

1985-86

Marxist-Humanist Draft Perspectives

I. Mikhail Gorbachev, the New Russian Ruler, Shifts to a New Global Outlook, Gloats at NATO's Contradictions

Mikhail Gorbachev, the new player in nuclear global brinkmanship, is about to attempt so new a chapter in the relationship between the two nuclear Behemoths as to actually shift Russia's world relations from West to East—and to the Middle East and the whole Third World. It isn't that the U.S., as the mightiest of all nuclear giants, is disregarded, but that Gorbachev feels Reagan has to be shown that he has no intention of humming Reagan's tune. In one respect, he has already done this by arranging to meet Mitterrand in Paris before Gorbachev meets Reagan. It is this that must be further developed and Gorbachev does not want to leave it only at what he can do in exacerbating the contradictions that exist in the West.

Contrary to what the State Department is feeding the media about Gorbachev, and the news that the media, in turn, is supplying to the State Department about Gorbachev's youth and robustness, Gorbachev is not interested in engaging in a competition with Reagan on the level of who is the best "communicator." The announcement of a November meeting, which was made simultaneously in Russia and the U.S. as early as late June, gives both of these global players in human lives plenty of time to change the "why" and the "what" they will talk about at the summit, from a mere "get acquainted" session to a total stalemate in the Geneva negotiations. None of the scenarios that the State Department and the media are writing for Gorbachev is determining his agenda.

What is setting his agenda is the post-World War II world, from Stalin's attitude to Mao's victory, to

Khrushchev's entry into the Middle East and establishment of the Camp David peace period with Eisenhower. This is on the one hand. On the other hand, the latest events since Reagan's ascendancy and Gromyko's total focus on the West demanded, Gorbachev decided, a shake-up and jolting of all global relations. Contrary to the Western focus on the internal "crises" of the Russian economy as meaning that they required a total concentration by Gorbachev on the domestic scene, it is Gromyko who is being assigned that task by being

moved to the ceremonial Presidency, while Gorbachev takes full responsibility for shifts on the international scene.

Here Gorbachev is attempting to initiate a truly new chapter in global politics as he tries to shift his global relationships from "the West" to "the East." What is truly new since World War II is the existence of a whole new Third World. Thereby he is attempting to reverse what was started by Stalin, who acted as if Mao, who had just won power

in China, was just a sub-lieutenant, like the Russian commissars who capitulated to Stalin.

Khrushchev, after his "de-Stalinization" speech (the famous secret "Stalin's Crimes" speech at the 1956 20th Russian Communist Party Congress), did promise China there would be a reversal of Russia's "Father Knows Best" attitude. But he reneged on his promise to share nuclear knowledge with China. He made things worse by proceeding to establish the Camp David "peace spirit" with Eisenhower before ever giving an account to Mao about the new global relationship.

AT THE SAME TIME, Gorbachev does not by any means feel he has "lost" West Europe, not even though they voted to accept U.S. deployment of nuclear weapons. Gorbachev feels that he has been given his greatest weapon for anti-Reaganism with Reagan's mindless visit to Bitburg. This demonstrated not only to the Russian masses but to the Germans, as well—indeed, to the whole world, U.S. included—that there is a good deal of affinity between Reagan and the Nazi SS officers buried at Bitburg.

For the time being, Gorbachev can gloat about the erosion of NATO from within its own contradictions. We are not only referring to the obvious, such as the divergent attitudes between West Europe and the U.S., on both Central America and Afghanistan. Instead, we wish to single out what they supposedly agree on "100%"—deployment of nuclear arms. The original request came, after all, from the former Chancellor of West Germany, Helmut Schmidt, not from the U.S.

What Reagan fails to sense is the "why" of this Helmut Schmidt proposal. It took an official not presently in the Reagan Administration to probe into that "why."

