The philosophy is not opposed, as a “correct scientific viewpoint” to practice, which must “correct,” to the Hegelian philosophy. The development of self-consciousness of practice, is internal to it, and as such a direct function of organization.

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Among non-Stalinist but leadership-conscious Marxists there is hardly a work that has gained the acclaim accorded to The Making of Marx’s CAPITAL by Roman Rosdolsky. This is partly because it has been brought out by Pluto Press in an English translation for the fantastic sum of $35. It is as if the price were not only a reflection of its contents but set to discourage its purchase, if not also, about the only available lengthy, serious commentary on Marx’s Grundrisse, which has only recently been published in English for the first time.

Roman Rosdolsky, a well-known Marxist theoretician, tells us that ever since 1948, when he obtained one of the first copies of the English translation, he had been studying that “rough draft” of Capital and set himself a two-fold task: (1) to write a commentary, or more precisely, an exposition of the new discovery “mainly in Marx’s own words”; and (2) to “make a scientific evaluation of some of the new findings which it contains.” Both these tasks, he says, comprise Rosdolsky’s original contribution. To it he devoted “The Grundrisse and Seven—Introduction,” mainly, the origin and structure of the work; and “Critical Excursions.” To these 225 pages should really be added some 35 pages (Part Six, “Conclusion”) which summarize what he found in the exposition and commentary of the work.* Since, as he correctly notes, “of all the problems in Marx’s entire system, that most important, that most original and that most neglected has been of his method both in general and, specifically, in relation to Hegel,” methodology is one of the principal sources of his critical excursion, but the reason for writing the whole of the 581 pages. I wish I could report that a genuine contribution to the study of Marx’s theory has been made by Rosdolsky. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. If there is anything that is totally missing in his massive study, it is an adequate exposition of Hegel’s philosophy. In his introduction Rosdolsky makes a contribution to the comprehension of the Grundrisse (lots of quotations, especially on money, but no analysis), and sets himself a task which he does not accomplish: “the view of the historical sweep of Marx’s concept of what the totality of his greatest work was to be, or any understanding of Marx, which he ever introduced and which Rosdolsky has been studying to the totally new “Fetishism of Commodities” when he refers to the Taiping Revolution, as against the quiescent Economic Processes which were not considered revolutionary, defeats, as if China embarked on their revolution “to encounter its spirit.”

Rosdolsky on the other hand, who writes 501 pages to expound the Grundrisse, has no a word to say about the orientation of Marx’s Capital. In the new, totally new, concept of the Orient, especially, contained in “Pre-Capitalist Economic Forms”, though the period he wrote in “the spirit of Marxist theory” to which the other, the revolution as a real movement, advanced. The correct, read written text we must therefore pursue, according to the directions of the author, a double course: from practice to theory and from theory to practice. The double course is deadly for Rosdolsky, because it is considered a „reflection of materialism“ as well as the Kotzian distinctions of revolutionary “method” (the dialectics) from the Hegelianism with which he wants to be “as close as possible” for her rereading of the philosophy of Hegel, Marx, Lenin, Sartre, etc., offering above all an authentic Hegelianism. Only here is the answer found to the original question: “Why Hegel? Why now?”

There is no doubt that the major new conception for which Rosdolsky is known is his enthusiastic evaluation of Hegel’s philosophy and in particular of his dialectics. This dialectics is mainly Hegelian without having a sign of revision. There are many books of which Dunayevskaya was the first Marxist interpreter to appreciate unconditionally, the identification of the absolute idea with the movement “from subject to theory” of the philosophical identity of the subject and the object of theory and the practice in the revolutionary process. The philosophy is not opposed, as a “correct scientific viewpoint” to practice, which must “correct,” to the Hegelian philosophy. The development of self-consciousness of practice, is internal to it, and as such a direct function of organization.
Preface by Harry McShane

It is certainly a compliment—to be asked to write a Preface to another work by the tireless, sincere and scholarly author, Raya Dunayevskaya. She never lets up in her efforts to unearth and make use of what is basic in Marxist theory and to tie that up with the practical tasks that must be undertaken by the people they are directed to, as they find insoluble. Retrogression gets deeper in modern society.

