Philosophy and Global Affairs
doi: 10.5840/pga202582186
Online First: August 22, 2025

Raya Dunayevskaya's Reorganizing of Revolutionary Thought

An Interview with Peter Hudis
Conducted by Jane Anna Gordon

ABSTRACT: This interview with Peter Hudis, conducted by Jane Anna Gordon in February 2025, offers a concise introduction to the life and work of Raya Dunayevskaya, an account of how Hudis's work as her secretary led him to encounter her remarkable memory, excellent judgment of character, and focus on how decentralized forms of mass organization could avoid both generating theory apart from active engagement with "masses in motion" and substituting grassroots organizing for cultivating thoroughgoing philosophy. It then describes Dunayevskaya's conception of translation as requiring sacrifice and of how her experience of antisemitism as a child informed her view of antisemitism as endemic to state and private capitalism and appreciation for how Black people in the U.S. faced what Frantz Fanon called an "overdetermination from the outside" that was not shared by European Jews. Hudis characterizes Dunayevskaya's most enduring contribution as her understanding of how humanism permeated all of Marx's thought and how all subsequent Marxist critique must similarly center how all alienated forms of social life, whether premised on class, gender, nationality, race, sexuality, etc., thwart humanity's species-capacities for creative self-development. Finally, Hudis recounts how Dunayevskaya's thinking dialectically is an effective way of avoiding the trap of ideology and belied the historic division of mental and manual labor that frames women theoreticians as intruders in a male intellectual world.

KEYWORDS: antiracist struggle, dialectical thinking, feminism, humanist Marxism, News and Letters Committees, Raya Dunayevskaya, translation

Recently learning that major political thinker Peter Hudis had worked as Raya Dunayevskaya's last secretary, I was eager to interview him about this work. Conducted in February 2025, in what follows, Hudis offers a concise introduc-

Correspondence: phudis55@gmail.com and jane.gordon@uconn.edu

tion to the life and work of Dunayevskaya, how he met and came to collaborate with her, on what problems she was most focused in that period, how she understood the nature and significance of translation, how her Eastern European Jewishness was expressed in her *praxis*, what he considers her most enduring contribution, how she influenced his own undertakings, why he is rare in engaging seriously with historical women thinkers, including Rosa Luxemburg and Dunayevskaya, and where someone encountering Dunayevskaya for the first time should begin.

Jane Anna Gordon (JAG): Who was Raya Dunayevskaya?

Peter Hudis (*PH*): Raya Dunayevskaya (1910–1987) was originally from western Ukraine and arrived as an immigrant in Chicago in 1921 after her family fled their homeland due to the Russian Civil War. Within a few years she became active in local left-wing politics and joined the Young Pioneers, the youth group of the U.S. Communist Party. She took a lively interest in antiracist struggles from the inception of her political career, joining (in 1925) the American Negro Labor Congress, headed by Lovett Fort-Whiteman—a group devoted to bridging the divide between Marxism and followers of Marcus Garvey. In 1927 she corresponded with W. E. B. Du Bois—that he responded to the letters of an unknown seventeen-year-old is a mark of his character.

In 1927, she was expelled from the Young Pioneers for objecting to a resolution condemning Leon Trotsky, who had recently been expelled from the Russian Communist party. After suggesting they not take a vote without first discussing what the dispute was about, she was thrown down a flight of stairs and called a "Trotskyite." She had no idea what that meant but was told by friends that a small group of his followers had just formed in New York. So, she left for New York to find them, meeting up with James P. Cannon, Max Shachtman, and Antoinette Konikow (a Russian émigré who had joined Russia's first Marxist organization, Plekhanov's Emancipation of Labor Group, in the early 1890s; in the U.S. Konikow was a leading abortion rights advocate). Dunayevskaya spent the next decade as an activist in the Trotskyist movement, traveling the country to participate in strikes, demonstrations, and union organizing (often alongside A. J. Muste). By the late 1930s, weary of the factional disputes within the Trotskyist movement, she decided to join the international brigades in the Spanish Revolution—only to be told that they didn't accept women. She then moved to Mexico to become Trotsky's Russian language secretary, serving in that capacity in 1937 and 1938.

