

C. L. R. James

On Notes on Dialectics: Two Lectures

First Session: June 12, 1971

Detroit, Michigan

(Taping started approximately 15 minutes late.)

high (the best of the) Notesbooks
[initials]

... [It was] "the LEAP" that enabled him [Lenin] to understand that the soviet represented a leap. The revolution didn't take place bit by bit. "Opposition to gradualism" meant that the Soviet was always there. It was the "Other" of the political-economic system in Russia. It was there, otherwise it couldn't leap out in 1917.

... Now what I am going to do today – I am not going to talk about quantity, and quality – and water. You know water? You have a little pool of water, the water increases, it increases, you have a lake. So that quantity changes into quality; you began with a little pool and you have a lake. And then the lake – you have to decide – the lake runs into a river down into the sea, so you have to work out the measure – the measure of the original pool, then it becomes a lake, then it runs into the sea... (These are absolutely ridiculous analogies because they confuse and switch people off.) Then there is another one – steam from the kettle. Then there is everybody talks about, you have capitalism, then there is the proletariat, which is the opposite, then capitalism is negated by the proletariat which is negating, and so on; those things lead to nothing else but confusion. I know it, I have met it. I'm going to stick today to a certain dialectic which will show you certain things which you need to know, and make you aware of what you don't know –

the immense amount of serious study you have to make to understand dialectical materialism.

I want to begin with politics today. With the leadership and the societies and the quality of those who are leading. We have a new phenomenon in bureaucracies. Over half the world: China – the rules of China constitute a bureaucracy. The rulers of Russia and Eastern Europe constitute a bureaucracy. And the problem with China – I mention this – the Cultural Revolution is due to the fact that Mao thought that the bureaucracy that he himself had built – if he died and left it – it would develop ultimately into what had taken place in Russia and it would be the death of the revolution; as to the means he chose and the success, that's something else. But the Cultural Revolution was not about Culture; it was to use the youth to get the revolution moving because he saw what was taking place and I never believe that a political doesn't see what I, from here, can see.

So I want to take to-day the leadership that exists in many parts of the world; the potential leadership and work out its dialectic so that you can get some conception of what the dialectic means. It's a method of thought, it's the way you think. Then tomorrow I will go more closely into the logical statements of the development. But the first thing is to understand that we are dealing with something that resists (?), that requires great historical knowledge.

Please begin on page 201.

Now capitalism was established in the 16th and 17th century. But the rulers of capitalist capital (?) and the rulers of France in particular were not suitable to the new capitalist system. They were people who were the landed aristocracy. And the same people rule in Britain. The revolution in Britain as was the one in France, was the

attempt to get a kind of leadership which was more suitable to the capitalist system. But don't make the mistake that those who were doing it knew then that they were fixing up something that was suitable to the capitalist system. ~~Not~~ at all. The revolution appeared the revolution that matters to us today appeared between 1640 and 1649. Page 201: The ruler of England – the king, and the landed aristocracy had to be removed. What the Puritan Revolution did was to remove them. And who constituted the Puritan revolutionaries? They were for the most part the petty-bourgeois but the petty-bourgeois peasantry, the yeomen and the petty-bourgeois of the towns. So what I want you to do – and get into the habit of doing when looking at the past is to look at them, and see what they are and see what is their 'Other'; what is in them that they themselves don't know very well. What I have called here on page 201, their "Ideality". ~~And~~ we can begin to understand dialectic when we can look back and see that.

Now there is a mistake here on page 201. I say, "These revolutionists did not dare openly to repudiate the Crown and the House of Lords." That is quite wrong. They put forward – the heads of them put forward – ~~they~~ ^{philosophers that} said: we want to finish off with the monarchy; we want to finish off with the House of Lords: throw them out altogether; we want to have the houses of parliament, the members of parliament arranged according to constituencies, according to population; members of parliament must be paid and the House of Parliament must be called once a year. Now we know what that was. Quite often it is difficult to find people ^{who} to understand: what they were talking about was what? Can anybody attempt to answer? (A voice: "Direct Democracy") Political democracy. It wasn't direct democracy. But they were putting forward – in other words, they were an army, they fought the King; they were Cromwell's Model Army. They fought the King

and later on they fought Cromwell for these things. But what they had in mind, their "ideality" was political democracy, something that didn't come until two hundred years afterwards.

And now we come to something that is very important in regard to Hegel. Hegel says that a political experience, a social experience of a certain class — although the class may come to nothing it is always stored up. And the next time the class appears it will start form where it left off the last time. It might be a hundred or two hundred years before that. But Lenin ^{also} was very clear about that. It will always begin at the highest peak where it left off the last time. That is the dialectic — it was there. Although they made the application of democracy — they voted to apply democracy. But there was more to it than that. Let's turn ^{to} page 202. On paragraph 4 you will see: this program that was the 'Other', that was the 'ideality' of the Puritans, that small body of men that fought in the New Model Army, that program did not come into existence until two hundred years after. It began to take place in Britain about 1832, and gradually, until in 1927 the women got the vote. But it was put forward in 1640 and 1649. and you have to be aware that with whatever they were doing there, there was something else. The great point of the Hegelian ^{is} is that the 'Other' is always there. That is what meant by the unity of opposites. And when things change, they do not change into something unexpected or something that came form heaven, it comes from something that is inside the object. What you didn't see ^{it} — that is your misfortune. Some very great people have not seen it.

When the Soviets ^[Lenin] appeared in 1905 the acutest political mind, particularly in regard to Russia, he didn't see that this was happening. And although it happened in 1905

- ~~come~~ ^{again} in 1917 ~~and again he...~~ but he was different from the others in that he could see it. He ~~says~~ ^{said}: this means that this whole society has moved forward. [new]

So that what the Puritans were putting forward in 1640 to 1649 only began to take effect in England, the practical actuality in 1832 when the rotten boroughs ~~were~~ ^{of this system of was} thrown out. Now go over to page 204, please. And I'm looking forward one day in the not so distant future ^{to} seeing a work appear on the French Revolution. Long, long ago I wrote that we should do some work on the English Revolution, and we should do some work on the French Revolution. I was not only concerned that you should learn some history; why should I be concerned that you should learn some history? The ideas, the political ideas which we know as Marxism are dependent on the understanding of these revolutionary developments. And when we see page 204, we will see the statement: Past Ideality and Concrete Reality in the French Revolution. When the French Revolution broke out in 1789 it was again the petty-bourgeoisie but now they were larger and stronger; the petty-bourgeoisie of the towns were the Sansculottes; the petty-bourgeoisie in the countryside were the immense numbers of the French peasants. And what do we know if we understand the development of Ideality. Right at the beginning they established democracy.

You know it's very hard especially for people brought up in an empirical country like the United States to understand that there is a logic in the development of history. They immediately established democracy. 1st paragraph, p. 204. "The new addition is the intelligentsia, a body of professional men, lawyers, doctors, technical, scientific, literary, journalistic and clerical." Now it's 'Ideality' as I write it in the next paragraph, couldn't have been democracy, because democracy was already established as a conception by the

English Revolution

petty-bourgeoisie in the ~~British~~ Revolution. There began the democracy. They established democracy in the municipalities, in the cities of France and everywhere the democratic system was firmly established. Where there was trouble was in the Chamber of Deputies ^{and} the Convention, ~~I mean the Constitution~~ ^{although there was trouble} - there was trouble. But in France, in various places, they established democracy. They started off where the others had. And now we come to a very important page, which I will tell you is on page 204-205.