The thought of the transformation of society coming from the masses is an indispensable element of Marxist theory fully expressed in the writings of both Marx and Lenin. Those who dispute his achievement of British theory, Raya Dunayevskaya and Paris Commune and how it affected Marx. The new kind of order initiated by the people of Paris won the admiration of Marx. What Marx said about this exciting historical episode should be read by all who would like to probe the depth of Marx’s revolutionary thinking. It was in the Commune that the act of self-government by the masses was initiated in such a way as to influence Marx, and, some years later, Lenin, the leader of the Russian Revolution. Bringing to life the admiration expressed by Marx, the author says, “The armed masses smashed parliamentarianism. The people’s assembly was not to be a parliamentary talk shop but a working body.”

One is tempted to devote more space to the Paris Commune than is permissible here, but the question must be put: Who, before reading the points made by Raya Dunayevskaya, suspected that the Paris Commune had anything in common with the Labor-Communists? Labor-Communists who, from the confines of value production “which robs the workers of all individuality and reduces them merely to a component of labour in general.” The author points out that new additions were introduced into the French edition of Capital. Marx makes the point himself. Before leaving this reference to the Paris Commune, it seems appropriate here to recall that Lenin, writing in 1919, accused leading socialists in Germany of failing “to understand the significance of Soviet, or proletarian democracy, in relation to the Paris Commune, its place in history, its necessity as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” Lenin, of course, said much more than that on the Paris Commune, and attached great importance to it.

When Raya Dunayevskaya writes of change coming from below she thinks not only of the world in which Marx lived; she relates the basic philosophy of Marx to the world of conflict in which we live and sees where the choice facing humanity is now. It is true that the crisis is so serious that unless some force exists that is capable of transforming society we may as well throw our hands up in despair. The force produced by the history and economics of capitalism is the proletariat. It is true that he wrote during a “free enterprise, private property, competitive capitalism era,” saw that, instead of leading to a “bourgeois idealism of the state-capitalist age.”

Raya Dunayevskaya underlines that the revolution, which Marx wrote of, was Marx in all his multitudinous and basic discoveries was “the distinction” Marx drew between “Utopian and scientific socialism,” as if Marx would not have stopped short merely peddle his view of Russia as “socialist,” and does not that the commodity labor-power appears in the shape of a commodity “which gives, or could give when not violated, action its direction.”

IN OUR DAY, we have the situation where a new French translation of Capital is introduced by that official. One of the main discoveries of the last 850 pages is that Marx’s “disordered” consciousness. And, for the English world, the beautiful, new capital edition is in

One of the most hopeful aspects of this Preface is the “real history” of the rise of capitalism instead of presenting it dialectically. Marx moved it to the end, not that the commodity labor-power appears in the shape of a commodity “which gives, or could give when not violated, action its direction.”

From the very beginning—in the first section Man- labor-power appears in the shape of a commodity “which gives, or could give when not violated, action its direction.”

The thought of the transformation of society coming from the masses is an indispensable element of Marxist theory fully expressed in the writings of both Marx and Lenin. Those who dispute his achievement of British theory, Raya Dunayevskaya and Paris Commune and how it affected Marx. The new kind of order initiated by the people of Paris won the admiration of Marx. What Marx said about this exciting historical episode should be read by all who would like to probe the depth of Marx’s revolutionary thinking. It was in the Commune that the act of self-government by the masses was initiated in such a way as to influence Marx, and, some years later, Lenin, the leader of the Russian Revolution. Bringing to life the admiration expressed by Marx, the author says, “The armed masses smashed parliamentarianism. The people’s assembly was not to be a parliamentary talk shop but a working body.”