We refer to the analysis of Earl C. Ravenal, former official in the office of the Secretary of Defense, on what the deployment of the long-range nuclear weapons signifies: "The additional protection they afford is illusory; they are not even subject to European control. They are a symbol of Europe's abiding distrust of America's extended deterrence." As if that didn't state openly enough that Europe has not lost DeGaulle's distrust of America, Ravenal adds: "...under the surface, America's nuclear commitment to Europe is not so sure." Because he thinks he has not yet driven the point home, he continues: "America, the alliance guarantor, hoping to escape the destruction of nuclear war, will seek to put time between the outbreak of war in Europe and the decision to escalate to nuclear weapons, and will take whatever advantage it can of its distance from Europe."

No doubt, the Reaganites in power now will deny that statement and the general cynicism that pervades both Europe's acceptance of deployment and America's cynicism, as well, from an "opposite" angle. They must face the stark reality of the way rulers decide upon so-called strategy. As Ravenal articulates it: "Americans are faced with an increasingly demarcated choice: the salvation of Europe, or their own solvency and safety."

All this makes it easier for Gorbachev to show his macho spirit in international affairs by removing Gromyko from that post. To the U.S. and the West generally, Gromyko meant the "evil spirit from the East." To China and the Third World, and most of all to the new leaders in the Kremlin, Gromyko stood for "the West"—that is to say, he was a specialist on the maneuvers of the Western powers. So it isn't only a question of being young among the elders. Gorbachev is starting a new chapter as the leader from Georgia, who is the Great Russian as well.

1. See "Europe Without America: the Erosion of NATO," by Earl C. Ravenal, in *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1965.

Moreover, he is replacing Gromyko with a nearly unknown non-specialist in any international affairs. Eduard Shevardnadze's specialty is as top cop and as Party chief in Georgia. Whereas all the pundits are correctly stressing that this new spokesman of foreign affairs will express Gorbachev's views, they are quite ambivalent about what was totally new in Andropov's ascendancy and what the "Andropov man," Gorbachev, is developing even further. It is the integrality of the Secret Police/Party ideology. No less than three of the 13 members of the Political Bureau have NKVD (Secret Police) work as their specialty.

It is not the Russian economy and its "inefficiency" that signalled the newness in Andropov, who had combined both the functions of an NKVD man and ideology as his prerogatives. As we wrote in 1982: "Suslov was Russia's preeminent ideologist... (but) Andropov, the NKVD man, nevertheless moved rapidly to take over that portfolio after Suslov's death."² In a word, the Leader has now monopolized both ideology and politicalization of the Army that had formerly been the prerogative of the NKVD.

CENTRAL AMERICA MAY BE geopolitically too far removed from Russia and too close to the U.S. for Gorbachev to wish to challenge the U.S. there, though he

will certainly aid Nicaragua. But what about the Middle East, where Khrushchev did achieve totally new relations ever since 1955 by selling them arms? In the Middle East, while Russia "lost" Egypt as an ally, Syria is not only its ally but is the key element for Lebanon, and has such influence in all of the Middle East that, for the moment, the U.S. cannot embark on any move there without paying serious attention to what Syria's role would be. There are many, many other points of contact for Russia, from Lebanon to Iran, from Afghanistan (which means also harassing Pakistan) to India.

Because Khomeini never underplayed what military strength meant, especially on a global scale, he was never confused by the propaganda that the U.S. "follows Israel." Israel remains Khomeini's enemy and he will continue to fight it. It is the U.S., however, that he has designated as the "Great Satan," always insisting that it is Israel who follows the U.S., not the other way around. Clearly, the initiation of a new chapter in Russia's relations with the "East," the Middle East and the Third World is, to Gorbachev, worth a try.

We need go no further into the games rulers play. Shocks of the order of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which initiated World War II, will abound. Instead, we have to look at the two worlds in each country.

2. See Raya Dunayevskaya's analysis, "Andropov's Ascendancy Reflects Final Stage of State-Capitalism's Degeneracy," in *News & Letters*, December 1982.