Let me talk to you and don't worry with the books. They established democracy in all the towns and villages, in the villages particularly, democracy was established all over France. Some of the finest historical writing in the world is by Michelet ^{the French historian} when he writes how democracy was established in the mass of the population by French peasants and the French workers in the towns. He said, they established the French Revolution. They made the French nation. But was the their 'Ideality'? ^{what} What did they have in mind? Does one look at them to-day ^{in - ing} what can we see ^{what} was there - the 'Other', so to speak? The 'Other' as I write there was nothing less than State Capitalism. ~~of today~~. State capitalism was the 'Other', the 'Ideality' of the French. Now that would not surprise anybody who has studied the French Revolution closely. ^{is} Because the French have an expression for it. They call it - does anybody know? - the Economie dirige ^(spelling?). The economy that ^{is} was directed. And Robespierre, and the Mountain and the left and ~~those~~ the army ^(?), that to win the war and defeat the enemy they had to mobilize the population, the mass of the population, the Sansculottes and the peasantry. But to do that they had to carry out some of the demands of the sansculottes and of the peasantry. And the sansculottes and the peasantry were demanding that prices should be kept down - there should be a maximum, and that the prices should not be raised higher; that the rich pay the expenses

of the war; and there should be some control of the economy. Particularly, the selling of the land of aristocrats and traitors, etc, by and large, the holding of prices and wages and all that; in other words, the petty-bourgeois – not as in 1649, democracy – but they had reached, in order to maintain the revolution, with demanding that the economy be run by those in charge. And I call that state capitalism. They weren't thinking in those terms of course. They were concerned with what was needed in order to defeat the aristocrats and preserve the gains of the revolution. (And when the question time comes I hope you will ask me what happened in Santo Domingo in regards to this State Capitalism. It reached further there than anywhere else.)

So that the "Ideality" of the petty-bourgeoisie is revolutionary in 1640 to 1649; that was democracy. By the time we reach France in 1789, the ideality is state capitalism. They don't intend to do it; they had no such concept in them. But if you look at it in the light of what had happened afterwards, that's what they were doing. And the French economy right up to to-day they call it the "economie dirigée" (spelling): the economy that was directed. It couldn't have been very well directed. To have an economy well directed you need transport, easy roads, telephones and so forth. The main elements – that's what they were trying to do. When they were defeated that disappeared. There appears a new section of the petty bourgeoisie – the labor leaders.

The proletariat now organizes and produces a body of labor leaders. And that is very strange to me – when we look at these things – in 1848 Engels tells us that from 1789 the proletariat had come out five times in France: it came out in 1789, it came out on the 10th of August 1792, it came out in 1793, it came out twice in 1795 and it had come out in 1830 so the proletariat says when it came out in 1848: it didn't get what it

wanted. In 1830 they changed the Bourbon King to the Orleans. So they came out again
in 1848. and the proletariat said: we do not want a democratic revolution; we have gotten
blows all the time – this revolution is to be a socialist revolution. What did they want,
we don't know. They couldn't say. When you asked them they didn't know. But they
said, we don't want a republic. Because we get blows by means of that. And what is
very fascinating is that the bourgeoisie says, OK. And then the proletariat organizes itself
and the bourgeoisie got into power and Marx writes the 18th Brumaire, very fine, the best
history book that I know; and when the proletariat formed some organizations, and what
did they set out? These petty-bourgeoisie leaders of the proletarian movement? They set
out to build large workshops for people to go to work. In other words, the conception of
state capitalism which they called the economie dirige (? spelling), the instinct to run the
economy – in 1848, when the workers were by themselves, they say, alright, build some
workshops and have some work. But the petty bourgeoisie were by that time some
political leaders of the labor movement. And Karl Marx wrote a description of them,
which is one of the most astonishing pieces of writing which you can find anywhere.

Page 213. Marx is writing of them in the Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, which
is the finest history book that I know. Now we have been watching the petty-bourgeoisie
when revolutionary. 1640 to '49, they are revolutionary from 1789 to 1793 or '94. They
are revolutionary in 1848, but by 1848 they are joined by the labor leadership, because
the society is changing – when people who were one set of people and a small lot in 1649
are not a larger lot. And the proletariat which was not clear in 1649 – were not at all clear
of what they were about in 1789 – 1848 it is there. So the proletariat produces leaders
who join up with the old petty bourgeoisie leaders and they produce a program. This is

what Karl Marx has to say – let's have a little fun. Page 213. They are for democracy now. And they want to establish democracy. You remember the democratic ideas of the Puritans were for the sake of carrying the revolution to its success, not for the sake of democracy. In 1789, the economie dirigee was for the sake of carrying on the war in such a way that the enemy could be defeated. But by 1848, we have a new petty bourgeoisie, something new appears. The petty-bourgeoisie is now what it was. Let us read p. 213.

“...But the democrat because he represents the petty-bourgeoisie therefore a transition class in which the interests of two classes are simultaneously deadened, imagines himself elevated above class antagonism generally... What they represent are the people's rights: what interests them are the people's interests. According when a struggle is impending, they do not need to examine the interests and positions of the different class. They do not need to consider their own resources too critically. They have merely to give the signal and the people with all its inexhaustible resources, will fall upon the oppressors. If in the performance their interests now prove to be uninteresting and their power to be impotence, then either the fault lies with pernicious sophists, who split the indivisible people into different hostile camps, or the army was too brutalized and blinded to apprehend the pure aims of democracy as best for itself, or the whole thing has had for this time spoilt the game. In any case, the democrat comes out of the most disgraceful defeat just as immaculate as he went into it innocent, with his party have to give up the old standpoint, but, on the contrary, that conditions have to ripen in his directions.”

Those are the petty-bourgeoisie democrats. But you begin to understand them when you realize where they were in 1649, and what they were in 1789 to 1794, and what's happened to them in 1848. the petty-bourgeoisie is no longer revolutionary. That is what you have to remember. Good. The dialectic means you have to track it and follow them.

And the petty-bourgeoisie has now been joined by the labor leaders who are petty-bourgeoisie democrats. By the time they reach 1870 what has happened? The ^{1st} ~~1st~~ ^{First} International is formed. And we have a statement by Karl Marx in the formation of the ^{1st} ~~1st~~ ^{First} International: the leadership against the oppression of bourgeois society is no longer the petty-bourgeoisie. It is the labor leadership. The labor leadership did not lead between 1640 to 1649, there was not labor leadership. It didn't lead in 1789 to 1793. it was new in 1848 and it reached at a certain time it said, well we will form some workshops to give work to the workers – which was a hint of what was going to happen later. But by 1864, the petty-bourgeoisie, they are no longer in control. Karl Marx had formed the ~~1st~~ ^{First} International and that is there in 1864. the ^{2nd} International is formed in 1889 and it is absolutely clear that the labor leadership is now the opposition to capitalist society. ~~1889~~ ^{the 2nd} International. But all this is against the capitalist society. And late we shall see that as these things develop, they become larger and larger and the difficulties they face are that of having to fight capitalism which ~~is~~ ^{is} itself growing larger and larger.

That is the dialectic. You trace these statements, these organizations, ~~where~~ ^{where} they are – what they say, you trace how they developed and how they correspond to the new stage. By 1889 you now have the ^{2nd} International which now has taken the place that the petty-bourgeoisie had taken before that. The proletarian movement has spread and it has

put forward this idea that socialism was for the new society. 1889 the 2nd International is formed and for the first time since the Crusades, for the first time since the Crusades, for the first time since the Crusades there is developed a movement over the whole of Europe or most of Europe, comprising many millions of people with a doctrine. That had disappeared from Europe altogether. The proletariat, organized under the leadership of Marx and Engels brought that back.