One is tempted to devote more space to the Paris Commune than is permissible here, but the question must be put: Who, before reading the points made by Raya Dunayevskaya, suspected that the Paris Commune had anything in common with the Labor-Communists? Labor-Communists who, from the confines of value production “which robs the workers of all individuality and reduces them merely to a component of labour in general.” The author points out that new additions were introduced into the French edition of Capital. Marx makes the point himself. Before leaving this reference to the Paris Commune, it seems appropriate here to recall that Lenin, writing in 1919, accused leading socialists in Germany of failing “to understand the significance of Soviet, or proletarian democracy, in relation to the Paris Commune, its place in history, its necessity as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” Lenin, of course, said much more than that on the Paris Commune, and attached great importance to it.

When Raya Dunayevskaya writes of change coming from below she thinks not only of the world in which Marx lived; she relates the basic philosophy of Marx to the world of conflict in which we live and sees where the choice facing humanity is now. It is true that the crisis is so serious that unless some force exists that is capable of transforming society we may as well throw our hands up in despair. The force produced by the history and economics of capitalism is the proletariat. It is true that he wrote during a “free enterprise, private property, competitive capitalism era,” saw that, instead of leading to a “bourgeois idealism of the state-capitalist age.”

Raya Dunayevskaya underlines that the revolution, which Marx wrote of, was Marx in all his multitudinous and basic discoveries was “the distinction” Marx drew between “Utopian and scientific socialism,” as if Marx would not have stopped short merely peddle his view of Russia as “socialist,” and does not that the commodity labor-power appears in the shape of a commodity “which gives, or could give when not violated, action its direction.”

IN OUR DAY, we have the situation where a new French translation of Capital is introduced by that official. One of the main discoveries of the last 850 pages is that Marx’s “disordered” consciousness. And, for the English world, the beautiful, new capital edition is in

One of the most hopeful aspects of this Preface is the “real history” of the rise of capitalism instead of presenting it dialectically. Marx moved it to the end, not that the commodity labor-power appears in the shape of a commodity “which gives, or could give when not violated, action its direction.”

From the very beginning—in the first section Man- labor-power appears in the shape of a commodity “which gives, or could give when not violated, action its direction.”
type of materialism expounded by many Marxist writers, to Lenin
dialectics was the proof of working people changing society. The
relevance of Marxists to give sufficient attention to the
Humanist Essays that
Marx produced in 1845 is likewise pertinent. The
presentation of material is presented by the author to give fresh meaning to Marxism.

Just as Marx and Lenin would, the author repudiates any suggestion
that theory and practice can be separated. They are related dialectically.
The present situation should bring about their higher unity; this is
the author's purpose. She has identified herself with the concrete struggles for
freedom in East Europe, in Africa and in Latin America. She has thrown
herself into the Women's Liberation movement now gaining strength,
just as she has participated actively in the Black movement for more
than a quarter of a century.

In this new work, as in all she writes, she makes visible the banner
of freedom. What is basic for her is the curtailment of freedom under the
present social order. The how and why of it is explained in the
chapters on Marx's Capital. It is important that these chapters be read
by all interested in the industrial disputes and the problem of unemploy­
ment. Why is it that in Britain while the balance of payments is im­
proved by the flow of North Sea oil, the number of unemployed has
turned a record figure? What produces the problem of investment?
What events caused Marx to make changes in the structure of Capital?

The recent virulent racialism and openly Nazi National Front ac­
tivity in Britain are today compelling even the bureaucratic Labour
leaders to take a second look at Marx's famous statement: "Labour in
the white skin cannot be free so long as labour in the Black skin
is branded." This was neither beautiful rhetoric, nor intended only for
the U.S. audience. It is so relevant to our day and age on both sides of
the Atlantic that ours is the generation that can fully understand Marx's
restructuring of Capital and the consequent struggles for the shortening of the working day both
great Britain and in the U.S.

The top politicians who have been tinkering with the economic prob­
lems plagues society have long since given up hope of getting any
solution from the writings of the late Lord Keynes or anyone else. They
would do well to read Raya Dunayevskaya's Karl Marx.

There is nothing dull in her writing. The reader feels that he
or she is being allowed to see the world through Tony Cliff's eyes.
The road to freedom and human emancipation — is there for all to see, even if it
is hard and uphill.