Horrified by the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939—and Trotsky's continued defense of the USSR despite it—she broke from him and joined the Workers Party of America (WP), which split from the more orthodox Socialist Workers Party (SWP). In many respects, this marked her birth as a theoretician—she was known as a lively rank and file activist up to this point but had not published any major theoretical works. She now committed herself to demonstrating that Stalin's Russia had become a state-capitalist society and spent several years doing extensive research on its economy to prove it. At the WP's founding conference in 1940 she met C. L. R. James, who had also come to a state-capitalist position. A few months later they formed the Johnson-Forest Tendency (Johnson was James's pen name, Forest was Dunayevskaya's; hereafter JFT) devoted, among other things, to developing a Marxist analysis of the class nature of the USSR. Not long afterward Grace Lee became a leading figure in the group. Dunayevskaya's studies on the Russian economy began appearing in radical publications in 1942–1943 and in *The American Economic Review (AER)* in 1944–1945; the latter exposed Stalin's shocking admission that the capitalist law of value operated in the USSR, albeit "applied in the interests of the masses." Her ensuing debate over this in the *AER* with supporters of the USSR such as Paul Baran and Oskar Lange drew international attention and was covered on the front page of *The New York Times*.

It was in the course of this research that Dunayevskaya came across a Russian translation of Marx's now-famous *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, which was then unknown in the English-speaking world, and translated portions of it for the JFT. (Several years later Lee translated excerpts of it from the German.) Dunayevskaya was especially taken with Marx's critique of what he called "crude and unthinking communists," who viewed the abolition of private property as a sufficient condition for creating a socialist society. It led her to argue that the unequal distribution of property, income, and resources is the necessary result of alienated human relations, not the other way around. But her discovery of Marx's humanist critique of alienation did not merely influence her economic analysis of the USSR. It eventually led her to argue that Marxists had struggled to integrate issues of race and gender oppression into an anti-capitalist perspective because their economism and objectivism blocked them from addressing the dehumanized forms of interpersonal relations that define modern society.

By 1947 the JFT left the WP—because of state-capitalist theory but no less due to the WP's rejection of its insistence that the struggle of Black Americans against racism had an independent validity and should not be regarded as a mere adjunct to the class struggle. Although the SWP, which the JFT then

joined, adopted James's "Resolution on the Negro Question" in 1948, the gulf that separated James and his colleagues from orthodox Trotskyism became all too clear—especially when the JFT began to reject the notion of a "vanguard party" of professional revolutionaries to lead the masses. The JFT then became an independent organization in 1952, the Committees of Correspondence. However, by 1955 differences over alternatives to the vanguard party led to the group's breakup. Whereas James and Lee argued that the role of Marxists is to serve as a "full fountain pen" to record mass struggles, Dunayevskaya held that that could not substitute for developing an organization devoted to developing a humanist Marxism that could give action its direction. She went on to form the News and Letters Committee along with Charles Denby, a Black autoworker in Detroit and author of *Indignant Heart, a Black Workers' Journal*. She led the News and Letters Committees from 1955 until her death in 1987.

From the late mid-1950s onward, Dunayevskaya wrote voluminously on issues of Marxism, humanism, the relation of race and class, feminism, and revolutions as well as counter-revolutions in the Third World. Her major works include *Marxism and Freedom* (1958), which probed the U.S. roots and world humanist concepts of Marx's thought; *American Civilization on Trial: Black Masses as Vanguard* (1963), which analyzed the historic development of U.S. antiracist struggles; *Philosophy and Revolution: from Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao* (1973), which explored the Hegelian dialectic "in and for itself" and in relation to the revolutionary struggles of the 1950s and 1960s; and *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution* (1981), which tackled the contributions of modern feminism in light of the legacy of Rosa Luxemburg as well as the "new moments" of Marx's thought found in his writings on non-Western societies at the end of his life. She also published a collection of her essays, speeches, and letters on revolutionary feminism in *Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution* (1985). In the last years of her life she was engaged in an unfinished work entitled, "Dialectics of Philosophy and Organization." Her Archives, housed at the Wayne State University Library of Labor History and Urban Affairs, total 15,000 pages.

JAG: How did you meet and come to work with Dunayevskaya?

