

1961 - 1964

**Weekly
Political
Letters**

by

Raya Dunayevskaya

2906

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River, Detroit 4, Mich. TYler 8-7053 Price: 20¢ per copy

POLITICAL LETTERS by RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

1. April 22, 1961 Preliminary Statement on Crisis Over Cuba (Bay of Pigs)
2. May 5, 1961 Recent Growth of the CP's in Western Europe, and Especially in Great Britain
3. May 11, 1961 DeGaulle and the Radical Parties at the Present Stage of French Crisis
4. May 17, 1961 Sino-Soviet Unity (at Geneva) and Rift (at "summit")
5. May 22, 1961 On Apologists for Russian Communism
6. June 3, 1961 Brief Outline of New Book
(not numbered) June 13, 1961 On the 5-4 Supreme Court Decision of 6/6/61
7. June 21, 1961 On the 20th Anniversary of the State-Capitalist Tendency
8. July 7, 1961 Self-Organization of Proletariat, Working with "Other" Organizations, "Small Mass Partyism" and Marxist-Humanism
9. July 14, 1961 Berlin Crisis, European Common Market, and International Class Struggle
10. August 2, 1961 Three Letters on Critique of the RCP Draft Program
11. August 9, 1961
12. August 14, 1961
13. September 10, 1961 Attitudes to War: The Not-so-Neutral Neutrals and the Working Class
14. September 17, 1961 Spontaneity of Action and Organization of Thoughts: In Memoriam of the Hungarian Revolution
15. September 25, 1961 Complete and General Disarmament, or Two Can Play the Game
16. October 2, 1961 The Syrian Revolt: The Cold War in the Middle East
17. October 9, 1961 Crisis-Soon-To-Be in South Viet Nam and the Sending of U.S. Troops
18. October 16, 1961 Marxist-Humanism vs. Communism
19. October 23, 1961 The New Stage in American Labor Struggles
20. October 30, 1961 The Sino-Soviet Rift, or State-Capitalist Power Politics
21. November 6, 1961 On the American Negro and the African Revolution
22. November 13, 1961 Israel, Burma, Outer Mongolia and the Cold War
23. November 27, 1961 Khrushchev's "Destalinization": Fact, Myth, Theory

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River, Detroit 4, Mich. TYlar 8-7053 Prices: 20¢ per copy

POLITICAL LETTERS by RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA (cont'd.)

- 24. December 4, 1961 Why the New Crop of Books on Marxist-Humanism? Why Not on its American Roots?
- 25. December 11, 1961 (second part of above)
- 26.* January 2, 1962 The American Katanga Lobby and the Congo Crisis
- 27.* January 15, 1962 High Blown Words on "High Road of Recovery" from the Recession that is Still with Us.
- 28.* January 22, 1962 JEE's Economic Report: A 93 Billion Dollar Budget, an Army of 5 Million Unemployed — and the "Atlantic Community"
- 29.* January 29, 1962 In Memoriam: Natalia Sedova Trotsky
- 30.* February 5, 1962 JFK's Wilful, Vicious Ignorance of Marxism and Rusk's Dollar Diplomacy at Punta del Este
- 31.* February 12, 1962 The General Strike, The Class Weapon, Its Spontaneous Birth, Development — and Abuse, as Well as its Relationship to the Peace Movements
- 32.* March 5, 1962 Japan's New Left of Intellectuals and Workers: Possibilities of New International Relations
- 33.* April 30, 1962 Theoreticians at the Crossroads, or Toward a New Formulation of the Relationship of Theory to Practice
- 34.* May 28, 1962 The African Revolutions at the Crossroads; Role of Labor, The Single Party, Neo-Colonialism, State-Capitalism, and Africa, Africa, Africa
- 35.* July 6, 1962 (Special Double Issue) Gambia Close-up: The Gambia Takes the Long, Hard Road to Independence
- 36. August 1, 1962 A Critical Turning Point in European History: British Anti-Nuclear Movements Come Up Against State-Capitalism, Russian and Franco-German Varieties
- 38. August 15, 1962 (Special Double Issue) Which Way Now? West Africa Under the Impact of Communism and Neo-Colonialism
- 39. August 17, 1962 The Negro American

* Letters numbered 26 through 36 were incorrectly numbered 25 through 35 when mimeographed.

A NEW SERIES---POLITICAL LETTERS

1. October 25, 1962 **Marxist-Bureaucratic vs. The U.S. Blockade of Cuba, The Russian Missile Bases There, Fidel Castro's "Selective" Party, All Playing With Nuclear Holocaust.**
2. December 8, 1962 **The China-India War In A Nuclear State-Capitalist Age: Relationship of Imperialism to the Ideological Struggles.**
3. February 12, 1963 **De Gaulle's Challenge To Kennedy: A New Franco-German Axis as a Dominant World Power.**
4. April 19, 1963 **American Civilization on Trial as statement of Our Views and as Basis for Follow-Up Studies and Articles.**
5. July 14, 1963 **The Challenge of the March-On Washington: Development and Divisions in Negro Leadership Vs. Moss AND the Marxist-Humanist Concepts of Freedom NOW.**
6. July 24, 1963 **The New Sino-Soviet Conflict.**
7. September 26, 1963 **Sartre's Search for a Method to Undermine Marxism.**
8. November 18, 1963 **The Forthcoming Paperback Edition of Marxism and Freedom.**
9. June 7, 1964 **Goldwater Primary Victory in California: or Under the Backlash of Counter-Revolution**
10. May 5, 1966 **Do Mao's and DeGaulles Pretensions to New World Roles Change the International Balance of Power? -- The State of the World Economy and the Theory of Retrogression**

2 9 1 0
TO ALL LOCALS (Including Glasgow and London)

Los Angeles - April 22, 1961

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT ON CRISIS OVER CUBA

Dear Friends:

Because the events — invasion of Cuba, statements of Khrushchev to Kennedy and Kennedy to Khrushchev, and, above all, Kennedy statement to the newspaper editors which, obviously sets the New American imperialist line — have moved so fast this week; because the idealism of the youth for the Cuban Revolution can be so easily exploited by the Communists, Russian and American, to make one forget the transformation in Cuba itself of the basic revolution into state capitalist channels, not to mention the mass arrests of all opponents, including revolutionary workers and opponent socialists, anarchists; because the general principle of opposition to both poles of world state capitalisms — US and Russia — is not too easy to concretize when one of the poles appears as the "defender" of revolution and one has natural and politically correct revulsion against the home imperialism (in the case the US); and because the whole question of war and peace is involved which will test Marxist Humanism in the immediate future, I am taking this hurried way of expressing my position at once (the day after the new Kennedy statement) instead of waiting for the end of the week when I will be back in Detroit and the REB will begin its discussions. Naturally anyone in the REB, NEB, or ranks can do the same instead of waiting till the usually set discussion time of our conference Labor Day.

I

First and foremost, we must understand that the reason that we have written so much of theoretical void since Lenin's death and have unfurled the banner of Marxist Humanism only after years of struggle with both Trotskyism and even Johnsonism, that is the type of state capitalism that stopped short of the positive workers' answer to the reconstruction of society on totally new beginnings, is that we recognized the validity not alone of the workers' self-activity but of his question, indeed demand to have the question, "What happens after", answered before the revolution is betrayed and we are confronted once again with a new bureaucracy we become ex-post-facto instead of prevent before it ever congeals.

In the concrete circumstance of the Cuban Revolution which could have opened an entirely new page in history not alone in Cuba, or even the whole of Latin America, but of a world that had already witnessed the Afro-Asian Revolutions as well as the crushing of the Hungarian Revolution, our record is clear: (1) The very first issue of NEWS & LETTERS after the Cuban Revolution succeeded (Feb. 1959) we headlined our solidarity with it: "Cuba's Revolution Highlights Mass Unrest in Latin America." (2) While the following year we could see the first steps of perversion from spontaneity to state-ism, we nevertheless gave our firm support, and especially so to its expropriation of American capitalism (Jan. 1960, N/L, "Cuba Jolts State Department Domination of Latin America.") (3) Naturally we would have been faithless not only to our theory but to the Cuban Revolution if we hadn't pointed to the inherent transformation into opposite that resides in the rule of the state, the centralized state embracing Communist totalitarianism without a qualm even as it brought no fundamental changes in the conditions of industrial labor, despite its agricultural revolution, which likewise was limited. Thus: (4) (a) both at our convention in the Revolution on War and Peace (Aug.-Sept. 1960) we set the dangers in the setting of the world revolution, and (b) this was followed up in Dec. 1960, with a comprehensive analysis of the revolution two years after in Two World, which I now wish to quote so that we get our principles straight before we confront the present events (TW, 12/60): "Forget Russia for a moment — it was nowhere around when Fidel Castro marched into Havana at the head of the July 26th

2910

guerrilla movement...The revolutionary petty-bourgeois lawyer who led this movement had been so little concerned with Communist theory that he gained financial help from many a Cuban and even some American liberal American bourgeois who had their fill of the corrupt Batista...

"There is no doubt that with the overthrow of the bloody Batista dictatorship, the revolution broke decisively with US imperialism which had plundered the Cuban economy. In expropriating the American capitalistic owners, it achieved an agricultural revolution and put an end to the feudal relation between the Cuban peasants and Cuban-American plantation owners. At the same time, however, the power lay not in peasant committees, but in the state who was the new owner.

"As for Castro's attitude to the industrial workers, from the very start his bossist, administrative mentality stuck out from the very first day of victorious entry into Havana when he demanded that the revolutionary students and workers there put down their arms...When it (the prol.) did, in due course, at the first trade union congress, question some economic policies of the new government, Castro ran out of the convention, calling it a madhouse.

"It is at this point that a kinship was established between the new regime and the native Communists...TOGETHER WITH WORLD COMMUNISM, FIDEL CASTRO SHARED THE CONCEPTION OF THE 'BACKWARDNESS OF THE MASSES' WHO HAD TO BE LED. THE STATE WOULD HENCEFORTH GIVE THE ORDERS, THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS WOULD CONTINUE TO WORK HARDER WHILE THE LEADERS CONTINUED TO LEAD AND SET FOREIGN POLICY."

The following month (Jan. 1961) we reprinted an article of anarchists in Havana that showed the deterioration of the workers standard of living that paralleled their not having a single voice of their own either in the press or in trade unions or in any kind of workers' councils. We warned also against considering all refugees of workers' councils. We warned also against considering all refugees as pro-Batista for it had become evident that after the first wave of the bourgeoisie running, came the youth and workers who had been key to the revolution escaping or going underground or being shot by Castro's firing squads for "subverting" the revolution he had transformed into its opposite. State capitalism may be an "improvement" on feudal-foreign imperialist-private capitalist rule — but not much, (including Law 22 that made the worker right at his weekly pay envelope pay 4% for "industrialization" as if the surplus value extracted from him didn't pay for that!).

The final stage of our analysis before the current attacks on Cuba concerned Khrushchev's appearance at UN in the embrace of Castro who likewise embraced the butcher of the Hungarian Revolution, Kadar, and finally, the Manifesto of the 81 CPs (1/61) which showed what was the new world line of Russian Communism regarding the Afro-Asian-Latin American worlds who were being given a lesson in world politics and the Communist line of wars as not inevitable: "The war that is not 'fatally inevitable' does not mean that the Russia of sputniks and ICBM's subordinates its policy in any way to that of 'the West! On the contrary, Russia champions 'peaceful co-existence' because the war that is 'not fatally inevitable' means that 'the West' is walking on glass lest any small war start a nuclear holocaust. Therefore, the 'independent national democracies' may go far indeed in challenging the US, and Russia will do all it can to help. In a word, 'peaceful co-existence' is the careful nurturing of every crisis from the Congo to Cuba."

JL.

Now then to the latest events. Obviously Kennedy has decided that, despite the fact that it would please Khrushchev no end if the war were started 90 miles from American shores rather than 90 miles from Russia or from China, he too cannot tolerate Castro's Cuba. Just as obviously Kennedy's is completely counter-revolutionary and imperialist a role and we will oppose from beginning to end.

This does not mean we will favor Khrushchev's "popular" side; as we are as opposed to Castro as to Cardona. We are either for the workers' rule and opposed to totalitarian as well as parliamentary capitalist rule in the specific context of a revolution in our time or we show we have no confidence at all that the workers can establish a workers' state and we want "shortcuts" a la Mao's "communes." If we should be expert at writing, in general, against both poles of capital, but not know them, in the concrete, merely because one of them has succeeded in jockeying itself into a position that appears as defender of revolution — provided the revolution is not against their rule.

PRECISELY BECAUSE MARXISTS HAVE ALWAYS KNOWN THAT IT DOES NOT MATTER WHO "STARTS THE WAR, BUT TOOK CLEAR-CUT CLASS POSITIONS, IT HAS REFUSED TO HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH SUCH BOURGEOIS TERMS AS "AGGRESSOR."

The reason is more obvious now than when we opposed both sides in the Korean war because the danger is greater, the danger to true revolutionary proletarian Marxist-Humanism, as is obvious from Kennedy's statement against "subversion."

The new is not in his ultimatum to the Organization of American States — that was to have been expected ever since the Cuban Revolution began and Kennedy who was not in office chafed at the collar as much as Eisenhower who was in office.

The new is not in his statement that the US Government's patience is "not inexhaustible" — the plan for the invasion was obvious from the first Russian tank that got there.

The new is not in his appearance that he opposed Castro's "betrayal" of revolution — that was his "new frontier", the subversion of language a la Khrushchev who uses Marxism in that way and taught this new state capitalist a lesson or two in his approach to "neutralism."

No, the new — frighteningly new for all of us and the revolutionaries throughout the world — is Kennedy's declaration of the "new and deeper struggle", "the struggle that is taking place every day, without arms or fanfare in thousands of villages and markets and classrooms all over the globe, "(my emphasis)"subversion, infiltration and a host of other tactics can steadily advance, picking off vulnerable areas one by one in situations which do not permit our own armed intervention."

This is what must concern us. This, and not taking sides other than opposition to both sides, is what we must single out as the threat to the struggle for the minds of men. This is far beyond the Cuban struggle. This is the American revolution. This is the world anti-war struggle. All this the Kennedy Administration has declared war on, and far from battlefields or on them, in trade unions or schools, this "new frontier" will come to nip in the bud what McCarthyism only blustered about but had no power to stifle. We must expose, root out this threat to our every freedom before all life is extinguished in a nuclear holocaust.

Yours, Raya

2912

TO ALL LOCALS (Including
London and Glasgow)

(On the Day of the First American Astronaut).
May 5, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

The Recent Growth of the CP's in Western Europe and Especially So in Great Britain.

The Daily Worker of London jumped the gun on the World Press, including that of Russia itself, by printing a story about the first world cosmonaut, who was supposed to have orbited the earth and returned safely to it — except that he was so organically injured that he could not face the press. Whether that story was true or not does not matter. (I am no scientist, but I could not be less interested in whether that was the first cosmonaut and the officially-proclaimed first cosmonaut, Major Yuri Gagarin was the first and healthily-returned to earth cosmonaut, because this race for space has as much to do with humanity's development as the first industrial revolution cared about the welfare of the workers.)

The point at issue in the contents of the present analysis of what is happening to the CP's in Western Europe is that it was the British Journal that had the access to such information. It was no accident. Whether it was a deliberately right story or a deliberately wrong story, it was undisputably and deliberately a world-first story. There is no mistaking what that did to the circulation of the paper, nor to its international standing, nor to its subsequent growth and prestige. Nothing succeeds like success and while it is the kind of hothouse success, planted by a "foreign state power", it will have its British ramifications that will be as "purely British" as are the recent spies for Russia and, unfortunately, some workers and idealistic youth, as well as some tarnished intellectuals. Let no one misunderstand that this is only the beginning of its present growth. It carries with it dangers for the independent revolutionary Marxists, who must begin by not underestimating this new phenomenon. Almost five years have passed since the revulsion of the Europeans, workers and intellectuals, against the bloody Russian suppression of the Hungarian Revolution. Since then has come the first sputnik, the pictures of the far side of the moon, Belka and Strelka and now Major Yuri Gagarin. Space first-aidness has replaced the myth of Stalin invincibility and it is so much more "objective", and, where subjected, so much more dynamic a la Khrushchev that it is a comfort for the non-party card-carrying intellectual who is nevertheless drawn to the party card-carrying leader.

Over a year ago it became obvious, in Italy first, that ^(many of the) tens of thousands who had been up their party cards after the Hungarian Revolution had been suppressed, had returned back to the CP fold. It looked at first as if it were only an Italian phenomenon and after all the Italian CP had even in 1956 been nearly two million strong. Again, Khrushchev's UN performance seemed aimed "only" at the Afro-Asian Latin-American worlds. But if you listen carefully, you could also have heard Khrushchev saying: "Who can say that French mothers whose children are dying in the fields of Algeria are less unfortunate than the Algerian mothers who bury their own sons in their own lands?" It was not unheeded by the French CP which had been saddled previously by Khrushchev's flirtation with DeGaulle when it looked like DeGaulle might undermine NATO, and who, therefore, had to change the lines also on the Algerian Revolution.

The insularity of Great Britain is unfortunately not limited to the ruling class. Both because the British CP was, in the first place insignificant in comparison to the other European countries, and because the break-away from the CP after the 1956 Hungarian Revolution had produced not merely party-card tearers-uppers, but had actually set up two new journals and innumerable splits and growth

of independent grouping, as well as the fact that the CND (Campaign for Nuclearly Disarmament) had been organized without the benefit of the CP, the illusion was great that a different, a unique, a non-Communist, a British "Humanist" variation would arise and develop on British soil and from there permeate the world. I previously had reported the callousness of one such independent mind who had answered my demand that a socialist must be against both poles of world capital by not falling into the trap of being only against NATO, while having nothing to say about the Warsaw Pact adherence, by saying: "I am a Britisher, so I must fight my bourgeoisie and they are part of NATO. It's up to the Russian and East European workers to fight the Warsaw Pact." It was easy to expose him; it was not and is not easy to show prove the urgency of a total, comprehensive, unyielding to the immediate obvious demands at the expense of any such ~~found~~/rounded Marxist-Humanism. It is this which preoccupies me now as I view yet another spurt in growth of the British CP.

II.

Let us approach the growth in another way, this time not from the space-race successes, which affect the "ordinary" person, but from the pseudo-Marxist ~~pickings~~ to which official Communism clings so. If the space race successes made the "ordinary" person disregard the ICBM threat, the U-2 spy plane definitely gave the Russian orbit the edge, and definitely put the label of aggressor on America rather than on Russia. How many remember that "aggressor" is a label revolutionary Marxists have nothing to do with, because they know that it matters not at all which side succeeds in putting that label on the other, since the basic, class-line is disregarded by both? Before being too quick and "subjective" with our answer (since we ourselves definitely didn't fall into that trap), let us remember that the tendency which considers itself state-capitalist in England (Tony Cliff) had analyzed fully, book-length in fact, Mao's China as state capitalist and yet on Formosa, thought one must take sides with the "lesser evil". And, obviously, that was Mao's China as against US imperialism. seventh fleet.

As Cuba shows presently, it is not easy to be against both sides and hue only to the independent working class revolutionary line. That seems to be fine only for history and thesis writing, not for the present and current doing.

Therefore, we must confront the sad, but clear and shocking reality that while the CP's are gaining new strengths with both the space race and the "peace moves", the third force, the third force not of neutralism, which at critical moments will of necessity be "neutrally" for one or the other pole of world capital, but the third force of truly independent, truly original in the sense in which Marx made it the original world outlook of the class that would put an end to all classes, has not put its stamp on world development. I'll not underestimate what we have done; none have done more. I am saying that the tasks are becoming ever greater and if we shut our eyes for so much as a moment to this new growth of the CP's, and relax for a moment the need to unfurl our own banner of Marxist Humanism, and stand only under that without deviation of "meanwhile" doing "something" for the general movement, we will in England particularly, have no solid theoretic foundation which others will be compelled to come to if they wish this truly new society.

III.

Toward that end, I want to deal with the following points which I hope others will expand and then use not merely as the basis for the week's Educational, but the basis for following events that will develop objectively during the next few months. That basis must be two-fold: (1) What/the Spanish Revolution and the World War II aftermaths in Western Europe lessons have for us today; and (2) What the state capitalist ~~has~~ lacks that only Humanist philosophy can release.

- 3 -

The Spanish Revolution in 1937 was so great an event historically, so phenomenal an achievement day by day, so new in its immediate occupation of the factories and its multi-hued political leadership from Republicanism to anarchism, so fraught with so potential world-wide proletarian developments, not only against fascism, but for a new world social order, that even the Trotskyists (and Leon Trotsky was then living) and analyzing and bearing the upon it the full weight of his revolutionary experience) very nearly "forgot" the Moscow Trials. Or at least did not draw any relationship between these infamous frame-ups and the role of Stalinism in crushing all other political tendencies, even when they are not in power. Despite all the hundreds of books on this revolution, and many were quite discerning, nonerally drew the lessons of Communism in Western Europe. For example, for Moscow arms, Spanish gold was paid and yet the strings attached imposed the getting rid of political tendencies unfavorable to Stalinism. For example, instead of the united front of people marching separately under their own political banner, but striking together the common enemy of fascism, there was substituted the popular front which, under the guise of representing all tendencies, actually meant a dissolution of all tendencies into the one that had the power. For example, the "rule or ruin policy" of Stalinism was taken in very nearly a journalistic sense instead of the counter-revolutionary essence that it was not only when Stalinism was in power that it was counter-revolutionary. The examples are innumerable and many who could list them and, therefore, fought Stalinism in '37-'41 forgot all about it when Nazism ran over Western Europe and in the Resistance Movement they once again met Stalinists as "comrades". The result was, at the end of World War II, when Communism had become so great a mass force in Western Europe that the popular saying was "They could take power by lifting a telephone," no one asked why they didn't lift a telephone to take power, much less draw the conclusion from it that they would rather have the counter-revolution than entrust the revolution to the self-active masses.

Only one break from Stalinism occurred and that was Stalinist. I am referring to the Yugoslavian break from the Russian orbit only after it itself was a state power. In a word, there was no Tito in Western Europe, because no CP had state power and none was going to get it unless they had total confidence in the masses reorganizing society and, therefore, did not need to wait upon the Red Army to lift them to power. None wanted the self-active masses to have power. Just as state capitalism had come to stay, so had the state capitalist mentality of the new intellectuals; in or out of power.

It is for this reason that Trotskyism failed after World War II to become a mass power. It is for this reason that the independent intellectual, who broke with the CP in 1956, could not gain a mass following. It is for this reason that those parts of the state capitalist tendencies (Johnsonism in America and Tony Cliff in Britain) had no independent banner to unfurl when war clouds gathered over Formosa. It is for this reason that no existing leadership saw in automation the new humanism arise out of the very daily life's battles of the proletariat with that inhuman mode of production. It is for this reason that after we did unfurl the Marxist-Humanist banner with both MARXISM AND FREEDOM and NEWS AND LETTERS, that no intellectual "flocked" to it. It is for this reason that we are once again faced with the growth of the CP just at the time when American imperialism is so utterly naked as not to have a defendent among its own allies, for none has a fig leaf to offer it. It is for this reason that the British friends must, in facing up to the reality of the space race, the nuclear holocaust, and the innocence running for any cover that we must concretize the theory where it is the life and activity of the masses aspiring to freedom. Nothing short of that will build a movement in Europe or in America.

May 11, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTERDEGAULLE AND THE RADICAL PARTIES AT THE PRESENT STAGE OF FRENCH CRISIS

In the month of April, right in the midst of the crisis over Laos and Cuba, came the much more terrifying threat ~~to~~ to France. That four ex-generals with no greater a "mass" base than a few thousand colons could threaten the existence, not only of nine million Algerian Non-Als determined to get their freedom and engaged in a drawn-out bloody war now seven years old, but the whole of France speaks volumes about the decline of French civilization. That DeGaulle can still appear "left", although in three years of total power which he had gotten from just such a putsch, he has done absolutely nothing "to solve" the Algerian War, much less the fate of France shows again how protracted the death agony of a civilization can be. That no less than ten million French workers throughout the length and breadth of France can mobilize themselves and put an end to the threat should, once and for all, put an end to all the hues of radicals from Communists to Marxists (such as they are in France) who had only one word for the fall of the Fourth Republic and that was "apathy", working-class apathy. Unfortunately, that won't put an end to it for the crisis continues and the impotence of working-class leadership remains unchanged.

The move on the part of the Kennedy administration to enhance the role of NATO by granting it an advisory capacity for "the West", not merely in Europe, but throughout the world, must be seen as the capitalistic correct reading of the ~~mass~~ signs of the times. They are not mis-reading the mass power of the proletariat as "apathy" and they are making sure that DeGaulle and not it, be given all the credit for both "stopping" the planned invasion of Paris and the total dictatorial powers for stopping in fact the forward move of the proletariat. Everything for the glory of the powers-that-be in the "West", as against the powers-that-be in the "East".

What is to be done? In 1958, when DeGaulle came to power, there seemed to be three answers among those who knew there was no difference between either Russia or America, Communism, capitalism or existentialism; (1) Workers' Committees had to be established and to call for them at this time was the only thing to be done, "so that the working class will know its own force and will determine, democratically the objective which it wants to struggle for and the methods it wants to use... (to achieve) workers' power." (Tribune Ouvriere). (2) "Workers' Committees, even if there was a network of these committees throughout France, are not, cannot be, nor can they substitute for the working-class party. It must be added, however, that the revolutionary party will fall short of its historical task if it does not know how to work as the vanguard of these committees..." (Battaglia Comunista). And (3) our own answer of the need to unfurl a total reply, that is to say, that while only the workers can decide, and they have not yet had their last say, we cannot use that as an excuse to shoulder them with the responsibility of the theoreticians to give the philosophic answer of Humanism, which answer should have been posed throughout the 1950's. The urgency of the present situation demanded that we ourselves confront both the current crisis and the situation throughout Europe since the end of World War II.

It was not merely a question of the workers "knowing" its own force, but of the intellectuals or groupings of workers and intellectuals, or the "party" working with the masses ~~not~~ freed from much of its own past.

That "freedom from its past" did not mean freedom from Marxism, but freedom from "taking it for granted" instead of restating it anew and comprehensively for its time.

2916

Ever since not much has been done by any group in France that in any serious way confronted this challenge, much less answered it. The groups go on exactly as they have been throughout the 1950's and into 1961. A few new magazines that portray either the split from the Communists after the 1956 Hungarian Revolution and some re-groupment on top with the unlikely, but unfortunately actual, fusion of a Pierre Keville and Mendes-France. A Jean-Paul Sartre never really broke from the Communists, though he criticized the suppression of Hungary, while some editors of Argument, in breaking not only from Communism but Marxism, have written some revealing articles about the role of the French intelligentsia, which shows a continued line of apologetics for those in power lasting all the way from the enlightenment through the existentialist, because obviously they want to "engage" or "disengage" in politics ~~and the Communist~~ provided that activity in the mass movement would not carry with it "responsibilities of leadership"; hence the willingness to be the pawns of the CP. "Thought" has its limitations -- when, to intellectuals, but not when it comes to their stopping the forward movement of the masses.

We can learn more from the enemy, the real class enemy, (in this case Kennedy's new proposition to NATO) than we can learn from some alleged co-thinkers. The enemy tells us they will not let go of Europe, that it is still the key to the world situation, so much so that the United States will give up some of its prerogatives of leadership. What is it the co-thinkers say that even shows an awareness that the hour is late?

To understand our constant emphasis on comprehensiveness of statement, revolutionary dialectic, Hegelian origins of Marxism, the humanism which is our absolute for this era, I would like to call attention to the critical 1920-21 period in Russia when Lenin brought in the question of dialectics into the Trade Union debate with Trotsky and Bukharin. Lenin goes so far as to put right after the word "Marxism" "i.e. dialectic logic" to contrast to dialectics eclecticism, stressing that "no mistakes, including political mistakes, can be properly explained unless one gets right down to its theoretical roots in the mind of one who makes the mistake, on the basis of definite, deliberately adopted propositions...dialectical logic demands that we take an object in its development, its 'self-movement' as Hegel sometimes puts it, in its changes. In relation to a glass this is not clear at once, but even a glass does not remain unchanged, particularly the purpose of the glass, its use, connections with the surrounding world. Thirdly, the whole of human experience should enter the full 'definition' of an object as a criterion of the truth and as a practical index of the object's connection with what man requires. Fourthly, dialectical logic teaches that 'there is no abstract truth, truth is always concrete.'" (Lenin's Selected Works, Volume IX, pages 62-66).

If I may paraphrase the whole essence of that trade union debate in which dialectic and concrete, theory and practice, relationship to the masses as "schools of Communism", rather than state and party played a role that is most applicable to us today, it would be to say that a theoretical article in a quarterly is not concrete, whereas a book is concrete in that over-all sense of comprehensive; that a Marxist groupings relationship to the masses, both in the shop and in the nationalist freedom movement when it excludes theory is not concrete, while our relationship to the masses which accepts a responsibility for theory is concrete; a disregard of intellectuals either as individuals or as groupings is neither dialectical nor concrete, even if it is supposedly based on the greater interest in mass movement, while an analysis of such break-aways as a reflection of the mass movement would not have been only concrete but a preparation for not having been in the same old place at the outbreak of the new crisis. The masses may still succeed in chalking up these co-thinkers to a responsibility of their task, but the hour is indeed late.

Yours,
RAYA

2917

TO ALL 1000 (incl. copies
of ...)

May 17, 1961

WORLD POLITICAL ...

Sino-Soviet Unity (at Geneva and Piff (at
"Hua it")

The present 12 nation conference at Geneva on Laos incident, prominently, (although that is always played down in American press) the Chinese delegation even as it did in the 1954 "peace talks" which first divided up the former Indochina French empire. To confuse the western spots, the Chinese case mailing and Gromyko case growling. 3 days later there are rumors of "murder" and Gromyko is mailing, and the Chinese growling, —and the Americans, as always, "confur

All this is taking place against a background of near famine in China, agricultural crisis in Russia, unemployment and imperialist dabbling in Cuba on the part of the Kennedy Administration. What does it all add up to insofar as the Marxist Humanists are concerned, that is to say, the proletariat of the world searching for a road out of all the preparations for war?

First let us untangle the ideology of Mao's China which recently has gotten so much publicity because it seemed to represent "orthodoxy" as against "the flexibility" of Khrushchev. It is definitely wrong to call Mao a "Stalinist", no matter what at any time the bourgeois theoreticians insert into that designation. For examples in the 1925-7 Chinese Revolution, Stalin built in defeat with his policy of the "four class strategy." In the 1930's Mao both worked toward and against "a four class strategy" and this lasted not only through K & E II, but the first year of power, 1949-50. Yet the policy meant very different things to Russia and to China. To Stalin the policy was only a way of "building socialism in one country", that is to say, betraying the world revolution, defending Russia, asking to be left alone by the foreign bourgeoisie. To Mao, on the other hand, it meant getting into position of power, no matter which road one was compelled to travel over, depending upon whether you had just been chased into the mountain vastness of China by Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary armies, or whether the Sino-Japanese war made it possible to be allies with Chiang Kai-shek but seeing that you fought Japanese imperialism your own way and controlled what territories you liberated, or whether you had just won over Stalin and Truman and finally got power but did not yet subdue all those "4 classes" that got you there.

