

JULY, 1986

MAXXIST HUMANIST DRAFT PERSPECTIVES, 1986-87

I. THE CHANGED WORLD

*From Reagan's
Foray into the
Gulf of Sidra
to the Russian
Chernobyl Disaster;
from Mass
Anti-Nuke
Demonstrations
to the Revolts
in Haiti, the
Philippines and
Latin America;
from the Mass
Protests in
South Korea
to the Continuing
Black Revolts
in Apartheid
South Africa.*

More than one million Black workers not only demonstrated their opposition in apartheid South Africa by their "stayaway" on June 16, the tenth anniversary of the bloody suppression of the Soweto uprising, but thereby showed their pivotal role in production. Nothing was produced. The empty factories and mines as well as the empty streets revealed that the continuing struggle in South Africa will not be stopped, not even by martial law.

Apartheid South Africa's May 18 assault by land and air against the sovereign nations of Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe was likened by Botha to Reagan's April 14 bombing of Libya. The sharp response this drew from the Reagan Administration fooled no one about the close relationship of the U.S. to Botha's South Africa. The demonstrations in the U.S. as elsewhere were directed not only against South Africa but against the U.S. for propping up that hated regime with Reagan's rationalization—"constructive engagement."

Indeed, it was U.S. imperialism's foray into the Gulf of Sidra which so exacerbated the totality of the myriad world crises that it changed the world. It becomes imperative to work out how to oppose the rulers as well as how to follow the ramifications of the crises. As the consequences of the near-meltdown at Chernobyl have shown, no sphere can now be excluded from the need to totally uproot the system. It is as if a nuclear meltdown had come close to releasing the sword of Damocles which hangs over the very existence of humanity.

Even so conservative a magazine as Time listed the following major nuclear accidents that had already occurred: Chalk River, Canada, 1952; Windscale, England, 1957; Idaho, U.S., 1961; Alabama, U.S., 1975; Three Mile Island, U.S., 1979; Tsuruga, Japan, 1981; Oklahoma, U.S., 1986. That list does not include the accident at an actual Titan nuclear missile site—in Arkansas, 1980. Now we have experienced Chernobyl. And what about all the space and shuttle disasters? Everything has been questioned in a new way since Chernobyl.

What has become clear from the events in April, whether in Libya or at Chernobyl, is that Reagan and Gorbatchev are identical twins in global ambition for single domination of the world.

On June 1 Ronald Reagan declared that, though he is "technically" within the limits of compliance with

continued

11026

SALT II, he is no longer "bound" by it. If the latest nuclear "invention" is ready to be deployed in December, he is ready to abrogate the treaty and put cruise missiles on bombers. This has so disturbed the six most industrialized NATO nations, plus Japan, who had just voted at the summit in Tokyo to underwrite U.S. imperialism's bombing of Libya as a "defense" against "terrorism," that they could no longer be under the illusion that Reagan's action was "only" against Libya and that Libya was an "isolated case." In truth, the declaration that the United States would abrogate SALT II disregarded the heart of Europe—that is, all the "front-line" nations, beginning with West Germany, who directly face the other nuclear superpower, Russia.

To make sure that not even the slightest loophole was left to miss any of the implications in his threat to abrogate SALT II, Reagan's direct mouthpiece, Secretary of Defense (read: War) Weinberger declared that the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty should also be abrogated. This time, not only did the NATO nations speak out "in general" against the abrogation, but Reagan's ideological twin, Thatcher (who had been the only one of the NATO allies to permit the F-111s to leave from its soil to bomb Libya), sent a special envoy to Washington to advise Reagan against such a move.

With Ronald Reagan's threat to abrogate the SALT II treaty, it has become clear that the ceaseless turning back of the clock at home—on Black civil rights, on labor, on abortion rights—was the other side of his shift from arms negotiations to negotiating in order to arm.