PH: I first encountered Dunayevskaya's work through Eric Fromm's collection *Socialist Humanism* (1965), which included an essay of hers. I had no idea at the time who she was—I assumed that she, like most of the contributors to the Fromm collection, was living somewhere in Eastern or Central Europe. At the

time I was an undergraduate at Queens College in New York and was shopping around the Left, having had some rather unpleasant experiences with several Marxist groups that seemed far too dogmatic. In any case, later that year a leading figure of the Yugoslav Praxis school, Mihailo Marković (who also had an essay in the Fromm collection) gave a talk at my college which impressed me greatly. At a reception afterward I asked him if he knew anything about Dunayevskaya and others in the Fromm volume. He said "of course, she is an old friend of mine; in fact, she'll be speaking next week in Manhattan." So, I attended her talk (at the New School for Social Research) and was surprised to discover she lived in Detroit and was part of a Marxist-Humanist organization. (No one in the Left at the time told me it even existed.) I got involved in the News and Letters Committees (N&LC) a bit later, spent a few weeks in Detroit where I got to know her (and Denby), and subsequently became an organizer of its Los Angeles branch.

JAG: In what capacity did you work with Dunayevskaya? How would you describe your working relationship?

PH: That depends on how one defines "working with." Quite a few who passed through N&LC over the years and didn't live in Detroit have stated in recent years that they "worked" with Dunayevskaya, when in fact their relation was more along the lines of occasionally speaking with her at meetings, engaging in correspondence with her, etc. And that was true of me as well for a number of years. I really got to work with her in 1983, when I accompanied her on a tour of the West Coast for a series of lectures on the centenary of Marx's death. We spent several weeks together on the road, traveling from San Diego to Seattle with many stops in between (one of them in Santa Barbara where she was interviewed by Cedric Robinson just before *Black Marxism* was about to be published). That's when we bonded personally and I was able to spend a considerable amount of time with her.

Two years later she came to LA for a series of talks and asked me if I could accompany her for a week at a cabin where she planned to stay in Lake Arrowhead. This wasn't exactly a vacation: she wanted to be away for a while to do some writing and wanted me there to take dictation and do some research. Raya liked to write by conversing—talking out ideas, having someone take them down, having some discussion on them, and then she would revise and further develop the typescript. So that's what we did for a week, dawn to dusk (with some nice walks in the woods, and great food—she was a very fine cook). Not long afterward she asked if I could move to Chicago to be her secretary (she

had moved there from Detroit in 1984). At that point she told me that our week away had been my audition. I was in a relationship at the time and my partner was not wild about moving to Chicago, but Raya said she understood and said I could take a year to think about it. I decided to do so and in 1986 I moved to Chicago.

From then until her death a year later I served as her secretary, which meant taking down thoughts that she dictated, typing up notes and drafts that she would then edit from, checking references and tracking down quotations, and being a kind of sounding board. At times she would look up from her notes or stop dictating and ask what I thought of some formulation or concept. At first, I didn't think it was my place to say much—I didn't want to interfere with her train of thought, and who was I to judge in any case? But she liked to hear honest, off the cuff reactions and didn't seem terribly bothered even when what I said was off base. She did not suffer fools gladly and could be quite stern when one was sloppy or inattentive to detail. But she was very gracious and supportive. We generally worked starting at 8:30 a.m. sharp through 5:00 p.m.; during lunch she would often have me call the N&LC office to see how things were going there and to arrange for meetings in the evenings for comrades or for them to attend other events. I was often amazed to come back the next morning and have her hand me a twenty-page document she had drafted overnight. It took a lot to keep up with her—I say this as someone who was forty years younger than her at the time.