Moreover, at that very time, insofar as the rest of "the East" was concerned especially India, Mao could do a great deal of shifting about on that "4 class strategy" by the words "from above" or "from below." Thus Stalin wanted it "from above" and neither encouraged Mao to fight for power while he negotiated alone with the Big Powers, nor did he wish to be critical of Nehru, while Mao wanted bourgeois revolutions not with Nehru but as against him. The basic reason no one talked then so much about a rift between Russia and China was that the basic unity of the two, which will keep being the real cement, was not alleged communism but hostility to the main enemy, the U.S.

This cement we will confront at each of the other basic "doctrinal" points of difference between Russia and China. Take the question of the new imbedded in the reliance of the peasantry as against the proletariat as the force of revolution. There is no doubt whatever that ever since Mao's Special Report on the Peasant Movement in Hunan in Feb. 19, 7, there was a fundamental diversion, theoretically, from the Comintern as Comintern as well as the Comintern as Stalinism. When Mao sought the new in the situation, he was not extolling the peasantry, as Lenin had extolled their deepest layers as being revolutionary and his insistence that in a country that was very industrialized, the proletariat could not gain power without the peasant as his comrade-in-arm and in government. Mao, on the other hand, was pointing only to the factually concrete in China— that while Chiang had put down the revolution and therefore the proletariat in the cities, the very vastness of China and underdevelopment meant China was incapable of entering his power in the hinterland where, therefore, movement did and could exist. He, Mao, too could use that cement . . .

in his army as in "the Soviets", which as a euphemistic name for power councils (which might include anything from war lords, thieves, adventurers and actual ~~extra~~ revolutionary peasants, whom, however, he could control). Now, Stalin never relied on the peasantry in Russia, so there was a difference. But, again, the point of unity was greater than the divergence, and the point of unity was the Party. Both Mao and Stalin never really had any use of the proletariat and the frequent use of the word so they meant only the alleged representative of the proletariat, that is to say, the monolithic Party. This Party as "the universal law" is what bound these two state capitalist mentalities together also on the 3rd point of deviation: guerrilla warfare. Where one did not control the national economy, as Mao did not before 1949, the army, the guerrillas, naturally assume an independent role, but, again, it was the Party that laid the law down for the strategy of the guerrillas.

And when it will become part of the state then it will also mean, whether it is the new "Communes" of Mao's China or "kolkhozy" of Stalin's Russia, THE MILITARIZATION OF LABOR BOTH AS TRADE UNIONS INCORPORATED IN STATE AND AS FORCED LABOR TO SUPPLEMENT FACTORY LABOR FOR THE MAJOR INDUSTRIAL MACHINES.

The first real difference between these two totalitarians comes in international, not in national policy, and it comes at the end of the Korean war. Eisenhower wasn't the only one who "capitulated"; Mao had to also, for Russia had signed away any independent role to China's "volunteers" and had to unless it was willing, as MacArthur was, to unleash the nuclear holocaust and W.R. III.

This marker of 2 Koreas, as the marker of 2 Germanys to signify where the "allied" armies had stopped to rest till the next outbreak, and the 2 Viet Nams in 1954, with its "neutral" Laos, Cambodia, etc., signified that it was not really China, or Britain (whose Churchill could appear "smarter" than Roosevelt because it, as a secondary power) no longer had "responsibility" for "keeping the peace" and therefore could point to the inevitable next war between "East" and "West" BUT ONLY THE U.S. AND USSR THAT ARE THE POWERS THAT WILL DECIDE THE NEXT WORLD STRUGGLE.

It is not only the bourgeois theoreticians that seem confused by what is "doctrinal" and what is power politics difference between Russia and China. These 2 themselves are often "confused", that is to say, have to compromise when opposition, internal opposition, threatens each one's domination over its people and those in the satellites. Thus the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 and the unfurling of the Marxist Humanist banner meant a threat not only to Russia, but to China and the Humanism to come from China (where, as the "100 schools of thoughts" that had so soon to be struck down, showed) and then also finally from Africa and Latin America. Then the two protagonists united, and, ~~again~~ again, the point of unity was stronger than any diversion since both are state capitalist societies, though at very different stages of development. They united in the fight against "revisionism."

What, then, has brought such sharpness to the point of diversion, rather than the point of unity, that anyone, from a Deutscher to a Rostow, thinks they can prove that, by comparison, Khrushchev is the "peaceful co-existence" exponent, and Mao the "inevitability of war" propagandist?

IT IS THE POINT OF DISCONTINUOUS DEVELOPMENT. IT IS THE POINT OF THE 1st SPURGE AND THEREFORE THE VIEW THAT SUPERIORITY IN WEAPONRY (not just "equality" in weaponry as with A and H bombs, but superiority as with ICBMs) SHOULD MAKE ONE WILLING TO RISK "SMALL WARS" THAT COULD HELP THE THIRD UNCOMMITTED WORLD, THE AFRO-ASIAN-LATIN AMERICAN WORLDS FROM WHICH CHINA COULD GAIN MORE, DESPITE ITS UNDERDEVELOPED WEAPON TECHNOLOGY.

The point of friction between Russia and China, therefore, has nothing whatever to do with "orthodoxy" or "flexibility". It has nothing to do with "doctrinal" points, although Khrushchev soon after 1956-7 declared that "doctrinarianism" (China's inflexibility on question of war's inevitability) was every bit as bad as "revisionism" (which existed not only in Hungary and Poland, but in Tito's Yugoslavia).

The point of friction is the degree of development of the economy. Russia is unevenly but industrially developed, and, while a certain "leap" or discontinuous step can be achieved, through automated production and scientific advance, the overall makes it 2nd, not 1st but 2nd, to the U.S. and it must think twice before embarking on war. China, on the other hand, is economically backward, and found that not even "communes", that is to say, full militarization of labor at 16-17-18 hours a day, can produce that "leap forward" that would put it in a competitive position vis-a-vis the U.S. It is in a hurry, in a big hurry (1) for A-bomb information from its comrade Russians, (2) for aid, more aid than the bourgeois revolutions "from the top" as La Masser and his Aswan dam are getting, again from the Russian; and (3) as bargaining point, it has its more "revolutionary" stand which promises "quickness" to power for the Afro-Asian-Latin American worlds.

At the moment, just when it is bowing to Russia, and meeting peacefully in Geneva with the big, bad wolf, Khrushchev is already rushing towards a meeting with Kennedy, and alone. Moreover, Mao has chosen a day to hand in his note, which it took him 3 months to write (since it is in answer to one from Kennedy in Feb.) on the 1st day of full negotiations of the 14 nations. But how can China, facing famine, object as vigorously as its "orthodoxy" would demand? Who will be left behind? Cuba? Berlin? And whom is Kennedy ready to betray for a new breathing spell?

But, above, all, what new illusions will that sow in Nuclear Disarmament movements as well as assorted popular fronts?

Don't let anyone forget that, in the meantime, Kennedy is proceeding on the home front against all oppositions. He has help from his lunatic fringe, which may not be as much in the news as Eke Mao's, but get there fastest with the mostest deprivations of our liberties. First, there was the McClelland Committee raising the bogey that the space lag is supposedly due to the strikes at missile bases -- and Secretary of Labor Goldberg takes it quietly away from him to "work out arrangements for the right to strike at missile plants" -- but only as a first step to take away the right to strike -- soon. Then comes Eastland with a new attack on any workers in defense industries, saying that since the Supreme Court had thrown out the totalitarian loyalty procedures which did not even allow the accused Communist confront his accuser, a "new" way should be worked out to enact law which forbid people "who are likely to become tools for espionage" to have jobs. At the same time the counter-revolution down South raises its head not merely in the lunatic fringes that beat the Freedom Fighters for riding buses in desegregated manner, but the Governor of Alabama refusing to give them protection from those violent gangster attacks.

All these continuations of the Kennedy speeches following the Cuban invasions show how twin-like in essence as well as in appearance is private to state capitalism. The move toward totalitarianism is the move toward war, whether it is called "peaceful co-existence" or "inevitability of capitalist war" or, as in Kennedy, "deeper struggle". The way not merely not to fall into it, but to build on its analysis by taking the independent proletarian road, is to refuse to subordinate the totality of our philosophy to a single point of struggle.

The unity of theory and practice cannot continue to remain merely a goal, but must become the fabric of daily life.

May 21, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER -- On Apologists for Russian Communism

Dear Friends:

Although the FBI is sending out Dick's translation of Cheulick's analysis of the Berlin strike as this week's political letter, and this is more in the nature of draft of a review of Marcuse's "Soviet Marxism" which will appear in the June-July issue of M&F, the following objective world events motivate its being sent out in this form: (1) Pres. Kennedy, in his address to the newspaper editors following the Cuban invasion which he used as excuse for taking away our freedoms here, used some extemporaneous (or at least those calculated misrepresentations were considered "extemporaneous" and reproduced in the released text of his speech) remarks about the near-fatal results from editors' underpayment of "new journalists." The reference was to Karl Marx's dispute with the New York Herald-Tribune, and the inference was supposed to be that if only the editor had treated Marx differently, "we" might not have had the phenomena of Marxism, Communism, and all those crises of our day. "Let that be a lesson to you," said the young and suddenly-caught-up-on-his-lessons-on-Marxism-Kennedy, and the extorted laughter followed. But it was said not merely to gain a laugh and thus divert them from the issue of the free press, but in order to continue the old capitalist line of forcing an identity between those two opposites, Marxism and Communism. (2) Fidel Castro has found that he too must betray what he used to call a "humanistic revolution", in distinction to both capitalism and Communism, rather than entrust his fate to the self-activity of the masses that made the revolution and thus open the road to a third road away from the 2 poles of world capital, Russia and America. And (3) The varied hues of the intellectuals, from Daniel Bell and Max Shectman who are siding with US, to Communists, Trotskyists, and "independents" of both the Deutscher and Marcuse varieties as well as C. Wright Mills, who siding with Russia are seeking, long before the actual outbreak of war, to brainwash the proletariat to take sides rather than sticking to the independent road of Marxist humanism and a truly new society.

All these make imperative not only a public separation from the professor who introduced M&F, but a warning to the proletariat not to be diverted from humanist causes to administrative short-outs. It is true that Prof. Marcuse, in his Preface, openly stated that he disagreed with my analysis of "the contemporary position, structure and consciousness of the laboring classes." But, to the extent, that he specified that "the Marxian notion of the working class seems to be applicable neither to the majority of the laboring classes in the West nor that in the communist orbit," it would have appeared that he is equally opposed to both poles of world capital, whereas in fact his book "Soviet Marxism" which was published within a few of M&F proves his attachment to the Communist orbit. Where, previously, it would have been merely an academic debate, presently, both because of the 3 basic points made in first paragraph, and because of his printed statement with other Harvard and Brandeis professors in The New York Times on Cuba, the need for a review is urgent. Finally, precisely because he is a philosopher and carries out a line logically to its ultimate, we can clearly see the road apologists must travel, whether they live in ivory towers or not.

2921

The very title of his book shows that he too is part of the conspiracy of forcing an identity of Marxism and Communism. Some of you may recall that, before publication of his book, I begged him to change his title to "Soviet Communism," so as not to

to mirror the word, Marxism. He refused, and it was obvious once I saw it in print, that, in fact, despite all he says to separate Marxism from Soviet "Marxism", he actually thinks and acts on the proposition that one is the "continuation" of the other. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ "There is theoretical continuity (sic!) from early Marxian notion of proletariat as objective truth of capitalist society to Soviet Marxist conception of partinost (partisanship)." (p.9)

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ The wrong translation of the word, partinost (party-ism) as "partisanship" is not accidental, although some bourgeois translators have done so before. The intent is not only to identify the monolithic party of Stalinism with the concept of vanguard party of Lenin, but to vitiate Marx's concept of the self-acting, revolutionary proletariat on the alleged ground that, "since" Marx too distinguished between "immediate" and "real" (i.e. historic) interests of proletariat, "therefore" any and all contradictory concepts in Stalinist Russia which degrades the worker to nothing but a cog in a machine is still "within the context" of Marxism. The vulgarity of Marcuse's reasoning can be seen in the ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ statement (p.86) "For what is irrational if measured from without the system is rational within the system", which could be used to justify everything from "counter-revolution" to sheer insanity. Nevertheless, we must not jump, as he constantly does over historic stages, for example, all the way from 1923 to 1955, but must follow him through his own beleaguered road so that we should be able to expose and root out what Hegel rightly called "the barbarous method" which assumes what it should prove.

Also we must exclude from this analysis the open dishonesty of the professor in not even mentioning, much less analyzing, under "spectacular controversies" either the 1943 revision of VEHIC, or the 1955 attack on Marxist Humanism, though he takes time out for the linguistic detours. Even his fort, dialectic which he takes up in detail, and to which we will return presently, he deals with in response to the Western analyses, and not in respect to Zhdanov's 1947 speech demanding a ~~XXXXXX~~ substitution for the law of the development through contradiction the "new dialectics -- criticism and self-criticism." Again, the irrational is made the rational, and the rational irrational with the claim that "This (i.e. the logos of dialectic no longer being that of liberation either in the Hegelian or in Marxian sense) is inevitable once dialectic is no longer focused on the contradictions of class society but extended beyond them." (pp.141-2) So that, with a straight face, Marcuse can conclude (p.154): "The Soviet Marxist 'revision' is 'orthodox'. Since Soviet Marxists maintain that Soviet society is a socialist society, they consistently invest it with the corresponding dialectical characteristics. What is involved is not so much a revision of the dialectic as the claim of socialism for a non-socialist society."

And yet it is this very barbarous method of assuming what should be proved which is exactly the method of Prof. Marcuse. And that is what we call an "immanent critique." The critique thus employs the conceptual instruments of its object, namely, Marxism, in order to clarify the actual function of Marxism in Soviet society and its historic direction." In the first use of the word, Marxism, Marcuse means "Soviet Marxism", and in the second, real Marxism, and, again, it is by no accident, that the 2 suddenly got used in the very 1st par. of the 1st p. as if they were synonymous. He accepts the Russian claim to be the new "struc"

2922

of Marxism: "From this point of view, Soviet Marxism appears as the attempt to reconcile the inherited body of Marxian theory with a historical situation which seemed to vitiate the central conception of this theory itself, namely, the Marxian conception of the transition from capitalism to socialism." (p.13)

Obviously Marcuse would rather vitiate Marxism than Stalinism: "We must try to identify the point at which the historical development seemed to explode the Marxian analysis." (p.13) All "sins" start from this point, "the transition from capitalism to socialism", that is to say, the Russian Revolution which happened in the "East" rather than the "West", where Marx "predicted" and was further left to "co-exist" with the capitalist world ~~because~~ because of the "decline in the revolutionary potential of the Western world", by which Marcuse does not mean that the German social democracy betrayed the proletariat, but that the proletariat betrayed.

He then leaves Marxism alone and goes to Leninism only in order at once to say that "the refusal to draw the theoretical consequences from the new situation (imperialism) characterizes the entire development of Leninism & is one of the chief reasons for the gap between theory and practice in Soviet Marxism." (p.30) Blame anyone -- Marx, Lenin, the proletariat -- but don't blame Stalin, don't point to the actual counter-revolution in Russia with Lenin's death! Even where Marcuse later admits that there is a "new ruling group" in Russia, he goes into such convolutions over the word, "class" and whether it is "truly sovereign", that he concludes that: "The Soviet bureaucracy thus does not seem to possess a basis for the effective perpetuation of special interests against the overriding general requirements of the social system on which it lives." (p.116) As if any other class could, once the system was gone, whether that be feudalism with its Louis XIV, or Cuban private capitalists or the Roman emperors!

So anxious is Marcuse to establish a continuity between Lenin and Stalin (not for praising the former, but the latter, that even Stalin's one original "theoretic" contribution, "socialism in one country" is dealt with as if it were Lenin's invention. At the same time he does not include, in "Lenin's Heritage" (pp.38-5) the new theoretical departure re the colonial world, at least none that "would alter the structure of Marxian doctrine, nor did he elaborate the new international character of the class struggle" (p.49) and this is supposed to be a summation of the Thesis at the 2nd CI Congress which speaks of the need even to subordinate the Russian Revolution if it were possible to overthrow world capitalism through the colonial revolutions! But while he denies the new departures for theory which are real, he is quick to invent those that didn't exist, such as, industrialization "without liberation" and the "Central Plan" which Lenin fought so hard when it was first proposed by Trotsky (whom Marcuse hardly mentions at all). Instead he jumps all the way from 1924 to 1956! (p.50) No wonder it appears as one period -- it takes up less than one sentence in his book.

He must, however, come to grips with how can Stalinism treat the entire period from World War I to the present era as one period, when such different events as Fascism and "The grand Alliance" (but he doesn't mention Hitler-Stalin Pact!) as well as the spectacular growth of the Italian and French CPs in post-war Europe occurred. ~~xxx~~ Marcuse admits (p.55) that Stalinism "never aimed at revolution as the immediate objective", although "the Soviet armies could have overrun the continent", but concludes that the whole question of "capitalist stabilization" is based

-4-

on Lenin's dictum for a "breathing spell"--in 1920!

The key to all of Marcuse's fantastic notions appears on pp.74-5 where he actually denies that there had been a break (he even puts the word, "break", in quotation marks) of Stalinism from Leninism on the ground that "if the dialectical law of the turn from quantity into quality was ever applicable, it was in the transition from Leninism (after the October Revolution) to Stalinism." (p.74) ~~xxxxxx~~ As if that qualitative transformation isn't, precisely, the break from Leninism.

Nevertheless the whitewash of Stalinism continues even in its most terroristic form on the ground that "The height of the Stalinist terror coincided with the consolidation of the Hitler regime." (p.75) If even that were true --which it isn't for the height of terror was before Hitlerism was in power, in the drive to collectivization, which ended with the slaughter of millions and actual famine in 1932, the forced labor camps as state institutions, and helped no little on the international scene to bring about fascism--but even if the contention were true, how possibly could you go on calling such counter-revolutionary terror "socialist." The answer is, you can't, and Marcuse doesn't --when you ask him directly, whether that has anything in common with Marxism as Marx theorized and practiced it. But, while that is answered abstractly, all the concrete development is dealt with as if it were a continuous line from Marx through Lenin to Stalin and Khrushchev --and all in order to conclude that "faith in this rationality" not only assured it "popular strength" but "may well determine, to a considerable extent, the course of Soviet development" (pp.266-7)--toward "liberalization."

Now "the new rationality" is the fancy term for post-Leninist Russia, which, Lord forbid, he call "state capitalism" even if he admits a "ruling group" and "a ruled majority". He would rather blame it all on the "backwardness of the masses." Thus he says (p.89) "The new form of Marxian theory corresponds to its new historical agent--a backward population which is to become what it 'really' is: a revolutionary force which changes the world." "In its magical use, Marxian theory assumes a new rationality." (p.90) And all this is supposed to be due to the "anomalous" conditions which began with Lenin and the co-existence of capitalism and socialism, and continues though now, in its economics as well as in its ethics, bears "a striking similarity" to capitalism in the West.

It is fitting that at this point (p.136) begins Ch.7 "Dialectic and its Vicissitudes", where, when he speaks of Hegel as Heraclitus and Marx as Paul Marx, he is the old dialectical and even humanist Marcuse, with some superb formulations, only to conclude that Stalinism didn't "revise" dialectics, but merely moved it to a different dimension--socialism--where it doesn't apply, and, "of course", Russian isn't a socialist society! "All this seems to confirm that the Soviet Marxist treatment of dialectic merely serves to protect and justify the established regime," says Marcuse --and then runs the other way, "However the situation is more complicated." (p.155) "Even during the last period of Stalin, it appeared that ideological preparations were being made for rendering the regime more flexible" and it is for this "flexibility" we are all supposed to welcome, but even here--after 40 more useless pages on "ethics"--we are never permitted to relax our attack on the "backward masses". Thus: "There (capitalist society), Marxian

theory and practice themselves were to be the lever which would break this determinism and free the subjective factor, that is, the class consciousness of the proletariat. We have tried to show that, in Soviet society, Marxism no longer has this function. Left without a conceptual level for the (determinate negation' of the established system, for the comprehending and realizing its arrested potentialities, THE RULED TEND NOT ONLY TO SUBMIT TO THE RULERS BUT ALSO TO RETRODUCE IN THEMSELVES THEIR SUBORDINATION." (p.191) my emphasis)

And all this Marcuse dared write when the forced laborers in Vorkuta had already rebelled following the East German rising of 1953, when the Hungarian Revolution showed the courage, steel, and profound humanism of "the ruled", while, on the other hand, the Russian counter-revolution had moved from being internal to being imperialist and "foreign". The fact that Marcuse denied any support to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters but extends it to ~~xxxxix~~ Castro's Cuba has its lessons for us within the country: We will not have many friends among the intellectuals when the going gets tough.

Both because you have Chauleu's analysis to discuss this and because the Two Worlds column in June will review the book for publication, I suggest that you do not discuss this letter at present. Moreover, it is too long to read. I therefore suggest that some one right now volunteer (1) to read (struggle through would be more correct an expression) Marcuse's "Soviet Marxism", (2) to study the present letter so that it can be presented in one's own words, which should be briefer, than in mine, and (3) to read TW when it does appear --and then devote a full evening to it as part of your preparation for the plenum.

Yours,
Ray

June 3, 1961

A Brief Outline of the New Book

Dear Friends:

This is not the regular weekly political letter that is read to the locals and then expanded upon as an educational dealing with current events. This time I'm forwarding a copy of a letter written to Jonathan who is to help with the chapter on China, and explaining to him Hegel's Absolute Idea in terms of what it means to the book and the whole world's objective development. One cannot read such a letter out. One must study it, and even after that no educational should be planned around it. Rather it is the preparation for the philosophical foundations of the problems around which the plenum will revolve. You may, however, read out this covering note, which will now proceed to give a very rough outline of the major portions of the new book on Marxist Humanism and the African Revolutions.

First, the frontispiece will set the theme. It will consist of the quotation from Hegel: "our epoch is a birth-time and period of transition." And another one from Marx: "When actual corporeal Man, standing on firm and well rounded earth, inhaling and exhaling all natural forces, posits...his actual objective essential capacities as alien objects, it is not the act of positing which is the subject. It is the subjectivity of objective essential capacities whose action must, therefore, also be objective....We see here how thorough-going Naturalism, or Humanism, distinguishes itself both from Idealism and Materialism, and is, at the same time, the truth uniting both."

Or I may prefer the one from Marx on Feuerbach rather than on Hegel, thus: "The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism -- that of Feuerbach included -- is that the object, reality, sensuousness is conceived only in the form of object, contemplation but not as human sensuous activity, practice, not subjectively....The standpoint of the old materialism is 'civil society'; the standpoint of the new is human society or socialized humanity."

In either case, the theme will be carried through, first, in the Introduction, to stress that we are beginning with the subjective, the actual people's revolutions in Africa from Western imperialism, and that of the Hungarian Revolution from Russian totalitarianism, to show the two new pages opened in history: (1) in the actual reshaping of the world's map; and (2) in adding a new dimension to thought: Marxist Humanism not merely as projected in theory by Marx 120 years ago, but as moved forward in practice in the world of the 1960s. Marx was able to anticipate this only because he built his philosophy on the "subjective element," the human being both in his economic theory where the worker, as the grave-digger of capitalism, transforms the whole science of economics, and in his world outlook where the new society is not merely a negation, an abolition of the old, but its whole transformation on new, truly human foundations. Marx's view of "technology" as the mainspring of the process was not only the foundation of the economic laws -- accumulation of capital and its attendant unemployed army which would bring capitalism down -- but the "all-rounded individual" whose "striving for universality" will be realized on the morrow of the revolution and after as the first beginning of the real history of man, instead of merely his pre-history. Thought can no more be running a losing

race with history than revolutions can be merely recorded to be buried. Hence the narrative of today's revolutions, and the appeal to today's humanity, in Africa or America, cannot separate theory from practice, or thought from activity because only in their unity will the contradictions be so totally resolved that the new will emerge.

* * *

Part I -- Narrative of the African Revolutions will be greatly expanded Afro-Asian pamphlet which must have as its foundation the report of my actual trip to Africa. Thus far, at most, we have been able to see the action of the masses as a whole at the moment of achievement, and through the voice of a Senghor or Touré; we must listen to the voice of the rank and file, and, as no one records his voice, we must go there to record.

At the same time, this Part I, in showing the higher stage reached by race rather than nation, thus is continent-wide (African continent, or at least West Africa as a totality rather than the individual nations whether little Ghana or large Nigeria). This will be the logical transition then to the Negro Question because it is here the present leaders have been inspired back in the 1930s and 1940s.

Part II -- The Negro Question in America. We will here develop our position from our view of its history through the Freedom Riders in the South presently, as well as the dual road from here to Africa, from 1919 Garveyism through Pan-Africanism today, and from Africa here. The two contradictory views of that -- of the intellectuals, DuBois' talented tenth, on the one hand, and the proletariat on the other -- will be carried through for these 43 years. At the same time, the new point of departure for theory laid by the 2nd CI Congress in 1919, and the 4th in 1924, both for the National Question in general, and the Negro in particular will be developed on the new level of attack against present day Communists who have suddenly rediscovered those plenums to pervert them. It is here, perhaps, rather than in the African Revolutions, Part I, where we will deal with China, and attack Mao-ism as the total opposite of Lenin's view of the nature of the peasantry as ally of the proletariat to reconstruct society.

Part III -- Russian-American struggle for world power, vs. American workers' struggle against Automation, and Russian workers' slowdowns.

The burden here will be the analysis of state capitalism in the specific context of the 1950s. This is not only a matter of being current, but the fact that state capitalism was a transformation into opposite of monopoly capitalism on a political scale while, methodologically, there was no difference in production itself, whereas with Automation we have the 2nd Industrial Revolution at full drive. Since the sputnik we have, moreover, discontinuous production in Russia not only as "rates of growth" -- that debate was already outlived when it got into swing in American expert testimony in Congress and books on "stages of growth" via Rostow -- but above all, as the one-ness of science, technology, production, thought that go beyond the confines of our world of capitalism, private or state, over into life and nuclear death.

The transition point then will be the dialectic and humanism of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution; 1957 debates on "Revisionism"; the 1958 coming of age of Africa in Ghana and Guinea as independent republics; and the year of the Congo crisis, 1960, where the crossroads for "advanced" and "backward" countries has been reached.

.....
Weekly Letter, 6/3/61

- 3 -

Part IV -- Hegel's Absolute Idea, or the Subjectivity of
Self-Liberation; and

Part V -- on the New Humanism, will bring all threads together
from the present-day revolutions backward to the French, and from there to
tomorrow's freedom victory.

Yours,
Raya

2928

2 9 2 7

TO THE NEE

June 13, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER
(on 3-4 Supreme Court Decisions, 6/6/61)

This week's letter is for the NEE only because I see no point to having it read at the local, as there is neither anything immediate of concern to us, and it will be dealt with in the August issue of NGL in the wider context of civil rights as interpreted in the southern states where the WACP is listed as "subversive" and has been asked to turn over its membership lists. It is true that in this case the Supreme Court upheld the WACP, but it shows to what extent the loose, irresponsible language of the 1940 and 1950 Smith and McCarran Acts can be twisted, even as the Supreme Court itself, though by a narrow majority, twisted them last week.

The 2 laws involved are quite different, yet they were both treated by the press as if they involved a "foreign government." That is a lie. The Smith Act of 1940 says nothing of that, nor of Communism for that matter; what it does is use its own perverted sense of politics to pervert Marxism from a theory of liberation to a "conspiracy". In order to carry through the lie about Communism the paper that is supposed to carry "all the news that's fit to print," lies in the so-called background article (NY Times, 6/6) when the impression gained is that the Act was first tested in 1948. The NY Times chooses that year because that's when it was used against the Communist leaders, but in 1941 it was used against not Communists, but against the Trotskyist leadership. Not a word of that is printed because it was such a frame-up by the government with the help of Dan Tobin of the Teamsters Union who wanted the Trotskyists out of his bureaucratic hair as they organized the teamsters into an industrial, militant union in Minneapolis. Above all, if they had referred to the facts in the case it would have been clear to all that the alleged charge of "wanting to overthrow the government by force and violence" was both frame-up and dealt with, not today (1961) but what a text said in 1848, not by the present defendants but by Karl Marx, in a Manifesto that is available in all libraries of the world, including the US, and can be bought anywhere (until such time as some CIA man presently will decide arbitrarily otherwise. And yet this thought -- and just the other day when President Kennedy wanted something beyond the uncommitted world and wanted it won for "democracy", he said "This country was born of revolution" -- is now proscribed, precisely in the manner all totalitarians proscribe unpopular thought.

it

While passing off this series of lies by omission, it then did others by commission, both in the way it described the 1948 case against the Communists, never once explaining why, not the Acts dealing with "foreign agents" had been used against the Communists at any time since 1950 Act (in order to build up "precedents" against genuine opponents to class rule), and in the way one day (6/6) their chief editorial writer, under his own name (Arthur Krock) hailed the Supreme Court Decisions, and the next day in unsigned editorial it criticized it. It did this both in the manner of what has always heretofore been true, that only when there is "immediate and present danger" can one have a right to suspend the rights of free speech, assembly, and press, the foundations of the Constitution; that in 1951 in the Dennis case had already departed from that Holmes decision, calling attention to Justice Douglas's dissent than "that only speech is involved in the Smith Act prosecutions"; and saying now "In upholding the requirement that the party register and list its members, the court emphasized its secret, conspiratorial nature and domination from abroad The sustaining of the Smith Act's membership clause and the setting in motion of the ponderous Internal Security Act, can only serve again to divert public attention to the virtually non-existent internal Communist threat. The real Communist challenge is from abroad...."

This brings us to the other law, the so-called International Security Act of 1950 or McCarran Act, which is supposed to be based on "foreign governmentn." This, however, is only in the presable, The Act itself is so loosely phrased, moving from "Communist action" to "communist front" in such totalitarian ways, that any organization that is unpopular can suddenly be called "communist front", as indeed the South held the

NAACP to be. Or tomorrow someone can decide that that stupid statement by 80 Harvard University professors against Cuban invasion is such a "communist front" action! No wonder that Justice Douglas in his dissent, wrote "nothing but beliefs are on trial in this case. They are unpopular and to most of us revolting. But they are nonetheless ideas or dogmas or faith within the broad framework of the First Amendment. What we lose by majority vote today may be reclaimed at a future time when the fear of advocacy, dissent and non-conformity no longer cast a shadow over us."

When will that be?

The fact that the majority knew it was acting against thought and the only violence was their violence is evident in the way they themselves tried to limit in some way their own decisions. Thus Justice Harlan, for the majority, which upheld conviction in one case, but not in the other, on the basis that in the second it wasn't proven, stressed the 1947 Supreme Court decisions in that the Act covered only advocacy, that is "incitement to action", and not advocacy of the "mere abstract doctrine of forcible overthrow. We held (in 1957) and we reiterate now that the mere abstract teaching of Communist theory, including the teaching of the moral propriety or even moral necessity for a resort to force and violent action and teaching it to such action." But in that case why didn't they redouble hard done to Trotskyists when the Smith Act (then with the connivance of the Communists because Russia was its ally) was not so interpreted?