As against the superpowers' mad rush to a nuclear Armageddon, let us look at the mass demonstrations against both nuclear madness and apartheid South Africa. The June 15 mass demonstrations against the bloody suppression of the Soweto uprising ten years ago once again point to a new generation of revolutionaries worldwide. In New York City, 90,000 poured into Central Park.

Although the generation of the '80s may appear more quiescent than the generation of the turbulent '60s, the Black struggles give the divestment movement of today's campus youth a new dimension. The demonstrations at the South African Embassies and Consulates have encompassed multidimensional forces—Black and white, women, workers, elderly as well as young. Above all, from the start, today's movement has been

international and searching for a philosophy of revolution, instead of displaying what characterized the 1960s—the Cohn-Bendit view that theory can be caught "en route."

Internationalism has also characterized the anti-nuke movement. Thus, following Chernobyl, the demonstrations—whether in Italy or in West Germany, in the U.S. or in England—were against not only Russia, but the U.S. as well. They were, that is, against the use and abuse of nuclear energy everywhere.

This year anti-nuclear activists hiked into the desert in Mercury, Nevada, to protest U.S. nuclear weapons tests. The demonstrations came to a climax on the weekend of May 30-June 1, when hundreds—including Daniel Ellsberg and Carl Sagan—gathered (5 protest in 100 degree weather, and 149 were arrested. One of the tests, the "Mighty Oak" explosion, had resulted in a serious accident with the subsequent release of radioactivity into the atmosphere. Two workers were irradiated trying to investigate the accident. The details are still kept secret. There is no doubt that these actions will continue; the world-wide anti-nuke movement will not stop.

Not only do capitalist crises keep multiplying but the political crises cannot be separated from the economy, globally and nationally. The bombing of Libya, and the near-meltdown at Chernobyl, are manifestations of the state of the global economy.

We need only look at the unwelcome reception that greeted Reagan in Bali, Indonesia, on his way to the economic summit. Before he even got off the plane, two accompanying reporters were prevented from covering the event and expelled from the country. Indonesia's dictator Suharto—who had carried out one of the bloodiest counter-revolutions, with the slaughter of over a million Indonesian Leftists beginning in 1965—far from showing that he is a loyal member of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), made it clear that he had crushed that 1965 revolution in the making on his own. Not only is he not beholden to the U.S., he outdoes Marcos and Pinochet, and is more anti-Communist than even Reagan.

It is clear that no political crisis can be considered outside of the state of the global economy. It is high time to turn to the fundamentals—capitalist production and alienated labor.

continued

II. CAPITALIST PRODUCTION/ALIENATED LABOR.

THIS NUCLEAR WORLD AND ITS POLITICAL CRISES

The basis of the economy of the most powerful imperialist land, the U.S., is that it is now a debtor nation. The global ramifications of that fact, as well as its implications at home, have not been seriously dealt with. Paul Volcker, head of the Federal Reserve Board, and considered by economists to be the "second most powerful man" in the land, did not bother to attend the Economic Summit. He refused to be deluded by all the hoopla about the great state of the world economy, especially that of the U.S. Volcker claimed the U.S. "put all the necessary solutions off on other countries... The action taken so far is not enough to put the deficit on a declining trend." The strength of the economy, Volcker concluded, "is not an unalloyed joy."

The Grand Illusion, however, that all capitalist ideologues, including Volcker, have created about this nuclear world with its robotized production was achieved by them through forgetting that Alienated Labor is the irreplaceable foundation, essence and universal form—the creator of all values and surplus-values. That is exactly what produces both capitalist profits and what Marx called the "general absolute law of capitalist accumulation"—its unemployed army.

What the industrial giants cannot bear is the death-knell that labor, employed and unemployed, as well as the homeless, are ringing out. The industrialists are under the illusion—never more so than in this robotized stage of production—that the unemployed army can be made to rampage against the employed.

Their ideologues are busy "proving" that Marx was wrong. They have never understood that other fundamental Marx prediction, that the failure to re-produce labor means the death of their whole system. Political crises reflect the general absolute law of capitalist production differently in different historic periods. Thus, the Great Depression produced a John Maynard Keynes, with his General Theory of Employment and Money, which proved to the capitalists that they cannot get out of economic crisis unless they couple production with employment. All kinds of "New Deals" were thereby contrived to save capitalism from revolution.