Now I will leave it with you to continue with this. I want now to jump forward a bit. When is the next revolutionary development? There was the Commune of 1871. I can't go into that too deeply. You have to know these things. But the Commune set out to handle the type of labor that people should be doing and what pay that should be paid to government servants etc. You know that much. By 1871 that's where they were, having started from 1641. by 1871 they are saying: all people who are working for the government will get the same pay as workers; and they pass other resolutions about what is taking place in the working class movement and the conditions of labor. And then 1917 comes the Russian Revolution... (tape ran out...)

Second Session:

June 13, 1971

Detroit, Michigan

In view of the fact that we have all these tapes here I think I am going to re-state what we had here yesterday afternoon. And which was not taped. It is worthwhile saying again,

both for the sake of the tape – to record it, and also because it serves as useful introduction to what I'm going to say to-night.

These lectures, these talks are talks about dialectical materialism; first of all as put forward by Hegel and secondly as Marxists have undertaken to use it. I am not trying to teach you dialectics. Nobody could do that in two lectures. Nobody could do that in twenty. I'm trying to introduce you to a book in which the subject is taken up in great detail, as much detail as can be taken up in a book of 250 pages. I am speaking about a book, Notes on Dialectics: Hegel and Marxism, that I myself wrote. I mention this book because there is no way of getting to dialectics unless you grapple with Hegel. And unless you know what Marx was doing and what has happened to the Marxist movement in terms of the dialectic. That you will find here. But chiefly you will find plenty of quotations and statements, analyses of what Hegel was doing, what the Marxists could take over and what we could take over. Now I am doing that because this is the only book I know. No other book that I know attempts to do it. I understand that a book is to come out within the next month or two or it is to come out but I haven't seen that. It may do what is necessary. This is the only book I know.

Now, it is important to study dialectic for this reason. I have been here in Detroit, many times. I have spoken on the black struggle in the USA, I have spoken on Pan-Africanism, I have spoken on the French Revolution, I have spoken on the international movement, I have spoken on Black Studies. But despite the fact that I have spoken on so many things I have never yet spoken on the method by which one can approach these subjects, and the method by which I approach them. I think the time has come for me to do that. And it has come to me that it is time to do that first of all because talking about

other things it is time to say how you say things that other people seem to be so interested in, and secondly because dialectics has become a topic of the day in the United States.

There are three examples. Stokely constantly talks about dialectics. When I ask people what he means by that, they say quite often: "We don't know". Or some of them say, "The dialectic means contradiction." When I try to get them to explain further it is clear that they do not understand dialectics and they do not understand contradiction either. Secondly, there is Angela Davis, who is a well-known expert in dialectics and Hegelianism, Kant and so forth. It is certain that as she makes more of an appeal to the general public, the dialectics is going to become a subject of debate. Further more, Huey Newton, as is stated last night, is constantly talking about the unity of the opposites, negation of the negation – he is constantly using the dialectical terms. That means, as usual – it is not surprising that it is among the black people that this process of finding a way of thinking, that is separate from the way the bourgeoisie think, or even the liberals think, is taking place among those who are leading the black movement, the most advanced movement in the United States to-day. (I hope when you do this, you will quote that passage that I quoted yesterday afternoon, of Huey Newton's speech, to show how vital a matter dialectic is in terms of people who are thinking of a new method of thought to-day.)

Now yesterday afternoon I dealt with certain aspects of the dialectic. And I am going to go further to-night. It's going to be rather tough, you know; it's going to be rather stiff. Now I am going to go into the three aspects of the Hegelian logic. The doctrine of Being, the doctrine of Essence, and the doctrine of the Notion. Now I want you to get in mind that the dialectic moves in a certain manner. It moves from one stage –

inside that stage there is a transition to another stage. Let me begin with the Doctrine of Being. If I say I am dealing with Being, everything is Being, so Hegel says quite rightly – I am saying nothing. To talk about everything as Being – I am not saying anything. But when I make a quality of certain things, as when I say: workers; that is a quality that separates a section of what is in existence – and I make two qualities there at once. Because when I say workers, I am saying at the same time – what? That there are non-workers. The moment I say, workers – a quality, I am moving in the direction that there are workers and that are people who are not workers. Good. Now Hegel says, Quantity, Quality and Measure.

Now I've separated workers from the non-workers. But groups of these workers – and they are a small number or a large number – but where there are a large number of workers, as in Britain where there are twenty million workers, they become what? (A voice: a class) They become an organized proletariat, a class of people with distinct qualifications. Now there are proletarians in Ghana, proletarians in Liberia – they are not proletarians, not a movement as the mass of the workers in an advanced country are. So, Quantity and Quality makes a certain difference; and then I have to distinguish between the workers in Britain, workers in the United States, the workers in France, the workers in Malawi, the workers in Nigeria, the workers in Ghana, the workers even in Ivory Coast.

So I begin now to work at the measure. I begin to measure them. So I begin with Quality – I separate from workers – then I give Quantity, because as the Quantity increases Quality assumes a different form; then as I reach a certain number I begin to measure them. I can't take a certain quantity but I must have some means whereby I will work at the Quantity and distinguish between them. So I go from Quality, Quantity to

Measure. Now Hegel keeps doing that all the time. And I have mentioned that one merely to make you understand the Doctrine of Being; that is, when I am dealing with some objective thing; I look at it, I decide what is the Quality, then the Quantity changes the Quality and then to measure what the Quantity is doing I have to measure – you do that with every single thing that you are doing. Take the proletariat – if you speak about Being in general, you say nothing – people. What is it? If I say all the people than I am saying nothing in particular. When you are saying all, you are saying nothing. But the moment I separate I say working class. That's Quality.

Divide society into two, the working class and those who are not workers. Good. But I'm interested in the workers. I'm watching that dialectic. And I watch them grow in size. The United States, Britain and France, there are sixty million workers – that's a labor movement. The working class. Then I look and see, those are one thing and I look in Ghana, I look in Liberia, I look in Malawi, I look in Ivory Coast – I see some small number of workers there. I have to measure them according to size and the situation they are in society and know what kind of workers they are. So that Hegel says that in concrete matters you deal with the Quality – separate it from the rest – then the Quantity of it you decide, and the Measure by which you distinguish between different types. Now he keeps on doing that in everything. And I want to jump to Essence.

The Doctrine of Being deals with things as they are. No problem about that; that is a straightforward objective analysis of something. You have the quantity as regards to working class, you have the quantity in regards to houses; you have quantity in regards to whatever dialectic you are doing. Then you have quality, the size, the Measure by which you distinguish between them. Then Hegel moves to the doctrine of Essence. And

Essence is not an easy Doctrine. I'm going to tell you what is happening. Essence means that something is always trying to be something, but failing to become that, going back to that and starting again. At a given moment the proletarian movement looks like the 1st International or the Commune or 1917 to 1920. What is this proletarian movement?