Russia, of course, has plenty of contradictions, not only when it comes to relationships with the other nuclear Titan and the "West" as a whole, but in the antagonistic class relations in Russia itself. Let's never forget that even in the forced labor camps of Vorkuta, there was a great revolt, which followed the great new freedom chapter begun in East Germany on June 17,

1953, when workers there issued the slogan: "Bread and Freedom," and tore down the statues of Stalin. Nor can we forget that each time a rebellion is put down in Russia's empire in East Europe, it is only driven underground, and not destroyed. Poland, which continues the revolt to this day in the struggles of Solidarnosc, is by no means the only one.

II. The U.S. Economy and Its Imperialist Tentacles vs. the Mass Struggles, Here and Abroad

To us as American revolutionaries, it is Reagan's retrogressionism at home that is the immediate enemy. That has priority over all else. What has the "four more years" Reagan won in the last election meant to the American masses? Even if we take the question of the American economy "in general"—as if people are not involved (as is characteristic of economists)—Martin Feldstein, the former head of the Council of Economic Advisers under Reagan, is forced to conclude that nothing short of the economy itself is in danger.³ We must remember that Feldstein had approved Reagan's union-busting. He tries to hide his own anti-unionism under the accusation that the American workers are bound by what he calls "rigidities." That is to say, they are union men and women who have fought hard to win decent wages and conditions of labor.

"Pragmatism" cannot hide the fact that the American economy is going down. Furthermore, it isn't true that this characterizes only agriculture and the timber industry, which have reached the lowest levels since the Depression. Feldstein admits that basic industries like steel, chemicals and even high-tech have become second-rate. The truth is that our so-called "prosperity" is totally misleading. There has been an increase of ten million in the number of poor since 1978. And, since Reagan has assumed power, the poor, writes Joseph Lelyveld (*New York Times*, June 16, 1985), "are generally further below the poverty line—now calculated by the Census Bureau to be \$10,610 for a family of four—than they were then."

"There is a real danger...that the capital inflow and the rising dollar are giving Americans a false sense of well-being," Feldstein bemoans, as he points to the "new inflow of nearly \$100 billion from abroad." The mighty U.S., he concludes, has become a "debtor nation."

Finally, though he was for the rise of military spending in the first years of Reaganism, he is by now so worried about "America's fiscal imbalance" that he stresses the fact that the deficit has risen from \$28 bil-

lion to "more than \$107 billion last year. This year it is likely to rise to about \$140 billion, or over three and a half percent of the Gross National Product." In a word, the imbalance has quadrupled in just three years!

What Feldstein fails to see—precisely because politically he thinks like Reagan when it comes to opposing workers' unionism, which he call "rigidities"—is that Reagan has deliberately created deficits in order to get the Democrats, too, to agree to dismantle what has been achieved since the New Deal, over a whole half century—whether that be welfare programs, or labor rights legislation, or creating institutions like the National Labor Relations Board.

In 1984, Senator Ernest Hollings of South Carolina told the Association for a Better New York that Reagan had "intentionally created a deficit so large that we Democrats will never have enough money to build the sort of government programs we want."⁴ And in the *New York Times* of July 21, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan develops in full "Reagan's Inflate-the-Deficit Game," revealing a discussion with David Stockman, the Budget Director (who was his former student), on the question of using the budget process to eliminate programs: "The driving motive has been to dismantle fifty years of social legislation."

THERE IS NOT A SINGLE element of the Black population, in particular, that has not felt the retrogression—whether that be in the increase in unemployment, the abridgment of civil rights, child care, housing, and on and on. Although, in general, the media have given

4. Quoted by Tom Wicker in his *New York Times* article of June 19, "A Deliberate Deficit." He here expands on this whole question and contrasts it to Reagan's public statements that cutting taxes "would expand the economic base and increase revenues. In his 1980 campaign he even contended that the increase in revenues resulting from the tax cut would pay for the military buildup he also planned."

3. See "American Economic Policy and the World Economy," by Martin Feldstein, *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1985.

the same attention, specifically they have not let the masses speak for themselves—not even as reflected in the leaders. Thus, we saw nowhere an account of Benjamin Hooks' report to the annual NAACP meeting; the media limited their coverage of that report to saying that Hooks' spirit was "combative." (The question of the Black Dimension will be developed separately in a supplementary report to the News and Letters Committee's Plenum by Lou Turner, "Black World" columnist.)