S. Edition

AND FROM CRITIQUE OF TONY CLIFF IN APPENDIX

Marx's Capital has gone on many adventures after
the author's death, 1932. These became known when
the death of his lifelong collaborator, Engels, 1895. The first revolutionary
to question Marx's theory of expanded
capitalism was his lifelong collaborator, Engels, 1895. The first revolutionary to
question Marx's theory of expanded
capitalism was Engels himself. The second
was who, with her brilliant pamphlet, Reform or Revolu­tion?
, had bested the revisionists who challenged Marx's
economic interpretations. This was the
moment when the author claimed, a "supple­ment," or a revision—were still
on the greatest of all the great
Marxist revolutionaries: the betrayal of the German Social Democracy
at the outbreak of World War I.

Under the circumstances, Lenin (who had made an
outlining of his critique in seven volumes, under the
claim that he was developing a "new version of underconsumptionism
not unlike the Narodniks) changed his mind. Instead, he
embraced on something totally new and totally apart from what all other
Marxist revolutionaries who had not betrayed were doing. Lenin, at one and the same
time, along with taking the most extreme anti-war position,
calling for the transformation of the imperialist war into a
civil war, plunged into the study of Hegel's Science of

A MARXIST economist like Tony Cliff is in little
agreement with Hegelian dialectics 62 years after
Lenin's break that he fails to see the relevance of Lenin's
study of Hegelian dialectics into his own works or to Lenin's
immaterialist. The miniscule Chapter
4, of five pages, Tony Cliff devotes to the question, with the
excuse that he will deal with it in his third volume
"which will deal with the Communist International." He
will then develop his theory (his, not Lenin's, analysis
of imperialism). He, of course, has a point of view of his
own. But that cannot be used as
ground for not facing Lenin's theory at the time when, and the
manner in which Lenin developed it...

Tony Cliff remains unmoved, deaf to the integral­
ity of Lenin's analysis of the economic world
of the present. He is so preoccupied with the "breadth of analysis of
Luxemburg or Hilferding," not to mention Bukharin,
that it is not surprising when he
leaves out of his study of Lenin, it
shouldn't revolutionary Marxists instead be preoccu­
pated with whether we are headed in the direction of
...
that the U.S. has to unite with its global enemy, Russia, if it, not Egypt, had taken the initiative for a new stage of the war.

No doubt U.S. imperialism's role will be the decisive one, but the U.S. is under pressure from the world, and this pressure will lead, perhaps, to a new stage of the war, which will be won by the U.S.

We have to understand that the U.S. has to unite with its global enemy, Russia, if it, not Egypt, had taken the initiative for a new stage of the war.

The truth, however, is that the first Arab war against Israel was not won by the U.S., but by the Jews. The U.S. will have no part of little powers setting the tune.

Finally, and most important, there were many revolu-
tionaries in the world who opposed the creation of an all-Jewish state. The U.S. has been left in no doubt that it will pay a high price for any new outbreak of war, even if that means a new war.

TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5) that he asked even those who had read it in the original to read the new French edition (1872-75) since it "possesses a new and independent aspect of the original." Rosdolsky, on the other hand, is virtually obsessed with the "movement from the abstract to the concrete" as if it were the only one.

It is true Rosdolsky has made some valuable contributions, the most important being that he makes clear that in the final analysis, the materialism of Marx is Hegelian. And if Rosdolsky, in his book, is to be believed, it is a matter of who won the Hegelian materialism of Marx to Hegel of the mature Marx, the Marx of the Grundrisse, 1857-58, and the "scientific" socialism of Capital, 1867-68, and the Marx of the "scientific" socialism of Capital.

It is also valuable when Rosdolsky demonstrates that, although Marx finished only three books after he outlined six, what he had to be left out, like the book on Landed Property, actually was incorporated in the part on Bent in Volume III, and Rosdolsky does indeed say (p. 610) "At any rate, it is not the case that (1) the historic sweep of Marx's famous chapter, "Historical Tendency of Accumulation," is a bari-

In the excuse that, "tempting" as discussions of value would be, it is outside the confines of his study, Rosdolsky is right and wrong. And since the authorship of his book is denied to Rosdolsky, as far as I can see, it is the case that Rosdolsky is right.