Today, modern profit-hungry capitalists, both state and private, think they can do the exact opposite—that is, "uncouple" employment from production. They think they can still go merrily on with their computerized stock market, false super-profiteering through mergers, playing the margins, and alternating ownerships from corporations to "private entrepreneurs." They now talk of factory "incubators," where former large plants are leased out to small producers who employ far fewer workers at far lower wages. They act as if higher labor productivity can come from somewhere other than sweat, living-labor, as if it can come out of computers.

The favorite word of today's economists is "uncoupling." Peter F. Drucker has written for *Foreign Affairs* (Spring, 1986) on "The Changed World Economy."¹ There, he arrogantly, and yet in an off-hand manner (as if the changes he is talking about are the true status of the world economy), insists that it is necessary to recognize the three truths of the uncoupling that he elaborates:

- 1) "uncoupling" employment from production.
- 2) "uncoupling" capital from capital investment, reducing capital to money by calling it "capital movement": "Capital movements rather than trade (in goods and services) have become the driving force of the world economy. The two have not quite come uncoupled, but the link has become loose and, worse, unpredictable."

- 3) "uncoupling" industrial production from the whole economy, by which he tries to explain that he means uncoupling it from the "weak" sectors like the farm economy and raw materials. It is as if digging out the raw materials is done without labor. Or, for that matter, as if our so-called post-industrial world is so "advanced" with its computers, its plastics, its synthetics, its "high technology," that labor which is not on a production line is not labor.

What they choose to disregard is that even those robotized, unimated production processes are built on sweated labor. A recent NBC television special on that most high-tech land, Japan, which has completely shaken up the global market, revealed how fully its production is rooted in the most wretched, low-paying, non-union, piecework labor, done by sub-contractors for its high-tech corporations.²

Indeed, all of the ideologues are rightly screaming against the astronomical indebtedness of the capitalist economy since Ronald Reagan has been in power. There is no way that even Reagan can deny that we have become a debtor nation. What the ideologues (who supposedly differ from the supply-siders and monetarists) have to recognize is this: once they have "uncoupled" industrial production from their whole economy, and capital from investment in production, reducing capital investment to money alone, they are left with what they supposedly rejected—monetarism.

These are not mere stock market fantasies; the monstrous reality they have created is a land in which, at one pole we see a thousand new millionaires, while at the other we see the pauperization of millions of the unemployed, of the homeless, of the masses of Blacks and women living so far below the poverty line that Hunger stalks the richest land in the world.

1. See also the Special Report on "The Hollow Corporation" in *Business Week*, March 3, 1986.

2. Back in the early 1940s when Plan, with a capital "P," was the rage among the Left, the first study of the Five-Year Plans of Russia, by those working out a State-Capitalist Theory, debunked the Plan as any kind of socialism, showing that "feudal" Japan, in the very same 1932-37 period, was out-producing "socialist" Russia. (See Raya Dunayevskaya's original 1942 study of the Russian economy, included in *Marxism and Freedom*, p. 223, and p. 358, footnote 226.)

continued

11028

Once capital is not tied to investments in production, it can move from occupation to occupation, from trade in products and services to mere exchange of services, there is nothing left but an exchange of money and investment for more money. The reason these still at the top of the heap is because the international capitalists feel safe in only one country—the counter-revolutionary Reagan's U.S.A. It is not only "right capital" leaving "stable" lands that gets to the U.S. Japan and West Germany have "invested" heavily here as well.

Let's take another look, then, at the "safe" U.S. and all of Reagan's victories in his ongoing counter-revolution at: forces against unions, against Blacks, against women, against the youth.

• It is true that the union bureaucracy has given too many concessions. But one look at Hormel's ongoing strike shows that militants know how to fight their own leaders, as well as the capitalists.