“The 1st International, 1864; or the Commune in 1871; or the tremendous outburst of the European proletariat, 1917-1920. And if you stop, look at it and be precise about it, you see that the essential movement is reflected in the form.” “The reflections disappear.” But the essential movement remains. In other words when you look at the essence of a thing it is always seeking to be something that it knows it has to be – but it fails – and it goes back to what it was and it starts again. An Essence means a continuous movement from one thing to the other, and it fails and comes back. And we believe that one day it will reach: Marx is very precise about that. He says, the proletariat will reach and then the real history of humanity will begin; we'll have socialism. Or Barbarism. There's no trouble. Somehow, the proletariat will do it and it is always attempting it: this constant attempting – the 1st International, the 2nd International, the 3rd International – the Soviet and the rest of them: this is the essential movement of a certain body. That it must move, that it constantly attempts it is the Essence of the question. In arriving at Essence Hegel talks about Identity, Difference and Contradiction. In the Doctrine of Being Hegel talks about Quantity, Quality and Measure.

In the Doctrine of Essence Hegel talks about Identity, Difference and Contradiction. And I'm going to spend some time on Contradiction because everybody talks to-day about Contradiction.. and nobody understands what it is at all because they haven't seriously got to it; it's a phrase that they use. Now, Hegel is very brilliant on

Identity, Difference and Contradiction. He says, whenever you talk about the difference between the two things it means that they have an identity. He says I can't compare top hats with hot dogs; I can't do that. I can compare one hat to another hat; I can compare two books. I compare two tape recorders. I can compare two people. But when I compare – there is a difference in identity, and an identity in difference. Now when you read Hegel, you begin to understand the language, what he is saying. Good. But he says, you have to see the difference and the identity, the identity and the difference, you have to look into the identity for the difference - and when you look at the difference you find it end up in a Contradiction,. And I say people don't understand Contradiction, because Contradiction doesn't mean the opposite. It means the life of everything living is the contradiction in it. Now we've got to get down to it.

Identity means difference. Difference means identity. “And now with a leap we can get into it.” Page 85: “Hegel says that this principle becomes important, in fact decisive, when you watch, make a philosophical cognition, about a single object. Within the identity of an object, you have to establish the specific difference,” and only when you have established the specific difference have you established the identity of the object. In every object there is a specific difference – and you have to look for it. So within the identity there is the difference and when you have the difference and pursue the difference you find there is a contradiction. Now, follow me please, page 86:

“Their truth consists only in their relation to each other. Each contains the other in its own concept.”

I will give you a simple example, and Hegel likes to take these simple examples and show you that they really express fundamental things which the philosophical

cognition has to work out. He says, when I say father – what is the truth of that, when I say, father? I imply son. Because if I didn't mean son I would say, man; I would say woman. Every time you look at something there is the identity and there is the difference. There is a difference between father and son; but there is an identity in that the two of them go together. And "Their truth consists only in their relation to each other." Page 86. "Each contains the other in its own concept." "Each contains the other in its own concept." You can understand what Marx means when he talks about capital, capitalism and proletariat. Each contains – there can be no capital without the proletariat; there can be no proletariat without capital there tied up together. And Hegel is working at these things and shows how you must think about it.

Hegel says, reflect on it. Otherwise you can't think. "Their truth consists only their relation to each other." Page 86. "The truth of the labor movement consists only in its relation to capital." Now we come to the most important page I believe in the whole dialectic. It is on page 89. I begin Observation 3 of the Larger Logic. And I will read paragraph 4, page 89 where Hegel deals with speculative thought. The real creative thought is after you get all the facts you speculate. Speculative thought, that is Reason, that is dialectic – speculative thought. Read with me, please, paragraph 4, page 89:

"Speculative thought consists only in this, that thought holds fast Contradiction, and, in Contradiction, itself, and not in that it allows itself to be dominated by it – as happens to imagination – or suffers its determinations to be resolved into other, or into Nothing."

Let me read that again.

“Speculative thought consists... that thought holds fast Contradiction” and does not, however, allow itself to be dominated by the Contradiction; and does not allow the Contradiction to go into Nothing. So you see that Contradiction is the heart of speculative thought. When you are speculating on something, as to what is the future of painting, or what is the future of society, or what is the future of the party, or whatever it is, you have to hold fast the Contradiction, because without the Contradiction you can speculate. Page 89, please. Read these over: “Speculative thought consists only in this, that thought holds fast Contradiction” – a lot of people who talk about the Contradiction, they don’t understand that he is speaking there of the fundamental movement of anything.

“Speculative thought consists only in this, that thought holds fast Contradiction, and, in Contradiction, itself, and not in that it allows itself to be dominated by it... or suffers its determinations to be resolved into other” into something else “or into Nothing.” It is the Contradiction that is the impress (?) of thought.

Now another passage, page 91. These are in my opinion the most important parts of the Logic for us. Now Hegel says there is something he calls imagination. Paragraph 3 on page 91. Imagination is when you just see something else and, see another thing and you say, well, that is not like that. A very commonplace type of mind. That’s imagination, paragraph three:

“Thus although imagination everything has Contradiction for content, it never becomes aware of it, it remains an external reflection, which passes from Likeness to Unlikeness...” This book is unlike this one. “Black Studies” – “Every Cook Can Govern”. This one is not like that. He says, that is elementary, that is the way the ordinary person will behave. “...it never become aware of it, it remains an external

reflection, which passes from Likeness to Unlikeness... It keeps these two determinations external to each other, and has in mind only these, not their transition, which is the essential matter and contains the Contradiction.” Oh Lord, I would like to read that ten times, but you would get rather tired by the time I reach seven, so I read it only once more.

“Thus, although imagination everywhere has Contradiction for content, it never becomes aware of it, it remains an external reflection, which passes from Likeness to Unlikeness...” This is not like that. “It keeps these two determinations external to each other, and has in mind only these, not their transition, which is the essential matter and contains the Contradiction.” Now, let us take something that we know, capitalism and the proletariat. There is a Contradiction. But the Contradiction is the essence of what is going to happen. And you have to look at the transition. Now Hegel wasn't writing about Capital. He was writing about the dialectic as he had seen it in many different parts of the world, and he said that when you are analyzing something you watch the identity, he notes the difference, but the difference becomes contradiction; the total movement is going to be the movement of this Contradiction. Now let us go back.

I would like to read three paragraphs. Page 91. Hegel is dealing with three points. “Imagination in so far as it is revolutionary sees Stalinism here, and ‘democratic socialism’ over there; and never sees them, their identify or their unity as opposites. It does not see that the labor movement being what it is in essence, the bureaucratic, criminal, organization domination of Stalinism will form inevitably the point of transition for another stage higher. It sees the degrading organization and in despair (or hope) scans the horizon looking for salvation. The Hegelian dialectic keeps its eyes glued on the

Stalinist organization for it knows that the Other of it is there.” And page 92, paragraph three:

“Thinking Reason, on the other hand, sharpens (so to speak) that blunt difference of Variety, the mere manifold of imagination, into essential difference, that is, Opposition.” And the last paragraph on the page, “The manifold entities acquire activity and liveliness in relation to one another only when driven on the sharp point of Contradiction.” I hope nobody is going to use Contradiction in the future carelessly. He says, Imagination – something over there, this is over here; this one is not like that. Then, Understanding – another stage – this is connected with that; but I don’t know how it can change. Hegel says, you begin to see when you begin to use your Reason, Speculative thought and Reason, when the two of them are there and you see that they are in Contradiction with each other. Then you see their movement. Let us look at it again.

Page 92: “The manifold entities acquire activity and liveliness in relation to one another only when driven on the sharp point of Contradiction...” So if you are speaking about Contradiction you are speaking of what is driving the two externals together and which constitutes the movement from one to the other. Nobody can say Contradiction and just throw it away. When you say Contradiction you mean movement.