Two things struck me in working with her that might not be obvious to those who didn't have the opportunity to do so. One is that she had a remarkable memory. She would often intersperse her comments by talking about one or another experience in her life—for example, what it was like when the Red Army came through her village in 1918, how Trotsky dealt with the first serious threat to his life while in Coyoacán, a question someone at one of her talks asked twenty years before and how she answered it, etc. She was more in touch with her lived experience than anyone I have ever met. So, working with her was not only a learning experience in how to do theory but also a catalogue of historical memory. Another is that she was an excellent judge of character: while I was working with her at times a comrade or visitor would show up for a discussion; she would ask a few questions to get to know them better, and then softly suggest the kind of project or even career they might want to pursue. Quite a number of subsequent academic careers came out of those brief interludes. And that judgment of character was also displayed when she sensed that someone was going off the rails. After not seeing him for a number of years, Marković visited Chicago in 1986, and she had him over for a discussion. Al-

most before he could take his seat, she shouted at him, "How can someone like you justify Serbian nationalism? That is shameful!" This was some years before the breakup of Yugoslavia. Marković denied he had become a nationalist and proclaimed his fidelity to Marxism. But she would not let up on him. Only later did we learn he was one of the signatories to a memorandum by the Serbian Academy of Scientists that [Slobodan] Milošević later used as a rationale for the ethnic cleansing of Bosnia.

Living through the dark decades when Stalinism dominated the Left, experiencing the interminable splits and feuds among Trotskyists, and witnessing how Maoism disoriented a generation of young revolutionaries in the 1960s and 1970s seems to have sensitized Dunayevskaya to how thin the line can become between revolution and counter-revolution in the present historical period.

JAG: On what problems was she then most focused and why?

PH: During my time as her secretary she was focused on tackling what she considered the most unresolved issue in Marxism—the problem of organization and its relation to the development of Marxism as a philosophy of liberation (as against limiting it to a critique of economics or a struggle for political power). Dunayevskaya was a firm believer in what is now called horizontalism: she emphasized the importance of decentralized forms of mass organization as found in the Montgomery Bus Boycott, the Hungarian Revolution, the feminist movement, etc. N&LC itself made no pretense to being a party (or a harbinger of one) on the Leninist model. However, she also emphasized that the task of developing a vision of emancipation from all forms of domination cannot be saddled upon spontaneous forms of self-organization. Ideas that can give action their direction remain of critical importance. At issue is how not to restrict their development to the halls of academia or some elitist party that claims to speak for the masses. She was searching for a way to avoid the tendency to either develop theory apart from an active engagement with "masses in motion" or refrain from doing so on the grounds that grassroots organizing can substitute for a thoroughgoing philosophy. This was not a problem that she claimed to have solved. She was seeking to open a discussion of it by engaging in a reexamination of important moments of revolutionary history (such as the Paris Commune, the Spanish Revolution, the African revolutions) alongside a re-examination of the work of Hegel, Marx, and some of the most important post-Marx Marxists. Most of all, she focused on why it was that, despite all the great social movements of the past century, we still didn't have an answer to the

most important question facing efforts at social transformation—what happens *after* the revolution, *after* the seizure of power, so as to ensure that a new ruling class or bureaucracy does not take over from the old one. This has been the fate of every revolution—not just those in those in her lifetime but of those since her death. *Why* does that keep happening, and in what ways does revolutionary thought need to be reorganized in order to deal with it? This was the problem that deeply concerned her in her last days.

JAG: While fostering and sustaining internationalism requires ongoing acts of literal and metaphorical translation, the labor of translating remains largely uncompensated and otherwise undervalued. Can you describe Dunayevskaya's work as a translator and how she understood the importance of that practice?

PH: Yes indeed—translation is among the least appreciated arts. I am painfully aware of this given the six volumes of Rosa Luxemburg's writings that I helped to edit and publish. I think Walter Benjamin best captured the challenge when he said the task of a translator is in some respects more challenging than producing an original piece of writing. You not only have to grasp the words and concepts of the original but reproduce its *meaning* in a tongue that may be radically different from the author's. And grasping the meaning of ideas is very difficult—most of all because we all bring our prejudices and political preferences to a reading of a text. To give one example, Dunayevskaya was very unhappy with a translation of parts of Marx's *Ethnological Notebooks* by a Soviet scholar who translated "the career of property" as "private property." The difference is enormous: the first refers to *class* property—the ability of one class to possess property at the expense of another regardless of whether it is owned individually or collectively—whereas the second reduces the object of critique to one particular form of ownership that renders invisible the hierarchical nature of some forms of non-privatized property. To provide an adequate translation, she held, one must be willing to surrender one's preconceptions of what a thinker might be saying. Translation involves a kind of sacrifice of basic assumptions. Perhaps this is one reason many theoreticians who think highly of their particular contribution tend not to do much translating—it is so easy for intellectuals to fall in love with their own thought. Dunayevskaya's translations of Marx and Lenin (she was the first to translate the latter's 1914–1915 *Philosophic Notebooks* on Hegel into English) were done in the 1940s and 1950s, long before I came on the scene. However, in the 1970s she provided the first English translation of parts of Luxemburg's speech at the 1907 Congress of the Russian