• It is true there is no ongoing General Strike. But if we count up all the "little" strikes from Minnesota to Chicago, from New York's sweatshops to California farmworkers, and every place in between, we will see that U.S. labor is in daily, unrecorded revolt.

• It is true that the Women's Liberation Movement has seen a retrogression of all its hard-won gains of the 1960s and 1970s. But anyone who thinks that the sudden mass demonstration of 100,000 in Washington, D.C. on March 8 was "just" against Reagan's stand on abortion has not heard the voices of the Black and white women who have made their rejection of Reaganism known on every front from housing to childcare and from affirmative action to freedom of choice—and that is not the question of abortion alone, but the passion for human relations.

• It is true that the youth today are not the youth of the 60s. But, as we have seen, the internationalism that was present in the anti-Vietnam War movement has reached a new dimension. Nor can one re-write the history which has proved that the two-way road of the Black dimension between Africa and America has never separated its struggles from its ideas of freedom, its search for a philosophy of revolution.

The Black masses see right through Reagan-Weinberger's "conceptual arsenal" as the ceaseless nuclear arming and genocidal imperialism that it is. The utter barbarism of the Holocaust is what shows us where this post-World War II world of capitalism-imperialism is heading.

The significance of the new, the concrete, is not only the general fact that it is a new form, but it also points to the need to express the system. The importance is that this new form of production, which Drucker and others tout, is leading the economy by creating the illusion that it is a new form of production, is the new Universal. It is necessary to work out the new and concrete forms as they appear. That does not mean merely saying that it is only form rather than essence. Rather, it is to see that only revolution can abolish these forms, that only revolution can abolish the illusion some Marxists have that these forms are the new Universal. This kind of transformation can be achieved only by the dialectic of Absolute Method.

As Hegel articulated it:

"To hold fast the positive in its negative, and the content of the presupposition in the result, is the most important part of rational cognition; also only the simplest reflection is needed to furnish conviction of the absolute truth and necessity of this requirement, while with regard to the examples of proofs, the whole of the Logic consist of these." (Science of Logic Vol II, p. 476)

Karl Marx projected his concept of the positive that would follow only after the old capitalist society was thoroughly uprooted:

"In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under the division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; after labor, from a mere means of life, has itself become the prime necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!" (Critique of the Gotha Program)

The positive in the negative was, not—was not—that Alienated Labor under capitalism is the human activity, much less that science is the human activity. Rather, it was the struggles of the Alienated Laborers against capitalism, and the laborers' passion for an actual unity of mental and manual labor, that spells out the urgency of revolution.

What the revolutionary theoreticians need to do is listen to the voices from below, and concretize that new unity by practicing it in their own publications, activities, relations, as they prepare for revolution, articulate it, labor for it. The absolute opposite of that is what comes out from the ideologues under capitalism—which is why Marx called them the "pale-fighters" for capitalism.

Let us return now to the Economic Summit that was actually all political.

continued

III. ONCE AGAIN, REAGAN AND NATO, THIS TIME FOCUSED

ON THE THIRD WORLD, AND THE PACIFIC

The "success" of the Tokyo summit—the communique in which the summiters approved U.S. military action against Libya on the ground of fighting terrorism—can, as we have shown, hardly veil their present open hostility to Reagan's action where the NATO allies are directly involved, SALT II.

Whether or not the Allies will slow Reagan's ever-recurring drive to abrogate SALT II, one thing is clear. Russia, as the other superpower, is at this very moment shoring up its influence in the Middle East, by having met with Syria and Libya and promising to continue rearming both.

Reagan isn't rushing to apply his so-called strategic defense against terrorism against Syria, which not only harbors many terrorists, but is directly involved (if not solely responsible for) the bombing of the West German discotheque for which the CIA claimed to have "irrefutable proof" that Libya was the guilty party.

Thus, when Israel was sending up trial balloons about the possibility of war between Syria and Israel, the U.S. must have said, "Not this time."

