

October 17, 1960

Dear Saul:

With the enclosed letter to HM on the Absolute Idea this letter to you ought to put down, in rough outline, the points of the new book, which, awkwardly enough, I am for the time calling the "Philosophic Foundations of Man's Struggles for Freedom in Colonial Countries." No such title would actually be used, and needless to say, the American proletariat will be very central to it, but, insofar as I wish stress on the new, and want it as a counterpart to MARXISM & FREEDOM, which did concentrate on the Western World, this will do, temporarily.

The one thing I am not dealing with here, or in HM's is that which will be the great bulk of the research for I am now reading heavily on the economics and political movements of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. I should imagine a minimum of a solid year, even with many, many people helping, as I expect they will, will be needed before I even know which I should use as central. For example, take Africa: even with leaving out both North and South Africa, for very opposite reasons, and concentrating on West, Central and East, I must have read dozens of books which told me next to nothing. I no doubt would wish to concentrate on Nigeria, Ghana, Guinea, Senegal, Sudan, the Rhodesias. All of the works, with hardly any exception, are by whites, well-wishers and arrogant ill-wishers - there will be no substitute for an actual trip and listening to the few in the masses I can find who would talk to me for even when you get a few little things by Africans - Nkomo's "African Nationalism" is one of them - these are not only by the "intelligentsia", but clearly, they don't tell what they think either - they are written for the white man who can help in their freedom. Asia presents the exact opposite problem both in "civilization", a long, very long, written, overly-written culture, thousands of intellectuals, ranging from Mao to a U Nu and a Nehru, who refuse to do other but give you the answers, without ever having posed the questions. Latin America presents still another picture - I might need to concentrate only on Cuba and Brazil, or Colombia - that is to say, to give "the feel" of the land and then merely concentrate on which road in this age of state capitalism when the whole world is divided into two. In any case, no such decision, or any other, as yet can be taken, and therefore I leave all that body or mass of material aside when I glance at the rough outlines.

Now, then, first, what are the "colonial countries"? Ever since Hitler showed that in the age of "world order" backward economies are not the only ones subjugated even without war, there really could no longer be the division in the old sense of advanced enslaving backward. France was as much a "colony" of Germany as Togoland. With the downfall of the Nazi nightmare, Stalin took over in Eastern Europe and, once again, did away with old views for there were willing victims over whom not a single shot need be fired, and advanced economically at that, like Czechoslovakia, as well as those who were run over and held by naked force, to be climaxed in the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution. By including Hungary, as I certainly will, it will give me the opportunity to handle the freedom struggles in Europe as well as those in the recognizably colonial countries belonging to England, France, Belgium, America. Above all, since I will not divide economic foundation from the struggle for the winds of men, we have, in Marxist Humanism, that which covers America as well as Hungary, Senegal, as well as Cuba.

Since Hungarian Workers' Councils, Tribal Chiefs' conclave, and conferences on Automation, seem worlds apart, what is it that nevertheless unites them, not as "wish fulfillment" or even ideology of an organized party

13768

cut of their own aspirations and midst, but objectively? THE OBJECTIVE WORLD CONNECTIONS MUST THEREFORE PREDOMINATE IN ECONOMICS AND IDEOLOGY ALIKE.

What are these? Here we must concretize state capitalism and follow next scrupulously through the new in it, the new which will connect it with science as well as production, with "Soviet Marxism" (to use a very misused phrase by us) or state capitalist ideology OF THE BREAK-THROUGH ERA, vs. its opposite, Marxist Humanism.

Here is the approach there: 1928-40 produced "regular" state capitalism, that is to say, at the end of the Five Year Plans Russia had achieved a development which followed, with some significant "skipping of stages", the inevitable capitalist development of constant over variable capital, leading to and flowing from the concentration in the hands of a single capitalist corporation, that all capitalist countries, including US, had in some manner to adopt if capitalism was to survive after its Depression. All did, and all roads led to war.

1940-60 the era of war and reconstruction back to before the war, 1940, found a new element, SCIENCE wedded to the military split the atom, what would it do wedded to industry is, at one and the same time, finding a "counter-force" to the rebellious proletariat who did not wish to produce and produce and produce, and yet "skip a few stages" for capitalism to transform from national to "world order"? We know the answer of Automation. We do not know the answer of what I call DISCONTINUOUS DEVELOPMENT. THAT IS THE NEW.

1960-1980 then is all new. Automation. Outer space. ICEDs. "Genes". The last is a pretty good example of how the Western "culture" misleads us all. Because of some overstatement on "transmutation", "heridity" wherein you could easily get to the traditional absurd, crazy, arbitrary conclusion, Lyenko was pictured here as a charlatan, and that's all I thought he was. Now, in following through scrupulously, I find, that in his field of agriculture and interbreeding, the man has achieved sufficiently to give the Russians ground to believe that they may yet conquer "agriculture." So that, whereas the sprogods of 1950, in the conditions of ravaged Stalinist Russia, were a fantastic scheme that they had to abandon at once, the Khrushchev 1955-60 virgin fields in Siberia with "free" rather than forced labor, need not necessarily become dust bowls.

Again, the scientific breakthrough with the sputnik, which I shall call as A WORLD TRANSPORTATION BREAK-THROUGH? that would allow no luxury of battlefields in "other" countries for America, is more than just the fact that they concentrated on the problem while Eisenhower played golf and his Defense Secretary Wilson pitched pennies. It means the fighting for every inch of soil in Africa (as we could see in the declaration of war that Khrushchev's peaceful co-existence performance at UN turned into by great deliberative effort, not show tantrums) whose imagination can be fired not merely because of scientific achievement, but because, concretely, and for freedom's sake, they see a chance to skip capitalism."