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S CONFERENCES IN KENYA

The same retrogression is true of the hard-won rights of women's liberationists. All these rights are now being threatened, from the right to abortion to the right to a job—any job at all, let alone comparable pay for comparable work.

Nothing makes Reagan's retrogressionism more obvious than the appointment of Maureen Reagan by her "dad" to head the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Decade for Women Conference in Nairobi, Kenya, and to push the line that whatever she raises is the proper business of a women's conference, while what all others raise is "propaganda." Anything contrary to Reagan's agenda is evidently to be considered "politics"—whether that be the matter of Palestinian women asking to be put on the agenda, or the matter of the Equal Rights Amendment, for which the entire UN delegation voted, the very first year of the "decade for women."

While the non-governmental "Forum '85" was good in exposing the retrogressionism of Reagan, it was non-critical of many of the conditions of women in the Third World countries. There is no doubt, however, that "Forum '85" was more representative of women both in the U.S. and around the world than the official conference. Not only were 10,000 present there as against 3,000 at the official meetings, but the spirit and discussion, whether on politics or other issues, were concerned with the actual problems of women. The greatest events, however, took place neither at the government-sponsored meetings nor at the Forum, but on the lawn where masses of women assembled, some just on hearing that there was such a women's conference taking place.

The most exciting and most seriously thought-out activity of all was what Elaine Sciolino reported in the New York Times of July 18: the way in which one

Kenyan woman, Elizabeth Wanjara, heard about the Decade for Women Conference on a transistor radio in her hometown of Bungoma, about 460 miles from Nairobi. It inspired eight other women to get together with her, sell honey and knit sweaters to raise enough money to buy her a bus ticket. The fact that she is illiterate only proves that intelligence is not related to reading and writing, but to experience and your own thinking. It was this woman who said (and she was the only one

who said it) that she knew exactly why she came: "I have to go back to all the women in my place and tell them the stories on all the happenings here. I have to tell them how we can be ourselves—no longer just have babies and have babies dying." As will be seen below, when we detail the Marxist-Humanist analysis, this is not to say that this woman has worked out the philosophic conclusions to be drawn from this conference or from the decade as a whole on what to do now.

WHAT IS IMPORTANT ABOUT this Conference is that thousands of women, spontaneously and many without any previous experiences at such meetings, had such a passion for freedom and gained strength from knowing that there were others who felt the way they did and that they did not have to solve their problems individually. But this spontaneity found no voice what-

soever at the official Conference, and even at the Forum found nothing comparable to the freedom they experienced, as Sciolino put it, "away from overcrowded workshop classrooms and the political overtones of the official United Nations Decade for Women Conference..." (our emphasis).

This is not a criticism of "political overtones"—which were certainly present also on the lawn in many crucial ways, such as the petition for others to "Support the South African liberation movements," handed out by Esther Levitan, a South African who has been fighting apartheid for 40 years; or material on the legacy of Hiroshima circulated by Japanese women peace activists.

The truth is that, though both conferences have formally declared this the end of a decade, not only did the Indian women propose another conference in five years and offer their country to host it, but all the women considered this not the end but the beginning of a totally new relationship.

This is precisely what is meant in pointing out that all the ramifications of the Conference are first now to be worked out. The very category that we made of the maturity of the women in our age—Woman as Revolutionary Force and Reason—was created to show that women are now ready to be part of the dialectic of thought as well as of revolution, to be constantly on the lookout for the concrete ways women have developed something new in the struggle against the status quo. The new that has emerged in this decade of women's struggles Marxist-Humanism has not only recorded but has developed as the dialectics of revolution and of thought in Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

Take the question of "The Disappeared" in the totalitarian countries—be it Argentina or El Salvador, Sri Lanka or Lebanon. It began with the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo in Argentina who have marched in the center of the city for eight years—walking voicelessly but with their message loud and clear in the names of their missing children painted or sewn onto their head-

scarves. They were a pivotal part of the struggle that brought down the junta. Or consider the Mothers Committee of Political Prisoners and Mothers of the Disappeared in El Salvador who continued their demonstrations when all other protests in San Salvador had stopped. Whether it is these, or the women in Guatemala who formed Apoyo Mutuo (Mutual Support), or many others, there is no doubt that women are present everywhere as revolutionary fighters for a new society.

