

4/5/87

ON ORGANIZATION, especially what Eugene (12/86) presented in a summation of 5 books, mainly on the 1st International, at the 1871-2 Congress i.e. the Minutes of the Hague, as well as various summations of the same period like Padover and Jacques Fr^ymond, plus the 1966 Peking edition of the Paris Commune, which contained both the 1st draft as well as the pamphlet we all know.

Marx's "Report of the General Council to the 5th Annual Congress" (The Hague Congress) begins as follows: "Since our last Congress at Basel, two great wars have changed the face of Europe: the Franco-German War and the Civil War in France. Both of these wars were preceded, accompanied and followed by a third war -- the war against the International Working Men's Association." (Padover, p. 71; Hague Congress, p. 211)

The truly exciting part is that when you see it as a totality -- "it" being both the PC and the precise motions after its failure on WL and on "membership", especially as it dealt with international matters like Wendell Phillips joining, you first begin to sense not only that he had the unusual position of women having their own locals, or the communal form displacing the state machinery, and the moving away from trade unions and into "lower and deeper", sections of the masses and the peasantry, that we already have in 1871 what would become the EN. Thus, take the Minutes of the General Council of May 2, 1871. which reports ~~XXXX~~ Dmitrieva's work:

10905

4/5/87

"The Russian lady had written that she was carrying on an active propaganda among the fair sex, that she was holding crowded meetings every night, and that an amazon corps was to be raised. Some 5,000 had enlisted already. Her health was so precarious that she did not believe she would survive the struggle." (Minutes 1870-71, p. 184).

Along with this report by Marx about the Paris Commune, he remarks that "the misfortune was that the trade unions and labor organizations held aloof from the International until they were in trouble and then only did they come for assistance." (Aug 8, '71 Minutes p. 244-245)

Or take ^{the London} conference of the 1st International, Sept 17, to 23, 1871 (especially as the conference is recorded in French in the book edited by Jacques Freymond, a section of which I have here. The 5th of the 17 resolutions passed reads: "The Conference recommends the formation of female branches among the working class..."

After noting that it was Marx who made the motion, the ^{minutes} ~~in a letter p. 541~~ states "Marx stressed the need for founding women's sections in countries whose industries engage many women..." ^{In the minutes is the following:} "Citizen Marx adds that it must be noted that the motion states 'without exclusion of mixed ~~sections~~ ^{section}'. He believes it ^{is} necessary to create exclusively women's sections... (since) they prefer to meet by themselves to hold discussions. The women, he says, play an important role in life: they work in the factory, ^{yes} they take part in strikes, in the Commune, and so forth... They have

10906

4/5/87

more ardor (passion) than the men. He adds a few words recalling the ~~passionate~~ ^{active} participation of ~~women~~ ^{the} in the Paris Commune." (This is recorded by Freymond, pp. 167-168.)

The 8th resolution is on agricultural producers on which he wants to concentrate so that we have the adhesion of agricultural producers to the movement of the industrial proletariat. Meanwhile "to propagate the principles of the International and to found rural branches." (Padover, pp. 63-64.)

There is a great deal of new forms of activity, new forces of revolution, after the Paris Commune. Marx calls special attention to the U.S. and reads a letter from the New Orleans ~~International~~ ^{Club} Republicans. Marx notes he has "nothing against forming a Federal Committee to represent the French and German sections, but they must not presume to represent the Yankee element." (11/8/1870) ^(p. 85 of 70-71 Minutes) He is especially happy to report on Aug. 15, 1871: "Citizen Marx reported that he had received news from New York... The most important item of new thought was that Wendell Phillips, the great anti-slavery leader, had joined the ranks of the International." This is recorded in the Minutes, p. 258. ~~the~~ ^{the} Sept. 2, 1871 report of Aug. 29, 1871 Council meeting states: and ~~reports~~ "A letter from America stated the need for drawing Negro workers into the International." ¹⁸⁷⁰⁻⁷¹ A ftn. to the Minutes, p. 531.)