And on page 93, paragraph three: Contradiction “is the inherent pulsation of self movement and liveliness.” Now, it is not a blemish, Contradiction is not a blemish: fourth paragraph: it is not “a deficiency in a thing if a Contradiction is to be found in it. That is its life.” And I can tell you I have heard that statement from any number of people and they look upon Contradiction as something dead. Or mere opposition. It isn’t saying that. He says that when you have Contradiction you have pulsation, you have life, you have

movement. I'm sticking to the book because that's the easiest way. It's easy for you and it's easy for me too. Now I hope we have Contradiction tightly. When you say the Contradiction in something, you're not speaking about mere opposition, you are speaking of the way it's going to move. And you analyze as much as you can and you get the essential movement in opposition to each other; and only when you have them in opposition to each other and start to see the liveliness of the opposition, when you sharpen that up then you begin to understand what is taking place. Identity, Difference, Difference – Contradiction and the Contradiction is the life and soul of movement. All right.

Now I want you to spend some time on an essential question, the question of Stalinism. There are some people today who say that the Second International should never have broken up and made the Third. I think Mr. Max Schachtman is one of those and may even be writing a book on it; he may have gotten some money to write a book, which is something else. Now when you look at Stalinism in a dialectical way, you understand that Stalinism is the form of movement of the working class movement. Compare the Second International with the Third, the Stalinist International. Forward movement. Some of you would say: what the deuce is he talking about now? Now in the Stalinist International in the old days, it had broken with the concept that the worker had a national identity; isn't that so? The Second International, when 1914 came they all went and said, we support the bourgeoisie. The Stalinist movement said no, and for years every genuine Stalinist had broken with the bourgeoisie; they always worked with other members of the Stalinist movement and the Stalinist movement and the Stalinist policy form Moscow. So they had gone beyond the Second International. Good. The second

thing was the Second International worshipped parliament. The Second International believed in parliamentary democracy. The Stalinist did not. He had broken with the national state; he was an internationalist. Unfortunately Moscow was his center; but he had broken with the national state; he had broken with parliamentary democracy; he had an opposition to war. He said, I will join the war or not join the war according to my politics. In other words he represented a very advanced stage of policy in comparison with the Second International. All that the Second International taught was organization.

Marge gave the idea in the First International. And that fell apart. Second International made the policy of organizing the workers. The Third International broke with mere parliamentary democracy; the Stalinists introduced a whole lot of things that were new. But the Stalinists did not go on to the socialist society. They remained separate and dominated by capitalism. So that the First International was one thing, the Second International was something else, the Third International was a higher stage even. And it finally reached the stage where I say that to believe, in Hegelian terms, that somebody was going to teach the proletariat to be master of itself and to develop a new society – Hegel would have laughed that to scorn. Hegel would have said: the proletariat will learn only when it is faced with a tremendous objective development which stands in its way and in overcoming that it will find its own way as to what it must do and what is most needed. So Hegel see Stalinism not only as a defeat for the proletariat but something the proletariat would have to learn to overcome; and the proletariat would never learn to become free unless it was faced with some tremendous obstacle. So that the First International, the Second International and the Third International – Stalinism; and then we have somewhere eels it has to go. But I hope we get that thing right clear. And I say

somewhere, that Hegel would have laughed to scorn the (idea?) that anyone was going to teach the proletariat anything.

Now we come to the Doctrine of Notion. Now what is the Notion? The essence of the notion is the work of the mind, it's the mind's working. We have had the Doctrine of Being, things as they are. We've got Essence, the way things move from stage to stage. The First International, the Second, the Third, Stalinism on. Now we come to the Notion, the Doctrine of the Mind. The mind works, and how the mind works is very important because when you form a judgment of something that is an action. To form a judgment on something you take action. Action doesn't mean you go and fight the police, though that's a very good action in its place. But to form a judgment is also to take action. Hegel's Doctrine of the Notion is the dialectical logic to the mind. And we had the Doctrine of Being: Quantity, Quality, Measure. The Doctrine of Essence: Identity, Difference, Contradiction. The Doctrine of the Notion is the Universal, Particular, Individual. And that is the end of the Doctrine.

(gap in tape)

...the relations of production. Page 189;

“Conservation, in an unaltered form, of the old mode of production was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes.” All earlier industrial classes kept it as it was. They didn't change it, except time and again. They later started to change it continuously. And Marx goes into it.

“Constant revolution in production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier one. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and

opinions, are swept away, all new formed once become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned and man is at last compelled to face with sober sense his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.”

“All fixed, fast-frozen relations with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices are swept away”, the bourgeoisie is doing that. “All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned and man is at least compelled to face with some senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.” When he faces his real conditions of his life and his relations with his kind he don’t need a party. Let me read it again.... He doesn’t need a political party. Political party is the proletarian means of knowing, and its best to have a party in all this disturbance. But you know what I said last time. Things happen and certain things get into your mind, Hegel’s knots, and in time you begin to change the categories and your conceptions. In the last few years, and in looking at the world, the whole idea of the party, particularly the Leninist vanguard party is thrown aside. Because I will give you an example. When Mussolini’s Fascism went in Italy do you know how many people were in the Communist Party? Two million and a half. Two million and a half people were in the Communist Party in 1946; they were expecting they were going to make the revolution as they had done in 1917. A vanguard party of two and a half million people – that is a joke. And that is before the revolution. After the revolution you would have ten million. Because they join up after the Revolution. So that in front of us there... you know the people who really needed a party? The bourgeoisie. They were the only people needing a party. The bourgeoisie needed a one-party state. Hitler – we need a party, a one-party state. We need a party to defend, the proletariat doesn’t need a party to attack the bourgeoisie. Not at all.

Lenin might have needed a party in 1903 in Russia. And he thought in 1917. But by 1971 it is perfectly clear the proletariat doesn't need any party, since 1917 defeated for fifty years. And after fifty years of defeat it's time that you dropped them. If a Communist Party or some party is in charge of a revolution that revolution would have been dead. It is not suitable to the age in which we live.

I will give you an example of that. In 1939 I went down to see Trotsky in Coyacon. We talked. We didn't only talk about the black movement, no sir. I presented a statement on the black movement. But I told him, I'll tell you, why is it that in France – and I used to be in France regularly to take part in the Trotskyist movement – the revolutionary feelings of the workers go up and up and up and the Trotskyist movement goes down and down and down? And I asked him. Will you explain to me why is this? (and you should translate it and publish it.) He gave me a long story. He said a lot of things that were not true. And he said a lot of things that were true but that did not apply. I didn't know the answer then; why the movement went up and up and the Trotskyists went down and down. The reason was that they were trying to do what was impossible to do. It was impossible to go – I know because I tried – and try and tell the working class: the party they had been following, the Moscow party that was the Communist party, isn't that today (?) but join us to form a party to fight the bourgeoisie – that was a ridiculous reason. I know it's so because I was one who said: for the revolution it is necessary to have a party. But the Communist Party is not the party; we have to form a party which will oppose the Communist Party and the Social-Democracy, and will lead the revolution to success – we were talking nonsense. By 1948 I had a conception about the party. By the way, that is common to-day. The idea that a vanguard party is needed, and that the

proletariat can manage without that, since the Hungarian Revolution and since the 20th Party Congress where people understood what Stalin and his party had been doing, nationally and internationally, and in the People's Democracies – you know what happened in the People's Democracies? They put some people in jail, they tried them and they hanged them or they shot them; and then some years after that did something – these Communists – they rehabilitated them. Do you know what re-habilitation meant? They said, we tried them for this and that, but that is all over with. So we have to rehabilitate them – take them out of the way he was buried, and say he was a good man and what we said about him was not true. That means the whole conception of the party was in pieces. And today we have reached the stage where the conception of the party is dead. You will get nowhere – people who will form a vanguard party with the idea of leading the proletariat. That is dead. And I am glad to say I took some party in killing it. Maybe my blows were not mortal but they helped to break it up altogether. So using the dialectic in 1948 I was able to say that; that the old concept of the party was finished.