The reason Reagan isn't ready to attack Syria is because that could very well become the "incident" that proves the impulse for World War III. The nuclear superpowers must ask themselves these questions, even more so now that the U.S. has announced that it may not be "bound" by SALT II, and Russia may feel "bound" to go all out in arming for the nuclear holocaust.

In a word, Russia's promise to sell arms to Syria if it is attacked cannot be anything as simple as what Russia did previously, when Israel destroyed Syria's SAM missiles in 1982. No one can know, but it certainly is a possibility that neither Reagan nor Gorbachev can exclude, that nuclear war could break out from a local war in the Middle East. This is what keeps the global situation heated up right now.

The imperialist reach of Reagan's militarism, whether we look at the Middle East, South Korea or any other part of the Third World, has its beginnings in the U.S. domination over Latin America.³

Presently, it is in Nicaragua and El Salvador where Reagan has been intensifying his counter-revolutionary hold. Indeed, his desire to overthrow the legitimate government of Nicaragua has made him christen the counter-revolutionary troops, which he had bought, equipped and tried to send into battle, as "freedom fighters," pro-

3. The greatness of the Black dimension can be seen at the point of the first expression of U.S. imperialism in 1898. The Black opposition was the only one to call it both imperialism and racism; the only one to organize the very first anti-imperialist leagues. (See *American Civilization on Trial*, pp. 16-17.)

continued

11030

claiming that he, too, "is a contra." In El Salvador the murderous bombings of the countryside by U.S.-supplied and equipped planes have wrecked havoc.

It has been the new revolutions in post-World War II Latin America and the whole of the Third World, involving peasant/worker/Indian/women, that have helped to give a new concretization and todayness to Marx's continual search for revolutionary forces, a search he worked out anew in his last decade.

It is upon this Third World that Reagan tries to impose his East-West—Russia-U.S.—context, adding only the phrase about "a fight against terrorism." The industrialized nations' acceptance of Reagan's attack on Libya reveals their own imperialist tolerance of such illegal acts when they are directed against Third World countries.

The same was true in Chile during the years of the Allende government, when Nixon-Kissinger were directing the overthrow of that legitimate Socialist government. The Chilean masses are still struggling today in mass protests against that U.S.-propped-up Pinochet dictatorship. In nearby Paraguay the emergence of open protest in the streets has shaken General Stroessner's rule. In Guatemala, the May Day protests this year were the largest in the past seven years, and brought together unemployed workers, peasants and Mothers of the Disappeared, who attacked the newly-elected President Cerezo for capitulating to Reagan's policies.

The unfinished Latin American revolutions have had a long, contradictory history of great leaps forward and jolting halts. In 1937, Mexico's Cardenas initiated the very first expropriation of American oil interests, nationalizing the oil industry. And yet the revolution remained frozen.

The 1960s saw the fires of revolt sweep through Latin America under the impact of Cuba's revolution which overthrew Batista and freed Cuba of American imperialism. The theoretical underpinning, however, for those revolts of the 1960s was based on Cuba's attempt to substitute guerrilla warfare for social revolution, and the Army for the Party as the vanguard. That, too, was changed once Cuba attached itself to Russia.

The 1970s opened a new stage in Latin America with the eruptions in Central America. It was then that we published our Political-Philosophical Letter on "Latin America's Unfinished Revolutions" and, later, the bilingual pamphlet on *Latin America's Revolutions: In Theory, In Reality*.

Indeed, that decade of the 1970s opened a new stage not only in Latin America, but in South Korea.

Our Draft Perspectives Thesis in 1980 was entitled "Tomorrow is Now" (N&L, June 1980), and centered on events in both South Korea and Latin America. We had been showing the ever-deepening stage of revolt that had been occurring in South Korea, beginning in 1976. We stressed, both that year and next, not only how widespread was the student revolt in terms of universities and cities, but how many successful strikes had occurred in a country where strikes were illegal. They included miners in Sabuk and steelworkers in a sit-in strike in Pusan. The universities in revolt included the Ewha Women's University.