10907

4/5/87

-4-

"Citizen Marx read a letter from the Central Committee of the Association for the U.S. Some of the miners in Pennsylvania were still on strike, but those in work were dividing their wages with those out. The painters and plasterers had organized themselves upon the model of the Crispins -- as the shoemakers call themselves. The Typographical Union had just held a congress at Baltimore, and a great strike of coloured labourers had taken place at Washington which was defeated by the stepping in of White labourers." (General Council Minutes of July 4, 1871, p. 228

10908

4/5/87

The truth is that I started the whole business on Organization in 1980 when I got very furious that the Iranians had published in Farsi, as if that were the last word on the question on party, a book by John Molyneaux, Marxism and the Party, and I had written a 5 page, single-spaced letter to Raha on Sept. 4, 1980, which begins with: "Nothing reveals more sharply how deep into the mire a Marxist can land when he disregards the philosophy of Marx ~~in considering~~ ^{in considering} organization, as when that separation of philosophy and organization occurs on the theory of permanent revolution. It is there, pp. 20-22"

I then go into the superficiality of his three pages on the famous 1850 Address, the misreading of the Communist Manifesto, as if that was a question of what he called "the main scheme" and ends with the outright slander that the 1848 revolutions had to depart from that "scheme," when in fact it is that revolution, and the CM, and the defeat, which produced the 1850 Address. Molyneaux, on the contrary, talks as if the independent political organization predominates over the theory.

From then on, the downslide on the whole question of "tightening the organization" gets separated even from politics and we jump to 1902, so that his "discovery" that there is such a great similarity between Marx's concept of the party...and Lenin's 50 or more years later derives in large part from the parallels of their situations" (p. 22) There is no reference to the 1907 Conference and all the

10909

YK/87

tendenci^s that failed to discuss the 1905 Revolution. The whole period of 1850-64, which ~~was~~ produced that Grundrisse, the CPE, the ~~the~~ 1863 draft of Capital, not to mention all the articles against colonialism and ~~the~~ ^{or} Civil War in the U.S. , which led Marx to reorganize the structure of Capital and ~~the~~ moved to the creation of the First Iⁿternational, are called by the expert Molyneaux "The Years of Retreat." Not so incidentally, not only does ~~the~~ ^{Marx's} expression "party in the eminent, historical sense" disappear in Molyneaux's interpretation of Marx on Organization, but the activity that ~~was~~ went into Marx's organization in London, in May 1861, to protest the arrest of August Blanqui by the French police. Marx wrote to Blanqui; " No one could be more interested than I in the fate of a man who I always ~~was~~ ^{held} to be the head and the heart of the proletarian party in France."

I wrote: "In reading out the totality of his misconception of Marx, Molyneaux becomes arrogant enough to tell Marx all about the essential starting point for a theory of the revolutionary party is rooted in what we called earlier the "optimistic evolutionism" of his (Marx's) view of the growth of working-class political consciousness...⁴...
'...it is also necessary to understand that in the sphere of his theory of the party, the legacy of Marx's work, whatever its positive achievements, was something that had in time to be overcome by the marxist movement if capitalism was to be overthrown.' (p. 35)"

10910

4/5/87

The point is what has happened to that letter of mine of 1980, not necessarily what has happened in regard to the person addressed, but what has happened to it in the 1980s and what became my preoccupation precisely because I feared that the magnificent Ch. 11, "The Philosophy of Permanent Revolution Creates New Ground for Organization," which inhabited a totally different world than Molyneaux, would be considered the answer. That is, that, too, was only ground for answer -- correct philosophic ground but none can write a blueprint. The burning question remains, as I put it to Rayha re: Molyneaux : "he never even poses, much less tries to answer, the crucial question: does a Marxist group have a historic right to exist?"

10911

4/5/87

Of the 12 serious works on the Spanish Revolution, that Mike briefly summarized for our special interest and reported extensively in his 2/12/87 letters, the 1st and most important is The Spanish Revolution: the Left and the Struggle for power during the Civil War, by Burnett Bolloten (Chapel Hill, NC: Univ. of N.C. Press, 1979)

The 79 edition is the most complete ~~one~~ in breadth of ~~documentation~~ *documentation*, but the ground seems to be what he originally wrote in '61 under the title The Grand Camouflage. By this time, however, he had spent 40 years of research work, studying ~~some~~ 100 thousand newspapers and periodicals, 3000 books and pamphlets, and 120 thousand microfilms. Evidently Mark Sharron is one of the people he thanks for reading the mss. The great part is that he proves that the mass movement started before Franco's challenge of July 16, 1936. He therefore begins what he calls "Curbing the Revolution" quite early. So that the real historic period of the book runs from the 1st months of 1936 through "Communist Triumph", June 1937, and everything after that is dealt with as an Epilogue. In other words, dated June 37 and not Franco's victory in March 1939.

In ~~the~~ Bolloten's book of 646 pages you see it as a revolution of workers and peasants in 1936 and then you see its destruction by the CP with emphasis on the fact that the path was paved by the anarchists and the POUM, who helped set the ground for the destruction.