What Terry Moon reported in News & Letters in October 1984 on these events is only part of our tracing of the new forms of women's revolt in this decade, as was clear from "Women's Liberation in Search of a Theory" by Olga Domanski, included in our special bulletin on Marxist-Humanism as a Body of Ideas, Dialectics of Revolution: American Roots and World Humanist Concepts. Now coming off the press is our new book, Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future—which it is necessary to sell, not as salespeople, but as founders of Marxist-Humanism. It is this task which figures most prominently in the perspectives for the coming year.

THE U.S. IMPERIALIST tentacles are by no means restricted to its outreach among women. Quite the contrary. There is not a part of the whole globe towards which it does not reach. That world outlaw, Ronald Reagan—who had refused to recognize the World Court condemnation of his violation of the international freedom of the seas, as Nicaragua had charged when it brought proof of the mining of its harbors—also did not bow to any criticism at home of that act, which Senator Goldwater called "an act of war." Nothing is stopping Reagan from continuing just such actions now that he has got Congress to approve the supplying of so-called "humanitarian aid" to the counter-revolutionaries who declare quite openly that their aim is to overthrow the duly-constituted democratic government of Nicaragua. Indeed, he has openly announced the "possibility" of military intervention, i.e. actual invasion, if the contras do not succeed in that end.

What Reagan fails to realize is that there are great mass struggles against the U.S. not only in Nicaragua—which he thinks he can disarm because they are supposed to be just Communist—but throughout the world.

PHILIPPINE STRUGGLES

Take the Philippines, headed by his ally, Marcos. At first it looked as if the mass demonstrations against the murder of Aquino were only against Marcos, and almost as if there were democracy in that land because of the coverage the murder received. The way, however, that Marcos has used the "complexity" and "comprehensiveness" of supposedly hearing all sides to keep General Ver and 24 other officers who were charged with the murder from actually serving sentences has proved to

the masses that Marcos has no intention of giving up any part of his power or that of General Ver. That he is doing so because he has the full support of the U.S. government has proved to the Philippine masses that they have to fight also against the U.S.

In a word, the Philippine mass struggle is not Communist only, but involves the great majority of the people and is directed against U.S. imperialism because the U.S. is supporting Marcos and is interested only in the strategic bases it has there—especially Clark Air Force Base and Subic Bay Naval Base. This mass struggle has grown tremendously in the last few years:

(1) There have been outright gun battles, both with the Communists and with new guerrilla forces, in Mindanao.

(2) Philippine military officials have admitted that gun battles between the military and members of the Armed Communist Party, an urban wing of the Communist New People's Army, have become nationwide.

(3) These armed encounters have so intensified that there were in June gun battles between government troops and 200 Communist rebels in Northern Mindanao continued for over eight days. They forced 1,500 families to flee to escape the crossfire between them.

(4) Salvador H. Laurel, president of United Nationalist Democratic Organization, the largest grouping of opposition parties, has put it bluntly: "Even metropolitan Manila is now threatened."

(5) There have been an average of ten violent "incidents" a day in the first five months of this year. There are an average of ten deaths a day.

(6) Western analysts say that the New People's Army numbers between 12,000 and 15,000 armed fighters, and that there has been, roughly, a doubling of activity this year. The U.S. Defense Department not only agrees with this estimate but has admitted that the arms of the guerrillas come mostly from what they can seize, steal or buy from the military.

But Marcos can do is call the insurgents "apostles of a godless ideology" and claim that the government has control over the situation.