And we have reached a new stage. And over the last ten or fifteen years we have reached a new stage of the party. Do you think in Russia you can put another party instead of the party? No sir, you have to completely – and the proletariat as such as to take hold and be the master of the situation. That's what I did by the dialectic and that's what I am putting forward. Now, to give you an example of the method. And I will do what I was doing yesterday afternoon.

I will take 1947 – this one, by the way, was written in 1948. And this speech was made in 1948. It was made on the black question in the United States – the revolutionary answer to the Negro problem. And we were saying something that is new. Making the

speech, I had written the resolution, the party had discussed it, the Committee, and I made the speech introducing the resolutions in 1948. At the same time that I was doing this. And I said, we are now putting forward something new in regard to the black movement. We shall compare what we have to say that is new by comparing it to previous positions on the Negro question in the socialist movement. The proletariat, as we know, must lead the struggles of all the oppressed and all those who are persecuted by capitalism.” That is what I knew, that is what I had been taught, that is what I was speaking about. “But this has been interpreted in the past – and by some very good socialists too – in the following sense: The independent struggles of the Negro people have not got much more than an episodic value, and as a matter of fact, can constitute a great danger not only to the Negroes themselves, but to the organized labor movement. The real leadership of the Negro struggle must rest in the hands of organized labor and of the Marxist party. Without that the Negro struggle is not only weak, but is likely to cause difficulties for the Negroes and dangers to organized labor. This as I say,” and that was the speech I was making, “is the position held by many socialists in the past. Some great socialists in the United States have been associated with this attitude.”

We, on the other hand, were saying something new. And what was new was three points. Number 1: “the Negro struggle, the independent Negro struggle, has a vitality and a validity of its own: that it has deep historic roots in the past of America and in present struggles; it has an organic political perspective, along which it is traveling, to one degree or another, and everything shows that at the present time it is traveling with great speed and vigor.” Point number one.

Number 2: "this independent Negro movement is able to intervene with terrific force upon the general social and political life of the nation, despite the fact that it is waged under the banner of democratic rights, and is not led necessarily by the organized labor movement or the Marxist party." Believe me that was very revolutionary in those days.

Point number 3: "and this is the most important, that it is able to exercise a powerful influence upon the revolutionary proletariat, that it has got a great contribution to make to the development of the proletariat in the United States, and that it is in itself a constituent part of the struggle for socialism."

(gap in the tape)

And I am very interested to find a lot of Negroes talking about dialectic, contradiction, the negation, unity of opposites, etc. now how did I arrive at that conclusion? I arrived at a new concept; left the old concept behind. I arrived dialectically at a new concept of the relation of the black struggle to the proletarian movement. How did I arrive at that? I was telling you yesterday that Hegel says that you have a concept and things happen; things happen to you. You see a thing kept to your mind and you compare it; and you unite it with a new concept and that's how I arrived at a new concept that the blacks struggle – now everybody sees it. But there is not much point in seeing it when it is already taking place. You are using the dialectic when you are doing speculative reason; when you are speculating on the results of what you have and move forward. In this I was speculating on the nature of the party, and there I was speculating

on the nature of the black movement, and how I arrived at it was – I said, let us not forget that the Negro people are what they are. “anyone who knows them, who knows their history,” you had to be able to read up their history, “is able to talk to them intimately”, otherwise they wouldn’t talk to you, “watched them at their own theaters”, where black people put on their shows, “watches them at their dances”, the way they dance and carry on, “watched them in their churches”, in church service, “reads their press with a discerning eye” – he will recognize that it is necessary to have new concepts about that people will do in the United States. So I changed the concept of the black people.

It is necessary also to change the concept of the students. Because the political movement today is now what it was twenty years ago. The students are taking a part of the revolutionary attack on bourgeois society that nobody suspected fifteen or twenty years ago. Students, students in Pakistan, students in Mexico, students in the United States, students in Britain, students in France, the students in Czechoslovakia – the student movement needs a new concept. If you look at it, to begin with you see quality, quantity and then measure: you work that out. If you look at essence, you see difference, identity and then contradiction which is the great (?) because it is the contradiction that drives them all. And if you look at the notion – what is in your mind – you will have a universal, you will get a particular, and then a concrete. And the mind is only thinking properly when it is changing the universal to suit the day because today we cannot have the same concept of the universal of socialism that Lenin and Trotsky had. Now not only what is taking place in Eastern Europe, what is taking place in Russia – the universal of socialism is something very different from what it had been. It has to be; and it takes a particular form. And these people write about it. Lenin’s writing is the best that we know.

The concrete is the actual revolutionary struggle that took place in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the movement in Cuba – these concrete examples of the universal, the particular and the individual of them all – I can only leave it to you to work them out.

The last thing I am going to say is that there is a lot about Trotsky in this. I say “Hegel and Marxism”. We did Lenin yesterday. And the important thing about Trotsky is that his universal, his particular and his individual remained the same that they were in 1914. They remained the same. Trotsky didn’t make mistakes. He followed a certain procedure which Hegel knew extremely well. He remained fixed in the old concepts and didn’t realize that it was necessary to move his universal was: you had to nationalize the property. And once the property was nationalized, well, all that could happen is that you could degenerate. And he remained there. Trotsky never understood what Mao-tse-tung was doing in China. He kept on saying, Mao-tse-tung is leading peasants; and the peasants have to be led by the proletariat. That’s what we did in Russia, the proletariat led the peasantry and enable the national state to be founded and the proletarian revolution to lead the peasantry Mao-tse-tung is leading peasants. And he died at the end not understanding the Chinese Revolution. He remained fixed in the old concept, the concept by which the Russian Revolution was made but we have to change. The universal changed, the particular changed, and the concrete. When Mao-tse-tung was marching down the streets of Shanghai and Peking, the proletariat was standing by the side watching. That was something new; that was the new conception; you had to reorganize that, you had to reorganize in regard to the peasants. Because the peasants made the revolution in China, There is no questions about that. Mao-tse-tung’s army was a peasant

army; and his party was constituted with some intellectuals etc. but basically it was a peasant party and the people who joined the peasant army.

It was the peasants in India who joined with Mahatma Gandhi to make the Indian revolution. And it is the peasants in Viet Nam who are making this impact upon the greatest power that the world has ever known. It is the peasants. So we now have a concept of peasants, a dialectical development – you look at them and you see the Other. What is the Other that we see in the peasant of to-day? What do we see? When we see INTL what the peasantry has done in India, what the peasantry has done in China, what the peasant is doing in Viet Nam, then we realize that the building of socialism by peasantry all over the world is going to be a much more rapid development than we thought. If people can do what they have been doing in Viet Nam without the help of modern technology and so forth, they may need a hundred years (?) but it is obvious that the peasantry is far beyond where they were when Lenin was writing. Dialectical conception: you watch the concrete, see what it is doing, and we see what is contained in it. What is contained in the peasantry today is not the mere fighting against the bourgeoisie or the imperialists. There is contained in the peasantry a capacity for tremendous development and creation – that is the Other that at the present time is Ideality. So I am trying to say that the dialectic is something that you use; you use it for your study. And I would advise you to pay some attention to the dialectical development of the black question.