Finally, both as to rate of growth, and as to need of labor force, Automation is creating for Russia its "pockets of unemployment" and the spurt

forward in basic industries which need not wait, either for color television, or the proverbial moon to turn green. "to catch up with capitalism in the most advanced country" (not just Western Europe or "countries", but country, the US).

Of course they won't win the world, but that is the HUMAN FORCE, not the technology which will do the overthrowing. We have in this decade moved from the "world market" to world technology, that is to say, it isn't that Russia is being "sucked into" the world market, it is that her technology is bringing the world, especially the colonial world, to her shores.

Africa is the proof of what I am talking about when I talk about discontinuous development and the world "transportation break-through", as well as the manner of "Soviet Marxism". Up until 1954 Russia was nowhere there, and in ideology in fact suffered the defection of its "spets" for the Padmores, fired in imagination by the practical men like the Khrushchev, left for greener pastures than waiting for Russia; look how far China had gotten by not following Russia's path and taking the peasantry as its revolutionary force. If Russia didn't call these nationalist fighters "fascists", they certainly did "nationalist stooges for imperialism." But it did feel it should compete with imperialism and began giving little drips of aid. Nothing succeeds like success, so when these little African countries began achieving their independence, there was a 180° turn not only in political line, which they have always been adept at, but in economics, which they never before had done. (I wouldn't be surprised if even the "Westerner" Khrushchev, in disgust of not getting the Volta project through with Western stalling, would also turn to Russia.) CHINA SEES ITS ADVANTAGE GOING TO RUSSIA. THAT DID NOTHING "TO RESERVE IT" AND IS FACED WITH SUFFICIENT UNRESOLVABLE AND UNPOSTPONABLE CONTRADICTIONS THAT IT WANTS WAR NOW. (It didn't even bother to send delegates to their (Russian) Orientalist and African Conference that met at end of August.)

What about the "Asia road"? He wouldn't have to go to war if the "communes" instead of discontinuous industrial development were the "answer" to bring them "to the level of ...". In a way, forced labor, which has its advantages for the capitalists, at certain stages simply will not do at others. As for "Mao's Thought" vs. "Soviet Marxism" - again it is the human force - the peasantry is revolutionary, indeed in our age of absolute the population to a man in no matter which kind of economy can and does make the revolutions. The question remains: WHAT HAPPENS AFTER? There state capitalism of the era of the scientific break-through has one answer; we and the millions, billions of sub-merged humanity another.

Here enters the intelligentsia, and I will not, as in M & F, leave it as a blast only against Russia and the technologists of man "as a buildable machine" - I must strike out at all, with naming of names. For one thing, as contrasted to M & F, I am not starting with past revolutions that created our machine age and gave birth both to capitalists and workers with Hegel "catching" the freedom struggles for a new world on this earth leading to Marx and the proletarian revolutions of the day, 1848-71, I am beginning with the present revolutions and Marxist Humanism, leading both back to Hegel in the sense of "ontologically" unresolved problems in any concrete sense even by Marx and forward with what is already fact: Marxist Humanism in Hungary and Senegal and USA and GB and Italy and France, etc., etc., etc.

Finally, we also have to project ourselves in all fields, including science, both because Science in the 1960's is practice, and because the unity of man's struggles for freedom, total freedom, and the "unified field theory" (if even we degrade it to mean only all related sciences are unified in the sense of general mathematical equations applicable) and the leaving of this earth for outer space explorations unfurls a truly divine becoming of man - provided he does not annihilate himself in a nuclear holocaust.

One final word then on the letter to Louis, which, now that I think of it, should be part of this group (HM, you and Louis) that gives the first broad outlines of the new book. There is a "great debate" (about as great as the Kennedy-Nixon tit-for-tats, but blown up into book and even institute proportions) between those who say dialectics is only for history (HM) and not nature, those who say for nature, maybe, but surely not man (Catholics, Jesuits, etc. who still fear the materialist doctrine will deprive them of their God and want to "accept" science if it permits them to subordinate it to God or at least "the infinite"), and Stalinists who say for both nature and man provided man follows the lead of the party and subordinated himself to it. Between all these stand the alleged impartialists, great scientists who just want to be "neutral" but cannot resist, in empirically going about their way, to hit out against theories of knowledge which have an a priori character, though so much of the world has changed and is forever changing. (Wies Bohr, Einstein before his death and in his present-day followers.) To wind up this conglomeration is our erstwhile colleagues who thought struggling against the party to lead was sufficient unto the day, only ending up as the worst sycophants of another party to lead.

Good old Hegel, he never tired of reiterating the truth is concrete; comprehensive but concrete; manifold but unified and concrete; godlike but concrete for not being just substance but subject he comes on earth in all these multitudinous historic forms. Now then when you take this Absolute Idea which is all and without which nothing else is and you name it SELF DEVELOPING PROLETARIAT CONCRETELY EVOLVING A NEW SOCIETY you can see (1) it is not just a negation of negation "in general", but concretely through all the revolutionary forces from Levellers and Diggers through Russian revolutionaries; in a word the concrete form of revolt at each stage of revolt as it confronts its opposite from Marx to Khrushchev; (2) in our age that concrete form of revolt is manifold for it embraces the whole world, and includes proletariat and peasantry, yes, and even "bushmen" want freedom and deserve it; (3) the "laws of the dialectic" as self-movements cover nature and man but the CREATIVE THAT ONLY CAN ARISE OUT OF MAN FOR THIS AND THE "WHAT HAPPENS AFTER" is the mass as reason that yet MUST FIND THE PROOF OF THE FREEDOM IN HIMSELF AS THE INDIVIDUAL. It is this no other age could see but us - and which the "colleagues" run from the enormity of responsibility.

Yours,

Rae

13771