10912

4/5/87

Chapter 1, "The Brewing Upheaval" is that the self-activity of the peasantry before the outbreak is dated to the agricultural crisis February 1936, i.e. immediately following the victory of the Popular Front and the non-enforced agrarian reform law. The SP-sponsored National Federation of Land Workers (FNLT) had gotten away from the control of the SP and by March 36, land seizures began, first near Madrid and then in Toledo. On 3/25/36, "80 thousand peasants in the provinces of ~~the~~ ^{and} Caceres, Badajoz occupied the land and began to cultivate it." The Institute of Agrarian Reform legalized the seizure. (Obviously, the best source, always quoted by everybody on peasantry in Spain is the one by Malefakis, Agrarian Reform and Peasant Revolution in Spain.)

Chapter 2, "The Revolution". The collapse of bourgeois power begins on July 16 and the old army ceased to exist. This differs from all reports by liberals.

Chapter 4, "Revolution in the Countryside", pp. 67-84, is substantial on the nature of peasant participation: "Between one half and two thirds of all cultivated land in Republican Spain was seized (p. 67").

Mike notes: "This lack of peasants' own voices is pervasive in the literature, whether the author is academic-liberal, Stalinist, Trotskyist, or Anarchist. What we get (at least in English) are descriptions by Spanish political leaders, or accounts by outside visitors. A lot of questions

10913

4/5/87

are left. Thus, Austin Souchy (anarchist) describes one collective and tells us that "Every male worker receives ~~one~~ a peseta a day; women and girls receive 75 centimes; and children under 10, 50 centimes. What does this say about man/woman relations in the collective? What did women think about it? We don't hear them at all."

That is really the whole contradiction that I face in a nutshell; all the works that I read or the works read by colleagues working on this for me, not to mention the discussions I had through the years of the whole 1/2 century, it really was never workers speaking for themselves. At most you would hear one para. sometimes just one phrase that some reporter, an intellectual, recorded as what a worker said. And how he introduced it and what he concluded from it. So that all my emphasis on workers speaking for themselves is really the acts they did rather than the thoughts they had. However, I will ~~not~~ here summarize also the Trotskyist work, The Revolution and the Civil War in Spain, by Pierre Broue and Emile Temime (MIT Press, 1970). Otherwise, the Hungarian seems closer to what I was looking for, but both Pannekoek ^{on} ~~and~~ the 1920 Workers Councils in Russia and Germany, not to mention the Johnny-come latelys, like Mattick, are just a bunch of rhetoric.

4/5/87

Broue does talk about ~~the~~ forms of organization and generally puts it in the framework of dual government, which is, of course, the Russian Revolution of both Lenin and Trotsky, where you had both a Kerensky and the Bolsheviks. Broue's ~~view~~ view of the Spanish peasantry is more crucial than given credit for by Trotsky. With emphasis on the fact that in '31 there were 2 million agricultural workers with no land at all, while 50 thousand landowners held title to 50% of the arable land while 1.5 million additional peasants held less than 2.5 acres.

Chapter 2 on the Labor Movement is an overview of tendencies in the Spanish Revolution with stress on the anarchists and some attention paid to POUM. Then, however, he continues with his Trotskyist position of the backwardness of the peasants. I think it's interesting to see that the discussion of the POUM begins with Nin and Andradne's break with LT in '34 because they could not understand the French Turn, moving instead to merge with an ex-CPer, Maurin, to form the POUM, which had 3000 members at the outbreak of the Spanish Revolution.

Mike says: "PB has a good description of the huge spontaneous uprising by Barcelona workers in July 1936, when they crushed Franco's coup in their city. He offers a real feeling of the self-organization of the workers, the revolt of the soldiers against the officers. (pp. 11--113) But

10915

4/5/87

-12-

nowhere in this does any rank and file participant get to tell his or her own story. That lack is repeated throughout the book."

Chapter 5, "Dual Power in Republican Spain". ~~Y~~ The fact that certain people opposed to Communism, and Trotskyism, for that matter, like the famous Borkenau, wrote, "Barcelona was the bastion of Soviet Spain -- in the original sense of the word, the Spain of Concils and Workers' Committees," /does not make it a dual government. On p. 124, Broue writes: "In Republican Spain there were no longer practically any forces for the preservation of law and order ... Everywhere, beginning on the 18th or 19th, there was a general strike, which lasted for at least a week; the workers were out in the streets from morning to night, weapons in hand." (p. 124)

(Do pay attention to the end of page 3 and page 4.)

Evidently in Catalonia there did exist committees that exercised such power and the most original regional revolutionary power was established in Aragon. Study pp. 131 to 136. Broue summarizes, in Chapter 6, the assessment of the period July to November 1936.

10916