There is no cause for alarm. None of this applies to Marxist-Leninists. But the atmosphere of witchhunting and thought gagging has been established, and has gotten into high gear with President Kennedy's report on Cuban invasion and on talks with Khrushchev, and can set violence into action against the best majority who are unarmed with anything but ideas for freedom.

Ray

June 21, 1961

On the 20th Anniversary of the State-Capitalist Tendency

Dear Friends:

Both the objective situation arising from Automation, on the one hand, and the US-USSR struggle for world power, on the other hand; and the objective attempts of regroupments on the ever fluid (and disintegrative) Left, compel a balance sheet of the political tendency that arose 20 years ago and called itself state-capitalist.

The state-capitalist tendency that arose in 1941 differed from all previous uses of that term in the following fundamental ways:

1) as contrasted to its first statement in Marx's works, where, of necessity, it was treated "abstractly," i.e., as the logical development of the laws of concentration and centralization of capital to its ultimate "in the hands of a single capitalist or capitalist corporation," this new political tendency dealt with state-capitalism as a concrete phenomenon of actually developing capitalism that followed from the world depression;

2) as contrasted to its second statement in Lenin's writings in 1916-1919, where it was conceived as split in two -- economically as capitalism, politically as soviet (i.e., workers') state control -- we pointed to Lenin's later writings, 1921-1923, where, having fought the early bureaucratization of the workers' state, and the newly-found "communist" "passion for bossing," he treated it profoundly as "a return backwards to capitalism." It is true he still thought that the actual overthrow of the workers' state could only come from outside, from imperialist attack, but there was no further doubt in his mind that unless "the party work was checked by the non-party masses," the differences between Trotsky and Stalin were symbolic, or could become, actual class differences, and in that case nothing at all could save the new workers' state from collapse. (See MARXISM AND FREEDOM, pp. 205 - 212 on Lenin's WILL; and footnotes 192, 195, 196, 205, and 206.);

3) in contrast to the anarchists, who had begun using the term, directly after the November Revolution had succeeded, as a mere swear word without any solid theoretical foundations, the state-capitalist tendency had undertaken a concrete study of the Five Year Plans in Russia, as well as a theoretic re-evaluation of the economic and philosophic concepts in Marx and Lenin;

4) in opposition to Trotsky, who had treated state-capitalism as a "possibility" that "might" develop, but not as anything that had actually appeared -- thereby introducing empty talmudist distinctions between "state intervention" into the economy, and "state capitalism as such," -- we insisted we must look at the world as it is, both in Russia and in the world as a whole;

5) in opposition both to those in the 1920s and early 1930s, who had been semi-Trotskyists, and had used the words "state capitalism" -- but without either a concrete study of the economy (satisfying themselves only

Weekly Political Letter, 6/21/61 - 2 -

with a study of the bureaucracy as bureaucracy), or relating it to methodology -- we insisted that when one departs from strict Marxist categories, one, at best, will end as Rosa Luxemburg by revising CAPITAL to explain imperialism; or, at worst and more inevitably, by departing entirely from class conceptions. This is what happened to those tendencies, in the 1940s, which had no direct connection with the 1920 or 1930 opponents of Russian Communism, but which refused to accept the state-capitalist designation (like the "Bureaucratic Collectivists of the Shachtman variety; and the Retrogressionists who did supposedly accept state-capitalism but refused to accept workers' revolt as inseparable from it). We, on the other hand, never separated the new stage of capitalism from the new stage of opposition to it -- workers' revolt in the form of wildcats, and underground movements whether slowdowns as in Russia or as they developed in Nazi-occupied Europe;

6) finally, in contrast to others, we related ourselves to the methodology Lenin used in IMPERIALISM, before which study he had returned to Hegelian philosophy; we stressed, however, that the new in our age demanded that such Philosophic Notebooks not remain private as with Lenin, but become public and extended beyond "the party" to the proletariat outside.

In a word, in contrast to all others, we were not abstract but concrete; we were not dealing with it as a "Russian Question," but as a world problem; we were not separating concrete from theoretical, but were returning to our origin in Marx and Lenin as well as its roots in Hegel, which, however, we had barely studied ourselves; finally, and above all, we never for a moment separated the economic analysis from the workers' revolt. This was sufficient for the 1940s, when the post-war strikes and political demonstrations gave every appearance that Western Europe would certainly rid itself of capitalism.

The decade of the 1950s made even this comprehensive analysis insufficient to the challenge of the times. First, and most important, because the new stage in capitalist development was not only from competition to monopoly to state, but, directly at the point of production, from what Marx called Mechanofacture to Automation. This Second Industrial Revolution was concretizing the workers' revolt against it by moving it from the economic and political fronts to the philosophic. They, the workers, began to ask such questions as, "What kind of labor must man do?" In the 1949-1950 miners' strike their restatement of the question of alienation in positive terms uniting thinking and doing, the fight against the labor bureaucracy, and the fight against the new permanent army of unemployed compelled, on our part, a return to the Early Essays of Marx and to Hegel's Absolute Idea. To the extent that we were not able to break that down into the concrete terms of Humanism and the new world stage demanded by the revolutions in the Afro-Asian world, the tendency itself broke into two -- one escaping to "Facing Reality" without Marxist continuity, the other (ourselves) moving to a restatement of both the Humanism and the American roots of Marxism in MARXISM AND FREEDOM.

Second, in the appearance of a workers' paper edited by a production worker, NEWS & LETTERS could open itself in a manner that deepened

Weekly Letter, 6/21/61

- 3 -

deepened the workers' own struggles and resulted in WORKERS BATTLE AUTOMATION, thus uniting theory and practice both on the production line and in the after hours' struggle.

Third, two other phenomena appeared in the world that did not separate theory from practice, that is, the movement from practice that has the full dimensions of a revolution: 1) the Hungarian Revolution which combined a Marxist-humanist banner of struggle against totalitarianism with Workers' Councils; and 2) the African Revolution which combined its struggle against Western imperialism with a new universalist conception of how that continent would try to by-pass capitalism.

On the other hand, the counter-revolution -- whether in De Gaulle France, or in the Russian suppression of the Hungarian Revolution, or in the US-UN domination of the Congo which led to Lumumba's murder -- was sharpening its fangs on all fronts. With the Sputnik the old US-USSR struggle became "equalized." That is to say, where the 1949 Russian discovery of the A-bomb eliminated America's monopoly, and where the 1954 H-bomb made "the reign of terror" the new deterrent, the 1958 Sputnik (with the concomitant ICBMs) made the Russians "first" and therefore capable of making of peace only another form of war.

The period, 1958-1961, which has placed humanity within orbit of nuclear holocaust has finally re-awakened the Left -- only to have them return neither to the foundations nor to the new developments of humanity that began with the First Industrial and French Revolutions. Instead, each looks for some "abstract", and therefore meaningless, newness which would treat history as if it isn't there. A Hitler with his "Mein Kampf" could break with history; the workers' movement cannot.

-- Raya

2933

7 9 3 1

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

July 7, 1961

Self-Organization of Proletariat, Working With "Other" Organizations,
"Small Mass Partyism" and Marxist Humanism

The actions of the Freedom Riders, and activity as well as lack of it on those on the outside, when seen against the background of the Mississippi jungle justice and the do-nothingness of the Kennedy Administration, compel a review not alone of the objective and current situation, but the historic and subjective actions which have characterized the relationship of ideas and organization since the time of Marx, but especially in the period of Gandhi.

Marx had no "theory" of organization. He relied solely on the self-organization of the proletariat as a natural part both of the class struggle and the struggle for ideas that expressed their innermost aspirations for the reorganization of society. In self-organization of the proletariat he included not only trade unions, on the one hand, and the full fruition of the Paris Commune, on the other, but also the First International for, although he was its General Secretary, he never once forgot that he came to it. That is, it was not a product of his head, although he wrote its statutes and Manifesto and kept it at the center of European life, 1865-1875. On the contrary, he had left the study room as his only occupation to which he retired after the 1848 revolutions were defeated and all the radical parties could do then was degenerated into cliques only when an actual mammoth mass meeting had occurred during the capitalist first world's fair which had brought together also many workers from different lands into London which at the moment was busy opposing its bourgeois attempt to intervene on the part of the South in the U.S. Civil War.

When Lenin, who had elaborated a theory of organization, 1903-14, had, at the collapse of the Second International, to call for a new, Third International, it was, more or less, still with the old ideas in head of a true, loyal-to-the-proletariat, vanguard party. It was only in February, 1917 that he saw the masses in the historic action of overthrowing the Tsarist Empire and said "Never again along the lines of the Second." Unfortunately, that was never as clearly spelled out as was his concept of the party to 1914. We get it only in concrete pieces as each new situation, 1917-23, confronted him. The two pieces that have a direct effect upon the situation of today are the ones that related to his struggle against "infantile leftism", and that which related to Gandhi, 1919. They are inseparable, although on such different levels, that they serve the cynics and hollow man to point to "irreconcilable contradictions."

The one against "infantile leftism" is known to us only because he opposed deserting the trade unions as "reactionary" organizations that could never be changed and building dual unions; instead Lenin insisted you must be where the workers were and work "from within." However, the aspect that is most applicable today is not regarding any "dual" unions, but the one which opposed what became known as "small mass party-ism", that is to say, Zinoviev's attempt at "electrifying" the workers and pushing toward revolution though the vanguard party was small; Bukharin's disregard of the realities of the situation at end of W.W. I, and insisting that no peace

Weekly Political Letter - 7/7/61

treaty be signed but continue the revolutionary war; the speaking of Russian "almost exclusively" in the congresses of the CI so that it lost real understanding of the concrete problems of the workers in other countries, etc. It happens to reappear in the movement, like clockwork, any time there is an action on the part of the masses and you think that with just a "push" we would "jump" into a new society.

Finally then, during that same historic period, there appeared Gandhi in India. Lenin was violently opposed to him, not because he used "non-violent" methods and Lenin supposedly wanted "only revolutions", but because Gandhi arose at a time when just the bare beginnings of a Marxist movement was trying to establish itself, when the masses were in great rebellion against British imperialism from which Gandhi diverted them, and, when they did follow him, and the British massacred them, whereupon Gandhi retreated.

Laurens Otter, the brave pacifist but direct actionist who is always climbing up on some polaris base and in every CND March, knows of this and more. But, though he is always ready to have debates on "non-violence" being more revolutionary than "violent" methods, he is never concrete either about the times of Gandhi whom all now remember only in his later successful fight for independence, or about the present British movement except how to get it more "active". Here is where concrete, concrete, concrete can be concrete only when it is comprehensible. That is to say, the times that produced the CND are our scientific epoch of A and H bombs at a time when both Russia and the US were so armed and yet, by being only an "against" movement and only US, not Russia, has missile bases in England, it not only "has" but is very nearly pro-Russian and the Stalinists can infiltrate with ease, where they do not dominate it, as they have recently begun to do. To be against both poles of world capital, however, it is insufficient, a la Tony Cliff, to state only that one is against both nuclear and any kind of imperialist war. You have to tackle the concrete new fear of nuclear destruction, tie it in with state capitalism in an automated age, and have full confidence that if the proletariat does not now follow the CND, their proletarian instinct means to tell you something, not the least of which is they are wise enough not to fall into a fight that sees only one side of the fear, and nothing at all of the reconstructed society.

In a word, the weakness of the movement is the almost complete lack of the proletariat, its self-organization, and while it is fine to work in other organizations where a single principle or deed is part of the whole one cannot forget that it is only part of the whole, not the whole. One cannot get swept up in the movement to an extent that one thinks theory is only for Sundays, or for theoreticians, and now one must "act" as if thinking isn't an activity too, the most important activity if we ever are to reunite mental and manual in the human being.

Now then when it comes to our own Freedom Rides and the organizations involved in that heroic gesture of breaking down segregation.

Weekly Political Letter - 7/7/61

While it doesn't have the self-organization that the Montgomery Bus Boycott had, it is far above that movement in being national and not local as well as getting white and Negroes working as one force, no mean achievement. The Sit-Ins were national and had some of these elements, but the North was North and just picketing, and the South was South, going through a great transformation in youth activity, but stopping short of organizational conclusions. Clearly, the Freedom Riders mark the highest stage yet reached in trying to establish some proof of democracy.

Here, however, is where the insidious liberals enter. As an election gesture, and a damned smart one, as it got him very nearly 90% of the Negro vote, Kennedy called Rev. King who was then in jail and got him released. Now that he has power, he thinks that if he gives a dozen Negroes jobs, he is "different" and all others should just follow. As a matter of fact, Attorney General Kennedy did less than Republican Eisenhower at Little Rock where he at least sent in Federal troops, whereas Democrat Kennedy satisfied himself with some Marshalls. Nevertheless, though he had the further gall to follow it up with calling for a "cooling-off" period (this after even a civil war they lost got them victory in Congress nevertheless), many of the Negro Leaders are playing. No, there is no complete sell-out. But those opposing the Freedom Riders, though they dare not come out in the open, manage to leak to the press that even the "Negro community" allegedly want to halt the Freedom Rides. It is not only a question that the New York Times, which saw fit to print that as truth instead as minority leak, did not see fit to print the official denial by CORE. It is that CORE itself has not thought through the reactionary intent of the Eastlands to keep them tied up in litigation for the rest of the century BECAUSE IT IS ALMOST AS AFRAID OF DIRECT MASS ACTION AS ARE THE REACTIONARIES.

Whatever we do to activate any local will not change the dominant nation policy. This does not mean that we would not participate in FREEDOM RIDES and mass actions in support of them. It does mean that we will not be bound by the stupidities of foolish type of principles such as sitting it out six months in jail. To prove what? That Mississippi can do anything it pleases? Or that you as CORE leader consider following through on your statement of "filling up the jails" as above the needs of mass action to carry through what neither the white supremacists nor the liberals will do.

It is at this point that both the needs of the Freedom Rider movement as a whole, and the specifics of our own activity and need of totality of fight, demands that only Marxist Humanism and not "another" organization decides our politics. This is for concrete decision and no doubt there will be plenty of discussion at the plenum on it (and I hope our Freedom Riders will be with us to reveal what the Freedom Riders themselves think and do and want done). I mention it, not for decision, but only as illustration of the theme on ideas and organization that will not wait for the plenum.

The reason of starting with the time of Marx is not only to orient us to the historic as well as the immediate. Rather it is to get down to that fundamental of the relationship of theory not merely to organi-

Weekly Political Letter - 7/7/61

sation but to anticipation of mass activity. Because of MARXISM AND FREEDOM. We were able to anticipate the problems and developments of the Afro-Asian Revolutions and, while only now, is it getting recognized internationally as well, we will ourselves only know when we integrate it with our position on the Negro Question, and so concretise it around the Freedom Rides that we would be able to come with a pamphlet on it. That pamphlet, in turn, must become integral to the new book, so that not a single of the facets of our work gets separated from the whole. This is our aim not only for "us" but for what we represent - the forward movement of humanity itself to break the capitalist chains in a way that it is not led to another bureaucratic trap, whether a la Khrushchev, Mao or Castro.

What is needed now is a leap forward in theory so that Hegelian philosophy does not remain buried in Hegel's works but becomes part of our practice: "the subjectivity that has absorbed objectivity", or the human being that has all of scientific and objective development a dimension of himself will know how to take that little step from a single action to one that involves his life in building the new society right now, with every approach in every corner of the world moving toward the final goal without any diversions whatever. Once the theoretical leap is made, the practical actions will follow as clearly as day follows night.

RAYA

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

July 14, 1961

THE BERLIN CRISIS, THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET
AND THE INTERNATIONAL CLASS STRUGGLE

Dear Friends:

Although presently manufactured by Khrushchev, the Berlin crisis has been a self-generating one at the start of the Cold War. Indeed, even before the Cold War was openly recognized, i.e., in the short honeymoon period at the end of the war, the very existence of a divided Berlin signified that the ending of the war had a built-in restarter. While the division of the spoils among victors in a capitalist world has always meant that there had been no fundamental solution to the causes which produced the war in the first place -- and there could be no solution other than a proletarian one -- the fact that this one was in the heart of Western Europe, in the very city that was the key to the world situation ever since World War I meant that the Communists could call upon historic memories that would make Marxists appear to fight for a proletarian cause, rather than a mere siding with one or the other of the two poles of world capital.

In 1947, I had my first big fight with the German group of Trotskyists living in England, who were so horrified at the division of Germany that they were quite willing to blind themselves to the Stalinist trap that was lurking behind the slogan, "Germany Must Be United." All of the horrors of Nazi-ism had miraculously disappeared in this passionate desire for unity, and none of them even as much as suggested that to fall into the trap of Russian Communism would not be a very great victory for anyone, least of all the German proletariat. "First there must be unity -- first there must be unity -- first there must be unity!" they all repeated, as if no class question were involved at all. But if no class question was involved, then one was actually for the reconstitution of Germany on capitalistic foundations. And, of course, one was blinding himself as well to the realities of the post-war world, which had brought about the new division of itself into the Russian and so-called Western camp.

As always, it must be said for the Stalinists that they were extremely astute in utilizing every prejudice: They were for a united Germany, at least as a slogan, "as Germans"; they were for the unification of Berlin "as Leninists" in the true tradition that if one had Berlin, one had Europe, and if one had Europe, one had the world; they were for the unification of Germany because the Nazis were the greatest scourge that the world had ever witnessed, and what Tommy or G.I. or French resistance fighter, or Jew who survived the holocaust, or German revolutionary who had seen the country of Marx become the barbarism it was under Hitler would not desire the final extirpation of Fascism to the point of even throwing in anything and everything German, and therefore fear any revival of "German militarism." And "automatically" choose "the other side" (Russia) as the unifier. Brain-washing is too mild a term in which to describe the thinking, or lack of it in all European groups on the question of Germany in the year after the war ended.

When the Cold War, the Marshall Plan, the Warsaw Pact, and the so-called Peace Movements broke out on the horizon, 1948-50, Trotskyism managed to fall along with other contending splinter groups and the void left in the Marxist theory was hardly less deep than the powers of the mass CP's in Western Europe was powerful. For whatever deep, anti-capitalist reasons the proletariat in France and Italy joined the CP, no independent working-class Marxist voice could be heard in explanation of this phenomenon and the last people in the world who had any explanation were the very ones who were constantly tail-ending the Communists on the "German Issue."

Unfortunately, the capitalistic class is much more class-conscious than the working-class movement and know that they must be willing to give up some national prerogatives if they are to survive at all in a world in which not only the proletariat is against them, but where the whole colonial peoples have risen in successful revolutions to undermine their empires. It is true that for a time a capitalistic United States of Europe seemed as remote as a Socialist United States of Europe, and that the idea that the former imperialistic empires turn from open colonialism to "help to underdeveloped economies" was fought bitterly. But not all the cards were in the hands of the imperialists -- the Asian, African, Middle East, Latin American revolutionaries took destiny into their own hands, and not only "Western" imperialism but Communist imperialism as well had to begin singing a new tune. They certainly learned it faster than did the self-styled Marxists who met every new event by singing an old tune.

When Khrushchev first put a 6 months ultimatum for a "Berlin solution", 18 months ago, there was sufficient disunity in the "Western" camp that a "Camp David" spirit did arise. Adenauer was not happy with the prospect of an extension of the spirit to a new European summit, and Khrushchev did have illusions of both a division in those ranks and a loan for Russia. All this has dissipated itself with the invasion of Cuba, the Kennedy-DeGaulle re-establishment of capitalistic Europe as the key to the world, and the reluctant but nonetheless consenting Macmillan on the way to joining the Common Market.

What has since been happening in the independent Marxist groupings? As if no one has ever heard the word, methodology, much less practiced an independent class line; as if the state capitalist theory is just a "word" instead of the methodology by which you judge a new stage in capitalist development on a world scale and thereby gauge its manifestation of one-worldedness split into two poles fighting for single world domination; and, above all, as if the working-class in your country and the Freedom Fighters in the colonies were not finished once and for all with leaders who stand on no other ground than that which the capitalists themselves use, we are in, once again, for a fight on the question of "the immediate" instead of the allegedly abstract philosophic. In a word, the groupings from Cheulieu to Tony Cliff, and from the Italians to the Japanese are ready to have "a position" on every subject except that of total reorganization of society by the masses themselves on the basis of a total view of the world and its future from a Marxist Humanist outlook.

One is prepared to be "for" the Common Market because it is a step toward a United States of Europe; the other "opposed" to it on the basis of taking away some "independence" of Britain (even if that independence is the insularity that has kept not only capitalistic Britain but labor Britain as "exceptional" and therefore not integral to the European mass movement); both the "pros" and

the "cons" giving down their analysis as the proletariat is altogether too "backward" to have a say in anything so "complicated" and must take the leader's word for it.

Even as the African Revolutions were treated as "old hat" -- hadn't Europe long before, centuries ago, experienced "mere" national revolutions? -- so now the theory surrounding them is treated as set "for all time" so that we can just go on with tracts on the "current" situation instead of asking for some fundamental studies of Marx's CAPITAL or the "abstruse" essays on Hegel, and be "active". As if running around with one's head out off can get you anywhere either on the practical or theoretical levels! WHILE "MARXISM AND FREEDOM" ONLY BROUGHT US CLOSER TO SEEING THE AFRICAN REVOLUTIONS WHICH NO ONE SAW AS "ANYTHING NEW" AT THE TIME, AND THE FREEDOM RIDERS NOW MAKE US SEE THE THEORY ON THE NEGRO QUESTION AS NEW, SO OUR CONVICTIONS IN EUROPE WILL KEEP US FROM GETTING INTO THE THICK OF WHAT WE SHOULD STAY OUT OF -- those debates of "Common Market" -- AND CONTINUE LAYING THE THEORETIC FOUNDATIONS FOR A REGROUPMENT OF MARXIST WHO WILL REFUSE TO DIVIDE THEORY FROM PRACTICE OR VICE VERSA, AND WILL PRESENTLY BE ABLE TO USE THE "NEW" KENNEDY IDEA OF A "UNITED EUROPE" IN ORDER TO PUSH FORWARD THE CONCEPTION OF THE SOCIALIST UNITED STATES OF EUROPE NOT AS A "STATE-IST" CONCEPTION BUT ONE BASED ON THE MASSES AND ONLY THE MASSES, FROM BELOW, REORGANIZING EUROPEAN AND THEREFORE WORLD FOUNDATIONS.

Any other method will once again lead directly into the Stalinist trap. The Communists see their only hope for maintaining their East European empire in the divisions they can create, both among capitalists and in labor, on the questions of "Berlin" and ICBM rattling "for peace". The crossroads for all those "peace movements" from CED to "disarmament" and from "anti-Adenauer" to "anti-Israel" have been reached. Just as we put a question mark over "Pan-Africanism" so we must now do the same on the "unity" movements, whether that concerns Germany or Korea. We are not playing capitalist games. The independent class line will win -- or civilization itself will go under.

-- RAYA

(labor donated)

2 - 9 - 4 - 1

CRITIQUE OF THE NCP DRAFT PROGRAM - (three letters)

- Raya Dunayevskaya

I. Brief Notes on the Over-Lengthy but Theoretically Empty Text of the Soviet Communist Party's Draft Program (Appearing in full in the N.Y. Times for Aug. 1, as released officially by Tass in Moscow July 30.) - Weekly Letter for Aug. 2.

1) The narrative style, which states lies as facts, facts as "laws," attempting to transform economic laws of development from objective course of history to subjective edicts, has in Khrushchev reached even a "higher" stage than in Stalin. For example, in rewriting history, and cutting out the role of Trotsky, Stalin had to mention him even if only for purposes of downgrading. Khrushchev manages not to mention Stalin at all. We jump straight from the 1919 program of Lenin's to 1961 draft herewith presented. Since Lenin is supposed to have covered "the entire period of transition from capitalism to socialism", we thereby get (a) the Five Year Plans attributed to Lenin on the ground that the 1919 Program had a "plan for Socialist construction," (b) Lenin also gets "credit" for Stalin's "theory" of socialism in one country: "V.I. Lenin... elaborated the theory of the possibility of socialism triumphing first in one capitalist country, taken singly." (perhaps they stole that point from Marcuse!) And, since everything Lenin did is "socialist," what Lenin called a partial retreat to capitalism — the NEP — is now described as one that was "designed to bring about the victory of socialism." On the other hand the Trotskyists get mentioned with "nationalist deviators and other hostile groups."

2) The break from Lenin to Stalin is not mentioned because to them it is "continuity," a continuity that can look all the more "obvious" when no other name intervenes between Lenin and the present rulers stripped of all "cult of personality" by mentioning "the Party," and only the Party. Moreover, it is made retroactive (a) back to 1903 when the Bolsheviks were born as a faction, which, however, here appears as a party, full-fledged, with a program. That was written by Lenin, it is true, but shared by Plekhanov, etc. as that for the whole Russian Social Democracy which had split, not on the program, but on the walkout of Bund and others, leaving Lenin a "majority." (b) no break, however, appears here from Social Democracy either in 1903 or 1914. Instead we are treated to this rewrite of history: First there were Marx and Engels, and revolutions. Then "In the early 20th century the center of the international revolutionary movement shifted to Russia." It becomes so Russian a world that the whole Chinese Revolution of the present epoch is given exactly 11 (eleven) words. (So much for the Deutschers and all other apologists who were seeing Mao pushing Khrushchev and making him accept co-leadership with him of the international.) But, while only 11 words, are spent on China, two very critical places will easily be read by those in the know, as sharp criticisms of China: (a) "the prevention of any action likely to disrupt that (Communist on an international scale) unity are an essential condition for victory;" and (b) "it would be wrong to jump over necessary stages of development" is put into a paragraph stressing "the building of communism must be carried out by successive stages."

3) The pie in the sky promised the Russian workers stretches over two full decades, during which they fail to mention war at all, although in another section war is made the chief question of our day, and preparedness and rockets rattling excused on that ground. So, if we forget that "peaceful co-existence"

(2)

is the motive force, (again attributed to Lenin, without mentioning the phrase was used at the end of the devastating war when peace was the revolutionary slogan to end the war, and to begin to breathe again.) and if we look only at "perfect" development, then in 20 years we will have 5 hour working day, and all skilled at that since automation will "eliminate all hard, painful physical labor" and we will get "perfectly developed persons."

4) Before that day arrives in 1980, we have over the very first decade, 1961-70 to remember that "To achieve this, it is necessary to raise productivity of labor in industry by more than 100 per cent within ten years, and by 300 to 350 per cent within 20 years." Just in case anybody got too enamored of the description of science, automation, and the wonders of atomic energy, and orbital flights (although "It is only logical that the country of victorious socialism should have ushered in the era of utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and that it should have blazed a trail into outer space.") the Text of the Program calls back for hard labor, and no idling while you are doing it; and no "equality" before those 20 years are up: "Technical progress and better production organization must be fully utilized to increase labor productivity and reduce production costs at every enterprise. This implies a higher rate of increase in labor productivity as compared with remuneration, better rate-fixing, prevention of loss of working time, and operation on a profitable basis at all stages of production." (My emphasis.)

5) Back to narrative style and the rewriting of history through the use of same words with totally different meanings. The outstanding word, both in content and in form, which permeated the whole Draft program is "Science". Science is used at the outset to designate socialism, only instead of showing that Marx's use of the word, science, was to counterpose it to the utopian schemes of intellectuals who think they can substitute their ideas for the actions of the masses, and place "scientific socialism" as the one that relied fully and wholly on the proletarians themselves as the "gravediggers" of the capitalist systems and the creators of a truly human society, Khrushchev and his henchmen use science in the purely bourgeois context of machines and ever greater machines; chemistry and ever newer plastic goods; science as ever deeper probings into outer space and missiles; AND, ABOVE ALL, "SCIENTIFICALLY FORMULATED PROGRAMS" BY THE COMMUNIST PARTIES. Thus we get not the development of humanity, but the development of programs. In 1903 there was the 1st program and this "the party carried out" and that is how we had the Russian Revolution. Then came 1919 and the 2nd program which "the party has likewise carried out." And since we are now moving from "socialism" to nothing short of "complete communism" we need a new "program" and this is what the Russian CP at its 22nd Congress in October is "asked to carry out" and so we will have world communism. And the workers? Oh, they are around as the "forces," the forces to labor and labor and labor. And when they realize how "honorable a duty" it is, whether in factory or office or as intelligentsia, then in "the second decade, every family, including newlyweds, will have a comfortable flat conforming to the requirements of hygiene and cultured living."

6) On the other hand, no one must underestimate the terrific impact this will make, especially in the underdeveloped countries, where capitalism is hated and therefore all attacks on it are welcome, and where promises make it sound like Communism is not the state-capitalism that it is. Moreover, the program, in claiming Marxism-Leninism, no matter how they degrade and transform it into opposite, have a most potent weapon, more potent indeed than their missiles. Moreover,

2942

(3)

the narrative style helps hide the unhistoric jumps and anyway the past is history; the present is to remake. And, knowing that, the Communists have set new traps that are "easy." Everything from disarmament "under strict international control" to preventing "export of counter-revolution," not excluding being for "national sovereignty" is taken care of as new points for popular frontism to "abolish" military bases, thus: "It will be easier to prevent export of counter-revolution if the working people, defending the national sovereignty of their country, work to bring about the abolition of foreign military bases on their territory and to make their country dissociate itself from aggressive military blocs."

7) The only use of the word, spontaneous, is not with people, but with economic development, and that single use is made equally unnecessary, since it gives way "to the conscious organization of production and social life as a whole, and when theory is daily translated into practice, the shaping of a scientific world outlook in all working people is of prime importance."

8) The one, the basic, the only meaningful core for our age -- the Humanism of Marxism -- that is never mentioned at all. There is a single reference to the fact that Marxism-Leninism is a "harmonious" whole of economics, philosophy, politics which somehow gets immediately translated into "Labor Education" against "parasitic living." Even democracy they like to promise -- for the future if not for the present. But never, never, Humanism or the self-activity of the masses sans "party to lead," or the "subjectivity" or Man himself who has absorbed "objectivity" or all their lauded science as no more than a basis for a dimension, a new human dimension.

-- Raya

(I must ask the friends to forgive this rather hurried and haphazard letter. I had not intended to write any more till after the plenum since the theses and discussions, though not called "weekly political letters" are in fact that, and more than that. But I could not resist, when I saw the Communist draft program, from making at least a few notes.)

August 14, 1961

II. Lenin's 1919 Program Cries Out Loudly Against Khrushchev's 1961 Thesis

When I wrote the Notes on the Communist Party's New Draft Program I did not have at hand Lenin's 1919 Program. Now that I have returned home and have it, it is easy to concretize from what totally opposite class views the two Communist Party programs were written. In contrast to Khrushchev's ruling class ideology detailed in my letter of August 2, the three central themes of the 1919 Program are:

(1) "gradually to draw the whole population, to a man, into the work of running the state;" (2) "the trade unions must eventually actually concentrate

* The Rough Draft of the Program and Lenin's speeches on it for the years 1918 and 1919 are to be found in English in Lenin's Selected Works, vol. VIII, pp. 311-336. But the full 1919 Program is here translated from the original which appears both in Lenin's Complete Works, Vol. 24, pp. 691-706, and in the Systematic Collection of the Resolutions of the Congresses of the All-Russian Communist Party (B), 1898-1925 (Moscow, 1926)

(4)

into their hands the entire management of the whole of the national economy as a single unit;" and (3) "full and all-sided introduction of all these measures ... will lead to the withering of the state power."