We will end with that because that is an urgent question today. The United States in 1938, when I brought my black skin of course, I used to talk to black people, but I also brought what was in my head – Marx – and I learned that the Trotskyists had a position

on the Negro question – they had nothing. They didn't know what to say, because the Stalinists were saying that the black people should take five states in the United States and become a state. Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama – five of the most backward poverty-stricken states, the Stalinists say – the black people should take them. But the Trotskyists didn't know what to say. So I began to study the black question. That's where I made this speech. I saw what the blacks were doing. I saw what the blacks had done in the Civil War. I saw what role the blacks were playing in the organization of the CIO. And I remember I was reading the Populist movement and I said something is wrong there. And I called Freddie Forrest and I told her, go to the library and find out what the blacks were doing in the Populist movement. Freddie comes back the next day and said they had a million of them in the Colored Tenant Farmers. That's the way it moves with the dialectic, because I said if they were here, and here, and here – they should have been there too. I made a dialectical analyses and she came back and said, yes, there were a million. And furthermore, when the Populists had a meeting to decide whether they would break with the Democratic Party or continue in the Democratic Party, the blacks were all for the new party. But Bryan said that you shall not crucify mankind with a crown of thorns – he was crucified, that's all. The Populist Party could have started something going. The blacks were all ready.

So, what they did in the War of Independence, what they did in 1812, what Andrew Jackson did with them – the fighting that they did, what they did in the Civil War, what they did in the CIO I came to draw a conclusion: that, being what they are and what they did – that they would do that; that was the dialectical development.

The Conception of the party in 1848, which I made clear was also the use of the dialectic. And now I can recommend to you finally: read the extracts over and over again. I was writing extremely well in this and now I know why. I knew what Marx was saying and what Hegel was saying and that makes for very easy writing; the mass of material carefully chosen and then you will be able to use the dialectic after about a year. How are you going to learn that? You have to keep on learning it. It took me and some friends of mine ten years before we came to from what Trotskyism was – we came in 1951. then years. You're not going to get it easily. But people are already using it. Huey Newton is doing his best – he isn't very successful. But the attempt is important. Stokely is always talking about the dialectic. It is part of the topic of the day. And I believe you will get an example if you get to understand in this book the word contradiction and what it signifies in this book you will get it (?)

Thank you very much.

Question: What do you conceive to be the Ideality of the blacks going out into the streets in 1965, 1967, etc.

CLR: I said that things happen and they form certain knots in your mind; in studying and watching events you have a different conception than what you had before. Now there is no question in my mind after what the blacks have done in Harlem, what they have done in Newark, what they have done in Detroit, what they have done in Watts, what they have done in San Francisco, what they have done in Cleveland – you have an immense

conception, the whole category of black struggle. There is no use waiting for them to do something. You have to see that by taking those actions the blacks are showing that they have something in mind. (?) They are not fighting the police merely to fight the police. You have to look at it and watch the dialectical development; like the students, it means that they are going places. They have in mind a new conception; you find that in the way they are fighting against the police. The blacks today – I remember when you had to be careful when you walked about in Harlem, there were some white boys who used to beat on you... but in those days when that happened to me and we went to the police, they arrested you. They arrested us, you who made the complaint. Today, black people have lost all respect for the police. They have a special name for him, they call him: pig. And the policeman cannot take up his rifle and shoot, they shoot first at him. That is what is taking place to-day. And after Watts and so forth, it is clear – we must look at the Other, we must look at what they do, they have a different conception of the society in which they should be in. that is what those riots mean. In an instinctive way they are fighting against the police and the people who are robbing them with money – they give them a little working over. That means you have to look at that and see that there is something else; that is for a new conception of society altogether. You have to know that that's what it means when they attack the police for two or three days.

(in the tape: reference to what happened in Washington, D.C.)

... And people who analyze the Black movement must know what it means. They're not fighting the police for the sake of the police. They want to get rid of the kind of life they are living. They have a concept of a new society; and people who are thinking and studying them dialectically must know that, must use speculative thought and not wait

until something – and then they try to analyze it. You must do that in advance. It is perfectly clear that if any people in the United States settle down and say: we are going to break up this society the blacks would not be behind. That's what it means by watching them and seeing the Other, the Ideality of the movement. You have to analyze it and see what it means and what it signifies. You use speculative vision and it breaks out in the streets of Cleveland, it breaks out in the streets of Detroit – burning up and fighting the police, in the streets in Watts – breaking up and burning up, in San Francisco, Newark – that is a sign that a new conception of them must be developed. That is what the dialectic means that is what Hegel would say; don't judge that empirically by what it means. Seek the identity, difference and the contradiction. What is that Contradiction? The Contradiction is that they are against the existing society.

The basic forces of the society are the army and the police. And the blacks have declared war on the police. They are uncertain as regards to the army. They have declared war against the media. They don't believe. There is no credibility gap with them. There is a totality gap. They don't believe anything. And you have to analyze – I'm trying to say – you have to analyze that point of view to what's it's likely to be in the time to come. But you know that Hegel has made a great master of the method of analysis, of how you look for evidence, how to choose it and so forth. Quality, Quantity, Measure; Identity, Difference, Contradiction; Universal, Particular, Individual. My friends, when you go through that and see what is happening, you begin to see things, I can assure you.

Question about the League of Revolutionary Black Workers. How do you view them?

CLR: The League of Revolutionary Black Workers does not say: we are a vanguard party. The revolution will be led by us and by nobody else. And until you join us and we have sufficient force there will be no revolution or the revolution will fail. If they said that, I would be their mortal enemy, but they don't say that. But that's what we used to say: the Leninist conception of the party. Trotsky until the end of the days he was speaking that. They would present a conception to the workers: a party is needed, we will form one. We will oppose the Communists. We will oppose the Social-Democracy. We will get enough people to lead the revolution. Trotsky went so far as to say, the Trotskyite movement is too small; we will join the Social-Democracy, and get enough people in the Social-Democracy to split away and form the party, defeat the Communists... that is what he was saying. There is no dialectic in there at all. None whatever. After Stalinism it was clear that the concept of the party had come to an end. The Stalinists had done everything that was to be done with the party. They were in many respects a very highly developed political organization. They were against the national state, they were against the use of parliament; they were for the war or against the war according to the truth of their politics; all that was very advanced. The only thing was they weren't prepared to lead the masses against the bourgeoisie. (? inaudible) And that was the end of them.

Lengthy question about alienation, the women's movement and Gay Liberation.

About separate organizations and a separate consciousness.

CLR: In what way – there is a Women's movement. I think that is progress. It is part of the struggle against the existing society. I don't know what you mean by changing

people's consciousness. When the people in Watts do what they do, when they do what they do in Harlem, when they do what they do in Newark, when they do what they do in Cleveland, when they did what they did in Washington, when they carry on in that way – I don't find that their consciousness is so bad, you know. That is a very good consciousness.

Interruption by Questioner: About bring over people...coming together...