The climax, of course, was the Kwangju uprising of four days in April, 1980. The counter-revolution which put down that revolt was not just Korean. The U.S. Army approved the withdrawal of all Korean troops from the U.S.-Korea Joint Command to crush the Kwangju uprising in a bloodbath.

In Secretary of State Schultz's recent visit to South Korea, though he supposedly came to criticize Chun Doo Hwan on human rights, he turned his back on the new revolutionary demonstrations that were occurring. His trip demonstrated all over again the pivotal role South Korea has played as a determinant in the whole

...the fact that the U.S. was confronted with the fact that some U.S. soldiers, Blacks especially, did not recognize the enemy as Korean, but rather as their own U.S. officers. Indeed, they identified the whole Black struggle against racism in the United States.

What distinguishes the late 1970s and early 1980s revolts, whether Caribbean, Latin American, African or South Korean, is the fact that the masses' opposition to their own rulers was inseparable from their opposition to U.S. imperialism, even as the East European revolts were directed against Russian imperialism. Ever since the late Brezhnev announced his Doctrine for the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia to crush the Prague Spring's search for socialism with a human face, the Russian counter-revolutions in East Europe have never stopped. In 1981 they found a "native" Polish dictator, Jaruzelski, to crush the independent Polish trade union movement, Solidarnosc. Again, instead of crushing it, they only drove the movement deeper underground. This month they finally succeeded in capturing Zbigniew Buzak, who had eluded them for nearly five years since the proclamation of martial law. On June 14, Anna Walentynowicz, the crane operator whose strike led to the creation of Solidarnosc, was also arrested along with 30 others.

The ongoing revolts in North Korea, on the one hand, and Schmitz's counter-revolutionary journey, on the other, make it necessary to look all the way back to the Korean War of 1950.

fact that this was the first time the U.S. was confronted with the fact that some U.S. soldiers, Blacks especially, did not recognize the enemy as Korean, but rather as their own U.S. officers. Indeed, they identified the whole Black struggle against racism in the United States.

What distinguishes the late 1970s and early 1980s revolts, whether Caribbean, Latin American, African or South Korean, is the fact that the masses' opposition to their own rulers was inseparable from their opposition to U.S. imperialism, even as the East European revolts were directed against Russian imperialism.

Ever since the late Brezhnev announced his Doctrine for the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia to crush the Prague Spring's search for socialism with a human face, the Russian counter-revolutions in East Europe have never stopped. In 1981 they found a "native" Polish dictator, Jaruzelski, to crush the independent Polish trade union movement, Solidarnosc. Again, instead of crushing it, they only drove the movement deeper underground. This month they finally succeeded in capturing Zbigniew Buzak, who had eluded them for nearly five years since the proclamation of martial law. On June 14, Anna Walentynowicz, the crane operator whose strike led to the creation of Solidarnosc, was also arrested along with 30 others.

© 84 National Committee, Marxist Humanism and the Anti-Communist Revolution for a Further Discussion of the Point

Continued

nant question: Who or what carries the organizational responsibility for the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism? Activities and the process of philosophic development loom as inseparable now that we are working out *Dialectics of Organization: Philosophy, the "Party," and Forms of Organization Born out of Spontaneity*.

Whereas that book may not be finished for two years, the organization has always been brought into the process of working out the ideas of every book. The bi-weekly is a test of how rapidly we respond to today's myriad crises. But, as crucial as the bi-weekly is for the year 1986-87, it is not a Universal; it is not the whole of the body of ideas of Marxist-Humanism. It is the body of ideas of Marxist-Humanism that has been the determinant in all of our activities and writings—whether in the paper, in the pamphlets, in the books, in the mass activities we have participated in and sometimes initiated.

No pamphlet of the 1960s or the 1970s was only a recording of what somebody said—whether that be *Workers Battle Automation*, *Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves*, *Notes on Women's Liberation*, or the bilingual pamphlet on Latin America's Revolutions, which centered around their unfinished nature.