Over and over again, whether Lenin is in the sphere of politics or moves into the field of economics, the conception of "the whole population to a man" holding destiny in its own hands is not only the ruling idea as idea, but as a goal to be made into a reality. Thus:
"The universal practice of accounting and control over the entire production and distribution of products, this accounting and control to be exercised at first by the workers' organizations and then by the whole population to a man" (Vol. VIII, p. 3)

For two solid years of discussion of the need for a new Program to replace the 1903 Program which had become invalidated, Lenin keeps hammering away at this new concept of socialism as "the population to a man" doing everything themselves. Here, on March 6, 1918, is how he addressed one Congress:

"Every citizen, to a man, must act as a judge and participate in the government of the country. And what is important to us, is to enlist all the toilers, to a man, in the government of the state. Socialism cannot be introduced by a minority, a Party. It can be introduced by tens of millions of people when they have learned to do everything themselves... to think that we shall not be thrown back is Utopian... (but) if what our Revolution is doing is not fortuitous ... not the product of a decision of our Party, but an inevitable product of every revolution which Marx calls a people's revolution, that is, a revolution created by the masses of the people themselves under their own slogans, by their own end and energy... if we put the matter in this way, we shall achieve what is most essential". (S.W. Vol. VIII pp. 320-21)

The chasm between this and the 1961 Program cannot be bridged, not because they were written 42 years apart, but because they concern totally different class societies. As I stated in Marxism and Freedom (pp. 202, 203 and 205): "To put it dialectically, Lenin had a clear 'Notion' in his head -- it was the new absolute, "to a man" -- and he judged the truth of reality by its relationship to the truth of the 'Notion'!...

"This total conception -- that only the masses, from below, "to a man," can create a new way of life for millions -- he elaborated in State and Revolution as theory. It was the guiding line in his everyday practical work...

"Just as he made no fetishism out of the workers' state, neither did he of the Bolshevik Party which he founded... Of course, that did not mean that he did not assign a very fundamental role to the Party he founded; but it was in strict relationship to the actual spontaneous movement of the masses. Outside of that relationship the Party would become anything its worst enemies could think of. It did ... "

Now that missile-toting Communist barbarian, Nikita Sergeievich Khrushchev, is trying to impose retroactively his monstrous conceptions onto Lenin. As if the whole development of humanity is nothing but a by-product of the CP's "carrying out" of its "scientific programs." Lenin, however, hit out early against his Party now that it was in power and was beginning to display both "a passion for bossing" * and a disregard of national minorities. Then in his speech .

* S.W. Vol. VIII p. 307.

(5)

on the Program of March 19, 1919, Lenin noted that Bukharin had spoken of the right of self-determination as applicable only "in some cases;" Lenin noted that Bukharin had "included in the list the Hottentots, the Bushmen and the Indians. Hearing this enumeration, I thought how is it that Comrade Bukharin has forgotten a small trifle, the Bashkirs? There are no Bushmen in Russia, nor have I heard that the Hottentots have laid claims to an autonomous republic. But we have Bashkirs, Kirghis, and a number of other peoples, and to these we cannot deny recognition. We cannot deny it to a single one of the peoples living within the boundaries of the former Russian Empire! (S.W. Vol VIII, p.342)

We who live in a period when Russia has enslaved not only those to whom Lenin had granted self-determination, but has extended itself more ambitiously than even the Tsarist Empire, can only marvel at Lenin's forebodings 42 years back; "Scratch some Communists, and you will find Great-Russian chauvinists." (S.W. Vol.VIII, p. 366)

Being an apt, though ungrateful, pupil of Stalin's, Khrushchev's program has updated the monolithic monstrosity Stalin had created for Russia, making this his universal for the world. But the world's workingclass is not that easily fooled, as witness the present new revolt of the East German people.

The vision of a workers state with no bureaucracy where the toiling population to a man manages production and runs the state has been transformed into its total opposite by the Russian ruling class. It does this for the same reason that private capitalism does it -- to extract surplus value through the exploitation of the masses. If the state-capitalist rulers are distinguished from those under private capitalism, by the use of Marxist phraseology, the American private capitalists are nevertheless in a veritable conspiracy with them to force an identity between those two opposites -- Marxism-Leninism and present-day Communism. Thus the N.Y. Times, in printing the 1961 program, publishes one picture of Lenin as "founder" and one of Khrushchev as "developer."

If substitution of imperialist domination for freedom and bureaucratic management for the "population to a man" running the state and production can pass as "development", then I suppose Khrushchev could be called a "developer." But then all words have lost their meaning in the hands of the Russian Communists and American capitalists.

III. A Footnote to the Detractors of Lenin: (On Paul Cardan)

The detractors of Lenin are not exhausted either with the Communist Parties that mummify him in order the better to impose their image upon him, or with "Western" capitalism that, for its own reasons, gleefully acquiesces to this vitiation of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin's detractors include also some who call themselves socialists. Paul Cardan, who has made his attack on Lenin's conception of the vanguard party into a veritable profession, has recently ventured into the field of Marxian economic theories and Lenin's economic practices.

Allegedly, or, to use Cardan's expression, "For some strange reason, Marxists have always seen the achievement of working class power solely in terms of the conquest of political power. Real power, namely power over production in

7 9 4 6
(6)

day-to-day life, was always ignored," **

This is written by a man who is — of this there is no doubt whatever — acquainted with all of Marx's writings, from his early humanist essays through his CAPITAL, which is humanism concretized, as well as with his historic writings on the Paris Commune. Yet through it all Cardan has managed to keep intact the vulgarized concept of Marx by the sleight of hand of dealing with "Marxists" instead of with Marx himself. Anyone who fails to see — even in "Marx the economist" — "the new passions and new forces" for the reconstruction of society; anyone who fails to grasp Marx's concept that the very alienation of labor produces the "quest for universality," or that the "leap from necessity to freedom" is made by the workers themselves grown to "all-rounded individuals" has succeeded in precluding any understanding of Marx, least of all for our own epoch. He has succeeded in blinding himself not only to the great division in Marxism-Leninism produced by Stalinism. Above all, he has blinded himself to a comprehension of the objective world development from monopoly to state capitalism, which entails with it the totally new forms of proletarian struggle that are inseparable from what Marx called "the quest for universalism." Where the proletariat has long since moved from a helpless feeling of alienation to the posing of the need to abolish the distinction between mental and manual labor (or, as they put it, the division between thinking and doing), Cardan still speaks of alienation as if it were a new discovery.

But, while Cardan attacks Marx mainly by implication, he goes at Lenin hammer and tongs. Thus he writes (in the bulletin referred to): "But he (Lenin) was also relentlessly repeating from 1917 until his death that production should be organized from above along 'state-capitalist lines.'" (My emphasis)

Outside of statements made by Communists and capitalists, I know of no greater lie than the one contained in the quotation from Cardan. If the writing of STATE AND REVOLUTION on the eve of the November Revolution, and the leading of the actual Russian Revolution are not the greatest examples — in theory and in life — of the spontaneous actions of the millions of people tearing everything up by its roots and creating a new society in the vast expanse of Russia and inspiring the rest of the world by this greatest historic creative act, then, just as all words have lost their meaning in Communist hands, so have all actions lost their meaning in the hands of this socialist — and there exists only the convolutions of this one mind grasping the "meaning of socialism" outside of the context of history, of theory, and of fact.

As proof of his slanderous statement, Cardan quotes from one of Lenin's

* (from previous page) — See especially "Facing Reality" by J.R. Johnson, Pierre Chaulieu and Grace C. Lee (Chapter VI, "The Marxist Organization: 1903-1958") where he treats that concept as if there had been no change in it throughout the two decades of 1903-1923. Although that pamphlet appeared after my "Marxism and Freedom", where, in chapter XI, "Forms of Organization: the Relationship of the Proletariat to the 'Vanguard Party'" I trace in some detail the changes that were wrought in the 1903 concept by the 1905 and 1917 Revolutions, Cardan has chosen never so much as to refer to this, much less grapple with the changes.

** See "The Meaning of Socialism" by Paul Cardan, p. 12.

2 9 4 7
(7)

speeches ("The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government") those passages (pp. 332, 342, 345 - S.W. Vol VII.) which relate to the possibility of utilizing the "Taylor system." So fantastic would that be as a summation of Lenin's life and works that Cardan himself is forced to comment: "We are no better revolutionaries than Lenin. We are only forty years older!" However, this is said only to give lip service to Lenin as "revolutionary." In reality, this left-handed compliment which is supposed to prove that it is "not a question of denigrating Lenin," serves to make Stalinism seem logically to flow from Leninism. Thus Cardan writes in that same footnote: "We believe these conceptions, this subjective factor, played an enormous role in the degeneration of the Russian Revolution... we can see today the relationship between the views he held and the later reality of Stalinism."

Cardan is standing everything on its head. No "subjective" factor could ever have produced an objective situation -- the new stage of capitalism, state capitalism, and the accession to power of a new class in Russia -- where state capitalism had been theoretically predicted by Marx 100 years back and discerned by Lenin in reality nearly a half century ago.

My letters on the 1961 Russian Communist Party Program sufficiently restore Lenin's true concept of the reconstruction of society from below. Whether he wrote in the first year of Revolution (1918) when Russia was attacked by world imperialism and white counter-revolutionaries, or in the last year of his life (1923) when a shaky peace had come, there never was any fundamental change in that vision of the workers state without bureaucracy, without standing army, without police. Thus in January 24, 1918, he had written:

"We wanted the workers themselves to draw up, from below, the new principles of economic conditions." (Vol. VII, p.227)

In that same month Lenin had written about how "shy" the workers still were since they had not "yet become accustomed to the idea that they are the ruling class now." In it he attacked "lacedasicalness, slovenliness, untidiness, nervous haste," of the "educated" which was due, he said, "to the abnormal separation of mental from manual labor." He urged upon these intellectuals to begin listening to these shy workers: "every attempt to adhere to stereotyped forms and to impose uniformity from above gave a great example of how to combine initiative, independence, freedom of action, and vigour from below with voluntary centralism free from stereotyped forms....there is a great deal of talent among the people -- it is merely suppressed. It must be given an opportunity to express itself. It, and it alone, with the support of the masses can save Russia and can save the cause of socialism." (Vol. IX, pp.419,420,422)

Indeed Lenin was willing to let a single distinction sum up the difference between the Second International that had betrayed the workers and the new, Third International. That single distinction was that genuine Marxists "reduce everything to the conditions of labor," (Vol. IX, p.440). The famous trade union debate of 1920-21 discloses how desperately he worked toward this one truth, how he differed even on the question of designating Russia as a workers' state. His contention was that a precise description would show instead that the designation of "workers' state" was an "abstraction" while the reality was that it was a workers' and peasants' state "with bureaucratic distortions." In arguing against Trotsky's administrative mentality, Lenin insisted that the only assurance there is for the workers protecting that state is through giving them the freedom to protect themselves from the state: "The entirely

2947

(8)

organized proletariat must protect itself and must utilize the workers' organizations for the purpose of protecting the workers from their own state." (p.9)

Now to return to Cardan's "proof" that Lenin's concept was "this subjective factor which played an enormous role in the degeneration of the Russian Revolution"—the quotation from Lenin's speech which refers to the possible need to introduce the Taylor system and says that "the masses must unquestioningly obey the single will of the leaders of the labor process." What Cardan fails to say is:

- 1) That the Taylor system was not put into effect in Lenin's time;
- 2) That the "single will" was not a reference to foremen or managers of production. The point of contention at that time — "single" vs. "collective" will — referred, not to a relationship between worker and boss, but to the question of parallelism in organizations. That is to say, because Russia was so backward during Tzarism that no national trade-union organization existed, there sprung up during the revolution factory committees and trade-unions, as well as Soviets and Party cells. There was also the question of utilizing the "bourgeois specialist" at a time when production was really at a standstill from four years of war, civil war, and counter-revolutionary attacks.

Were we, for the sake of argument, to disregard the objective circumstances in which this speech was made; were we further to disregard the six years which Lenin lived and wrote following the speech; were we even to say that a single article could sum up an entire revolutionary period, would it still not be incumbent upon the analyst to summarize the whole of the article? That speech consisted of more, a great deal more than those quotations used by Cardan. That speech analysed the principle task of the proletariat to be "the positive or creative work of setting up an extremely intricate and subtle system of new organizational relationships extending to the planned production and distribution of the goods required for the existence of tens of millions of people. Such a revolution can be carried out only if the majority of the population, and primarily the majority of the toilers, display independent historical creative spirit ... By creating a new Soviet type of state, which gives the opportunity to all the toilers and the masses of the oppressed to take an active part in the independent building of a new society, we solved only a small part of this difficult problem. The principle difficulty lies in the economic sphere." (Vol. VII p.315)

In that same speech Lenin speaks of "Our work of organizing nation-wide accounting and control of production and distribution under the guidance of the proletariat has lagged very much behind our work of directly expropriating the expropriators." And again (pp. 328-9) "The socialist state can arise only as a network of producers and consumers communes which conscientiously calculate their production and consumption, economize labor, steadily raise the productivity of labor, and thus enable the working day to be reduced to seven, six, and even less hours per day." Let's not forget either that, while the goal of the six-hour day was made integral to the program the following year, the Taylor system was not.

Far from the Taylor system (which he most certainly did not understand) being the ruling conception, proletarian democracy was the guiding line which permeated Lenin's speech. This is what the Soviets meant to Lenin. This is why he put the whole stress on the fact that the soviet form of organization is justified because "for the first time a start is thus made in teaching the whole of the population in the art of administration, and in their beginning to administer" (pp.345-6) And he warns against "a petty-bourgeois tendency to transform the members of the soviets into 'members of parliament,' or into

2948

(9)

bureaucrats. This must be combatted by drawing all the members of the soviets into the practical work of administration... Our aim is to draw the whole of the poor into the practical work of administration... our aim is to insure that every toiler... shall perform state duties." (p.347) The workers' state was only four months old and was confronted with "a period of waiting for new outbreaks of the revolution, which is maturing in the West at a painfully slow pace."

The capitalists--state and private--have good and sufficient, that is to say, exploitative reasons for denigrating Lenin. But why should socialists stoop to this 37 years after his death when the theoretical void in the Marxist movement remains unfilled with any meaningful contributions to meet the challenge of our times. Truly it has been said: "Mine enemies I know. Protect me from my friends."

--Raya

August 5, 1961

2949

September 10, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

ATTITUDES TO WAR: The Not-So-Neutral Neutrals and the Working Class

Dear Friends:

The shockingly aligned behavior of the so-called non-aligned nations at the Belgrade Conference last week compels a second look at the decisive life-and death question of the attitude toward war. It is not that "neutrality" means anything serious to the working-class which can under no circumstances allow itself the luxury of neutrality, real or pretended, in a war between classes. But the 1960's, nevertheless, differ sharply from the 1950's when, after the Korean War, neutralism of the Afro-Asian world did compel both sides of the Iron Curtain to give to the newly-emergent third world economic aid and, where war threatened from the West, whether over Formosa or Suez, it was stopped before it became World War III. It is true that in each case the "West" itself was divided and that helped in no inconsiderable way. Nevertheless, the totality of the war weapons in our era were not unloosed and "neutralism" played an independent part. This is no longer true, and the ones who know it are the "neutrals"

This was the first of many shocking elements in this Belgrade meeting which took a year to prepare and began as, at least in part, as an anti-Russian gathering, only to end as toeing the line, now that the world's division into two, and only two nuclear goliaths had been made clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt. Whatever motivated Tito in his nationalistic break from Russia and then pushed him into trying to build a "third bloc" was now compelling his return to home base.

At our Labor Day plenum which opened on the day of the Belgrade Conference and the day after the Khrushchev unilateral decision to resume nuclear testing, I stressed that he was making sure that he, not they, was setting the agenda. This remains true, but since, previously, he wanted to be "alone" in "representing" the neutrals and showed open disapproval of Tito's maneuvers to arrange for this conference last year, this act of setting the agenda "for" them made it appear as if the Conference would disapprove yet one more unilateral act. The not-so neutral neutrals, however, got over their "shock" so very quickly, without changing in a single fundamental of what they came prepared for, that a re-examination is called for by us.

For example, Tito cushioned his supposed shock by openly stating he could understand Russia's "motivations." Very obviously, the man was realigning too easily so that it can by no means ~~be~~ be excluded that he actually knew in advance of Khrushchev's actions. Perhaps he and Khrushchev and Ulbricht are having a good laugh over the fact that the bourgeois press in the West had so totally misunderstood Tito's motivations in accepting American aid that they wrote up the East German delegation's visit to him a few days before the conference's opening as if it were begging for support on the Berlin question. In truth, they must have been informing him of the atomic terror Khrushchev would soon unloose against the "West."

What I am saying is that no small change in the world complex of aligned and non-aligned, even though the non-aligned cannot be considered "powers" in any sense in which the United States and Russia are. For, just as I am pointing out the change in the complexion of neutralism from the 1950's to the 1960's, so the rebirth of chauvinism in its most virulent form, though now directed against Germany (with not a little anti-Semitism on both sides of the German wall), can be used not only to undermine the neutrals but the "West." No one knows better than Khrushchev who rules a country that supposedly follows the line of "a German, Karl Marx" that Russia has demagogically transformed the hated Nazi into "a German" any German — except of course the East Germans who are his puppets. In truth, this hides (1) that the Encyclopedia of Russia does not even mention that Karl Marx was a Jew, (2) that the Russians and Jews were not the only anti-Nazis; so were millions in Hitler's concentration camps, not to mention all that that great nation had produced in the greatest mass movement of the proletariat before World War I and up to Hitler's conquest of power, and then unloosing of the war with the help of the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

But at the moment, precisely because no new revolutionary society arose out of World War II, and therefore a residue of anti-Germanism remained also with the proletariat of the West that had to destroy Nazi Germany, Khrushchev is using this to undermine "the strong men in the West." Thus in DeGaulle France which is strongly aligned with Adenauer Germany, a recent poll revealed that only 9% of the French were willing to fight over the status of Berlin. While no doubt a great part of this percentage of anti-war sentiment was against any capitalistic war, Khrushchev in this latest anti-German campaign concerns himself only with concentrating on the single question of antiGermanism — and he is succeeding with the help of the so-called radical intellectuals, from the Existentialists to the pacifists.

The nearness of war can be gauged not only by Khrushchev's threats or Kennedy's military preparations but by the fact that Tito, who had to fight for his nationalism — a "socialism" in one tiny, little country to match Stalin's vast empire — seems now to be returning to the fold. Moreover, this is not one European country returning to the Slavic fold.

Take the question of Nkrumah and how easily he got over his "shock" of Khrushchev's unilateral action in poisoning the world's atmosphere in atomic dust. Without a single pause that dutiful statement was followed by a parrot-like repetition of every single proposal of Khrushchev from that on Berlin to that of the reorganization of the UN Secretariat. Even the nationalistic request that Africa be declared a "nuclear free zone" was strictly in line with Khrushchev's foreign policy which does not test in Africa while France does. That demand failed to take into account that Russia's 100 megaton bomb is over 5,000 times the power of France's and will surely poison the air all over the world. Africa is on this planet, and cannot escape the consequences of that insane totalitarian action. Nkrumah's faint protest cannot be construed as anything short of knowledge aforehand. Indeed even his "co-neutralists" treated him as a "spokesman for Khrushchev." Geography not being as easily changed as leadership ambitions, Nkrumah may change once again before the outbreak of war. But the fact that the head of the African country that gained its independence first could be outchone by Premier Cyrille Adoula of

the Congo who got the post by UN manipulation is important to note. Adoula stated that any war between the big power blocs might deprive all Africa of independence. While he too kept away from naming the Soviet Union as the one who had ended the cessation of nuclear testing, he did say that their resumption "defies the legitimate hopes of mankind."

Naturally the bourgeois press of the West pounced upon the double-tongued oratory of those who are supposed to be opposed to nuclear testing but nevertheless followed the line set by the totalitarian ruler who broke the nuclear test ban. At the same time the bourgeois press gave the impression that all of independent Africa was there whereas in fact Nigeria, which had thrown a general strike in protest against France when she exploded her bomb, declined the invitation to attend the Belgrade Conference. No need to shed tears over the hurt feelings of "the West" for being treated so unrewardingly by this conference although they had not been the first to resume nuclear testing. For this need not mean that they will not be the first to start the war.

We are not concerned with either of the blocs who are equally out to dominate the world even if it means destroying it. What concerns us in the underdeveloped countries is how the leadership there is aligning itself without regard to any new society on other beginnings than that of state capitalism, thus putting as great obstacles in the path of their people, who are the best allies of the proletariat of the advanced countries, as the Big powers put in the path of their proletariat.

The pro-Russianism of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals must also be called by its rightful name for there is nothing more dangerous to the proletariat than the labor bureaucracy and the radical intellectuals who do the same job as the capitalists -- but all in the name of "peace," even if peace be the type of atomic terror that Khrushchev practices to a Hitler degree. Thus he tells each visiting delegation, trade union included, that the country from which they came will be the one to be wiped off the face of the earth. What Harry McShane wrote me on that is worth underscoring: "The Trades Council delegation, on its return from Russia, told us that the Russians could not understand why we tolerated the Polaris ship at Holy Loch. The 'Daily Worker' said it was a 'virtual certainty' that the submarine seen in Russian waters was a Polaris ship from Holy Loch, and reminded us of the Russian announcement that if one of these ships figured in a dangerous incident there would be retaliation at its base. This is using the weapon of fear. We can build nothing on that."

Once again it becomes necessary to return to our Marxist ABC's. In the present case, the Glasgow proletariat is showing the only truly independent way. Harry McShane reports the following: "The West of Scotland District Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen has condemned Russia's decision to resume nuclear testing, and asks the EC to call on the Soviet Railwaymen to demonstrate against it." In contrast to this the only truly independent Scottish workingclass appeal to its Russian brothers, is the fact that the Committee 100 are relying on the CP to make a success of the demonstration at Holy Loch as if the Scottish workers were not aware that there is no difference between American private capitalistic Polaris and Russian state capitalist 100 megaton bombs! To professional "I'd-rather-be-Red-than-dead" CNDers, it is necessary to

repeat Lenin's notes to his delegation at the Hague Peace Conference;
"I think that if we have several people at the Hague Conference who
are capable of delivering speeches against war in various languages,
the most important thing to do would be to refute the opinion that
those present at the conference are opponents of war.... It is de-
sirable to illustrate with especial concreteness.... the examples of the
Basle Congress of 1912, that the theoretical admission that war is crimi-
nal, that war is impermissible for a Socialist, etc., turns out to be emp-
ty phrases because such a presentation lacks all concreteness... only the
formation of revolutionary nuclei...." (Emphasis added)

It becomes as necessary to expose the leadership of the neutrals and
the so-called peace movements as it is to oppose the direct class enemy in
one's own country and at the other pole of world capital. There is only
one way to work for peace and that is through the reconstruction of
society on other than capitalistic grounds, on truly new, human beginnings.
Those who flee in terror-- the intellectuals and other whitewashers of
Russia at this moment or those who would whitewash the US at another--
are preparing the ground, not for peace, but for nuclear holocaust.

-- Raya

P.S. I ask that the discussion on this letter be held in conjunction with
the On War and Peace bulletin of September, 1960.

September 17, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

Because this article on the 5th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution is due in Scotland this week—a month in advance of the anniversary—we are jumping the gun here and presenting it as the Weekly Political Letter. We cannot conceive of a better way of getting away from the negative of the daily news than by remembering the positive lessons of that great revolution.

— the Resident Editorial Board

SPONTANEITY OF ACTION AND ORGANIZATION OF THOUGHT:
IN MEMORIAM OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

by Raya Dunayevskaya

"Don't talk to me about space ships, a trip to the moon or Marx, about life in the atomic age...."

"We live like this. In darkness, in mud, far away...."

"Don't tell me it is worse in Africa. I live in Europe, my skin is white. Who will embrace me to make me feel that I am human?"

— Karoly Jobbagy
Budapest, April 1956

On October 23, 1956 the Russian puppet regime in Hungary fired on a student youth demonstration in Budapest. Far from dispersing the young students, these were soon joined by the workers from the factories in the outlying suburbs. The Revolution had begun in earnest. During the following 13 days, ever broader layers of the population revolted. From the very young to the very old, workers and intellectuals, women and children, even the police and the armed forces — truly the population to a man — turned against the top Communist bureaucracy and the hated, sadistic AVD (secret police). The Communist Party with more than 800,000 and the trade unions allegedly representing the working population just evaporated. In its place arose Workers' Councils, Revolutionary Committees of every sort — intellectuals, youth, the army — all moving away from the Single Party State. Overnight there sprang up 45 newspapers and 40 different parties, but the decisive force of the revolution remained the Workers' Councils. When 13 days of armed resistance was bloodily crushed by the might of Russian totalitarianism, the new form of workers' organization — factory councils — called a general strike. It was the first time in history a general strike followed the collapse of the revolution. It held the foreign imperialist as well as the "new" government at bay for five long weeks. Even a Janos Kadar had to pretend he was listening to the demands of the Workers' Councils for control over production and even the possible abrogation of the single party rule.

As late as November 21, 1956, the Appeal of the Central Workers Council of Great Budapest stated: "We protest against the attitude of the newly-formed 'Free Trade Unions' which are ready to accept the workers' councils merely as economic organs. We declare that in Hungary today the Workers' Councils represent the real interests of the working class, that there is no stronger political power in the country today than the powers of the Workers' Councils." (1) And on November 30th the Bulletin of the Central Workers Council reported a meeting with Kadar at which they demanded a daily press organ: "Our position is that the Workers' Councils are in absolute need of a press organ so that the workers may receive uniform and true information...We also raised the question of the multi-party system." (2) It was the attempt to publish the Workers' Journal without state permission that made Kadar realize that "the government was simply ignored. Everyone who had a problem to settle came to us (Central Workers' Council)." (3) that made the Kadar Government, with the help of the Russian Army, move in and dissolve the Councils, on December 9th, long after armed resistance had been crushed and the exodus of refugees had reached 200,000 or a full 2 per cent of the total population.

Although the Revolution had been sparked by the intellectuals, not only had the workers borne the main brunt of the fighting, but it was they who had shown the greatest creativity and given the Revolution its historic direction. Even their support of Imre Nagy was dependent on his acceptance of the workers' control over production, a multi-party system of government, and new type of socialism. Central to it was, an independent Hungary, but this demand for self-determination had nothing in common with narrow bourgeois nationalism. As Imre Nagy himself recognized — it was this fact that brought him to the leadership of a revolution he did not desire — "They want a People's Democracy where the working people are masters of the country and of their own fate, where human beings are respected, and where social and political life is conducted in the spirit of humanism...An atmosphere of suspicion and revenge is banishing the fundamental feature of socialist morality, humanism." (4)

This Marxist humanism was in the air since 1955. Because the Communist intellectual caught this in the air, he was assured of leadership of a revolution against Communism. When the fight against the Stalinist, Rakosi, had first begun and he called these intellectuals "outsiders" Tador had replied that the ruling circle "is not the party. The party is ourselves, those who belong to the other current, who fight for the ideas and principles of humanism, and whose aims reflect in ever-increasing measure those of the people and of the country." (5) But though the intellectuals had caught the

-
- (1) THE REVIEW (published by the Imre Nagy Institute, Brussels) #4, 1960
 - (2) Ibid. EAST EUROPE (New York) April 1959 also carries an "Eyewitness Report of How the Workers Councils Fought Kadar."
 - (3) "My Experiences in the Central Workers' Council of Greater Budapest" by Miklos Sebastyen, THE REVIEW, Vol. III, #2, 1961
 - (4) IMRE NAGY ON COMMUNISM: In Defense of "The New Course," pp. 49, 56
 - (5) BEHIND THE RAPE OF HUNGARY by F. Fejto. See also my MARXISM AND FREEDOM, pp. 62, 255-6 on the Russian debates on Marx's Humanist Essays, and my "Nationalism, Communism, Marxist Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions" on the Polish debates.

humanism in the air and set off the revolution, they did not reveal themselves as leaders and organizers at the moment of crisis. The best, the young however, did recognize that the spontaneity which produced the revolution will see that it does not die. "As a true Marxist I believe in the inevitability of the historic processes. We know perfectly well that a wave of terror and Stalinist repression will be let loose on us....You know how the revolution broke out -- spontaneously, without any kind of preparation. When the police fired on our students, leadership and organization sprung up over night. Well, we'll scatter now just as spontaneously as we came together....The revolution can't die; it will play dead and await its moment to rise again." (6)

Today, when the world stands on the brink of nuclear holocaust, sparked by Russian state-capitalism calling itself "Communism" and American private capitalism calling itself "Democracy," the page of freedom opened by the Hungarian Revolution shows the only way out of the crisis-racked capitalist order. When the 1917 Russian Revolution put an end to the first betrayal of established Marxism, Lenin never wearied of reminding us that without "the dress rehearsal" of 1905, there could have been no successful 1917. Because of the maturity of our age, marked, on the one hand, by the African Revolutions which broke from Western capitalism, and, on the other hand, by the East European Revolutions against Russian totalitarianism, the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 is more than a dress rehearsal for a new European Revolution. It is the dress rehearsal for a world revolution that is out to reconstruct society on new, truly human beginnings and in that way finally bring to an end that which Marx called the pre-history of mankind.

(6) From a report by Peter Schmid quoted in THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION, edited by Melvin J. Lasky.

September 25, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

COMPLETE AND GENERAL DISARMAMENT, OR TWO CAN PLAY THE GAME

The new "peace dove," John Fitzgerald Kennedy, has just shown "the other," Nikita Sergeievich Khrushchev, that two can play the game of "complete and general disarmament." His speech before the UN, in tone distinguished by Anglo-Saxon understatement, was, in content, as ruthless and overbearing as Khrushchev's shoes thumping. At the very start he established his own ground rules: "In this hall there are not three forces, but only two." He followed this up by giving his own interpretation of the Belgrade Conference: "It is in this (UN) spirit that the recent Belgrade Conference... endorsed "general, complete and strictly an internationally controlled disarmament."

He then launched into an attack on the "others:" "The other, seeking a different world, would undermine this organization (the UN) in the process." Secondly, the "others" not only, for 15 long years, that is directly as the war was over, met "our concessions... by obstruction" but "the pleas of mankind have been met with disregard." On top of that, "while we were negotiating in good faith at Geneva, others were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction." Just in case anyone did not understand who "the others" were, JFK became specific: "the tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire... which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners." "If there is a crisis (over Berlin) it is because an existing peace is under threat" and "peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks." Even Russian literature was brought in to draw sharp the comparison between the current "others" and the mad Tsar Boris Godunov as Pushkin interpreted his orders: "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced by barriers... that not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow to fly." And Kennedy quickly left Pushkin and the Tears to throw at Khrushchev his own type of threat: "the United States has both the will and the weapons..."