In my commentary, I stated that this was but the reflection of "economic reality," that is to say, if it is "true.

In the excuse that, "tempting" as discussions of value would be, it is outside the confines of his study, Rosdolsky is right and wrong. And since the authorship of his book is denied to Rosdolsky, as far as I can see, it is the case that Rosdolsky is right.

It is also valuable when Rosdolsky demonstrates that, although Marx finished only three books after he outlined six, what he had to be left out, like the book on Landed Property, actually was incorporated in the part on Bent in Volume III, and Rosdolsky does indeed say (p. 610) "At any rate, it is not the case that (1) the historic sweep of Marx's famous chapter, "Historical Tendency of Accumulation," is a bari-

In the excuse that, "tempting" as discussions of value would be, it is outside the confines of his study, Rosdolsky is right and wrong. And since the authorship of his book is denied to Rosdolsky, as far as I can see, it is the case that Rosdolsky is right.
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In the excuse that, "tempting" as discussions of value would be, it is outside the confines of his study, Rosdolsky is right and wrong. And since the authorship of his book is denied to Rosdolsky, as far as I can see, it is the case that Rosdolsky is right.

It is also valuable when Rosdolsky demonstrates that, although Marx finished only three books after he outlined six, what he had to be left out, like the book on Landed Property, actually was incorporated in the part on Bent in Volume III, and Rosdolsky does indeed say (p. 610) "At any rate, it is not the case that (1) the historic sweep of Marx's famous chapter, "Historical Tendency of Accumulation," is a bari-

In the excuse that, "tempting" as discussions of value would be, it is outside the confines of his study, Rosdolsky is right and wrong. And since the authorship of his book is denied to Rosdolsky, as far as I can see, it is the case that Rosdolsky is right.

In my commentary, I stated that this was but the reflection of "economic reality," that is to say, if it is "true.

In the excuse that, "tempting" as discussions of value would be, it is outside the confines of his study, Rosdolsky is right and wrong. And since the authorship of his book is denied to Rosdolsky, as far as I can see, it is the case that Rosdolsky is right.

It is also valuable when Rosdolsky demonstrates that, although Marx finished only three books after he outlined six, what he had to be left out, like the book on Landed Property, actually was incorporated in the part on Bent in Volume III, and Rosdolsky does indeed say (p. 610) "At any rate, it is not the case that (1) the historic sweep of Marx's famous chapter, "Historical Tendency of Accumulation," is a bari-

In the excuse that, "tempting" as discussions of value would be, it is outside the confines of his study, Rosdolsky is right and wrong. And since the authorship of his book is denied to Rosdolsky, as far as I can see, it is the case that Rosdolsky is right.

In my commentary, I stated that this was but the reflection of "economic reality," that is to say, if it is "true.
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triumph, without in any way revealing the intra-Arab counter-revolutionary role of welcoming Syria's inter­

internationalism. In any case, the unifying element for Israeli-Arab wars was never revolution, but simply and purely anti-Israel. And, along with the goal of "driving Israel into the sea" came unconvincing alliances with Russia. Which, in turn, con­

unifying U.S. imperialism that it had but "one outpost"—

Israel — in the Middle East against its global enemy, Russia. That is no longer true. And though the U.S. is no longer in a position to unite the world, the world is a lot closer to the point where it is again possible to unite the world.

Because of the Palestinian preoccupation with Israel as Enemy No. 1, however, (and the PLO playing political
games in the UN to get the Resolution equating Zionism to South African racism passed), the revolution in Lebanon has been totally overshadowed. Even so that we remember that it had been for a long time along class lines, and when it finally erupted, supported also by the neo-Nazi Christian Right massacres of Palestinians returning from a Reaction Front meet­

the Palestinians worked as one with the Lebanese revolutionaries.