Take the activity of the Freedom Riders of the civil rights movement at the time Marxist-Humanist Freedom Riders were in jail. They recorded voices of other Freedom Riders, established relationships that continued when they were freed, showing their fellow Freedom Riders the editorial in an issue of N&L on the Smith Act and the McCarran Act. Freedom Riders who read that editorial experienced such a shock of recognition that their actions and achievements were related to the ideas articulated by News and Letters Committees, that it was suggested that this editorial be included in our pamphlet, *Freedom Riders Speak For Themselves* (1961).

Or take *Workers Battle Automation* (1960), in which Charles Denby succeeded in getting other workers to collaborate in the whole process of working out that pamphlet. Even there, it was the Resident Editorial Board which worked out a framework to include not only production workers, but a white collar worker who said, "I'm not a production worker...I work with computers...The machine does a sort of mental process for you."

The whole question of artificial intelligence and machines that supposedly think, but dehumanize the human being was inseparable from Automation—be it in mining, in auto, in steel, in the office, or in medicine. Two worker-leaders in our organization—Charles Denby and Angela Terrano—had such different views on Automation that it became imperative not to close discussion. Thus, we published both of their views in the same pamphlet. Besides having the voices of production workers from different fields, the pamphlet also included the computer specialist quoted above, the M.D. columnist from News & Letters, and a youth who articulated her anger at relationships in this society: "I don't want to wait to be 21 until I am treated as a human being." It is these kinds of attitudes that we wish to permeate the bi-weekly.

Everything centers around organizational responsibility for Marxist-Humanism. This rests on the self-disci-

pline needed for the concretization of that philosophy, be it in actual activities in mass movements as well as analyses, in journalism and in financial responsibility, outreach as well as projection. These are all tests that are demanded by the objective situation for any serious revolutionary on the long, hard road to revolution.

Self-discipline is not the absence of discipline; it is the absence of an order to be disciplined. Self-discipline is born out of the Idea of Freedom as Absolute and History as not only past, but *history-in-the-making* which Marx saw as the actualization of freedom; its struggles throughout human development. The long, hard road to revolution cannot be achieved if History is skipped over; *history-in-the-making*, as well as in the past, is inseparable from the self in the *self-determination of the Idea of Freedom*.

It was no accident that it is precisely in the post-World War II period that Marx's Humanist Essays were re-discovered and the imperative for revolutionaries became working out the relationship of these essays to our age.

Our present activities in fighting Reagan's retrogressionism, whether they be activities we initiate, or whether they be our participation in the mass movements around the anti-nuke struggles, the Black fight against racism, women's liberation struggles, or the youth struggles in education, were always a matter of not separating activity from theory, or finances from philosophy.

Last year the objective/subjective situation made it imperative for us to issue an expanded edition of the 1978 pamphlet on Frantz Fanon, *Soweto and American Black Thought*, with a new Introduction/Overview and our Political-Philosophic Letter on "Grenada: Counter-Revolution and Revolution," as well as the essays on Negritude by Rene Depestre and Ngugi wa Thiong'o. Non-members together with members raised a special fund for its publication. The relevance and the urgency of this decision has since been demonstrated by orders direct from South Africa for this new 1986 edition.

To actualize our perspectives for this year, we need:

- 1) A minimum Sustaining Fund of \$35,000.
- 2) Rigorous preparation, during the period between the end of the Convention and the end of the year, in each Local as well as at the Center, for the new kind of brevity-yet-totality demanded by an eight-page newspaper every two weeks.
- 3) Finally, the National Chairwoman is to be assigned to take this period, before the bi-weekly begins, to concentrate on the writing of *Dialectics of Organization*.

It is impossible to predict the precise date, place, and all the revolutionary forces of a spontaneous outbreak, whether it is the American Revolution or the beginning of the world revolution. This makes it imperative to be theoretically prepared for the act as well as the ceaseless movement that arises to determine the unity of theory and practice which creates the ground for totally new human relations.

That is what makes it imperative to concretize Marx's concept of "revolution in permanence" for our age.

—The Resident Editorial Board
June 17, 1986