Now that the brandishment of nuclear war has been made, one (if that one is a capitalistic ruler) must of course cover up. And here Kennedy did Khrushchev one better by not only talking of pie in the sky, literally since outer space too was to be guaranteed ("The cold war reaches of the universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war."), but proudly stated that the US now has "a new non-statutory agency fully endorsed by the Congress." The only thing he failed to add is that it is the same Congress, in the same week in which it established the new US Disarmament Agency, that also went in for the greatest military build-up, from increasing the armed forces on active duty to appropriating funds by far the greatest amount ever ear-marked for the "peace-time" military. The same Congress approved the underground nuclear testing and the offering of nuclear arms training to the French contingents of NATO. But Kennedy didn't fail to hit at those "others" who use the question of disarmament merely as a slogan "to resist concrete steps" even as they use outer space that way, so that the UN must keep "nuclear weapons from seeding new battle-

grounds in outer space." This generation knows moreover that either "brandishing or yielding to threats can only lead to war." Above all "peace is not solely a military or technical problem— it is primarily a problem of politics and people."

This, or rather what concrete steps flow from this, is really the only new thing in the Kennedy speech. That is, the President has now announced that he means to use the UN for his ends both by arming it and by setting its line: (1) "In the world we seek, United Nations emergency forces which have been hastily assembled, uncertainly supplied and inadequately financed will never be enough." And (2) "Nor are these aggressions any less real because men are knifed in their homes and not shot in the fields of battle."

Now that the all-seeing head of "the West" has taken over the UN, the Afro-Asian bloc, which he has not recognized as any third force, but toward which all this was directed, is told how it must act: not only to deal with "colonialism" "in full" — that is to see the Communist empire and not only Western imperialism. It had better realize (1) that "a nuclear disaster, spread by winds and waters and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted;" (2) that we cannot endanger security "by another long uninspected ban on testing;" (3) that "we cannot fail these commitments" in West Berlin—therefore not only may there be world war but (4) the Africans, better accept the Administration's rewriting of history that in 1945 (despite Hiroshima, mind you) we wanted international control of the atom, witness the Baruch plan; that, despite the Korean War in 1951, we wanted "disarmament," and that, of course, the 1961 military build-up and the readiness to use nuclear war is to be disregarded since, of course, we would not be "the aggressors;" "others" would. Above all, this bloc must accept our word for it that the fight against "colonialism" "where it still exists" has our "sympathy."

I don't know how much time the President intends to give the bloc to see the light, but the generalities of his anti-colonialism against the concrete realities of the Algerian war his ally DeGaulle and the Angolan outrages by another NATO partner, Portugal, will call his bluff soon enough.

The point is (in this Kennedy was right, although not for the reasons he gave) there are only two nuclear giants out for the domination of the world — US and Russia. — Therefore the reaction of Russia is decisive. Kennedy has shown that he too can play the game of nuclear disarmament and even "total disarmament." If he should be able to steal Khrushchev's thunder not only among rulers of small nations that are "neutral," but even, say, in the spontaneous peace movements who have shown in both England and Japan that, in part at least, they know also how to demonstrate against Russia, and not only against America; if some of the Africans move away from the "troiks" conception and do give their support to a new UN General Secretary who would surely follow the US line; if, despite the fact that Khrushchev had not bothered to inform the Russian people of the actual nuclear explosions, they do hear of all the pollution of the world's air, including that of their own land, and begin to show their restlessness; if, if, if, — what then?

Khrushchev could hardly care less for he has already won what he was

after — and now he is back off on the "peaceful" aspect of "peaceful co-existence," with just the right dosage of terror, threats, and being "friend" of the fight against "colonialism" — when it isn't his empire they are revolting against. Here is what I mean: the nuclear explosions were started directly after the Draft Program of the Russian Communist Party was published. This promised the Russians "complete communism" provided there was no war, and provided there would be, in the decade (1961-70) a 100% rise in labor productivity and by the second decade (1971-80) a 300% rise. Khrushchev then created the Berlin crisis, which, like the unilateral action to resume nuclear testing, he blamed on "Western imperialism's military build-up." He has succeeded in sealing off East Berlin and the drain on the manpower there by what he dared call "head hunters," and he will now tell Ulbricht of the norms that East German workers must produce to become the industrial arsenal for all of Eastern Europe, if not also Russia. To the Congress of the Russian Communist Party, which is to convene on October 17th, he can thereby "show" these "successes:" (1) he has avoided war over Berlin, which was allegedly to be if he hadn't threatened and threatened and actually sealed off East Germany; (2) he did succeed in getting Tito back (and if Tito now regrets his action because war was not imminent, he can console himself with the fact that it is not yet excluded that the RCP Congress will not also secretly vote special powers for a possible "sudden" war); (3) he can claim that it was his threats to Western Europe to use it as a "hostage" is that which put the pressure on Kennedy to at least promise not to "transfer" nuclear weapons to the "militarists of West Germany" or others and instead recognize the "realities" of either the Oder-Niesen line or East Germany or both; and (4) on a par with the labor productivity the Russians must produce is the new stage in African relations, as witness Nkrumah's actions at Belgrade and soon to be followed at the UN and already followed by dismissal of the British officers of the Ghanaian army.

The really new is that last point, although, again, it comes not from Khrushchev's doings but from the internal development. What has been happening in Ghana — and may tomorrow reach other African nations for none can escape the objective pull of world capitalism, on the one hand, and the subjective pull of the newly-born proletariat on the other hand, is this: private capitalism, even when it endorses a Volta dam, has neither developed the country much industrially, nor could it possibly escape the class struggle. The proletariat has been striking — a great transport strike has just taken place in Ghana. At the same time the intellectuals have been demanding more "state planning" — so the administrative mentality of Nkrumah makes him think he can "satisfy" both by accepting "socialism" (read: state capitalism) for which the workers would be willing to continue tightening their belts. He has evidently learned nothing either from Quadros or from Fidel.

For the moment — we are merely left where we were before Kennedy began playing Khrushchev's game. But the UN's new role, in both arms and "politics," and the crossroads which the African nations have reached will develop in the new stage of the struggle for the minds of men to where the peace movements too will need to realize their paralysis if they are not backed up by the actual proletarian mass movement for the reconstruction of society.

— Raya

(labor donated)

2959

October 2, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

THE SYRIAN REVOLT The Cold War in the Middle East

Dear Friends:

The successful army coup to regain the independence of Syria from Egypt put an end to the United Arab Republic. Nasser says the revolt was an "imperialistic plot" against his "socialism." There has been little enough "socialism" in Egypt, let alone Syria. It is true there had been some land reform in Egypt while the feudal potentates in Syria went very nearly untouched. But it was these same landowners plus the small capitalist class plus the military bureaucracy which, less than four years ago, had asked for union with Egypt, though the latter had neither a common border nor a common history with Syria. About the only reason anyone could adduce then for this sudden merger was that the Communist Party of Syria was getting to powerful and Nasser had shown his expertness in dealing with political opposition. Nasser obliged again by putting the leaders of the CP in jail and driving the party underground.

On the other hand, the reactionary government in Syria was not exactly a novice in such matters either. The Communist Party, which had, four years back, looked so threatening had itself come out of illegality only in 1954. Between 1954 and 1958 it had become the best organized and most active party in the whole Middle East. However, throughout this period, its leaders had functioned, not as revolutionaries, but as Arab nationalists. Although it controlled all three trades unions and varied "National Front" organizations, it had given up its agrarian demands. For the class struggle it substituted Russian foreign policy, tailored to suit the Arab Middle East.

As its leader, Khaled Bakdash, had put it, "Syria is Arab nationalist, not Communist, and will remain so." Its Manifesto appealed to "all four classes." "The National Front," said the 1955 Syrian CP Manifesto, "ought to unite all those who oppose the Pact of Baghdad." To make themselves fully acceptable to the ruling cliques, it spiced its program with a good deal of anti-Semitism. The cornerstone of all Arab Communist policy being that Israel is an "outpost of Western imperialism in the Middle East." With the Czech arms deal, the CP persisted with its central aim: to lead Syria, like Egypt, unto the Russian foreign policy path.

When the United Arab Republic, under Nasser, drove the Communist Party underground, not a word of open criticism came from Russia. This doesn't, of course, mean that Russia had no interests other than those of Nasser, but he is too important an ally in the fight against "the West" for Russia to encourage its CPs in the Middle East to carry on any independent policy except when Nasser turns against Russia. Thus, when the Iraqi Revolution occurred, and Kassim and Nasser competed for leadership of the Middle East, Russia hurried massive aid to the High Aswan Dam, although, or precisely because the CP played an independent role and Iraq competed with Egypt for leadership. In a word, when Nasser

began to suspect Russia's role, Russia was quick to appease him. Let's not forget that it took two full years after the Suez war and Dulles's scuttling of the promised aid to Egypt before Khrushchev consented to step in.

It is true that in the past few months exposes of Nasser's dictatorial rule, with accusations that he had murdered a leader of the Syrian CP, began to appear in the Russian press. The present military coup, however, seems to be without benefit of Russian complicity. It is concentrated in the same clique which, four years back, had handed Syria to Egypt most enthusiastically. In the tangled Middle Eastern situation, this doesn't mean that the Syrian CP wouldn't help the same clique break away from the United Arab Republic! It becomes all the more important therefore to review the whole Middle Eastern situation from the vantage point of the cold war.

The entry of Russia in the Middle East in 1955 with the Czech arms deal came on the initiative of Cairo and Damascus as much as from Russian ambitions. Therein lies the key to the difference in Russian policy between 1945 and 1955. At the end of World War II, Russia tried direct military intervention in Iran. Its "Western Allies" soon made it clear to Stalin that they would not tolerate it, and Stalin's army withdrew.

With the victory of Mao in China, the Russian attitude to the Orient changed. It is widely believed that this was due to the fact that Stalin finally realized the value of the peasantry, that he came over to Mao's position of the peasantry as the "vanguard." Nothing could be further from the truth. What finally united Stalin and Mao was that both now had the same enemy: the United States. Ever since the Marshall Plan and the beginning of the cold war in Western Europe, Stalin was looking precisely for such an ally in the East. The war in Korea was meant to show in no uncertain terms that now Russia could fight the United States on two fronts.

The world was now divided into two, and only two, main blocs, both West and East. The old revolutionary line of distrust of the bourgeoisie continued, however, and the leadership of the national revolutions, whether in India or the Middle East, (and later Africa) was treated as "imperialist agents." The slander persisted, no matter how revolutionary these leaders were in throwing out the imperialists.

Here some flexibility did appear with the death of Stalin and Khrushchev's coming to power. But on the whole, the initiative did not come from Russia. Russia refused to participate in any UN aid to the underdeveloped countries until the actual military rulers there began to sound out Russia as to direct help against "the West."

ALONG WITH THE FEELERS FROM ABOVE, THE COMMUNIST PARTIES BEGAN TO EXPERIENCE A GROWTH FROM THE POST-WAR INTELLIGENTSIA THAT WERE SEEING IN POST-WAR COMMUNISM THE ROAD TO BECOMING THE RULING POWER IN THEIR OWN COUNTRIES.

This rhymed with their own ambitions and the objective pull of the new stage of capitalism - state capitalism - which meant they

neither needed "capital" nor a proletarian mass base, which, in the underdeveloped economies, was very tiny in any case. An administrative mentality would suffice. "Anti-Westernism" would get aid from Russia. In the case of the Middle East, though Russia originally voted for the establishment of Israel, it soon, in and out of Russia, began its own anti-Israel campaign. "Rootless cosmopolitans," was the byword in Stalin's Russia and became popular in the Middle East.

All politics in post-war Middle East revolves around Israel's establishment. Most regimes had been toppled because of their defeat in the Palestine War. Egypt alone tried to make its revolution not only against Israel but for the Egyptian masses. It embarked on a Land Reform Act. It is impossible, however, to carry through a social revolution "from above." Nasser's method of stopping midway in the revolution, continued with his class-collaborationist way, both with the capitalists and the feudal potentates he had just displaced as ruler, and adding to the opposition to Israel, the question of industrialization as "above classes." This is the reason why Sputnik No. 1 is a much greater magnet in the Middle East for Russia than the brutal crushing of the Hungarian Revolution ever became a symbol against Russia.

The checkered role of so-called "revolutionaries" can be seen also among the Middle Eastern Socialists. Thus the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party, BA'ATH, came about as a union of two separate factions in 1953. The history of both these groups goes back to the early '40s; they were pro-fascist and two of its present leaders -- Aqram Hourani and Colonel Afif al-Bizra -- took part in the abortive pro-Axis Rashid Ali revolt in Baghdad in 1941. One of these groups was originally headed by Michel Aflaq, a leading member of the Syrian CP. When the Axis failed they shifted sides. I don't mean to say there is no kind of "socialism." One must remember that the workingmen's total disillusionment with private capitalism was so complete that even Fascism called itself national socialism. This bastard socialism is what characterized Peron's Argentina, and the Middle East. In their national attempts to gain independence, they have stood for agrarian reform. Their socialism never was international. They do not permit the Israeli Socialist Party to sit in any congress in which they participate.

The anti-Semitism of Russian Communism in the post-war period became an open phenomenon in Stalin's last days not only because of the birth of Israel and the greater room for maneuver that Russia achieved by being for the more numerous Arab countries. Above all, it became an open phenomenon because, in fighting the true internationalism of Russia's returning soldiers and intellectuals, Stalin had to contend with the irreversible fact of post-war history, that state-capitalism was a world phenomenon. If "the West," as well as Russia could now plan and, according to Varga, would thus be able to avoid the type of depressions that doomed private capitalism, then Stalin, in his aim to dominate the world, faced a mightier competitor than he was willing to contemplate. He thereupon turned to a sort of new type of "social fascism" "third period" adventurism. It is this the Stalinist bureaucracy could no longer stand, and welcomed Stalin's demise.

What Khrushchev achieved with his "deStalinization" and "war is not inevitable" doctrine at the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party was the recognition that there were "other paths to socialism." That is

2 9 6 3

-4-

to say, the neutral zone, the underdeveloped countries, the national revolutions, the "progressive bourgeoisie" — all these would unite with a single objective — anti Western imperialism.

In the case of the present coup in Syria, Khrushchev may be confronted with a divided Middle East. As he was shown during the Iraqi Revolution this is coming faster than his policy for all-national subversion would prefer. The CPs there are too weak to rule without the "co-leadership" of the ruling classes as presently constituted. But then even a Khrushchev cannot have everything he wants. The jockeying for position in the UN will pale before that in the Middle East over the next period.

--Raya

The most perceptive books on the Middle East are those written by Walter Z. Laqueur. "The Soviet Union and the Middle East" is the best of these. "The Middle East in Transition" edited by Laqueur has a good contribution. "The National Front," by A. Bennigsen. John H. Kautsky's "Moscow and the CP of India" throws valuable light on the relationship of Mao and Stalin. Also Nasser's "The Philosophy of Revolution" should be read.

(labor donated)

October 9, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

CRISIS-SOON-TO-BE IN SOUTH VIET NAM AND THE SENDING OF U.S. TROOPS

Dear Friends:

Hidden in the inside pages of the local press of Friday and Saturday (October 6th and 7th) was a brief AP dispatch which stated: "State Department sources revealed privately yesterday that sending troops to South Viet Nam is under consideration." The same day one of the Alsop brothers wrote a column which, at one and the same time, tried claiming that the most important aspects of Kennedy's speech before the UN had been the references to Laos and South Viet Nam, and played down the idea of commitment of US troops to "the defense of South Viet Nam" on the ground that these were not so much for combat as for "training." Obviously, however, the "training" would be on live human beings!

Just now the Sunday N.Y. Times has arrived and I note that, contrary to the local press, the Times does give the matter front page coverage. However, it becomes even further removed from the real danger point by relating it to the failure to achieve the peace in Laos promised by Khrushchev. Since at this moment the three princes have finally worked out a modus vivendi, the item on South Viet Nam will again "be lost."

Following the long bloody mess of the Korean War which Truman had called a "police action," no doubt we should be hardened on the matter of imperialistically undeclared wars. Nevertheless, the new point here is that while all eyes are on Berlin, and nothing short of mankind's total annihilation is deemed worthy of serious discussion, an old-fashioned war is being clandestinely prepared.

Let's bring it out into the open. If the Berlin crisis was manufactured in Moscow, the one in South Viet Nam is being manufactured in Washington, D.C. — and for the same reasons. That is to say, the struggle for world domination means, first and foremost, a struggle against the working people in one's own country and the countries one dominates. In the case of South Viet Nam, the so-called "democratic regime" of Ngo Dinh Diem has so steadily moved to the right that it is little distinguished either from the old-fashioned mandarin regime, or the French puppet regime of Emperor Bao Dai, except that this one's bills are paid by the United States. The agrarian reforms promised and haltingly begun when Ngo Dinh Diem first won the presidency have in each case given way to the old landlord rule and even when a new project is begun, it is the old landlord who becomes the new administrator. The peasant masses rightfully see no difference from the old ruling class. Neither does the petty-bourgeois revolutionary intellectuals that originally helped the country created in 1954 see any of its civil liberties restored, or even the corruption cleared up, now that the corruption has moved from the religious sects to the family of the aristocratic president.

The victories of the guerrillas are not "foreign" but mass supported. In the 7 years existence of South Viet Nam Ngo Dinh Diem has lost what

support when he fought France and its puppet, Bao Dai. When South Viet Nam was first established, nearly a million refugees from Communist North Viet Nam moved in. At the moment of the regime's total isolation from the masses, however, the "liberal" intellectuals around the young, vigorous, smart man in the White House think it is time to rally around the flag (though the flag be that of a tottering though new semi-feudalism).

Inasmuch as the war is not yet full-fledged, it does give us the opportunity not to limit our analysis to the immediate question, but to extend it to the relationship the theory of permanent revolution has to the conditions in the underdeveloped economies in general, and Viet Nam, South and North, in particular.

Heretofore,* we stressed the negative features of the theory of permanent revolution because, in its under-estimation, if not outright rejection, of the peasantry as revolutionary, a vanguard force, the theory was far removed from the realities of our age, while in its over-estimation of the role of the State Plan, Trotskyism turned out to be nothing but the loyal opposition to Communist rule-- that is, where it was permitted to exist at all.

We presently wish to take up the positive features of that theory as it was first born in Russia, 1903-06, and as it gave Trotskyism the only base it has in the underdeveloped economies, whether that be Ceylon, Indonesia, or Viet Nam. That positive element is twofold: (1) the element of genius -- its anticipation of future development --relates to its thesis that the Russia of 1903-05 need not await full industrialization to have its revolution; that it could be the first to have a proletarian revolution since it does have a cohesive, though small proletariat, to lead the vast mass of peasants. Victory could therefore be assured it, provided (2)it was part of a world revolution.

These two elements fired the imagination of the colonial masses in our era and won the Trotskyists members, especially during the periods when the Communists were in one of their right-wing zigzags of being for "all four classes," or of slavishly following the Russian foreign policy at a moment when the national revolution in any one country demanded a totally different policy. Thus in 1936 during the Blum regime in France which gave IndoChina some political freedoms, while the Stalinist "anti-fascist" policy within the colonies made it unite with the middle-class, the Trotskyists won a Saigon municipal election which put the Communists in the shade. Even during World War II when all political freedoms were once again removed, the Trotskyist participation in the resistance to the Japanese occupation kept it stronger than the CP. When, however, at the end of the war the Trotskyists became part of the Vietminh and a provisional government, with Ho Chi Minh as president, was established, the duality in the theory of the permanent revolution aided the Communists in gaining power. The Communists do not take chances with anyone who questions their monolithism. Whether it was the great figure of Leon Trotsky himself whom Stalin made sure to murder during World War II, or the Trotskyist leader in Viet Nam, Ta Thu thau, whom the Communists assassinated as World War II

*See Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions, pp20-22, and the article, "Leon Trotsky As A Theoretician"

2 9 6 6

-3-

ended, the Communists made sure that no polarizing independent Marxist force remained alive for long.

When I was in Paris in 1947 and met some Vietnamese Trotskyists, they saw the role of class-compromise the Communists were practicing then, but failed to see the vanguard potential of the Vietnamese peasants. They did not fight for that question to be put as a separate point on the agenda of the Fourth International because they themselves could not see victory through total reliance on those revolutionary peasants. At the same time France betrayed Ho Chi Minh by only promising to negotiate for an independent Viet Nam. By then civil war was inevitable, and once again the Trotskyists, to the extent they existed there, became just an appendage to the Communist movement.

Viet Nam was divided in two by the Geneva Agreement of the "Big Four" plus China in 1954. Though by 1950 Peking had recognized the "Democratic Republic of Vietnam," headed by Ho Chi Minh, and though Ho Chi Minh had been a leader of the resistance, the Vietnamese masses did not accept him in 1954 when the civil war ended and they fled South by the thousands, tens of thousands, until they had numbered nearly a million. Only in part was this due to the fact that Ngo Dinh Diem had resisted French overlordship and its puppet Bao Dai for, by comparison, Ho Chi Minh was still an outstanding revolutionary. What, then, made the peasants run? They were, quite obviously, the first to smell that the state capitalist bureaucratic administrators were no different from the old conquerors. Therefore they ran in the opposite direction -- but no one was there to listen, much less to build on what these refugees felt and thought.

The nearly million refugees were, at most, attended insofar as their immediate needs of shelter and food were concerned. They were then made part of the villages whose ancient village democracy was destroyed and nothing replaced the village council, but the old oppressive landlord class as the new administrators. No wonder that when Ho Chi Minh's guerrillas, once they bided their time and in North Viet Nam made some agrarian changes, could return this time, not as administrators, but as opposed to the semi-feudal administration.

In 1958, before the rightist coup in Laos I had written to a friend specializing in the study of Southeast Asia about the moment in history when the Communist tide had been stopped -- and not by arms: "What is this totally new phenomenon? You seem to think that in part we had under-estimated Ngo Dinh Diem... But, to me, at most he would be a reflection of something very great and new in the objective movement and the subjective aspirations of the people.

Could the refugees from Communism tell? Could living with Vietnamese at this point of history reveal the new and dramatic that may be so vital to the whole 20th Century struggle for the mind of man? All I know is that what is abstract in Hegel in the Absolute Idea, like 'Self-determination in which alone the Idea is in to hear itself speak,' was made concrete in Lenin's time by the speech of the Irish Revolution which Lenin

immediately embraced as not just 'ordinary principle of self-determination of nations' but as the 'bacilli of socialist revolution.' Can we try to be that daring and bold in the philosophic approach needed in our day?"

"To me of course it is significant that in his Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic, Marx points... to the type of Noble Consciousness... as one of the great areas which point the way to a critique of the world far beyond that of Hegel. In any case, if you will allow me to roam freely, I'll name Mao Tse-Tung as 'The noble type of consciousness then finds itself in the judgement related to state-power.... This type of mind is the heroism of Service; the virtue which sacrifices individual being to the universal, and thereby brings this into existence; this type of personality which of itself renounces possession and enjoyment, acts for the sake of the prevailing power, and in this way becomes a concrete reality.' (pp. 526-7) But owing to the alienation implied in sacrifice this 'noble type of consciousness' soon becomes 'The haughty vassal... active in the interests of state power.'

"In a word, the 'Good' (Power of the State) and the 'Bad' (Resources or Wealth) go through what Hegel calls a 'thoroughgoing discordance' (p. 595) which applies equally to the state capitalists in power and those only in mentality as, say, a Djilas 'this type of consciousness is bound up with this condition of utter disintegration, the distinction constituting its spiritual nature -- that of being nobility and opposed to baseness -- falls away and both aspects are the same.... in place of revolt appears arrogance.' (pp. 598-9)"

The rightist coup in Laos in 1958 was followed by the Leftist Pathet Lao coup in 1960. Supposedly peace and "neutrality" has now been established -- only to have the Kennedy Administration announce that the U. S. "would not permit Laos to be used as a Communist military base against South Viet Nam." (N.Y. Times, October 8, 1961) As I stated above, it is not "the foreigner", the outside that makes the downfall of South Viet Nam imminent -- it is the internal, the rejection by the masses of the corrupt Mandarin nepotism of South Viet Nam. Just as it was important to show the positive in the theory of permanent revolution to explain the mass base in the few places Trotskyism has one in the underdeveloped countries, so it now becomes imperative to clarify the distinction between U.S. monopoly capitalism with state overtones and Russian state-capitalism with "socialist" overtones. Both are out for single world domination, it is true. Both are part of the world stage of capitalist development -- state capitalism -- it is equally true.

NEVERTHELESS, THE RUSSIAN (AND CHINESE) VARIETY WISH TO REMAKE THE WORLD IN THEIR OWN IMAGE AND THEREFORE OPEN UP FOR THE INTELLIGENTSIA THE VISTA OF BEING THE NEW RULING CLASS WHILE THE AMERICAN PRIVATE CAPITALISTS ARE LAZY ENOUGH TO WANT TO DOMINATE BY PURE IDENTIFICATION WITH THE OLD RULING CLASS AND THUS OPEN NO VISTA TO ANY SECTION OF THE POPULATION THAT WOULD GAIN FROM THE OVERTHROW OF THE STATUS QUO.

It is this which makes Kennedy resort back to the mailed fist, the old Eisenhower-Dulles policy variant of it; whether it is West Germany and

the re-establishment of the Krupps that gave birth to Nazism, or it South Viet Nam and the re-establishment of the rule of the mandarins. In this way the young bright intellectuals around Kennedy expose their total bankruptcy. In less than a year of rule we face the possible commitment of US troops in Southeast Asia. But the American people are not about to consent to another Korea, nor to another brainwashing, whether it comes from the full state-capitalists, or those only on the road to state-capitalism. What we as a group need to do while this still is in the discussion stage, and the State Department is still busy denying it means actual combat duty, is to show that no event, no matter how minute, can be analysed, or acted upon, except as a totality of philosophic, economic, political and organizational outlook such as Marxist-Humanism is. No other pretender to Marxism can compete with us here, and yet our analyses are used in a manner that makes them into "educationals" rather than into an education--an education that should add a dimension to "others" as well as to ourselves.

—Raya

P.S. Incidentally insofar as this political letter is concerned, but most crucial for future development, note this: 1947 was also the year I met the African from the French Camerouns who had spoken of how the population to a man, without any vanguard party "to lead it", had turned out to take destiny into its own hands--only to have the French warships return to re-establish their rule, and the Parisian "vanguard" tell him he must return and first organize the Camerounians into trades unions, then political parties, etc.etc. Here too no Trotskyist could be made to see "the new subject" that appeared on the world scene. This was two years before Mao won power in China, and longer still before the Trotskyists, now that "a vanguard party was there to lead the peasantry" to admit the peasants were a revolutionary force and China nothing short of "a workers' state." Both in thought and in organization, they failed to recognize the Vietnamese masses as creators of a new point of departure in theory capable of meeting the challenges of state-capitalism. Trotskyism recognized neither the existence of state capitalism, nor the torrent of elemental human energy ready to "skip" capitalist stages, including that of total state control. How could they discern reality when the concept of peasant backwardness is integral to the theory of the permanent revolution which governs them?

During that same year of 1947 I was also fighting with some in the state-capitalist tendency on the question of Palestine which they were anxious to designate as the point of world revolution. My contention had been that, as long as the Jewish workers were not extending the hand of a fraternal relationship with the Arab masses, the creation of an independent Palestine would create a situation where the Arabs would be put in a position that the Negroes are placed in in the United States, thus making it inevitable that Palestine "socialism" would be transformed into state-capitalism. As we now know, the Arab refugee problem later became the Achilles heel of that type of "socialism."

--R.D.

Labor donated.

October 16, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

MARXIST-HUMANISM VS. COMMUNISM

Dear Friends:

This week's convocation of the Russian Communist Party Congress makes imperative a restatement of our opposition to the conspiracy on both sides of the Iron Curtain to force an identity between those two opposites: Marxist-Humanism a theory of liberation, and Communism, the practice of enslavement. We have already written three letters on the Critique of the 22nd RCP Congress's Draft Program (Bulletin No. 3 Aug. 1961), and this will be followed up by a critique of the Congress itself when it adjourns at the end of the month. Presently, however, a forthcoming British edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM has given me an opportunity for a new introduction, which is reproduced below, as it tries to give in a very abbreviated form what MARXISM AND FREEDOM deals with comprehensively.

Two further reasons govern the present publication. One is to see that the geographic point of departure is neither limited by our own country, nor by any country with which the live Karl Marx had actual contact, for Marxist-Humanism is more cogent for our world than it ever was for Marx's time. The second, and primary, reason is to create the theoretic basis in Great Britain for discussion both of MARXISM AND FREEDOM and the development of the British page in NEWS & LETTERS. Both here and in Great Britain the discussion must, of course, include Harry McShane's special Preface which was mimeographed in Bulletin No. 3. Both Harry's Preface and my Introduction will be expanded somewhat by the time of actual publication.

Together with the original introduction to the American edition, this will quickly disclose, in concrete terms, what is meant by the expression: "Marxist-Humanism is not a theory enclosed in books. It is in the daily lives and aspirations of the workmen." Whether our point of departure is the relationship of Karl Marx to the Abolitionists in the United States at the period of the Civil War, or his relationship to the British workers during the struggle for the shorter workingday at the time of the Workmen's International Association, it is obvious that all the workingclass struggles within national boundaries were so many different forms of the world struggle for a new social order and therefore became "part of the stuff" of his philosophy — the new Humanism which not only opposed all class rule, but any stopping-point short of the unity of mental and manual labor within the "all-rounded" individual.

— Raya

7 19 7 0

INTRODUCTION TO THE BRITISH EDITION

I welcome this opportunity to greet the country which was Karl Marx's second home, particularly since it permits me to point to the deep Hegelian roots which are beclouded by the intellectual empiricists.

Despite the well-known facts of Marx's activity -- from the Chartists to the Workingmen's International Association -- in the workers' movement in England, there is a popular misconception that the only British institution Marx appreciated was the British Museum, where he worked on CAPITAL. The truth is that before he ever came to England he wrote enthusiastically about the Levellers as the predecessors of the modern proletariat and its philosophic conceptions. "We find the first appearance of a really functioning communist party in the bourgeois revolution at the moment when monarchy is removed," he wrote in The Moralising Criticism and Critical Morality. "The most consistent republicans -- in England, the Levellers; in France, Babeuf, Buonarroti etc. -- are the first who proclaimed these 'social questions'."

The one fact everyone recognizes in Marx's development is that there would have been no Marxian theory of surplus value without the theory of value of Adam Smith and David Ricardo. Marx himself said that the theory of surplus value was implicit in the works of Smith and Ricardo. He stressed the debt Hegelian philosophy owes to classical political economy. "Hegel," he wrote in Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic, "stands on the basis of modern political economy...regards labor as the essence....Hegel's Logic is the money of the spirit, the abstract expression of the speculative value of the thoughts of man and nature."

It has always seemed to me that the Anglo-Saxon pragmatists have overshadowed the no less characteristic dialectic trend, especially in Scotland. Marx, for one, never forgot his debt to Adam Ferguson's Essay on the History of Civil Society, 1767. It is often quoted in CAPITAL as a seminal work on the philosophy of history, even as Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations is praised in its totality as well as for the fact that it created as great a revolution in economic thought as the Industrial Revolution had in economic life. If contemporary economists, on the other hand, speak of Wealth of Nations as being more of a philosophic than a strictly economic work, this is said in disparaging terms. They tear asunder the unity of philosophy, history, and economics in order to keep each discipline isolated in its separate oppositeness.