Social-Democratic Labor Party (other versions have appeared since). She often remarked that Marx's work has not been treated well by translators. She was very pleased with Ben Fowkes's 1976 translation of Volume One of *Capital*, which restored Marx's Hegelian language to the analysis of the value-form. But the question that concerned her was why it took so long for that to finally happen.

JAG: How, if at all, did you see Dunayevskaya's Eastern European Jewishness expressed in her Marxist humanist thought and praxis?

PH: There is no question that her experience of antisemitism, especially as a child, deeply impacted her later political and theoretical development. She recounted to me a number of times that when the counter-revolutionary armies seeking the restoration of Tsarism swept through her village in Ukraine, her parents would hide her and her sisters for fear of them being raped. When she asked her parents why they did not try to hide them when the Red Army came through, she was told, "They wouldn't harm the Jews." That surely helps explain why she defined herself as a Bolshevik even before reaching the U.S. And I also think it impacted, at least in part, her virulent critique of the USSR under Stalin, when his "great Russian chauvinism" (as Lenin put it) led to increasing tendencies toward antisemitism in the latter part of his reign. That his regime laid claim to the mantle of "Bolshevism" while it murdered so many of Lenin's associates and arranged for the mass deportation of Jews to Siberia (prevented only by Stalin's sudden death in 1953) deeply affected her.

This also relates to her criticisms of the Soviet-style regimes long after Stalin's death—such as the purge of tens of thousands of Jews from Poland's Communist Party (as well as from other institutions) in 1968. At the time many still considered the East European regimes as having "solved the nationalities problem." In contrast, she viewed antisemitism as endemic to state as well as private capitalism and likely to resurface in some form whenever it faces endemic crises.

On a different note, upon arriving in Chicago in 1921 she saw a Black man for the first time; not knowing what to make of it, she asked if he was a coal miner. He laughed, saying, "No, my skin is naturally dark." She recalled feeling a shock of recognition—Jews could at least try to deny their Jewishness, but Blacks could not hide their blackness, making them prone to even more discrimination (in the U.S. at least) than Jews. I think this realization as a child—an echo of what Fanon called being "overdetermined from the outside"—is part of what sensitized her to becoming involved in antiracist struggles from such a young age.

At the same time, such experiences led her to be wary of those claiming that the holocaust (of World War II) was a unique, incomparable historical event. She viewed it as the descent into utter barbarism of a European civilization that long before engaged in the systematic slaughter of innocents in the colonized world. Hence, at the same time as criticizing leftists for not speaking out against the antisemitism of some leaders of reactionary Arab states, she pulled no punches when it came to attacking Israel's alliance with U.S. imperialism. For instance, during the Suez crisis of 1956 she wrote that nothing more could be said of Israel than that it had become another state-capitalist, sub-imperialist power. By the time of Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon, she referred to it as a "genocidal regime."

JAG: What do you consider Dunayevskaya's most enduring contributions?

PH: I think her most enduring contribution was demonstrating that humanism permeates the whole of Marx's body of thought and that any effort to reconstitute Marxism for our time must proceed from that basis. Many thinkers before and after Dunayevskaya emphasized the humanism of Marx, but most did so in terms of his early writings where he actually uses the term (such as in his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*). Dunayevskaya was the first to show that it permeates the value-theoretic categories of his mature work in *Capital* as well as his studies on the non-Western world and precapitalist societies following the publication of Volume I of *Capital*. This enabled her, I argue, to develop an intersectional Marxism decades before the term entered political discourse. Diverse forms of oppression become intelligible within a single theoretical framework when the object of critique is alienated forms of social life that thwart humanity's species-capacities for creative self-development. This makes it possible to target class domination without treating struggles over race, gender, and sexual identity as secondary considerations, just as it makes it possible to target the latter without putting aside a critique of class society and the logic of capital, as do many more recent intersectional approaches.