EVEN IF WE LIMIT OURSELVES only to intra-imperialist struggles, there are enough contradictions among the Allies themselves that the fragility of NATO becomes quite obvious. One event that happened in a small town in North Africa—Oujda—could upset the tenuous struggle of the only two super-nuclear powers, Russia and the U.S., both out for world mastery. Naturally, these nuclear powers think that they and they alone can make decisions that count in that struggle for single world rule. That, however, does not mean that their timing may not be jolted by "little things," such as what happened in August 1984 in that faraway small town of Oujda, from which issued the shocking news

that the rulers of two totally different countries—Morocco's King Hassan II and Libya's Kadafy—seemingly out of the blue, concluded what they called an "Arab-African Union of State."

LIBYA-MOROCCO PACT, AND POLISARIO

What a shocker that was to the U.S., which has staked everything on such reliable allies (on a par with the Shah of Iran) as the King of Morocco, who was chosen to assure the interests of the "West" in North Africa. To see how the U.S. was given just such assurance, listen to the King in January 1982, telling a Dakar newspaper: "I would close my eyes and, intellectually, turn elsewhere, if the U.S. tried to overthrow the Kadafy government."

What, then, happened between 1982 and 1984, which has presently led the editor of Middle East Journal, who has been Ambassador to Lebanon, Algeria and Morocco—Richard Parker—to point to the fragility of the alliance? Though he had not opposed their getting more aid from the U.S., he had held that the U.S. was overestimating Morocco as the protector of the West. But his expose of Hassan's hypocrisy—in claiming that the meeting at Oujda happened too suddenly for him to inform his Western friends, and that this Union was not against anyone—is not what is important. What is crucial is the fragility of the whole Western Alliance.

Kadafy is by no means the scatter-brain that the U.S. government and the media are making him appear. You cannot, for example, dismiss the other critical alliance he has now negotiated with the new ruler of Sudan, General El-Dahab—to whom he promised he would be "neutral" on the question of the guerrillas in southern Sudan who are supported by Ethiopia. Kadafy wields important power in the whole Third World.

What needs analysis is the sudden union between the monarch of Morocco and the "revolutionary" Kadafy is not the hypocrisy, but the class interests in Morocco that created this unholy alliance. This "Union of State" cannot be dismissed as merely one more wild scheme of Libya, since it was Hassan II and not Libya who took the initiative in the Union. The truth is that what motivates Hassan is the unemployment situation in Morocco, which has reached catastrophic proportions. Kadafy's Libya must have promised it could provide a considerable amount of employment from its oil fields to have Hassan dream of 100,000 employed. (Could not Kadafy replace the 60,000 Tunisians now employed in Libya's oil fields with unemployed Moroccans?)

What is involved in the matter of the "Arab-African Union of State," besides the two countries of Morocco and Libya, is the difference in the positions of Morocco and Algeria on the question of the war in the Western Sahara. Kadafy has promised to be "neutral" on that question also. Hassan has not given up any of his monarchic claims to the Western Sahara ever since it gained its independence from Spain. He acts as if the great guerrilla movement, Polisario, was created by Algeria, just because Algeria supports it. What none can

deny is that Algeria is quite influential in the Third World that supports Polisario, but so is Kadafy. His promise to King Hassan II about his "neutrality" on the question of Algeria-Polisario is not taken seriously by Hassan, but, for the moment, he is willing to claim that it was the *quid pro quo* for his signature on the "Arab-African Union of State."

Who will betray whom—whether in this new union or in the whole relationship of "West" (U.S. and France, especially) and "East"—is just one more sign of the fragility of imperialist alliances. Reagan will soon find out how little any "pacts" mean when a genuine revolution begins in any of these countries.

6. Quoted from Merip Reports, May 1982, in an article by Martha Wenger, "Reagan Stakes Morocco in Sahara Struggle."

7. See Foreign Affairs, Summer 1985. See also Parker's 1984 comprehensive work, North Africa: Regional Tensions and Strategic Concerns.