It was the empirical British who revived Hegel's philosophy long after its death in his native Germany. We remain indebted to the translations of Hegel's major works, and valuable commentaries by Wallace, Johnston, and Haldane among others. Some of the finest modern editions come from St. Andrews University. While wholly within a religious framework, these recognize Marx's relationship to Hegel. Thus, Richard Kroner, in his introduction to Hegel's Early Theological Writings, refers to the "Lordship and Bondage" section in the Phenomenology of Mind, as follows:

"Perhaps the young Marx, reading this, found the germ of his future program. In any case, foreshadowed in the words ('mind of his own') is the pattern of the labor movement which was to make the proletarian conscious of his existence and to grant him the knowledge of

having a mind of his own."

In contrast to such penetrating analyses, the so-called Marxist materialist on the British scene has hardly varied from the Moscow line. This is not the fault of British empiricism — no one was more empirical than Karl Marx in his study of British capitalism. In contrast to the dialectical method of Marx's Humanism, the Communist intellectual cannot free himself of the grand illusion that Russia is "a new society, socialism."

I wish here to comment on the developments in Russia since the publication, in 1958, of the American edition of Marxism and Freedom. Ever since Sputnik No. 1 rocketed to outer space, a new legend has been invented by the Russian bureaucracy. "It is only logical," says the October, 1961, Draft Program of the Russian Communist Party, "that the country of victorious socialism should have...blazed a trail into outer space." This is not without its effect on the Western intellectual.

Just as the American bourgeois theoreticians, ever since Automation, have been writing of "Man Viewed as Machine," so the Russian theoreticians have been writing of science as ever greater machines, ever more perfect machines, automation machines for production, scientific machines for probing outer space and for shooting at targets "any place on earth." Science is the one word that keynotes the whole of Khrushchev's new program. It's a thoroughly anti-Marxist concept of science. Marx, indeed, had foreseen the impasse of modern science. "To have one basis for life," he wrote, "and another for science is a priori a lie."

I have been told that my analysis of Russia as state-capitalist has failed to take into consideration the "fundamental changes" Khrushchev introduced with his "deStalinization," especially the "abolition" of the forced labor camps. I will not dwell on the fact that those who today speak of the "abolition" of forced labor camps, yesterday denied their very existence. To the extent that there has been any elimination of the forced labor camps, state-capitalism has not thereby been transformed into a new social order. As I wrote in the introduction to the American edition of this work:

"Marxism is a theory of liberation or it is nothing. Whereas Marx was concerned with the freedom of humanity, and with the inevitable waste of human life which is the absolute general law of capitalist development, Russian Communism rests on the mainspring of capitalism — paying the worker the minimum and extracting from him the maximum. They dub this 'the Plan' Marx called it the law of value and surplus value. He predicted that its unhindered development would lead to the concentration of capital 'in the hands of a single capitalist or a single capitalist corporation.'

"Today, in the face of the constant struggle of man for full freedom on both sides of the Iron Curtain, there is a veritable conspiracy to identify Marxism, a theory of liberation, with its opposite, Communism, the theory and practice of enslavement. This book aims to re-establish Marxism in its original form, which Marx called 'a thoroughgoing Naturalism, or Humanism.'"

Where Marx wrote, "We should especially avoid re-establishing society,

as an abstraction, opposed to the individual; the individual is the social entity," the Russians now write of society as an ever mightier state. In place of the development of humanity, we get "scientifically formulated programs," which "the Party has carried out." As under American capitalism, the workers all the while must work to achieve the State Plans.

As the 1961 program states: "...it is necessary to raise the productivity of labor in industry by more than 100 per cent within ten years, and by 300 to 350 per cent within 20 years.... Technical progress and better production organization must be fully utilized to increase labor productivity and reduce production costs at every enterprise. This implies a higher rate of increase in labor productivity as compared with remuneration, better rate-fixing, prevention of loss of working time, and operation on a profitable basis at all stages of production... (and in) the second decade every family, including newlyweds, will have a comfortable flat conforming to the requirements of hygiene and cultured living."

It is no wonder that Marx rejected "vulgar Communism." One hundred and twenty years before the totalitarian Communism of our day, he wrote, "Communism is not the goal of human development, the form of human society."

No theoretician, today more than ever before, can write out of his own head. Theory requires a constant shaping and reshaping of ideas on the basis of what the workers themselves are doing and thinking. The research for this book, for example, on the transformation of Russia from a workers' state into its opposite, a state-capitalist society, began at the outbreak of World War II. Scholars, both those who did and those who did not agree with my conclusions, took part. In its beginning, this work was a Marxist analysis of state-capitalism. But it did not take its present form of Marxism and Freedom until 1950-53, the period of the American workers' resistance to the introduction of Automation, and the East German and Vorkuta Revolts.

Because we live in an age of absolutes -- the threshold of absolute freedom out of the struggle against absolute tyranny -- the compelling need for a new unity of theory and practice dictated a new method of writing. At least it dictated the method by which this book was written. A tour was undertaken to present orally the ideas of the book to groups of American auto workers, miners, steelworkers, and student youth. In their own words, and out of their own lives they contributed a new understanding.

After these discussions, the first draft of the book was written. The manuscript was then submitted to some of these groups for study and, over a period of three months, their discussions were taped. Again, the author studied the discussions carefully, revised the first draft, and undertook a second tour for extensive personal discussions, some of which are reproduced in the text. Only after these extensive discussions was the book in its present form finally written.

I regretfully cannot claim such extensive relationship in Great Britain. I fear that, during my last trip in 1959, my lectures before

2 9 7 3

-4-

the Departments of Philosophy at the Universities of Leeds and Manchester -- as well as before individual trades unions -- have been more instructive to me than them. Nevertheless, the global struggle for the minds of men makes the challenge to thought imperative, particularly since the world stands on the brink of nuclear destruction.

Times of crisis are also times of great vision. Throughout history the forces that have produced great social revolutions have also generated great philosophical revolutions. This is true whether we reach back to Great Britain's "Glorious Revolution" of the 17th century; the Great French Revolution at the end of the 18th century; the Civil War in the United States in the mid-19th century; the 1917 Russian Revolution -- or whether we limit ourselves to the past few years, 1956-61, and consider the Hungarian Revolution against Russian totalitarianism, and the African Revolutions against Western imperialism.* From the Levellers to the sans coulottes; from the run-away Negro slaves to the St. Petersburg proletariat; from the Hungarian Workers' Councils to the African Freedom Fighters, two features have been characteristic: 1) A new "subject" -- to use a Hegelian expression -- was born to transform the objective pull of history to reason and freedom into the reality of the day. 2) A new unity of theory and practice was forged.

The paradox in the history of thought is that the idealist, G.W.F. Hegel, held that great philosophies were born as civilizations perished. On the other hand, the materialist, Lenin, considered philosophy the prerequisite for an emerging revolution. So seriously did the latter take his maxim, "Without revolutionary theory, there can be no successful revolution," that in the dark days of July when his life was in danger and he went into hiding, he told his co-leader Kamenev: If they "bump me off" be sure to find the manuscript ("State and Revolution") I left in Switzerland and publish it.

When the fate of humanity, not only rhetorically but literally, is within orbit of an ICBM, a compulsion to thought arises which creates a new unity of theory and practice. This historic link between thought and deed, as it is embedded in British soil, Marx discerned in the British workers' struggles for the shorter working day. As he put it: "In place of the pompous catalogue of the 'inalienable rights of man' comes the modest Magna Charta of a legally limited working day which shall make clear when the time which the worker sells is ended, and when his own begins. Quantum mutatus ab illo.... Beyond it begins that development of human power which is its own end, the true realm of freedom, which, however, can flourish only upon the realm of necessity as its basis. The shortening of the working day is its fundamental premise."

Marx foresaw the impasse of modern science not because he was a prophet, but because he had made the human being the subject of all development and saw that there was no answer to: can mankind be free in an age when machine is master of man, not man of machine. There still is no other answer. It is from this ground that we face the birth-time of history today.

October, 1961
Detroit, Michigan

-- Raya Dunayevskaya

* I have dealt with this question in my "Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions." In May, 1961, The Left Group, Cambridge University Labour Club issued a British edition.

NOTE

I was the first to publish and translate the Economic-Philosophic Essays, 1844 into English. I have nevertheless eliminated them from the present edition because since then an English translation was published in Moscow and is easily available to the British reader. On the other hand, I have retained Appendix B which contains the first English translation of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks because to this day they are unavailable in English in any other edition.

To conserve space, however, I have cut out the following chapters, the content of which seemed to me to be better known in Great Britain than in the United States: Chapter 2 which dealt with classical political economy; Chapter 4, which analyzed the role of Ferdinand Lassalle; and Chapter 9, Organizational Interlude, on the Second International.

(labor donated)

2 19 7 5
NEWS & LETTERS - 8751 Grand River - Detroit 4, Michigan - TYler 8-7053

Price 20¢

October 23, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

THE NEW STAGE IN AMERICAN LABOR STRUGGLES

Dear Friends:

This coming Friday night, Oct. 27, is the tentative deadline Reuther has set to decide on whether or not he will authorize a strike against Chrysler Corporation. Whether or not that decision will be left entirely to Reuther is another question.

A Chrysler worker told me yesterday, "Everyone in the plant is saying Reuther sold out the workers in GM and Ford, and now seems to be trying to evade a conflict with Chrysler. But every worker wants a strike. We have been looking forward to it to show our resentment and our solidarity. We want to write our own picket signs to show everybody how we really feel about things. It will mean more to us to win by striking -- even if we don't get more than Reuther might get without a strike."

I am not predicting that there will be a strike, which is by no means to be excluded. What I am saying is that whatever course negotiations take in the next few days, one fact is unmistakably clear: with the auto negotiations in general, and the Chrysler negotiations in particular, American labor struggles have entered upon a new stage. It isn't only that Chrysler is the weakest of auto's "big three," and shows the crisis in production most sharply. It is also that a quirk of history -- which knows no accidents -- has put a special stamp on the Chrysler crisis that serves to emphasize, and bring full circle, the last decade of workers' struggle.

Chrysler's new chairman of the board is George H. Love who is also the head of the Consolidation Coal Co. which, in 1949-50 first forced automation on the American workers in the form of the continuous miner. The miners fought back with their great 9-months strike that was the first of the workers' battles against automation in which the question of a "normal working day" was raised fundamentally in terms of human working conditions. The striking miners asked: What kind of labor shall man perform? From Consol to Chrysler -- from coal to steel to auto -- wherever they have suffered the ravages of automation, during this decade of struggle, the workers have raised the same question of conditions of labor. Now even the most dense must recognize it.

If I may digress for a moment: The September issue of "The Wage Earner Newspaper," published monthly under the auspices of the Detroit Catholic Labor Conference, hailed the American Motors contract as a great new breakthrough in labor contracts. In general, they parallel Reuther's line. Despite the countless sermons, referring both to the Old Testament and to the Temptation of Christ, on the text that "man doth not live by bread only...", it wasn't until the massive GM and Ford strikes on local working conditions that "The Wage Earner," this month, finally carried the headline: Workers Go to the Pennies! Fiery at Working Conditions.

For years, the practical politicians, the bread-and-butter union bureaucrats, and the old radicals as well, dismissed the workers' struggles as being aimed only at wages, or what they contemptuously called "the full belly."

2975

Today, even Reuther has to admit it's not wages but conditions of labor. Because the GM and Ford strikes erupted after national economic agreements were reached, Reuther and Chrysler agreed, as "Automotive News" put it, "to reverse the method used in the Ford and GM final contract talks in an effort to avoid plant strikes over noneconomic and local factory problems."

There is, however, a world of difference between such a gentlemen's agreement and the reality of this new stage of the workers' struggle. It is again necessary to return to our fundamentals. A century ago, in his magnificent analysis of "The Working Day," Karl Marx revealed the wanton brutality with which capitalism buries the worker's life down to as much as a third of his natural life-span. Even unto the "small thefts snatched from the workers by encroaching upon the times professedly allowed for rest and refreshment."

He showed how overwork and unemployment go hand-in-hand: "Crises during which production is interrupted and the factories work 'short time,' i.e., for only a part of the week, naturally do not affect the tendency to extend the working day...The less time spent in work, the more of that time has to be turned into surplus labour-time."

His conclusion: "The creation of a normal working day is, therefore, the product of a protracted civil war, more or less dissembled, between the capitalist class and the working class."

Yesterday's theory in the experience and the practice of the worker today.

A Chrysler worker told me, the other day, "When Reuther talks about 'readjusting production,' he doesn't mean any gains for us. He only means he's going to try to get the company to agree to stop at the present man-killing pace and not raise production any higher. I have been talking to GM and Ford workers," he said, "and they tell me they haven't got a thing to look forward to under the new contract because the company has not retreated one bit. The only thing they gained is the fact that they went on strike. There will have to be a complete change in the shop," he added, "before things can be improved."

Another Chrysler worker said that they call the place he works "The Bar-B-Q Pit." He is being barbecued. His is the flesh that is on the spit. "You can protect yourself from your own flash," he said, "but we weld so fast, and so close together, you can't protect yourself from the flash of the man next to you. Everyone is burned and baked from his waist up," he said, showing me the burns which cover his face, arms and hands. He works in one of Chrysler's newer plants near suburban Detroit.

"There's another job there," he went on, "we call 'The Monster.' We get 'loaned' to the Monster because it's so rough the company can't, and doesn't expect to, keep workers on the job as regulars. So they go around to other departments borrowing men to feed the Monster."

If Reuther acknowledges that this is what Marx called "a protracted civil war," he cannot dissemble the fact that though he sits opposite management at the negotiating table, his sharpest pressure is directed against his own ranks. While tensions were mounting at Chrysler, Reuther's pet contract with American Motors — which had been signed, sealed, and delivered — was

Weekly Letter, 10/23/61

- 3 -

repudiated by the Kenosha rank and file, by far the largest local in AMC. Just as he had discovered, during the GM strike, that his 24-man Executive Board constitutes a majority, no matter how the vote goes against him, so he used them again to declare that the Kenosha majority was actually a minority. Thus, he ordered another "ratification vote" while trying to brainwash them.

A young woman worker from that plant was asked why she was willing to give up profit sharing. She said: Why should my wage depend on Romney's profit? She also asked: "Why should they give up 5 minutes of relief time for that? To you it seems like only 5 minutes, but do you know how long the older workers fought to get that 5 minutes? Why give that up?"

At a meeting, the other night, a steelworker reported: "I made it my business, last week, to question guys in different departments about the attitude of foremen since that Gary steelworker shot those supervisors. They all tell me the pressure's off! Foremen are even enforcing safety in some departments. You don't have to remind them about safety, they come running to tell you."

To which a young woman in the electrical industry said, "I'm sorry a worker had to commit murder and get himself killed before there's any improvement in conditions, and that only for a very short time. Besides, they have completely forgotten about the unemployed. The critical point used to be 3 million, then that became the 'normal.' Now, 5 million has become 'normal.' Yet at the same time they're overworking the employed to death. I've never seen or heard of so many workers getting sick, wracked with pain and ailments, while so many others are out of work."

The steelworker replied: "The rolling mill is becoming like that now. They'll work a man as long and hard as they can, then they send him home — and you have to wait till they call you again. People have to sit by the telephone and wait to be called for a few hours work. One guy didn't work more than 36 hours in 6 days."

A Chrysler worker concluded: "I feel we're much closer to total outbreak than ever before — to change things completely so that we can work as human beings, and be recognized as human beings, and have the say-so on how we live and work."

The theory of yesterday is indeed the practice of the workers today. The Humanism of Marx is in the daily lives and aspirations of the workers. This is the new stage in American labor struggles that the auto strikes have brought into sharpest focus yet. This, despite, or perhaps because of, the fact that Chrysler now employs only 50,000 UAW members where a few years ago there were 135,000; that the industry as a whole now numbers only 500,000 auto workers where a million worked a few years ago.

— RAYA

(labor donated)

2977

October 30, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

THE SINO-SOVIET RIFT, OR STATE-CAPITALIST POWER POLITICS

Dear Friends:

Like De Gaulle's search for "France's grandeur" in the face of the hard fact of world politics that the U.S. is the "leader of the West," Mao's search for world power, despite Russia's acknowledged "leadership of the East," is grounded in the strategic importance the particular country has in the world complex. With Kennedy's re-establishment of Germany as the capitalistic key to the European, and thence to world power, De Gaulle achieved a partial victory. Mao's failure to achieve a similar position at the other pole of world capital has just been thunderously, even though indirectly announced by Khrushchev via his attack on Albania at the 22nd Russian Communist Party Congress.

Ever since the Korean War, Mao has aimed for equal partnership with Russia as co-leader of the "Communist" world, in charge of the Orient, only to have the post-Stalinists conclude an agreement with the U.S. to end the war in 1953, without much regard to China, although it was its "volunteers" that brought about the world-important military stalemate. Mao, who has for decades now followed a road different from that laid out by Russia (whether laid out by Stalin* or Khrushchev), saw his next big chance for world influence at the Bandung Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in 1955 at which Russia as a European country was automatically excluded.

It goes without saying that, just as Egypt's Nasser cannot quite pass as a black African, the Khrushchev-Bulgarian "goodwill tour" in the East could not really entitle them to "membership" in this suddenly discovered new, third world.

By 1959 Mao reached over into Cuba on the ground that he really has a special experience applicable to all underdeveloped economies. Finally, as if to prove there were no limits to his competition with

* Of all the stupidities the capitalist press is writing, nothing is quite so far afield as the picture of Mao as a "dogmatic Stalinist." Neither theoretically, politically or practically have those two state-capitalist tyrants been seen alike. Stalin was already uncontested leader in Russia during the Chinese Revolution, 1925-1927, when Mao began his original contribution. Though his 1927 Report on the Peasant Movement in Hunan was presented, not as theory, but as a factual statement, in the vastness of China, especially when on the run from Chiang Kai Shek's terror, Mao could and did follow his own bent. World War II may have given the impression that Mao returned to the Stalin line in making a coalition with Chiang against Japan, but in fact, he kept himself apart and openly disobeyed Stalin at the end of the war when Stalin ordered him to enter Chiang's government. He won despite the fact that he got no help from Russia, and he did not mourn Stalin's death in 1953.

Khrushchev, he reached right into the uncontested Russian sphere of influence and took the side of Albania. That was the straw that broke the camel's back and ever since Khrushchev had been planning the present attack. This is not the end, but just the beginning. Where in the Weekly Letter of May 17, we stressed the unity above the rift, we must now show the rift above the unity. But to do so it is necessary to remove the smokescreen that both Khrushchev and Mao have set up to the effect that this rift has to do with Albania and "Marxism". In truth, it is a case of the purest power politics, between China and Russia as to who will lead the world in the contest with the U.S. (Albania has become the test case, not because it is more or less Stalinist, but because it lost part of its territory during World War II to Yugoslavia. Because of Yugoslavia's expulsion from the Cominform, Hoxha has felt that Russia should help him in getting back this territory. When, in 1959, Khrushchev made it quite clear that he was not for such adventures though Yugoslavia be "revisionist," the matter would have ended -- except that China decided to get into the act and took Albania under its wing, not to speak about being in the forefront all over Eastern Europe as the biggest fighter against its "revisionism", whether it stems from Yugoslavia or Hungary.)

The timing for the new stage of the rift between China and Russia has been chosen by Khrushchev, to be triggered by the monster bomb and the Draft Program's promise of "communism" in 1980. Set off against the Chinese "communes" which have only succeeded in bringing famine conditions back to the mainland, Khrushchev must have thought he would compel, if not compliance, surely isolation. Chou's departure from the conference compels a second look at the underlying causes as they unfolded, on the one hand, when the Hungarian Revolution was crushed and the "Hundred Flowers" campaign collapsed; and, on the other hand, at Russia's launching of the Sputnik and China's "Great Leap" in 1958.

The new page of freedom opened by the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 came as a challenge to Russia's totalitarian rule. So little was Mao concerned with either the Hungarian proletariat or the challenge to Russia that no immediate response was forthcoming from China. (Indeed, some who make a practice of blinding themselves to class forces were under the illusion that, because China's "socialism" was "different" from Russia, Mao would aid the Hungarian Freedom Fighters.)

What shook Mao and made him out-Khrushchev Khrushchev was the deep opposition to his own rule revealed through the little bit of freedom he had unfolded in China with his slogan to "Let 100 flowers bloom; let 100 schools of thought contend." While Mao crushed the internal opposition he sent Chou to East Europe in full support of the crushing of the Hungarian Revolution. Whether Chinese Communism thereupon thought it had become indispensable to Khrushchev or whether Mao at once saw that ideological opportunities do not depend on the degree of industrialization it is impossible for us to say. But for those two tyrants 1957 was the "good year." Khrushchev got rid of the "anti-Party" group, and Mao was ecstatic about the exceptional harvest in his country.

By the end of the year, however, Russia, by launching its Sputnik, became the first not only in the Communist world but in the world period. Mao was a man in a hurry, wanting to skip stages fast, and the unusual harvest made him a bit "dizzy from success" -- dizzy enough to launch his

2 0 8

-3-

"Great Leap Forward" the following year. 1958 then becomes the critical year of the Sino-Soviet rift with Khrushchev lecturing Mao on the impossibility of "skipping the stage of socialism and going directly to communism" and Mao shouting so loudly that the whole, new third world of emergent Africa hears, that indeed it can be done, and his way is applicable to the whole world of underdeveloped countries stretching from Cuba to the Congo.

The competition between Russia and China over influence in this new, third world was on full blast now within the Communist orbit, but denied to the outside world. Khrushchev's UN performance in 1960 was a solo since China is not a member, but Khrushchev meant to make this a solo also in the Communist orbit. Hence the meeting of the 81 CPs in Moscow in December 1960. (See Two Worlds column on that Manifesto, E&L, 1/61) By the time the Draft Program for Russia's 22nd Congress was published, and China rated only 11 words out of 50,000, it should have been obvious even to a Communist apologist like Isaac Deutscher that Khrushchev wasn't "sharing" power with Mao. But, while it was obvious enough to Mao, Chou did not expect that, without foreknowledge, Khrushchev would make this obvious to the whole world by an open attack on Albania. He said his piece and walked out of the congress.

The thousands upon thousands upon thousands of words that will gush forth from the Communist orbit on "theory" and from the wishful thinkers of the private capitalist world on who is "hard" and who is "soft" so that they can choose partners with whom to "peacefully co-exist" will do nothing to illuminate the real class contradictions which have brought the state-capitalist world to the same "stage of development" as the private capitalist world and its power struggles. Unified or divided capitalists everywhere have the same aim and the same method: to rule the world through exploitation of the workers. Marxist-Humanists have no sides to take -- except to be with the workers.

-Raya

(labor donated)

2980

November 6, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

ON THE AMERICAN NEGRO AND THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

This letter, intended for a new newspaper in Gambia, will limit itself to the relationship of the American Negro and the African Revolution as it was reflected in the past two weeks on two opposite fronts: (1) the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO Conference on Africa held in Boston, and (2) the "Freedom Riders Speak for Themselves" pamphlet coming off the press right now. This narrowing down of view does not, however, mean isolation from world headlines and the particular crossroads of the African Revolution reached in Ghana.

Outside of the fact that 2,000 American teachers and students were so interested in Africa that they were willing to pay their fare from all parts of the United States to listen to the subject, the only redeeming feature of the State Department sponsored conference was that some 50 Africans were here to speak for themselves. The African voice was different from the American, whether the latter was merely a stooge for the State Department or an "independent" talented tenth but so separated from the militant active freedom movement of the American Negro that he could contribute nothing either to the African Revolution or the freedom movement here. The African voice, on the other hand, not only spoke loudly for his own freedom but for the freedom of the American Negro. For example, Nathan Shanyarira, editor-in-chief of African Newspapers in Southern Rhodesia, criticized the State Department sharply for seeing "a communist behind every bush" and forgetting that the headlines of "Little Rocks, Freedom Riders" create the "image of America."

"This (Negro) population is now American in every sense of the word," he went on. "If given full civil rights it provides you with a definite psychological advantage in influencing people in Africa. But if treated in the way some freedom bus riders have been, you should know that every newspaper report of anti-integration incident throws mud in the face of your spokesmen."

Another African, the Nigerian Stephen O. Awokaya, Nigerian chief federal adviser on education, had spoken on the colossal needs of Africa to industrialize, to educate, to bring out its own history as against all the strings that are attached to aid: "Whether we like it or not some of us will dance to the rock 'n' roll from Washington, others to the ideological conga from Moscow. A few will try to dance to both tunes and in the process stay put...We Africans cannot afford the 40 years it took the Soviet Union to reach its present goals...we should move faster."

Alioune Diop, editor of Presence Africaine, spoke of "negritude": "A Negro spirituality would bring something of value into world culture. That is why men of culture feel they must safeguard the Negro culture." He criticized the Negro writers for writing on topics suiting the taste of Westerners, "not their own people. In the future only if they (Western Negro writers) receive the approval of their own people will they survive as writers." All the Africans spoke openly of African socialism and the

and the refusal to be cowed by the "communist bogey."

The one weakness arose on the question of so-called neutrality. There they definitely tried to avoid the reality of the day -- the 50 megaton bomb had just been exploded by Russia -- pretending to believe that nothing has changed in the cold war to compel them to change from flirting with both sides unto a truly independent role by appealing, not to the ruling powers, but to the working people, and especially so the American Negro.

In this respect "the talented tenth" were of no help for the Negro American professors are even more adept at burying their heads in the sand as to the American reality. For example, I asked one well-known sociologist why (1) he was writing pieces as to how poor the Negro is and therefore could not give the African the material aid he needed, when the much greater wealth was the centuries of struggle for freedom right here in America from which the African leaders like Nkrumah and Achebe had indeed learned; (2) why, when the African is discussing Marxism openly and facing, however, the dilemma of the Communist totalitarianism calling itself Marxist, the Negro writer, who in the 1930's openly paraded his Marxism, now pretends he never heard the word; and, above all, (3) why is he not a participant in the youth movement -- the sit-ins, the bus-boycotts, the freedom rides -- at least to the extent of openly aligning himself with it and telling the African "This is our contribution to freedom."

To all this the famous writer had nothing to say except that his generation is "worn out," that "maybe" the Negro youth and now the white participating with him, would be a new stimulus both to the freedom movement here and in Africa, but "my generation, the old ones have nothing to offer." In the face of such bankruptcy, intellectually, no wonder only the African voice was heard loudly to speak for freedom, though the platform was State Department.

The African Revolutions have, however, also entered the crossroads, not only because they are being torn asunder by the two state-capitalist nuclear giants, Russia and the United States, fighting for world domination, but also because of their own administrative mentality.

Take the question of Ghana. What no one said from the platforms, everyone was speaking about in corridors: where is Ghana going with its new arrests, all-out fight against all opposition, including that from its own workers? Everyone thought there was some new deal between Nkrumah and Khrushchev while Nkrumah was in Russia, that "Ghana will become the African Cuba." etc. etc. This certainly cannot be excluded. What, however, is entirely wrong is to think of "deals" and "conspiracies" when you are against something -- and think it is all "ideal Pan-Africanism ridding itself of Western imperialism not only politically but economically" if you are for something. (I should have specified that "everyone" meant the whites, while those who were "for" but likewise didn't face the reality were the Africans.)

Two instances of different attitudes when it comes to the American scene will help us get to the questions raised, but not answered on Ghana. Of all the panels that were "controlled" not only from above but "from below," was the technology, private aid, and labor panel. I met a visitor from Tanganyika outside the panel and before I could say five words to him,

up came his "host," one of the smart boys from Goldberg's Labor Department to see that the Tanganyikan isn't "diverted." Wanting to show how "democratic" and "free" labor was in the United States he spoke of the fact that, though a government employee, he was a member of a union, and pulled out his membership card. The young Tanganyikan asked simply, "Can you strike?"

To have heard this labor bureaucrat hem and haw about how Congress, not private industry, was the employer and therefore... The young Tanganyikan and I smiled at each other, and then the question moved over to discrimination, whereupon he was quickly hurried away by his "host."

Now this question, "Can you strike?" is the critical question in all independent Africa where the Western imperialist has finally been driven out, the great human passions that made possible freedom in such quick time perfectly enthusiastic about "single party unity" to drive out the foreign conqueror, now want to see results -- different conditions of labor.

As the industrialization, limited though it may be, progresses, so does the class struggle. In the case of Ghana it is the transport workers, and not the old opposition that was brainwashed by British imperialism, that now challenge the "one-party" Nkrumah.

"osgyefo"

It is something that Nkrumah will not forgive -- and he will not have jails for these because they are the great Ghanaian, especially Accra, workers who made possible his revolution. Nkrumah has not only forgotten his youth, his revolutionary temper and mass method of winning power, he is constantly moving within a narrower and narrower and narrower conception of "vanguard." Thus, first, it was "the party to lead" -- the Convention People's Party certainly did. Then it was the "vanguard group" within the party. And now it is an elite within this vanguard. (Read his latest book, "I Speak of Freedom.") And he needs this narrow conception because he has no faith either that the great creativity which has made the revolution would construct society if you let management of production and the state in their hands, or that he and his party can convince two generations to give up any struggle for improvements in conditions of labor so that their "grandchildren" can have "the full life."

Under the circumstances, it isn't that Russia is "Marxist" but that it is state-capitalist, planned and monolithic that is the pole of attraction. He feels moreover it is the State Plan plus ideology for he has not forgotten that you cannot win without winning the struggle for the minds of men. The administrative mentality of "osgyefo" is not Russian, but African -- and that is the crossroads the African revolution has reached.

"osgyefo"

It becomes imperative therefore to speak of the only relationship that can save the African revolution. The relationship of the African revolutionary with the worker in the technologically advanced country cannot, however, just be "a thesis." It must show a movement of its own -- and when it is shown, not in books, but in everyday life, and in every type of freedom struggle -- then and only then will a third road be seen, away from "West" and "East" as poles of capital.

No publication we have ever engaged in has ever been so totally part of the actual struggle as FREEDOM RIDERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES.

-4-

This is not because it is limited to the Freedom Rides, the jail experiences, the continuing struggle to end segregation. These are exciting enough, and indeed the pamphlet reads like an adventure story that you couldn't possibly put down until you finished it all. (We were so conscious of that contribution that we have nothing between the readers and the authors -- not even a contents page. The readers hear Freedom Rider Mary Hamilton say, "We pulled into the Jackson station, Sunday morning, at 10:15. Everything was deadly still, Police were posted all over..." and you are off to the dramatic encounter of Freedom Riders and state police.)

The cogency of the publication, however, is not exhausted by these exciting experiences. The experience also becomes the thought, self-developing thought which suddenly brings alive as a single unit, the self-determination of people and the self-determination of ideas. Hegel even becomes alive with his "Self-Determination of Idea in which it alone is to hear itself speak" -- and speak it does of the Negro struggle now and of David Walker, 1829; of the Freedom Rides coming after the Sit-ins, Bus Boycotts; of freedom coming in South USA as in South Africa; of civil rights being the name of freedom in America whether it is of white or Negro struggles, against segregation, or against all thought control.