Furthermore, Dunayevskaya's studies on Hegelian dialectics, which began during her tenure in the JFT but became greatly extended from the 1950s onward (and especially in her *Philosophy and Revolution*), brought forth a distinct philosophical category—"absolute negativity as new beginning." This concept challenged claims that Hegel's dialectic is a closed ontology in which differentiation and contingency become subsumed under a set of logical abstractions. Not just negation, but the negation of the negation, is the process by which a subject becomes (as Hegel puts it) "personal and free." Concretized in political

terms, absolute negativity as new beginning signifies a challenge to all forms of dehumanization and oppression, in whatever form or name they happen to appear. This is an important counter to the widespread tendency in the Left during the twentieth century to oppose Western capitalism-imperialism while either supporting or failing to oppose its state-capitalist opponents in the USSR, Mao's China, and elsewhere. This becomes no less important today, when much of the radical movement still suffers from a tendency to treat the enemy of one's enemy as one's friend—such as in solidarizing with the Palestinian struggle for self-determination (which is surely an absolute imperative) while refraining from supporting the Ukrainian, Georgian, or Uighur struggle for self-determination.

JAG: How did your working relationship with Dunayevskaya influence your own subsequent thinking and *praxis*?

PH: As I wrote in the acknowledgment page in my Fanon book, Raya taught me how to think. How successful she was in that endeavor is for others to decide. I learned that "dialectic" is not some phrase to be thrown at an opponent, but a challenge to think creatively in trying to grasp the object of investigation as it is in and of itself. It is not about relying on a set of conclusions, let alone reducing a body of ideas to dogma, but revisiting and rethinking what one takes for granted as new realities come to light. That is how one can avoid the trap of ideology, which is so often expressed in repeating conclusions without taking the trouble to reconstitute the dialectic in the face of unexpected developments. Not all of those influenced by Dunayevskaya lived up to this standard, which is why I (along with most of its members) left N&LC in 2008 when the group began reducing her ideas to a catechism. I am now a member of the International Marxist-Humanist Organization, which aims to avoid this by focusing on developing a philosophically grounded conception of an alternative to capitalism through an open-ended dialogue.

Working with Dunayevskaya also forced me to slow down and listen—not just to her but to people in general, especially in my political work. Her concept that the movement from practice is a form of theory helped me shed the illusion that theory is the province of intellectuals and that those without formal training cannot be theoreticians. Ideas come from efforts to come to terms with the lived experience of oppression and struggles against it, and I try to take that into my teaching mainly working-class students as well as in my political organizing outside the classroom. Raya was remarkably open to people of a diverse array of backgrounds—she could dialogue with Hegel scholars at one moment

while advising immigrant workers how to organize a union at the next one—and that is a skill I've set as a goal to master, difficult as it often is.

JAG: You did not only work as Dunayevskaya's secretary, you have made singular contributions to the availability and understanding of Rosa Luxemburg's thought among English-speaking audiences. In so doing, you buck an all-too-familiar trend: responsibility for serious study of historical women political thinkers typically falls almost exclusively to fellow women. How do you understand the relative absence of male fellow travelers in your endeavors?

PH: What a good question! It is hard for me to fathom the reason for this other than the impact of the division of mental and manual labor, which has structured relations between the genders for millennia. We don't realize how much we have imbibed its baggage. One might think negative stereotypes about women political thinkers would not afflict socialists and communists, but that is sadly not the case. Luxemburg was often accused of having been "a romantic," someone "lacking in political realism," and even being "hysterical." Similar terms were applied to Dunayevskaya. More subtle forms of dismissal, in Luxemburg's case, are expressed in the oft-asked question, "Was Luxemburg a Leninist?"—while few ask, "Was Lenin a Luxemburgist" (even though she was more famous and widely read than Lenin was as of 1914). Likewise, there is a disturbing tendency among many (mainly male) writers who mention Dunayevskaya solely in the context of the JFT, as if her theoretical and political life ended when she parted ways with C. L. R. James. Even James was not immune from this: when she died, he sent a telegram stating, "Raya was outstanding for never breaking from Marxist-Leninism"—as if her development of Marxist-Humanism hadn't happened. For some reason, women theoreticians rarely catch a break—especially when they take an approach that differs from prevailing views in society and in the Left. Women theoreticians too often tend to be treated as intruders in a male intellectual world. For whatever reason, I've never felt a need to consider myself part of the latter.