8. See "Sudanese-Libyan Accord as a Shift Away from the West," New York Times, July 10, 1985.

9. See "Philippine Insurgency: Out of Rice Paddies and Into the Cities," by Steve Lutz, New York Times, July 3, 1985.

In the face of all these myriad crises in this nuclear world, the question of "What to Do" becomes more urgent than ever because it demands, at one and the same time, the concretization of what we intend doing in the objective situation and our own organizational responsibilities. Put otherwise, the expression we discussed in our last Perspectives—"Not by Practice Alone, the Movement from Theory"—must be rooted in the fact that time is, indeed, running out, as the rulers have changed the very nature of the debate on nuclear war by suddenly talking about the fantastic concept that a nuclear war is "winnable."

It is this that makes it clear that the expression "not by practice alone" cannot be left as a generality. Organizational-Philosophic-Journalistic responsibility requires that, in the analysis of current events, the dialectics of thought and of revolution. It is Marxist-Humanism which has insisted on seeing Marx's "new Humanism" as a whole new continent of thought and of revolution. In singling out the dialectics of thought this year, we are showing that to practice it, it must be made inseparable from the dialectics of revolution. That, indeed, is the only proof that we will have become practicing dialecticians for the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism.

This motivation, and not any sort of mere 30th birthday celebration, was the red thread running through the 30-year retrospective of News & Letters, which could not be separated from all our books and pamphlets. That red thread is the universalization of practice, which becomes reality because there was a theory that looked for it, anticipated it and could transform it into a dialectical philosophy of thought and of revolution.

THIS CHARACTERIZED OUR HISTORIC reason-for-being as we began in 1955 with News & Letters and summarized the whole post-World War II world as the epoch which made it possible to see that the movement from practice was itself a form of theory. Our first philosophical-political book, *Marxism and Freedom—From 1776 Until Today, 1967-1968*, established that category by tracing the dialectics of revolution from the industrial age and the age of the French Revolution and the Hegelian dialectic, through what made Lenin return to Hegel, to our own age of State-Capitalism vs. Freedom. It led also to recording in our Constitution the four forces of revolution for our age—Labor, Blacks, Women, as well as the Youth even when they were not of the working class.

The turbulent 1960s were reflected in a whole series of pamphlets, where all these new revolutionary forces spoke for themselves. At the same time, new international relations were forged in trips to Europe—especially Britain, where not only was a Marxist-Humanist group established, headed by Harry McShane, but relations were made with new tendencies, including both the mass Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the

Left Group of the Cambridge University Labour Club who published our pamphlet, *Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions*, with their own Foreword. The trips also included one to West Africa, the analysis of which was recorded both in our Weekly Political Letters and in *Africa Report*, while Presence Africaine published our appeal: "Why not a new International?" The trip to Hong Kong established relations with dissident Chinese refugees, who translated the chapter on "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung" from *Marxism and Freedom*, and smuggled it into Peking University. In Japan, Zenahin, a group which had broken with the Communist Party, translated *Marxism and Freedom* and sponsored an extensive tour of Japan where the views of Marxist-Humanism were discussed with factory workers as well as university audiences and peace activists.

In one East European country, Marxist-Humanism created a group which sent direct reports to News & Letters. In Yugoslavia, Praxis published an essay on "Lenin's Philosophic Ambivalence," which became a chapter in *Philosophy and Revolution*, from Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao. In Poland, in-person contacts were established with Solidarnosc. News & Letters not only published many reports from East Europe in the pages of the paper, but brought out as pamphlets Czechoslovakia: *Revolution and Counter-Revolution and Today's Polish Fight for Freedom*. Indeed, East European dissidents could be given credit for being co-authors of the whole chapter on "State-Capitalism and the East European Revolts" in *Philosophy and Revolution*.

Finally, a new affinity was found, directly on dialectical philosophy, precisely on Humanism, with Frantz Fanon, who, in his *Wretched of the Earth*, called his philosophic vision for the African Revolutions, as for all humanity, a "new Humanism."