So that when Freedom Rider Louise Inghram ends the story, it is not an end we have reached, but a new beginning: "This is why I think that whether the Freedom Rides continue, or whether the struggle to end segregation and discrimination once and for all takes a different form, the fight for freedom will not stop until we have torn up the old, from root to branch, and established truly new human relations based on new beginnings. I think that the Freedom Rides, and whatever may come after them, are a form of just such new beginnings."

We -- NEWS & LETTERS -- are especially glad of this opportunity to write for a country on its way to freedom -- Cuba will put itself on the map of history both by its courageous freedom fight and its immediate establishment of fraternal relations with the working people, white and Negro, of America. All power to you!

-- Raya Dunayevskaya

(Labor donated)

November 13, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

ISRAEL, BURMA, OUTER MONGOLIA AND THE COLD WAR

Dear Friends:

Today's press carries a brief announcement of Ben Gurion's plan to make his "cherished dreams come true" by going to a Buddhist "meditation center" in Burma in December. Despite the brevity and seeming personal nature of the news item, it is highly significant politically. Moreover it concerns not only the relations between Burma and Israel, but their joint role in the Cold War. It is an attempt to influence the economically underdeveloped world to "neutrality" for "the West" as the non-aligned nations conference in Belgrade proved it to be "neutrally" for "the East."

On Burma's side it is related to two internal and one external development in the post-war struggle of U Nu to keep Burma out of the clutches of the native Communists as well as from an independent socialist path. During the war U Nu was a leader of a broad anti-fascist alliance which united the nation, including the proletariat, in the struggle against Japan. At the end of the war, U Nu lost the support, first, of the small but important Burmese proletariat when he put down a general strike. Then, at the beginning of the Cold War, the Communists embarked on a guerrilla war to try to overthrow the U Nu regime.

U Nu tried to win back the proletariat by aping the methods of Communist ideological warfare. He said he was a Marxist — when it came to material demands, but that Buddhism was necessary "for the soul." He was there "to combine" the two ideologies. All this shilly-shallying led to chaos and corruption. He thereupon stepped down from power, and turned the country over to the military while he went to "meditate." He has recently resumed the premiership of Burma, and concluded a shaky agreement with China on trade and border disputes. He is looking for allies, showing a considerable amount of independence from the pull of the Afro-Asian toward Russia. At the recently held Belgrade Conference he successfully opposed a section of the Resolution (sponsored by Nasser and supported by Ghana, Guinea and Mali) which would have branded Israel as an "outpost of Western imperialism."

On Ben Gurion's part, "the meditation" in a Buddhist temple has many more immediate implications than that which concern his "admiration for Asian thought and letters." Israel was the first country to realize the pivotal importance of the newly emergent independent African countries. It is true that it was acting to break its isolation in the Arab Middle East. But the knowhow of Israel in the technological conquest of the desert and in the kibbutz form of agricultural cooperatives was considered valuable enough by Ghana, Guinea, and later Mali that all accepted aid and even allowed the formation of joint cooperations in their respective countries.

At the same time Ben Gurion is meeting increasing labor opposition to his autocratic state-capitalist rule in Israel. He is moving further and further to the religious right and away from any pretense to socialism. All this at a time when the Communist Party of Israel is making considerable headway among the Arabs in Israel who are fighting for equality both in trade unions and in civil rights. He has won another hold on the premiership, but he must work in a coalition government. He prefers leaning on the right to working with the trade unions.

According to a dispatch from Tel Aviv (Arye Wallenstein in the Chicago Sunday Tribune, 11/12/61), the invitation to visit the Rangoon meditation center was extended to Ben Gurion by U Nu fully six and one-half years ago when Ben Gurion had first stepped down from the premiership and became "a shepherd in the communal village of Sdeh Boker." Obviously Ben Gurion was in no hurry to go to the retreat for Buddhist priests. He chooses now to realize "his cherished dreams" because, far from having time to act the shepherd, he must play for time as Israel's isolation in the Middle East is being extended to Africa. U Nu too prefers 1961, the year of Burma's "peaceful coexistence" with China, when he's challenged from within not only by the Chinese community there but the Burmese Communist Party which gets its orders from Moscow. It is a time of quiet crisis. Kennedy and Khrushchev are eyeing each other as Mao Tse Tung looks down at them and out into the whole of the underdeveloped world from Asia to Latin America, and from the Middle East to Africa.

The conflict between Russia and the U.S. recently eased in one instance -- admitting Outer Mongolia into the UN. The press generally played this up as a move of the African countries to seat Mauritania which has remained unseated since it won its independence because of Russia's refusal to vote for Mauritania unless the UN simultaneously recognized its satellite, Outer Mongolia. Supposedly it was the African bloc that won the U.S. In fact Kennedy's enthusiasm for his moves stemmed from the Sino-Soviet conflict.

While Kennedy is not about to join the press innocents who consider the Sino-Soviet conflict so deep that Russia would suddenly join the United States in the fight against "the Chinese threat," he is shrewd enough a politician to sense that Russia's all-out drive to get Outer Mongolia recognized is by no means exhausted by wanting one extra vote for its side in the UN. On the contrary, the main impulse behind Khrushchev's drive is to have a country it completely dominates to be able to gain entrance to the Asian world from which his white face excludes him.

Ever since the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Bandung in 1955 Russia has resented China's ever-expanding role in the world. In the conflict between China and India, Khrushchev made certain to inform Nehru that he disagreed with Mao's side in the border dispute. In the areas where the conflicts in the Asian world touch the United States, however, as in Laos and Viet Nam, he enters to help the national movements both to oppose his main world challenger, the United States, and to challenge Chinese dominance there. Above all, he wants a chance to influence policy and he knows well enough that state aid is not equal to the seating of Outer Mongolia which will now permit ideological

influence, direct participation in ^{non-}governmental as well as governmental Afro-Asian bodies, with ideological as well as financial weapons. Khrushchev aims to shift the Sino-Soviet conflict from the confines of a single country in Eastern Europe (Albania) to the vast continent of Asia.

Under the circumstances Kennedy almost welcomes the Sino-Soviet conflict. The small countries in Asia, the Middle East, Africa do not. When Khrushchev resumed testing on the eve of the Belgrade conference of non-aligned countries, none there dared to challenge him directly and some, like Yugoslavia and Ghana, very nearly approved the action. But by the time the 50 megaton bomb was unloosed, even these countries criticized Russia's irresponsible action.

This was the beginning for the new attempt for realignment or thinking of a basis for realignment on the part of Israel and Burma. The proposed "meditation" for December has the purpose of working out a new role for both countries in the Afro-Asian-Middle Eastern-Latin American worlds, and thereby also in the decisive world conflict between Russia and the United States. As we see, power politics is not limited to giants. Until the day when the war is to be actually unloosed and all realize that only the working people have the power to stop the fight for world domination, the small powers can play the game of "mediator." In the present case, they must play it at a time when the stage is very crowded indeed with the "non-aligned." To think that they can compete with all others at the very time when the nuclear giants have shown utter disregard for "the neutrals" only shows that even the most down-to-earth politicians can dream in "temples of meditation."

-- Raya

(labor donated)

November 27, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

KHRUSHCHEV'S "DESTALINIZATION" Fact, Myth, Theory

Dear Friends:

ABC's 11 o'clock night newscast on November 23rd presented a "scoop" by its "State Department correspondent." The "analyst," a Mr. John Scali spoke breathlessly about "the coming rehabilitation of Stalin's arch-enemy, Leon Trotsky." This wild conclusion was grafted onto Khrushchev's "deStalinization" because (1) on p. 16 of this week's USSR magazine there appeared a picture of Trotsky alongside of Lenin, (2) and since such things "do not happen, in Russia, by accident," and (3) Natalia Trotsky was in Paris "trying to get a visa to go to Moscow," "therefore..."

No doubt the finding of a picture of Trotsky alongside of Lenin must have taken a great deal of digging in Stalinist Russia. No doubt its appearance in a Russian magazine could not have happened "accidentally," and will probably mean a further downgrading of Stalin's 1917 role. But to add to the matter of a picture of Leon Trotsky, the fact that Natalia Trotsky (whose influence is surely non-existent) volunteered to go to Moscow, and to deduce from these two unrelated facts, that "therefore" Khrushchev will "rehabilitate" Trotsky only testifies to a total bankruptcy of thought.

It would be easy to dismiss Mr. Scali's wild conclusion and attribute it to mere ignorance, but the bankruptcy of thought is not necessarily due to ignorance. Some of the most knowledgeable of the specialists on Russia contribute more substantially to this bankruptcy of thought than those who are so without "background material" on Khrushchev as "a lackey of Stalin" that they take his "deStalinization" at face value. The knowledgeable men may have the facts, surely Trotsky during his lifetime had them but he too failed to grapple with the class nature of Stalinism, that is to say, state - capitalism, so that his voluminous writings on the origins of Stalin, as theirs on Khrushchev, only serve to compound the confusion on the question of Khrushchev's "de-Stalinization."

On the other hand, a serious grounding in the theory of state - capitalism helps illuminate not only basic class conflicts, but conflicts in the Sino-Soviet world. A review of Khrushchev's "de-Stalinization" since its first appearance at the 20th RCP Congress in 1956, 3 years after Stalin's death will take the ground away from under the "news scoop" as well as illuminate the more basic conflicts. But, without a dialectical methodology, this could only lead to a conclusion which is only the opposite side of the coin of Mr. Scali's fantastic conception. In a word, the absurdity of his conclusion on the basis he laid for it -- or for that matter the basis laid by the experts for an opposite conclusion -- can only be eliminated when you see that either conclusion must be approached from an entirely different vantage point. Therefore the whole post - Stalinist period will be viewed against the background of the different conceptions of the nature of Stalinism, not only of proletarian versus bourgeois, but also of Marxist-Humanist versus Trotskyist.

First of all there was a more fundamental move away from Stalinist policy directly after Stalin's death, before Khrushchev's proclamation of "deStalinization" than there has been in the period since. By Stalin's headlong rush to the brink of WWII (the Korean War) at a time Russia had barely recovered from the devastation of WW II, Stalin had become before his death, a millstone around the neck of the bureaucracy he established as the ruling class. He was no sooner dead than all his heirs rushed to scuttle his policies, without, however, in any way shaking the state - capitalist foundation on which they rested. Thus the Korean War was concluded but the new area for maneuverability in the Orient kept. Far from enforcing Stalin's "Economic Problems of Socialism" -- merging the peasant's private allotment adjoining the collective into the collective itself -- Malenkov let the peasants keep what they had, cut the peasant's taxes in half. To stem the agricultural crisis and industrial unrest from overflowing to the lower rungs of the bureaucracy, he embarked upon a new priority for consumer goods. At the same time, however, a short 16 days after Malenkov had assumed both the Premiership and the post of First Secretary of the CP, he suddenly asked "to be relieved" of the latter. Khrushchev stepped into that place. I then wrote: "It is not the death of Stalin that produced the new conflicts in the bureaucracy. It would be far more correct to say that the conflict produced Stalin's death.... Instead of arguing who -- Beria or Malenkov -- will win out, why not look at the little known Khrushchev?"

The difference between Stalinism and "deStalinization," with or without Khrushchev, is the difference in two stages in the development of state - capitalism. In the first case, we had the establishment of a new -- the first in the world -- state - capitalist ruling class with all the counter-revolutionary brutality that of necessity involves.

In the second case, the state capitalist foundation having been laid and now the "new collective leadership" solidly resting on it, state - capitalism is threatened as it moves into its imperialistic phase. The undermining of Stalinism came not from Malenkov or Beria or Khrushchev, but from class opposition. Russia is threatened by revolutionary upheavals in its satellites (East Germany) and revolts in its forced labor camps (Vorkuta). Thus we enter the beginning of the end of totalitarian rule.

Where Khrushchev differs from Malenkov is in the more daring ways he has sought to maintain state - capitalist power; from throwing capital into plowing up vast virgin fields, to the decentralization of industrial management while keeping tight centralized control at the summit, and by ridding himself of the burdensome name of Stalin. While the East German Revolt killed the myth of totalitarian invincibility, helped bring about the downfall of Beria, and opened a new page of freedom in European history, Khrushchev guided the new "collective leadership" (Malenkov lasted 23 months as premier) back to a "milder" total power but was as brutal a crusher of actual revolutions as ever Stalin was.

Let's not forget that the first stage of Khrushchev's "de-Stalinization" or "post-Stalinism" -- the superspectacular at the 20th RCP Congress -- specified its limitations which hold to this day.

(1) While at the secret session, he called Stalin a "murderer." He limited the public proclamation to ending "the personality cult." He was

moving cautiously not only because of inner opposition which we'll see revealed the following year in the so-called "anti-party group" but because he did and will continue to rest on the state-capitalist foundation. The removal of Stalin's body from the mausoleum in 1961 does not change the ambivalence on Stalin.

(2) Mikoyan who developed the same theme specified the period for which "an accepted history" was needed as being "about 20 years," that is to say, not over the entire period since Lenin's death 32 years back, but only after the victory over Trotsky and the establishment of the State Plan.

(3) While in Eastern Europe some who were "rehabilitated" were alive, none in Russia were. Both in Eastern Europe and in Russia those "rehabilitated" had always been faithful Stalinists, and did not question state - capitalist rule. It is true that Trotsky too had failed to analyze the class nature of Stalinism, much less oppose the State Plan which he had been first to propose, but his criticisms of the bureaucracy were substantial and Khrushchev got his first chance at big politics by enthusiastically participating in the anti-Trotsky campaign. While the 1956 mention of a need for a history of "20 years back" "could" mean disowning the Moscow Frame-Up Trials, nothing like that did occur. Both Khrushchev and Mikoyan went out of their way to repeat the standard accusations against Trotsky.

Far from being concerned with Trotsky's role, in 1917, or 1937, or his murder at the hands of a GPU agent in 1940, Khrushchev's "de-Stalinization" had the aim of freeing himself for an entirely new arena -- the emergent Middle - Eastern, Afro - Asian and Latin American world. Where, in Russia or in Eastern Europe, the oppressed peoples would recognize their exploiter whether called Stalin or Khrushchev, the new, independent countries where Russia had had no vested interests and the Marxist theory of liberation was the greatest polarizing force for their freedom struggles, Khrushchev's "de-Stalinization" was a master stroke and permitted him to march under the usurped Marxist banner. He created for himself a new sphere for maneuverability which would have been the envy of Alexander the Great. At the time Mao consented to this.

The people who didn't were the oppressed -- "de-Stalinization" could not stop the Hungarian Revolution.

The 2nd stage of Khrushchev's post Stalin Stalinism, "de-Stalinization" was forced upon him by the "anti-party" group of Molotov, Malenkov et al in 1957. The struggle for power within the presidium -- the opposition to Khrushchev's sinking of so much capital into the virgin land scheme and his moves for long-range super plans while decentralizing the administrative responsibility for the execution of plans -- thought that, just as the East German Revolt brought down Beria, so the Hungarian Revolution would decapitate Khrushchev, although he had put it down as bloodily as Stalin would have. So ossified was this opposition that, far from seeing that "de-Stalinization" was an attempt to stave off repetitions of the East German Revolt on an ever-expanding scale, they claimed "de-Stalinization" "caused" the Hungarian Revolution. Khrushchev could show that there would have been many Hungaries had "de-Stalinization" not helped contain the upsurge in Poland and throughout Eastern Europe.

-4-

Khrushchev's present revival of the campaign against the "anti-party old Stalinists" long after his victory over them in July 1957 is only a cover for the new stage of struggle for Russian hegemony in the Communist world now challenged by Mao's China. We have dealt with this 3rd stage of Khrushchev's "de-Stalinization" in previous Weekly Political Letters (see especially issues of Oct. 2 and Oct. 30, 1961) and will deal with this phase again by considering the underlying "theories" of the Sino - Soviet rift in the Two Worlds column in the December issue of NEWS & LETTERS. Here it will suffice to say that neither the class nature of state - capitalism nor the less serious attack on Stalinism as a bureaucracy ruling over a "degenerate workers' state" (Trotsky's analysis) are affected thereby.

Now then is the wild guess of ABC's correspondent to be completely ruled out? Unfortunately, we have to answer: No. If this flies in the face of all the facts we have just cited, to which we could add that it would be a most improbable outcome when you consider Khrushchev would have much to lose to revive the infamous Moscow Trials which started him on his career to the upper echelons of the bureaucracy and little to gain from the adherence of the Trotskyist movement which is neither a mass force nor a state power. Nevertheless such an unlikely possibility is not excluded. It would not be the first time in history when politics made strange bedfellows.

The truth is that there is nothing in the theory of Trotskyism on the nature of the Russian bureaucracy which would absolutely forbid such an alliance. This is so in the face of Trotsky's struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy for nearly two decades. Because Trotsky's opposition to Stalinism had no class basis as its foundation, history must record that Trotskyism presently, by no accident, has become the left face of Communism, both in its Russian and Chinese varieties.

Whether Trotsky denied the class nature of Stalinism because he failed to see the world phenomenon of state - capitalism as fact, or vice versa, he remained a prisoner of the State Plan. If the irony of history should bring about his rehabilitation in Khrushchev's Russia, it would be a more pathetic end to Trotsky's theories than his stature as a great revolutionary deserves. We need hardly fear, however, that Khrushchev would embark on such a fantastic turn to his fake "de-Stalinization." At the same time we must theoretically arm ourselves for the many strange turns and twists that a world on the brink of a nuclear holocaust has in store for us.

- RAYA

(labor donated)

2991

December 4, 1961

(Note by the Technical Committee: Raya's letter this week was too long to be mimeographed in time in view of the fact that this week we also go to press with the paper. Therefore we divided the letter into two parts. You will get Part II next week, at which time the December issue of NEWS & LETTERS will also be out and you can staple together as one, Parts I, Two Worlds, and II as a unified whole on the origins and philosophy of News & Letters Committee.)

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

WHY THE NEW CROP OF BOOKS ON MARXIST-HUMANISM? WHY NOT ON ITS AMERICAN ROOTS? (Notes on the Historic and Philosophic Origins of News & Letters Committee.) Part I

Dear Friends:

1961 has witnessed the publication of several serious works on Marxist - Humanism both by bourgeois writers and by socialists. This is a very different world than December 1957 when Marxism and Freedom came off the press and met up with quite a conspiracy of silence on the part of the bourgeois press, and a total one on the part of the various varieties of socialists, not to mention Communists. What has changed in these four years to make both bourgeois and socialist so ready to "rediscover" Marxist - Humanism?

To the extent that it was noticed at all by anyone outside ourselves the Marxist - Humanist banner raised by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters was attributed to the fact that the Hungarian revolutionaries utilized the Marxist "language" they had been "taught." Peculiarly enough, although Africa is certainly as "foreign" a continent as Europe, the Humanist banner raised there was not explained as "foreign." It was just disregarded -- until the year 1960 when 22 newly-independent nations were born -- and Khrushchev's performance at the UN gave notice that this third emergent world in Africa, in Asia, in the Middle East and in Latin America was the battleground where Russia chose to drape itself in the usurped Marxist banner and challenge "the West." At the same time the total fiasco of the invasion of Cuba taught Kennedy a lesson he will not forget about the impotence of capitalist democracy to win the minds of men bent on getting rid of exploitation and imperialist domination and taking destiny in their own hands.

In the Two Worlds column for the December issue of NEWS & LETTERS (which is to be considered an integral part of this week's letter) I deal with the paradox that the end-result of the books by the new admirers of the Humanism of Marxism is hardly distinguishable from the veritable conspiracy between the State Department and Russian Communism to try to force an identity between those two irreconcilable opposites -- Marxism, a theory of liberation, and Communism, the practice of enslavement. What I want to concentrate on here is the question of the American roots of Marxist - Humanism both as history and as present. To that end I wish to call your attention to the Introduction to MARXISM AND FREEDOM

(pp. 23 - 4) which deals with the impulse to the writing of the book being of twofold origin: (1) the American workers' battle with Automation which began in 1950; and (2) the East German Revolt of 1953 which killed once and for all the myth of Russian invincibility, or, to put it another way, that man can be "brainwashed" to forget their historic, never-ceasing struggle to be free.

1950 was the start of a new epoch on a world scale. The struggle of a new world being born took its most acute form in the U.S. because of the high technological development here, on the one hand, and the lack of a labor party, on the other hand, to explain away this stage as "progress." The American workers raised, in a most concrete manner, the philosophic question raised by Marx regarding the division between mental and manual labor which characterized all class societies. THE CRUCIAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE WORKERS RAISING THE QUESTION, "What Kind of Labor Should Men Perform?" AND THE LEARNED WHO WERE RAISING THE QUESTION ABOUT "THE ALIENATION OF LABOR" TURNS ON THE POSITIVE ASPECTS OF HUMANISM. I therefore wish to deal with Humanism from two vantage points: (1) as Marx first raised it in 1844, and (2) as it was raised, on the one hand, by the Catholic and Protestant theologians in France, Italy, Germany and Switzerland in the post-WW II period; and, on the other hand, in the America of the 1960s.

I. The 3 major essays in the now famous Economic - Philosophic Manuscripts, 1844* were: "Private Property and Communism," "Alienated Labor," and "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic." These established the new world outlook later to be called Marxism, the central point of which was that all history till the present was only "the pre - history" of mankind since labor, instead of being a self - activity which while producing goods, also develops man to a new human dimension, was, instead, so alien an activity to the worker who had been degraded to "an appendage of a machine" that we have no idea of what humanity is really like, man's talents remained hidden from him and he will never find them until he has gotten rid of this exploitative system of production.

Marx, however, was not only against the capitalist class which had appropriated as its private property all that the workers produced. He was also against what he called "vulgar communism" or those who had thought that if only private property was abolished, a new non-exploitative social order would arise. Marx's point of view was that while it was certainly unjust that all the products of men's labor were "alienated," that is, taken away from him, by those who owned and/or managed the means of production, there would be no new, truly human society unless with doing away with private property what was most alien to man -- his being fragmented to do only manual work, reduced to no more than a cog in a machine -- was also abolished. Unless the fusion of mental and manual activity were re-established within man so that his body, his mind, his heart all were functioning as a human entity there would be no new society.

Without the re-creation of the whole-ness of man, the abolition of private property would not be a great improvement; communism was not "the goal of human development, the form of human society." In a word,

* See: MARXISM AND FREEDOM, Chapter III, A New Humanism (pp. 53-66).

Marx was against any exploitation of man by man; he wanted new, truly human relations, beginning with labor at the point of production. He insisted that you could not counterpose the individual to "society" because the "individual is the social entity," the only proof that freedom was real, was that it was for all, and meant doing and thinking incorporated in the same person.

This was his main criticism of the great German philosopher, Hegel, that he de-humanized thought as if thought was not in the head of man, which was in his body, but floated above between heaven and earth. It is in the article, "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic" where the famous words defining his new world outlook as Humanism appear:

"When actual corporeal Man, standing on firm and well - rounded earth, inhaling and exhaling all natural forces... does not depart from its 'pure activity' in order to create the object, but its objective product confirms merely its objective activity... We see how thorough - going Naturalism, or Humanism, distinguishes itself both from Idealism and Materialism and is, at the same time, the truth uniting both." (MARXISM AND FREEDOM, p.313)

Now this Humanist philosophy was expressed long before he worked out all his economic theories. It runs as a red thread through his greatest economic work, CAPITAL, 1867-73. However, this is not because he had the theory "all worked out" as far back as 1844. No, it is because he re-discovered humanism, on a higher, that is to say, more concrete plane by the actual class struggles of his day. As Marx put it, he "had to turn everything around." The "everything" he had to turn around were the manuscripts he had been writing and researching for 20 long years. The reason and the time he had to do so was the struggles for freedom the world over, especially the Civil War in the United States, the struggles for the shortening of the working day which followed it both in the United States and Europe, climaxed by the Paris Commune, the first workers' state in history.*

As Marx himself put it, John Brown's heroic death in 1860 began a new world epoch. The Civil War which soon followed "sounded the tocsin" also for the social revolutions in Europe. The decade of the 1860's was the decade where the paths of the American Abolitionists and that of Marx crossed. Marx was busy reprinting for his European audiences the speeches of Wendell Phillips which he considered more important than "the battle bulletins." It was the decade of the birth of the Workingmen's International Association which came to the aid of the North. It was the decade of the birth of the first national trade union movement in the U.S. which became affiliated with the International headed by Karl Marx. Marx gives the National Labor Union headed by Sylvis (which passed the Resolution on the 8 Hour Day at its Baltimore Congress on August 10, 1866) credit for having "by the right working class instinct" formulated a resolution which was the equal of the one he had worked so hard on for presentation to the Geneva Congress. He moreover lays stress on the fact that "Labor in the white skin cannot be free so long as labor in the black skin is branded." A national labor movement in America was first born after the abolition of slavery.

*See: MARXISM AND FREEDOM; Chapter V, The Impact of the Civil War in the United States on the Structure of CAPITAL, Chapter VI, The Paris Commune Illuminates and Deepens the Content of CAPITAL (pp.81-102)

-4-

Marx's relationship to the Abolitionists has special significance for our day because it illuminates the question that Marxism is not just found in books, but in lives and aspirations of men, and that the affinity of ideas of freedom has nothing whatever to do with "parties to lead." On the contrary, Marx found much more in common with those who fought for freedom and did not know of "Marxism" than with those who tried to justify taking no position on the Civil War because they were "opposed to wage slavery as well as to chattel slavery." Just as he held that if this were Marxism, he wasn't one, so we have had to separate ourselves from those socialists who call themselves Marxists but see neither his Humanism nor the American roots.

(For many years in the development of some of us who have been Marxists long before the creation of NEWS & LETTERS Committees in 1955, the Negro Question occupied the central point of debate.* We will return to this later. We want first to contrast the Humanism of Marxism as it appears in Marx himself, and as it was "rediscovered" in the post-war European world.)

II. Now then "the rediscovery" of Marx's Humanist Essays in the post-war world of Western Europe had very little to do with all that concerned Marx's vision of the creative drama of human liberation. On the contrary. The politics of the day showed at a glance that the West European proletariat were through with capitalism which had brought them nothing but crises and wars. Two million workers joined the Communist Party of Italy; one million the Communist Party of France; for defeated Germany the Communists who had usurped the banner of Marx dangled the slogan of "unification." The popular saying was that all Stalin needed to do to conquer Western Europe is to pick up the phone. The fact that he never would pick up that telephone because he did not want a revolutionary proletariat gaining power and so soon discovering that Russian Communism was only a euphemism for state-capitalism did not pacify private capitalism. It wanted to break the revolutionary working class movement.

Soon the scholars caught the politics in the air -- and discovered the Humanism of Marxism. Some very valuable studies were made which proved easily enough that Communism was not Marxism. The reason behind the sudden "discovery" of the Humanism of Marxism was all too obvious; the priests who went to the factories were opposed to all class struggles and tried to stop the strikes, even as the Communists were beginning to do. Moreover, the thesis that "alienation" meant not "alienation of labor" but "alienation of soul" made as little impact as U Nu's statement that Marxism was good for "material things" and Buddhism was necessary for the "soul."

The decade from 1945-55 when everyone from the Catholic theologians to the Existentialists were busy printing and reprinting those Early Essays with heavily biased commentaries as to what they "really" meant made no impact at all on American intellectuals who all too easily had moved from their flirtation with the Communists in the 1930's to super-patriotism in the war. By the '50's they were frightened out of their wits by McCarthyism and lost their collective tongue. Daniel Bell's THE END OF IDEOLOGY, The Exhaustion of Utopias in the 1950's, serves at least one good function -- it reveals the utter bankruptcy of the bourgeois intellectuals.

* See: "Negro Intellectuals in Dilemma," NEWS & LETTERS, Feb. 1951

-5-

So far removed was the intellectual world from the real world of workers that the book's publication coincided with the birth of the African Revolutions both as actuality reshaping the world and as alive, independent, creative thought which many called "Humanism" or "African Socialism." Needless to say those who had "exhausted utopias" could not appeal to the world's oppressed and were totally disregarded by the youth who were sick of men who had lost their dreams. From the wildcats in Detroit to the Freedom Riders in Jackson, Miss., American youth, Negro and white, showed they were determined to tear up the crisis-ridden world they had not made, tear it up by its roots and remake it. It is at this historic juncture that the bourgeois intellectuals in the United States caught the spirit the European Intellectuals had caught the previous decade, and rediscovered the Humanism of Marxism.

Not by accident, however, they failed to discover the American roots of Marxism. It is not that they consciously averted their eyes. Rather it is that it was inconceivable to them that the scattered facts that they may or may not have about the activity of the First International headed by Marx in support of the North in the Civil War in the United States had any fundamental relationship to the theory of Marxism; that the class struggles of Marx's day were not just "setting" for his CAPITAL but fundamentally changed its structure were as beyond their bourgeois mentality as the objective reasons for their sudden discovery of Marx. That the socialists who kept silent on MARXISM AND FREEDOM are enthusiastically loud in their endorsement of these bourgeois books on Marxist Humanism makes it necessary to show why we had to separate ourselves from all old radicals in order to rediscover the American roots of Marxism, and not as history of the past century, but as today's history.

--- BAYA

(labor donated)

December 11, 1961

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

(Part II of the Dec. 4th letter on the origins and philosophy of News & Letters Committees in light of the current "rediscovery" of the Humanism of Marxism.)

The class difference that separated the West European post-war workers joining the Communist Parties of France and Italy by the millions, from the theologians' sudden discovery of the Humanism of Marxism merely as an instrument to fight the Communists doomed the "discovery" from having any concrete meaning for the workers. Where they wished to do away with capitalism that had brought them nothing but crises and war, the theologians asked them to accept private capitalism. At the same time the existentialist twist to Marxist Humanism while holding on to the tails of the Communist Party acted as a buffer to keep the workers from finding out the truth of Communist totalitarianism.

In the United States, on the other hand, the intellectuals' 1961 "rediscovery" of Marxist Humanism is so belated a phenomenon, separated by a whole decade from the 1950 worker's instinctive raising of the question of alienated labor — Automation as an alien operation that makes labor an inhuman act separated from the worker as man, and as thinker — that it only underlines the unbridgeable gulf between worker and intellectual in the United States. At the same time both the concreteness of the question raised — what kind of labor should man perform? — and the fact that the Communist Party was not a mass movement in the United States helped Marxist-Humanism establish itself on native grounds.

The Miners' General Strikes in 1949-50, which, as we saw, opened a new epoch in workers' attitudes to production marks our own beginnings although News & Letters did not begin publication until 1955.

"Just as 1945-6 general strike transformed the abstract Russian question on property forms into one of actual production relations, so at present the struggle of the miners and the new content they have infused into 'No contract, no work' is what gave us the impulse to go into the essential dialectical development of Marx himself. Dialectically, the problem of form is the problem of the contract today." This appears in a discussion (on February 15, 1950*) where I presented an outline of what was to become MARKISM AND FREEDOM. The 1950 discussion was distinguished by the fact that for the first time we invited a worker to a theoretic discussion held by a few intellectuals.** The importance of the invitation arose from the two new vantage points of the book: (1) the American proletariat; (2) the philosophic foundations (Marx's Essays had been mimeographed by us as far back as 1947 and the new reference was to Lenin's Philosophic notebooks.)