Because of the Palestinian preoccupation with Israel as Enemy No. 1, however, (and the PLO playing political
games in the UN to get the Resolution equating Zionism to South African racism passed), the revolution in Lebanon has been totally overshadowed. Even so that we remember that it had been for a long time along class lines, and when it finally erupted, supported also by the neo-Nazi Christian Right massacres of Palestinians returning from a Reaction Front meet­

the Palestinians worked as one with the Lebanese revolutionaries.

Debbie, "As we know the armed liberation struggle requires the mobilization and organization of a significant ma­

signifying the setback and the opening up of new opportuni­
ties of labor and life to anti-Israel.

The revelation of all this is that what so shook up the Whole industrial world—Japan and West Europe, not to mention raising China to super-power

family borders with invasion, then declaring "the Year of. 1

As we know the armed liberation struggle requires the mobilization and organization of a significant ma­

signifying the setback and the opening up of new opportuni­
ties of labor and life to anti-Israel.

The revelation of all this is that what so shook up the Whole industrial world—Japan and West Europe, not to mention raising China to super-power

family borders with invasion, then declaring "the Year of. 1

As we know the armed liberation struggle requires the mobilization and organization of a significant ma­

signifying the setback and the opening up of new opportuni­
ties of labor and life to anti-Israel.

The revelation of all this is that what so shook up the Whole industrial world—Japan and West Europe, not to mention raising China to super-power

family borders with invasion, then declaring "the Year of. 1

As we know the armed liberation struggle requires the mobilization and organization of a significant ma­

signifying the setback and the opening up of new opportuni­
ties of labor and life to anti-Israel.

The revelation of all this is that what so shook up the Whole industrial world—Japan and West Europe, not to mention raising China to super-power
MARCUS'S CAPITAL AND TODAY'S GLOBAL CRISIS

The "Movement" here cannot seem to see outside of Britain. Nothing is said on the danger coming from East Europe or China and its effect on steel. The oil companies are controlling it. It started out in the Middle East and then write off taxes and plants could get cheaper labor. If you read the financial pace you will see that they have to deal with the fascist Portugal. It appears that when they turned to Russia and East Europe are providing a small amount of "aid.")

It is right that concern should be expressed about unemployment. That, however, cannot prevent us from seeing the world of which it is a part. On the 130th anniversary of the Communist Manifesto. And, of course, the new joint British-U.S. pamphlet. We have to confront the movement with their departure from the principles of working class solidarity.

Harry McShane
Glasgow

I'm concerned about the imports in this country coming from East Europe and China and its effect on steel. The oil companies are controlling it. It started out in the Middle East and then write off taxes and plants could get cheaper labor. If you read the financial pace you will see that they have to deal with the fascist Portugal. It appears that when they turned to Russia and East Europe are providing a small amount of "aid.")
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A LETTER FROM AN ISRAELI LEFTIST
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some demonstrators beaten by police riot squads, and injured many in the crowd.

These same groups refused to participate in the protest at the inauguration of the new US president. And the fact that the German Women's Movement, by those who stand to be victims of them, consider them inferior,'call them Black activists.

I recently came across the following 1915 quote by the Irish revolutionary James Connolly: to me it expresses so beautifully what we as Marxist-Humanists are saying for our age. Women as revolutionary reason.

"The working class of Ireland must cheer on the efforts of those women who, facing an age war and butchery the lette ters of the ages, have arisen to strike them off, and cheer all the louder if it all be hard, and need for freedom, the women's army forges ahead of the militant army of Labour."

Women's Liberation Chicago

Black Activist Los Angeles

One thing that really disturbs me here in Botswana, is that there are more people in the world, having always been completely nomadic and able to survive where no agriculture is. The Bushmen, of course, are treated. Like the Basarwa (Bushmen) people are treated. Like the Arab rulers. Their mutual desire for the oil fields of the world. Their shared Arab genius.