JAG: For someone living right now and unfamiliar with Dunayevskaya, where would you suggest they begin their encounter with her life and work?

PH: A good place to begin is with the collection, *Raya Dunayevskaya's Intersectional Marxism*, edited by Kevin B. Anderson, Kieran Durkin, and Heather A. Brown (Palgrave, 2021). It includes appraisals of her work by Adrienne Rich, Rodolpho

Mondolfo, Paul Mason, as well as a number of us who were associated with her for many years. For her own work, I suggest beginning with *Marxism and Freedom*—especially its 2000 edition (Humanities Press [now an imprint of Bloomsbury]), which includes an Introduction by her that provides an overview of her life and thought. In addition to *Philosophy and Revolution* and *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution,* for those interested in her writings on the Hegel-Marx relation there is *The Power of Negativity: Selected Writings on the Dialectic in Hegel and Marx*, edited by Kevin B. Anderson and me (Lexington Books, 2004 [also now an imprint of Bloomsbury]).

JAG: Is there anything that you have not addressed that you would like to add?

PH: In the last several years there has been a burst of critical writings on Dunayevskaya, which is a welcome development—too many have previously treated her as a non-person. Never an academic divorced from political practice, nor an activist divorced from philosophical development, she forged her own path in becoming an original thinker. I think the new generation of activists now coming of age in what seems a hopelessly regressive period will learn [not only] from her writings but also from her life, in which she constantly searched for new beginnings while facing reality with sober senses. As she wrote a few days before her death in June 1987, "It never fails that, at momentous world historic turning points, it is very difficult to tell the difference between two types of twilight—whether one is first plunging into utter darkness or whether one has reached the end of a long night and is just at the moment before the dawn of a new day. In either case, the challenge to find the meaning—what Hegel called 'the undefined foreboding of something unknown'—becomes a compulsion to dig for new beginnings, for a philosophy that would try to answer the question, 'Where to begin?'"

Peter Hudis is Distinguished Professor of Philosophy and Humanities at Oakton College (USA) and author of *Marx's Concept of the Alternative to Capitalism* (Haymarket, 2013) and *Frantz Fanon: Philosopher of the Barricades* (Pluto Press, 2015) and has published in numerous journals on issues related to Hegelian philosophy, Marxist theory, Critical Pedagogy, Latin American social movements, and Philosophical Perspectives on Race. He has edited or co-edited six volumes of writings by Rosa Luxemburg and is general editor of her English-language *Complete Works*.

Jane Anna Gordon is Professor of Political Science and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, with affiliations in American Studies, El Instituto, Global Affairs,

and Philosophy. She is, most recently, author of *Statelessness and Contemporary Enslavement* (Routledge, 2020) and editor, with Drucilla Cornell, of *Creolizing Rosa Luxemburg* (Rowman and Littlefield/Bloomsbury, 2021).

REFERENCES

Anderson, Kevin B., Kieran Durkin, and Heather A. Brown, editors. 2021. *Raya Dunayevskaya's Intersectional Marxism*. London: Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53717-3

Dunayevskaya, Rosa. 1985. *Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Dunayevskaya, Raya. 1989 [1973]. *Philosophy and Revolution: from Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Dunayevskaya, Raya. 1991 [1981]. *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Dunayevskaya, Raya. 2000 [1958]. *Marxism and Freedom: From 1776 Until Today*. New York: Humanities Press/Bloomsbury Publishing.

Dunayevskaya, Raya. 2001. *The Power of Negativity: Selected Writings on the Dialectic in Hegel and Marx*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Bloomsbury Publishing.

Dunayevskaya, Raya. 2003 [1963]. *American Civilization on Trial: Black Masses as Vanguard*. Chicago: News and Letters.

Denby, Charles (Matthew Ward). 1978. *Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal*. Boston: South End Press.

Fromm, Erich, editor. 1966. *Socialist Humanism: An International Symposium*. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Robinson, Cedric. 2021. *Black Marxism, Revised and Updated Edition: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.