CLR: I want to say something here very clearly. In 1970 President Nixon and his man of business took a step, which I have been assured by people, has no precedent in the history of the United States. Usually a president fights to get in, but having gotten in he doesn't fight usually to get in a second time. In between he bears in mind that he is the president of the whole nation. Two years after he is elected president he doesn't usually come out with great emphasis. I have been told by people, and I have read it, that no president ever enters into the fight after the first two years. Nixon and Agnew entered into this one. What did they enter for. They said, these students are behaving badly, we're going to deal with that. Furthermore, these blacks are creating disorder, we want some law and order. They went to the public with that. The president and the vice-president: they said, give us the power and we will restore the old America. They were rejected completely. They said, we will fix it; this is the president, I am the Vice-President; I am more noisy than he is, he is more noisy than I am – and they got one vote. Nixon, he gets the vote of the silent majority. Good. He said, we've won a moral victory in the Senate. The silent majority and a moral victory, that's all. In other words, this attack against the black

people, - they've tried to work it out and failed: I don't see any big backlash. I don't see it. If people point it out to me, I will be glad to see it. But they went out to get it and white population didn't bother with them. And I haven't seen the black population... they talk about it, they watch. They are aware that there are tremendous politics involved. No, I don't see any backlash. If anybody will tell me about backlash, I will be glad to get the information. (Interjection: the editorial writers keep up the backlash.) the editorial writers – but the average person in the United States isn't getting ready to keep the blacks in their place. The people who were scared in Washington were the white people who live in Maryland and Virginia; when blacks took over many parts of the city these whites put up barriers, took up guns – the blacks were coming. The blacks were not interested in them. The blacks are very much advanced. They are interested in institutions and the people that deal with them. They are not interested in white people as such. That is a highly political development. They are concerned with institutions and the people who run institutions. Otherwise they are not bothered. And the great mistake today, and what I'm saying is, do not misread that black struggle. Please understand, as the peasants have shown we misread it for years, that they're ready to go places, that blacks and the students in the world at large are ready to go places. We must not be caught: we must take speculative thought – we must act in a way that shows that we understand what has happened and to read what is contained in it.

The identity in the difference and the difference in the identity, that's all we have to do; and the way we do it is the dialectical method. I can talk about it because I use it all the time.

Question: I'm still confused about the...vanguard party. Cuba...(inaudible)

CLR: The Cuban revolution demands a special analysis. I spoke to Dorticos of the Cuban Communist Party. And he tells me, we were an army, we went and defeated Batista and took power as an army. He says, everybody knows that and...the only problem was to transfer the power from the army into a broader body (?) It isn't a political party that took power, and they gave it to an army. He said, and he was very hostile to Marxists abroad; he said, those people don't understand the problem we have. We took power as an army, and we had to take power as an army; nobody understood that. They didn't take power as a vanguard party. That is a special situation. That is a special situation. The vanguard party does not apply to Cuba. It is an army that has taken power there. The discipline of an army; and now it must impose some kind of discipline on the kind of government it is having. They are bitterly against the Marxists outside who attack them for it. "We couldn't help it. That's what we were. That's what happened to us. Help us... to change that. Don't just criticize us." That was the secretary of the Communist Party. He was very bitter. And I knew he was right. The moment you say... that is a different situation.

Now, you say somewhere else. I don't know but that in Viet Nam, behind that party, the party that is leading that revolution, the whole of Viet Nam is an army. Bu the people in charge, in every struggle you have leaders, are Communists. But the vanguard party says, we will lead them without that everything is lost. I don't think the vanguard party could run the party in that way. They have to mobilize the whole country and they have been fighting for twelve years; it's a military struggle. That's another case. I haven't met any young people – I have met a few who talk about it – who are concerned with the

vanguard party to-day. There are some fanatical people called the Maoists, who read the little red book. But I don't bother with them. No, the idea of a vanguard party is dead because I could remember when it was alive. I could tell you when it was alive. Now I know what happens after a talk of this type. You are somewhat, mentally – not confused – but hesitant. Because these ideas are undoubtedly new.

You know, there was a man in the United States who wrote a book, on the Hegelian Logic. I believe his name was Harris. There was a governor of Missouri, what was his name? (Interjection: Brockmeyer.) Brockmeyer, who was a very educated man, and he wrote a translation of the Hegelian Logic into English. And he gave the translation to Professor Harris. And Harris said that he copied out the translation, every line of it with his own hand. And when he was finished he did not understand one word. That is very tough. And I have taken particular pains to choose the passages that are most easily assimilable by people who are concerned, and to explain them and to refer them to concrete historical acts. So please get down to it.

I'm glad there's a whole lot of you here. About how many people would you say? (Interjection: about 70 or 80) Seventy people come to hear the lecture on the dialectic and Marxism. I would really be flattered to think that you come to hear me; you haven't come to hear me. It's dialectic you have come to hear about. Because that is in the air at the present time. This can take it from out of the air and put some of it in your head. (laughter) I don't hesitate – it's very tough. But I'm glad to see so many of you here. Out of seventy or eighty two or three will manage. And...that will be enough. And I will come back and speak about it more. You have the book. And you must get down it. It is very hard I admit, but it is floating around.

Question: Dr. James, the difference of the one-party state that Nkrumah built and what is happening in Tanzania. (partially inaudible)

CLR: Well – Nkrumah formed a state in Ghana. You will read his autobiography where in that autobiography which represent many years of study and his prime ministership of the country, where would you find one word directed against the conception of a ruling body in Ghana? I read the autobiography; nowhere does he speak about it. But Nyarere talks from beginning to end about the way of presenting the development of a black elite. He says the basis is he extended African family and the fact that you have no capitalism or feudal people, educating, the educating not to professional standards but to go to the masses of the population. You will never see that in Nkrumah. The thing about Nkrumah is that after he had been in power for about ten years he made a famous broadcast, the Dawn Broadcast. He broadcast to the nation one morning at dawn. Does anybody know about that broadcast? In that broadcast – get a copy for me – in that broadcast, he said: now you all who have made the revolution, you have got enough; you have two cars – you had one; you have large salaries, you have made enough: No more.

Isn't that a way to tackle a leadership? The Dawn Broadcast, you have had enough, you are not getting more. That was the best that he could do. And the whole point of Nyarere's document...to base the development of the country on the African masses themselves, using the extended African family. You don't find that in Nkrumah at all. You can find Nkrumah's weakness by finding what Nyarere did and what Nkrumah did not do. Very important in what Nyarere is doing is found in the statement: we have to

develop the economy of the country; bring technicians, and so forth to the countryside; but we must see to it that whatever we do, we do not destroy the African village. Because if we destroy the African village we destroy everything. Now Nkrumah...didn't speak in those terms. Their chief thing was to make the economy develop, build some factories and Nkrumah tore up the villages and so forth – that's where they are. But Nyarere and now Kaunda: let the village be, we will not destroy the African village. And Nyarere says, we are proud of our Africanism and we believe that there is much in it which would be useful to us in the future. You will read Nkrumah and you don't find that at all. He had a conception of trying to develop the economy – and he finally had nothing. The factories were not functioning properly and build up where there was no need. You have to support him and you were OK. You were a business man, you supported him and gave the party some money and you could carry on. Now what Nyarere is doing shows what Nkrumah did not do.

And I end the book (History of Pan-African revolt) with a quotation from Lenin and what he was trying to do in the last days. And I showed to Nyarere and he said he didn't know that; "I didn't read that anywhere". And I said, but you see how close it is; and he said, yes. He had worked it out and I was glad that it had come from Africa. They themselves have worked out a policy. I have been told in Nigeria and Uganda and in Ghana that if Nyarere is successful over the next five or ten years all of formerly colonial Africa will follow him. All these General who are taking over – they seize the power and that's all. But Nyarere has a policy, a program, a philosophy and a method. If he is successful, people have told me, otherwise will have to go, otherwise they will continue