Prisoner California

I am aware of the cold murder of Steve Biko that you wrote about in N&L. That is what much more they have been in this racist U.S.A., for we must struggle each day that passes to maintain our forces of the capitalists. As George Jackson stated, it transforms the Black criminal mentality into a Black revolutionary mentality. You learn the battles of a cell and you learn to know your keepers. I have also come to know freedom of the press, would also help. For further information or to send help, write to: Diethus Bikila, 1122 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Prisoner Illinois

URANIUM AND INDIAN LANDS

The Geneva Conference on the "Indigenous Americans" produced some exciting reflections and a couple of radical resolutions, including one urging the new UN Institute on Transnationals to investigate invasion of Indian lands by transnationals as a matter of first priority. I have witnessed the bedazzling power of editors, imprisonments without trial. The press represented those arrested as "anarchists." It was launched when some groups denounced the deaths of Baader, Enns and Rassmussen. The Canada newspapers, arrested for editing a "banned pamphlet, Working Women for Freedom for the unity of worker and intellectual, philosophy and revolution, could be heard, and the unity of worker and intellectual, philosophy and revolution, could be worked out for our age. A Black production worker, Charles Denby, is a first-class example of a worker who has been able to work out a theory of liberation for our age.

For more information on classes in your area, contact the News and Letters Committee nearest you listed on page 3.
Carter's 'human rights' drive excludes Blacks

In December, 1977, President Carter told Black leaders: "We have not been able to come up with any solution to problems of urban areas. We are working as hard as we can on it." And in a year-end, hour-long TV interview, the President said that the problem of unemployment was different from any international problem, and that the leaders in Western Europe were having the same problem with little success too.

The upshot is that the President has no solution to the problems of unemployment, and most especially to the problems of Black unemployment. This "showcasing" style of the President was evident at his inaugural when he walked to the White House in central cities, i.e., ghettoized cities, and Black human rights substantive achievements, insofar as Black Americans Carter appeared before the Urban League Convention, ending in getting Carter's support for the eviscerated Black Progressive Labor Party.

American citizens serve as hard currency in a thriving market black that avoids government lines.

Every official organization for workers, from trade unions to workers' councils, is in the service of the state plan. Thus, human rights miners recreated their jobs to protect and maintain the status of a thirteen member "council of elders." The great strike against private capitalists in 1929 in Rumania resulted in getting Carter's support for the eviscerated Black Progressive Labor Party.

The workers took something from their own history to fight Ceausescu, who is known for his independent national policies and his vision of a self-reliant Rumanian state. They had already tried an uprising in the tractor and truck plants where workers destroyed machines and wrote, "Down with Ceausescu.'

The machines are dear to Ceausescu, whose authoritarian regime runs everything according to a state plan. The increase in production quotas is to further the policy of investment in hard industry at the expense of consumer goods. American cigarettes serve as hard currency in a thriving black market black that avoids government lines.

"I have no jurisdiction there," and "The ultimate decision is the right one!" These Remarks came out of the mouth of the same U.S. President who took the time to write a letter of encouragement to the human rights activist in Russia, Andrei Sakharov.

In case the President does not know it, the dissenters in Russia are opposing the same type of injustice that exists in the U.S. But what Carter apparently does understand is that injustice to Blacks in his neighborhood does not make problems for him and he is not even aware of it.

"It is just such political 'expediency' by world leaders that delegitimates all struggles for human liberation," Black leaders are quoted as saying.

When the Carter Administration supported the arms embargo against South Africa, it was with the same cynical and hypocritical logic that since South Africa has long been self-sufficient in manufacturing arms to suppress Black Revolution. If Carter was trying to make inroads into the African continent, he might well have asked himself: how would the campaigns of the Black bourgeoisie, which would really have affected the economy of South Africa, have beenrgbetter for the U.S. State Department. Carter has no intention of raising the Khashoggi issue as long as it might offend the Shah.

"We are watching him very closely."

The American people have already despised the President. They want to see him, "I have no jurisdiction there." They want to see him, "The ultimate decision is the right one!" They want to see him, "I have no jurisdiction there." They want to see him, "The ultimate decision is the right one!"