In 1968, when these trips were concluded, the Black Revolution, the Anti-Vietnam War Movement, and the Youth rebellions, in general, had reached a peak. We called for a Black-Red Conference, which was chaired by Charles Denby and at which Raya Dunayevskaya presented what was to become the final Part of *Philosophy and Revolution*—"Economic Reality and the

Dialectics of Liberation." *Philosophy and Revolution*, from Hegel to Sartre and from Marx to Mao was published in 1973. In 1978 a new edition of Charles Denby's *Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal* was published with the inclusion of a full Part II which encompassed his experiences as a Black worker-editor of News & Letters. It was in the 1970s that all the works of Marx were finally published, including his *Ethnological Notebooks*, which made it clear that there was so sharp a difference between Marx's multilinear view of human development and Engels' unilinear

view, that Rosa Luxemburg, *Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*, published on the eve of the 1963 Marx Centenary, created a whole new category of post-Marx Marxists vs. Marx's Marxism, beginning with Engels himself.

All of these works have become the humus as well as the ground with which we approach this year's Perspectives, especially the question, "What to Do?"

BECOMING PRACTICING DIALECTICIANS cannot be achieved by any sort of generality, as if "organizational responsibility" was a mere matter of "loyalty." Organizational-Philosophic-Journalistic responsibility means practicing the dialectic of thought as well as of revolution, both in activity and in the analysis of current events. The creation of the category that all of human history has been born out of a movement from practice could not be grasped fully until it was worked out philosophically, dialectically, and then became the humus for the present needed leap forward.

Now that we have—or soon will have—*Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution: Reaching for the Future*, along with the 30-year retrospective look at News & Letters and the present Perspectives, the Resident Editorial Board makes the following proposals:

1) That, instead of this year's drive being just an Appeal for \$2.50 for a subscription to News & Letters, we transform the Appeal to all readers of N&L to help us establish a **SPECIAL FUND TO EXPAND N&L INTO A BI-WEEKLY PAPER**, with the 1966 Convention to decide, on the basis of this response, when the first bi-weekly could appear.

2) That the Theory/Practice retrospective on our 30 years, together with this 1965-66 Marxist-Humanist Perspectives Thesis, become a pamphlet in January, 1966.

3) That, in selling *Women's Liberation and the Dialectics of Revolution*, we see ourselves, not as salespeople, but as founders of Marxist-Humanism, from the time it was founded in 1955 with N&L as its paper, to the present challenge we have just been given with the new Spanish edition of Rosa Luxemburg, *Women's Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution*. It is this which has led to our decision to undertake new trips to Mexico this year and Spain the next, as well as to India to expand our international relations.

4) In order to help us in all of these new undertakings, we ask Peter Wermuth to move to Chicago next Spring to help the Center expand its activities, including working with Raya Dunayevskaya on a projected new book on the dialectics of the party.

5) Clearly, these additional responsibilities will affect all of our activities—whether in other organizations such as support committees for the freedom struggles in El Salvador and Nicaragua, the anti-nuke movements, the demonstrations against apartheid, or the labor picket lines; or whether they be in our own development,

including recording the voices from below in all of our activities. It is a means of humanism that we project. This is not a slogan or a philosophical development but a concrete imperative that we must carry out. We are not concerned with the U.S. and Russia. It is our duty to be concerned with the people of the world and the people of the world are our duty. We are not concerned with the U.S. and Russia. It is our duty to be concerned with the people of the world and the people of the world are our duty. We are not concerned with the U.S. and Russia. It is our duty to be concerned with the people of the world and the people of the world are our duty.

came to power, had to survive. Communist (Stalinists) killing all revolutionaries who did not agree with them from Socialists to Trotskyists to Anarchists — and whom we saw in the People's Front. The Chinese Revolution in Spain against Francoism was not restricted to anti-Stalinism. It was the result of the decision to fight against the Communist Party. This meant that there was a real revolution. As we saw in the People's Front in the name of the People's Front in the People's Front. We are not concerned with the U.S. and Russia. It is our duty to be concerned with the people of the world and the people of the world are our duty. We are not concerned with the U.S. and Russia. It is our duty to be concerned with the people of the world and the people of the world are our duty.