* Interestingly enough that discussion contains this statement by J.: "Take R.'s letter of January 24, 1950, where she speaks of Marx's shifting from history of theory to history of production relationships. A whole essay could be written on that."

** Johnny Zupan was the white worker, who with Charles Denby, the Negro worker, was to become co-editor of News & Letters.

Up until 1950 the various outlines of the book all centered around an analysis of Russia as a state-capitalist society. Although the break with Trotskyism over the nature of the Russian state meant removing the question from the political field into conditions of labor in the factory, it remained "the Russian question." Where we did deal with the role of labor as a universal question (in publishing Marx's Early Essays) the alienation of labor so predominated over cooperative labor at the point of production that humanism maintained an abstract character, as if it were merely a philosophic question.

With the 1950 strike, however, the question of labor even in its philosophic aspects became most concrete. The reason is simple; the actuality of a general strike involving no less than 100,000 miners could not be separated from the Automation which caused it as well as the revolution in thinking.

1950 also marks the time when we began thinking of specific American workers who were to assume leadership roles within the state-capitalist tendency (that is to say, the tendency that analyzed Russia as a state-capitalist society and state-capitalism as a world phenomenon). What had heretofore been considered as intellectual tasks, such as editorship, authorship, lecturing, would from thence on be practiced by workers. The whole period between 1950-55 could be called a "practice period." It was climaxed by the publication of the story of a Negro American of today, INDIGNANT HEART, the very title of which was from the great Abolitionist, Wendell Phillips:

"...whether his voice cheered the starving Hindoo crushed beneath British selfishness, or Hungary battling against treason and the Czar; whether he pleaded at home for bread and the ballot, or held up with his sympathy the ever-hopeful enthusiasm of Ireland, — every true word spoken for suffering man, is so much done for the Negro bending beneath the weight of American bondage. It is said that the earthquake of Lisbon tossed the sea in billows on the coast of Cuba; so no INDIGNANT HEART is beating anywhere whose pulses are not felt on the walls of our American Bastille."

--- Wendell Phillips, November 26, 1850

We also published "The People of Kenya Speak For Themselves" by Mbiyu Koinange.

Although we did not know it at the time, 1955, which was the year of the split in the state-capitalist tendency,* was the year the Communists began an attack on Marx's Humanist Essays. At our first convention (July 1956) we analyzed our now fully developed Marxist-Humanism which was to become the central point of the book in the document, "Theoretical and Practical Perspectives: Where to Begin." Because history is not only the past but the present, MARXISM AND FREEDOM deals with Humanism not only in Chapter 3 (A New Humanism, Marx's Early Essays), or in Chapter 7 (The Humanism and Dialectic of Capital), but also at the very end of the book (Chapter 16, Automation

* The break from the Johnsonites had good and sufficient reasons in the anti-war struggle around Formosa as well as the worker's role as editor of our paper, but the underlying differences on Humanism were more implicit than explicit.

and the New Humanism). The introduction to **MARXISM AND FREEDOM** states its aim to be the reestablishment of the Humanism of Marxism as well as the revelation of its American roots. The last chapter ends with the section, "Toward a New Unity of Theory and Practice in the Abolitionist and Marxist Tradition," and brings us back to the American roots which are dealt with in Chapter 5 "The Impact of the Civil War in the United States on the Structure of Capital." What we could not deal with in any detail there are the numerous writings, research and development, over a period of some two decades on the so-called "Negro Question." The history of the Negro in this country is a history of continuous revolt which has shaped the United States as it moved toward Civil War and thereafter to today's Freedom Rides.

It is no accident that ^{of} all who participated in the Freedom Rides we are the only ones who published **FREEDOM RIDERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES**. Even a quick scanning of the pamphlet will reveal what is the distinguishing mark of Marxist - Humanism -- to create the form where when freedom fighters speak for themselves, the doing and thinking becomes one unified whole.

Thus today's Freedom Riders see a relationship to David Walker, the rag picker of Boston, who back in 1829, published "An Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the United States," and took issue with none other than Thomas Jefferson, whom he warned prophetically, that race prejudice would yet "root some of you out of the very face of the earth." (p. 10) Because history is not only past but present; and not only activity, as the act of going to jail for a principle, but activity as thought, we get in the midst of the exciting story of the Rides and the Marches and the Sit-ins and the Bus Boycotts, an editorial reproduced on the state of civil rights, not only of the Negroes but those resisting thought control (pp. 39-44).

In contrast to the Communists, who change their line depending on the foreign policy of the Soviet Union so that when the United States and Russia became allies, the American CP urged the Negro to forget his struggle for full equality, Marxist - Humanists have a view seeing the continuous history of the vanguard role of the Negro American. That is to say the development from the slave revolts to the Civil War, from Marx's time to the Populist Movement; from the Garvey Movement to the CIO; as well as the struggle for full equality during World War II and after till today, has been a struggle for freedom that has brought the Negro American to the forefront of the fight to reconstruct society. As **FREEDOM RIDERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES** puts it, "the Freedom Rides, and whatever may come after them, are a form of just such new beginnings!"

In a word, the Constitution of News & Letters Committees states that there are two inseparable phases to our existence: (1) to publish a workers' paper edited by a worker, which at the same time is a weapon in the class struggle, and (2) to publish **MARXISM AND FREEDOM** which would theoretically establish Marxist - Humanism on native grounds. As the Introduction to **MARXISM AND FREEDOM** (pp. 23-4) phrases

"That the Negro Populists were the deepest section of the working people can be seen from the share - croppers' strikes. Cf. "Tom Watson, Agrarian Rebel" by C. Vann Woodward.

it. "No theoretician, today more than ever before, can write out of his own head. Theory requires a constant shaping and reshaping of ideas on the basis of what workers themselves are thinking and doing....the compelling need for a new unity of theory and practice dictates a new method of writing. At least it dictated the method by which this book was written.

A tour was undertaken to present orally the ideas of the book to groups of auto workers, miners, steelworkers and student youth. In their own words and out of their own lives they contributed to a new understanding....This work is therefore dedicated to the auto workers, miners, steelworkers and student youth who have participated so fully in the writing of this book. They are its co-authors."

Now to return for a final look at that new crop of books on the Humanism of Marxism. The avoidance of its American roots transformed Humanism into an abstraction. It was not done because of any international considerations. None of the authors has the universality of Marx. No, keeping the American roots hidden was the way to confine Humanism's world concepts to books instead of allowing them life. The great Abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, wrote on the masthead of the LIBERATOR he had founded in 1831 when Marx was still a teen-ager. "The world is my country." Later Marx said the workers had no country of their own, but the whole world was theirs to reshape. Because Marxist-Humanism is a philosophy of freedom, every country can find its indigenous roots.

Old radicals who hail the present crop of books help keep hidden not only the genuine American roots as history, but what is even more crucial maintain a bourgeois division between philosophy and action. It is true that the radicals are active and do not live in ivory towers, as do the bourgeois writers. However where socialists fail to see the workers not just as "muscle" but as the source of all theory, they inevitably fall into the trap set up by the bourgeois "scholars" of dividing thinking from doing, the Humanism of Marxism becomes an abstraction instead of something present in the daily lives of workers, youth, Negroes and other oppressed minorities.

Because on the other hand, we saw the miners' strike of 1949-50 as theory of labor we were able to move to the rediscovery of Humanism on native grounds, and therefore were the first to publish the Early Essays of Marx in the English world. Because we saw the vanguard role of the Negro American throughout our history we were prepared to listen to the present Freedom Riders and hear their world view of the Negro.

Far from the deep rootedness of the Marxist - Humanism of News & Letters Committees signifying any isolation from world relations, our pamphlets -- not only AFRO-ASIAN REVOLUTIONS but WORKERS BATTLE AUTOMATION -- show that Marxist - Humanism cannot be hemmed in by any national boundaries. On the contrary. Along with FREEDOM RIDERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES, the most recent addition to our publications is the Weekly Political Letter. These weekly informal statements began on April 22, 1961.

* See Weekly Political Letter, 10/16/61, Marxist Humanism vs. Communism which presents the Introduction to a British edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM.

The first* was entitled Preliminary Statement On Crisis Over Cuba. It was called forth, on both sides of the Atlantic, by the need to keep with events more than is possible in a monthly publication. Our response to objective events was also a response to the organizational needs of various groups, especially youth, who desired a Marxist-Humanist analysis that drew practical, organizational conclusions as well as exploring the theoretical ramifications.

The fact that we make no distinction between members and non-members in printing the contributions to News & Letters, has inspired many in the United States, in Europe and in Africa who are not members of News & Letters Committees to turn to us for a Marxist-Humanist analysis of world events. Just as we had to break from the old radical groups who taught Marxism as a foreign doctrine, so the youth of today who approach Marxist-Humanism on their own, have found that both for its American roots and world conceptions, they must turn to News & Letters Committees rather than to the standard publications of the American radical groupings.

-- Raya

* Technical Editor's Note: Because of the popularity of the Weekly Political Letter it was decided to mimeograph them and make them available to the general public beginning with the letter of August 2, 1961

(labor donated)

3001

NOTE: Because the office is closed both Christmas and New Year's, and the locals aren't meeting this week, this letter is dated January 2, 1962, though it has been written December 24, 1961.

January 2, 1962

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

THE AMERICAN KATANGA LOBBY AND THE CONGO CRISIS

Dear Friends:

As the newly-spawned Katanga Lobby shows once again, politics makes strange bed-fellows. Here we have the Negro-hating white supremacist, Senator Eastland of Mississippi championing Moise Tshombe. Here also is Eastland's Northern counterpart and America Firster, Senator Dodd of Connecticut, literally flying across continents, oceans, mountains, chaos, to ride in Tshombe's car to some plush party "proving" that law and order prevails in Tshombe's Katanga only to be attacked by Tshombe's armed police obeying the call of the white mercenaries. This neither stops the damage from seeing the lawless action as a "Communist plot" nor from returning to join the Katanga Lobby in the company of the erstwhile fellow-travelling Negro "educator" Dr. Yergan, and the other paid propagandist for the Portuguese atrocities in the Congo, George S. Schuyler.

This hypocritical color admixture is being financed by home-made as well as foreign fascist elements, embracing the whole lunatic fringe from the pros of the old China Lobby (Mrs. Alfred Kohlberg), with the inevitable fringe of retired military brass (Admiral Ben Moreell of "Americans for Constitutional Action"), through the Belgian unregistered agent Michale Struelens of the "Katanga Information Service," which has spent some \$140,000 to white-wash Union Miniere's Katanga figure-headed by Moise Tshombe, to the standard American rightests, such as Clarence E. Manion and William E. Buckley, Jr., editor of the National Review, not to mention the senior Republican foreign spokesman in the Senate, Senator Dirksen of Illinois, who wasn't fast enough on the draw (now that he is running for office) to withdraw his name from the \$5,200 full page ad in the N.Y. Times of December 14, 1961, and later denied giving authorization for its appearance. As if to make up for his sudden withdrawal, other Republican bigwigs who bear official responsibility for "the Party line," such as Richard M. Nixon and Republican Party National Chairman, Miller, came out as defenders of the "one anti-Communist, Christian Tshombe." By this time the fascist stench was so strong and the extremist coloring so gaudy on the Republican banner that General Eisenhower felt compelled to separate himself from it and come out in support of President Kennedy's "Congo Policy."

What is it that brought this motley crew together, and what is it that has made John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who is not too far removed from them, appear to be the very opposite of this counter-revolutionary galaxy? Why is he now supporting military action to bring secessionist Katanga back into the Congo Republic?

To get to the bottom of this, it is necessary to spend time not on the lunatic fringe- the Katanga Lobby -but on the official State Department

policy of the Eisenhower Administration which conspired in the murder of Patrice Lumumba and the State Department policy of the Kennedy Administration which shed crocodile tears over this murder while insisting on the recognition of Kasavubu as the "legitimate" head of the Congo Republic, the same Kasavubu who handed Lumumba over to Tshombe. Though there is a grain of truth in the charge by Khrushchev's UN representative that Kennedy is meddling in the Congo in order "to save Tshombe," the greater truth is that Kennedy is also willing to dump Tshombe if he cannot make him toe the US-UN policy. It is not the "sameness" of the imperialist policy, "the West's" or the Russian -- that holds the key. The key is in the change, the fairly fundamental change, in the State Department and UN policy.

The New Tune Kennedy is Humming

"The West's" inability to work out a "united" policy in the Congo stems from the fanaticism and impotence of private capital. The combined fanaticism and impotence is causing Belgium, France and Britain to forget the price of Nazism's "anti-Communism" -- the subjugation of the whole of Europe. Kennedy has been compelled to remind his NATO allies of this asking price which, when translated into 1961 African realities, would unleash the most gory war of black against white, stretching from Katanga through Rhodesia to South Africa. Now, he is asking them, could they possibly think that Belgium's Union Miniere (even if aided now by a new sawdust Caesar, Sir Roy Welensky of the Rhodesian Federation, and later by the more powerful Verwoerd of apartheid South Africa) could win when technologically advanced Nazi Germany, helped by Mussolini's Italy, Vichy France, Leopold III's Belgium and the other European Quislings, as well as Japan in the Orient, couldn't win in this world struggle to turn back the clock of history!

The American lunatic fringe -- the Katanga Lobby -- may be willing to substitute for the Nazi extermination of the Jews, the extermination of the black race in order to hold on to the minerals, ancient and new, of Katanga, the copper belt of Northern Rhodesia, the gold and diamonds of South Africa. But one lesson Kennedy has learned (if not from history, then from the post-war freedom movements still shaking not only "foreign" empires but his own country). It is this: it was not by arms alone that Nazi Germany was brought down to defeat. The great resistance movements of occupied Europe who could be counted upon to fight both against the fascist invaders and the native Quislings, were the indispensable allies. What was true in Europe, 1939-45, is even truer in Black Africa of the 1960's, again both where it is independent and where it is ground in the dust and bull-whipped, as Sharpsville showed. Massacres can drive a mass movement underground; it cannot destroy it.

The trump card, insofar as Kennedy's co-capitalistic rulers are concerned, however, is not any pan of praise for black Africa's freedom movements. It is this: if puny Welensky can wag the British lion's tail, won't Britain land in the impossible position of DeGaulle of France -- incapacity of commanding the loyalty of his own army in Algeria, though he dreams of world glory? If Tshombe has shown greater willingness to accept advice from the white mercenaries and the \$52 million per year in taxes from the single Union Miniere, than from the Belgian Government, how can Belgium be sure of his loyalty? And don't "we" all lose everything

-3-

once this one small-time politician, ("European black" as the Katanga white settlers like to call "their" Tshombe) is given free rein, that is to say, allowed to unite with the other blind men of Africa -- the colons of Algiers as well as the other last hold-outs of reaction in Central and South Africa? That surely would unleash the most ferocious and gory fight of white against black and create the perfect situation for Russia "to take over"

This new tune that Kennedy is humming has such good horse sense that even a General Eisenhower can recognize it. And if that man on horseback is willing to sing along with Jack, private capital may yet learn to play the state capitalist game and "win." If not -- if not, that bourgeois pundit, Walter Lippman, is telling the world, the world will indeed "go mad." The tune to sing then is a "united Congo." But if that is the tune, why did they all either directly participate in, or stand by gloating, when Patrice Lumumba was murdered by Tshombe who would not be bound by any national movement? "Aye, there is the rub" -- there all stand naked, revealing their same class clay.

Lumumba's MNC and the Baluba, the Lulus, the Bakongos vs. Tshombe's Lundas

Of all the slanders against the Congo Republic, none is more demagogically fostered than that about tribal divisions. Into it gets woven every prejudice of "backwardness" and "primitiveness." Not a word is said about the fact that Catholicism and Protestantism, not just "in general" and in "history," but presently is dividing each tribe -- for example the Bakongo of Kasavubu. Since there are indeed tribal divisions, pointing to the obvious, fixes the prejudice to where it covers up all basic class divisions.

One would think that Tshombe, by being "a Christian," is not a member of a tribe, a very specific tribe that has lorded it over all others whenever and wherever it could, even as he as the richest black tradesman has turned every personal failure into a political success because he can sell himself to the highest white bidder while at the same time compel the white mercenary to obey "his" orders since he alone has the advantage of a black face. It is this which has given even some unprejudiced journalists the impression that, far from being a puppet, Tshombe is holding the billion dollar Union Miniere empire as a sort of "hostage." It would take us too far afield to enumerate all the tales the press writes up as "facts."

The simple facts are easy to ascertain when one has not been brainwashed: Tshombe is related to the royal family of the Lunda tribe, which is powerful in Katanga and across the border, Northern Rhodesia. His marriage to the daughter of the Paramount Chief helped him not to go down when his various businesses failed. When the vast strike movements in the Belgian Congo in 1958 compelled Belgium to grant the right of free speech and assembly, Tshombe built his own party -- CONAKAT -- but never for a moment was it part of the African national movement. Nor, for that matter was he loyal to the Belgian Government. His adeptness at the double-cross showed itself early. At the first Round Table in Brussels, he so intrigued with the private financial interests in Katanga that he became persona non grata even to the Belgian Government. Tshombe thought that his Provincial Government would

-4-

hail his secession. Instead when the Baluba leaders arrived they denounced his "fantasy government." In a word, he is a minority not only in the Congo, but in his own province.

It is no "tribal" war that is at the core of the Baluba struggle against Tshombe's massacring gendarmes, any more than Ford's turning water hoses in freezing weather on the workers fighting for union recognition was a "tribal" war.

The Balubas in Katanga were part of Lumumba's National Congolese Movement. To this day they oppose Tshombe. On the other hand, Kalonji, leader of the Balubas in Kasai and once part of the MNC, has since declared himself "King of the Diamond State." With as much money coming in from the diamond mining interests as Tshombe has from the copper interests, Kalonji is now opposed by the Lulus who are part of the National Movement. The Bakongos also split from Kasavubu's party in Leopoldville and joined Lumumba. In a word, Lumumba's was the only true national movement that crossed both tribal and territorial lines. Though not organized until 1958, this national organization was also international, both as African and as socialist. As Lumumba phrased it: "Our need is to democratize all our institutions. We must separate the Church from the State. We must take away all power from the traditional chiefs, and remove all privileges. We must adapt socialism to African realities. Amelioration of the conditions of life is the only true meaning independence can have." (Quoted by Colin Legum in his "Congo Disaster," p.95)

(Since Kivu has been so much in the headlines recently, it is also in order to call attention to the statement by Ancient Kashamura, who is a leader there: "The Africans are natural socialists....We Africans will not throw away anything simply for the sake of doing so. We will be guided by our own African past, and take whatever is useful to us from both the West and East.")

Because Lumumba did head a mass movement; because he was a leader who undertook to bring Katanga back into the Congo not only via the UN but via a mass movement within Katanga, the UN made no rush then to heed his call for help.

At the same time the American Embassy in Leopoldville became the sponsor instead of the so-called "General" Mobutu who was always at their beck and call. The Cold War entered when Russia, wise enough to recognize who really represented the Congolese, jumped on the Lumumba bandwagon. Eisenhower's policy at that time, along with Hammarskjold's, propped up Tshombe, though they claimed he "really should" join the Congo, offering to dilute the Constitution to give him all the autonomy he needed to continue to rule over the Katangese as well as over a great deal of the wealth that belongs to the Congo but is mined in his province. No wonder Tshombe began to have delusions.

Though the continuity of the Eisenhower - Kennedy Congo policy has created the base for the American Katanga Lobby, Kennedy must oppose it. He must now strike out against the blind, narrow - minded, stubborn lying dangerous demagogue Tshombe because the heady mixture of the private interests of the Union Miniers and its arsenals, the fanaticism of Welensky

-5-

and his British co-lords, DeGaulle's illusion of grandeur and the delusions of the colons who act as "advisers" to Tshombe has created such chaos that it may very well be the Congo, rather than the Berlin crisis which sets off World War III. Whoever puts blinders on when faced with a possible global struggle of the two nuclear titans must be brought down to size, if even when first spawned, this was his own creature, pure and simple. Hence the new tune that Kennedy is humming.

At the same time the African national movements have also come to the crossroads. Their leaders have reached this impasse because they have been so preoccupied with "neutrality" in the Cold War on the one hand, and "loyalty to the UN" in the Congo crisis, on the other hand, that they have failed to ask their own people what they were struggling for, what were their aspirations, their self - development.

- Raya

(labor donated)

3006

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River Detroit 4, Mich. Tyler 8-7053 Price 20¢ No.26

January 12, 1962

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

HIGH-BLOWN WORDS ON "HIGH ROAD OF RECOVERY"
FROM THE RECESSION THAT IS STILL WITH US

Dear Friends:

President Kennedy's State of the Union report is the supreme example of how very foreign the American language can sound when it issues from Washington, D.C. At a time when nearly 5 million are unemployed, and twice that number only partially employed, when veritable civil war on civil rights is going on throughout the South, when the crisis among farmers has not eased at all, when a million youth, as J.F. Kennedy himself has delicately put it, "are out of school and out of work," when the rate of growth of the economy as a whole at a period that is labelled as "prosperous" and been pumped full of vast military spending is at the snail's pace of 2 per cent at a time when Italy's is 8 per cent-- at such a critical time the Man in the White House assumes the air of confidence of "world leadership," not to mention head of "a going concern." And all the bourgeois press pours forth paeans of praise of the Harvard man who has proven himself a master at turning a good phrase, the latest being "the burden and glory of freedom."

Juggling figures has been a characteristic of the mighty in power and the speech writers in the capitol are expert at this. Thus our sly Secretary of Labor speaks of the great achievements of the New Frontier in increasing production, in "not" increasing the rate of unemployed in the month of December that saw no less than 100,000 added to the number of unemployed. And the Man in the White House speaks of a reduction of "surplus labor areas" from 101 to 60, without mentioning that the total number of unemployed saw very little decrease in the nation. Not even these master jugglers can see any prospect of substantial reduction, much less "full employment" to which they are supposed to be committed by nothing less than an Act of Congress--the Full Employment Act which every Administration has conveniently forgotten. No doubt that "burden" is too much for them. The young man from Boston, when he was campaigning for the presidency, was "brave" in appearing in West Virginia and other hard-pressed "areas of surplus labor"--but now he prefers to travel elsewhere. Since, however, he is supposed to be such a voracious reader, I suggest that he read today's Detroit papers and see how in the sleet and snow, Monday, early morning, 3,000 job seekers lined up at a little church which had "hit the jackpot last week and found 43 jobs"! Yes, 3,000 line up today for 43 unadvertised jobs found last week--and this is one of the glorious 41 areas that has been taken off the list of "surplus labor areas."

How does the Chief Executive propose to deal with facts instead of phrases? He takes for granted that unemployment will continue--and goes on to other business. Following in the footsteps of all good capitalists,

3007

- 2 -

he proposes, to meet unemployment by granting relief—to the capitalists. In addition to depreciation allowances, he now proposes no less than 8 per cent "tax credit" for investment in machinery and equipment. More Automation to make it "more competitive" and put more workers out of work.

At the same time he conveniently forgets all the campaign speeches about "rates of growth" of the economy and his laughter at the then President's (Eisenhower) cynicism about "growthmanship." The only mention at all of the rate of growth of the economy, or more correctly, its failure to achieve any rate of growth when compared with growth of population, is at the point when he tries to convince the vested interests it is for their good to become actively engaged to the Common Market in Europe. It is there that our State Planner admits that our rate of growth is only a half that of Western Europe and that we stand to lose all unless (1) a 5 Year Trade Expansion Act is passed and (2) he is given executive authority to cut tariffs. This is what he calls fulfilling "the world's hope by fulfilling our own faith."

No doubt the glorious destructive competition so characteristic of capitalism could, if fully applied by Western Europe to the United States, cut the latter to size. Here however we come to the crucial political problem that is seen neither by radicals nor bourgeois now any more than it was understood before World War II. Between the two world wars, when state intervention in the economy was still a novelty and thought to apply either only to war periods, or "only" to Great Depressions, it was common for radicals to say the "real" struggle is between the United States and Great Britain, the two capitalist giants. So while they were all being economic determinists, Nazi Germany was born and it "offered to unite" all of Europe under its hegemony—in order, of course, "to fight Communism." And while Chamberlain appeased—and Stalin entered in a pact with Hitler—the national resistance movements throughout Europe revealed their uncompromising opposition to fascism—and "all" became allies against Nazi centralization of European capital as the preliminary to world domination.

Now that European capital has centralized itself under a Franco-German axis, and Britain too waits to enter, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, following Mao's Confucianism that "For us Chinese" things that oppose each other really "complement each other" is now dreaming of an integrated economy stretching from Europe to America—a sort of super-"Atlantic Economic Alliance"—that could bring the Russia-China axis down to size economically and "therefore".... Now that the capitalist, instead of the radicals, have become economic determinists, they should be asked a couple of political questions, if not about their inter-capitalist fighting, then about the much more fundamental class struggle in each country. That, however, they will understand only as they lose power—not when they still have it and thus can pretend "to represent all its citizens."

All the State of the Union report had to say on that was to ask the workers not to demand wage increases, not to fight for the shorter workweek, not to demand public education, not to go all out for medical care, not to expect full employment and not to demand full civil rights, but to be ready at all times for "compromise"—trading any and all proposals to appease this or that reactionary bloc in congress.

- 3 -

If ever there was a sham battle, it is the one between New Frontierism on the part of "the Executive," as against the conservatives of "the Legislative." It has stood all Administrations in good stead-- that is to say made it possible to appear "progressive and bold" when in fact the Chief Executive was only the chief demagogue. This has never been truer than of the present Administration. The moderation, it is alleged to be "compelled" to show in order to get "the most important bills" passed is in fact its own true capitalistic inner and outer character.

Which are the most important proposals in this year which are supposed to prove that we are "on the high road of recovery and growth" if it is not to put an end to the blight of unemployment as a permanent feature of the present economy, an end to the lack of civil rights which has always characterized this "great democracy"; where it wasn't outright chattel slavery, a beginning of some minimum medical care for the aged which has long since been taken for granted by its junior partner, Great Britain? After all the talk of illiteracy in the "backward countries" isn't it massive aid to public education that is needed in place of "scholarships" and college aid?

No, there is nothing to expect in the coming year from this New Frontiersman who has brought himself down to size more than any Republican could have done for him. At a future date, however, I do wish to go in further on the one dream JFK still retains--the economic union of all "good" capitalists in the world against the state-capitalisms of Russia and China which call themselves Communist. This dream has now extended itself to visions of "Western" unity as against the Sino-Soviet Rift. The special supplement (News & Letters, January, 1962) on Mao Tse-tung will deal with the actualities instead of dreams of that rift and the underlying unity, and I will return to the West European as well as the Administration's view of the Common Market in a future letter.

--Raya

(labor donated)

3009

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River Detroit 4, Mich. TYler 8-7053 --206--NO. 27

Technical Committee Note: Last week's letter was wrongly dated Jan. 9th, as is obvious from the fact that it dealt with the State of the Union Message, delivered the 11th. Please redate your copy the 15th.

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

January 22, 1962

JFK's ECONOMIC REPORT: A 93 Billion Dollar Budget, An Army of 5 Million Unemployed--and the "Atlantic Community"

Dear Friends:

Despite the fact that Presidential Economic Reports are an outgrowth of the Employment Act of 1946 and their very reason for being is supposed to be concern with full employment, this is conveniently forgotten by the President and the press. Yet the Act, passed to pacify returning GIs that they had not fought in vain and were not returning to the state of joblessness they had left, makes it "the responsibility of the Federal government...to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions and resources... (to achieve) maximum employment, production and purchasing power."

Far from utilizing "all" resources for that purpose, it is common knowledge that since 1954 there has been no less than a 180 billion dollar loss of wealth in idle men and idle plants. All the varied Administrations, Democrat and Republican, have been busy building up since the passing of the Act, is the military. The present 93 billion dollar budget is the largest since 1945, the largest ever in peace-time history and is overwhelmingly for purposes of war preparations.

Full employment has long since been forgotten as a goal. Since the end of the Korean War, the recessions have come more often--every 3 to 4 years--the upswings have been shorter--from 45 weeks to a mere 25 weeks--the unemployed army has been growing longer and becoming a permanent feature. All the President even bothers to promise now is that he hopes the unemployed would constitute "only" 4 per cent by 1963, just when we are due for another recession at that!

One thing only is clear that the utopias of all State Planners are empty indeed. Whether these State Planners head "free enterprise" economies or state economies, a single pin-prick bursts the balloon--and that single pin-prick is always, always its relationship to labor. Just as Khrushchev, in presenting his 20 year program for the millenium to the 22nd Russian Communist Party Congress, exposed the actual state of the Russian economy when he promised that "in the second decade, every family, including newlyweds, will have a comfortable flat conforming to the requirements of hygiene and cultured living," so the President of the richest country in the world exposed the one-sidedness of its "prosperity" (profits) by revealing that over 6 per cent of the labor force in these "prosperous" times remain unemployed.

The cold-blooded recognition by the Administration that its "superior economy" is getting used to living with a permanent army of unemployed is matched by another bit of hypocrisy called the "Atlantic Community." Whether this is referred to matter-of-factly in the Economic Message itself as "A Five Year Trade Expansion Act," or is played up as a "natural" extension of the European Common Market over to this side of the Atlantic it adds up to but one thing—"globaloney."

Supposedly what socialists dreamed about—a United States of Europe—has been achieved instead by "democratic" capitalists with hearts of gold who are now opening their arms wide in a fraternal embrace with its original mentor, the United States. Of course the European Common Market is not all European yet and it is far from being "socialist," but it is "integrated"!

Where the President must pretend that "all" want to reduce tariffs and "all" will gain thereby, the British press is compelled to tell the world a few facts about this loving act of communal living. In its January 18th issue, The Manchester Weekly Guardian writes that the President's stated policy is "at variance with the kind of thinking which helped to bring the Common Market into existence...the high tariff, introverted, and Europe-centered" from which even Great Britain, much less the United States is in fact excluded, since the moving force of low tariffs for its 6 members means high tariffs for all others, especially so the U.S. As the Guardian frankly puts it, "If a high external tariff is ruled out, what will be the "unifying force"?"

It cannot be that President Kennedy does not know at least that much. Nor can it be that he thinks that the European Common Market will fall all over itself with joy at the prospect of the United States horning in on their "integrated" economic community. Furthermore, he surely cannot think that American business men will greet his Plan—as The Wall Street Journal did—unless they understand him and read his mind correctly, which is: go at them, boys, and win in cut-throat competition stemming from automated production—while I make the hard-sell ("good for the nation") of this project, to labor. In a word, the admonition for labor not to fight for higher wages or a shorter workweek or better conditions of labor.

Kennedy lost his look of being cool as a cucumber (and did he also fall out of his rocking chair?) when he heard that the electrical workers won a 25 hour week. The press reports that the mildest terms any of JFK's aides could think to say was that it was completely "unjustifiable." After all, how will their boss be able to bring wages down if the unemployed army should be lessened through this shorter workweek?

The British workers, on the other hand, who have struck against the ravages of Automation, will feel a close kinship for this action of the American electrical workers. It is precisely because this is the type of action they wanted all European workers to engage in, that they opposed the idea of the Common Market as it was pursued, first by the 6 members, and

now by Britain that seeks to join it. Far from that being any sort of "socialist" dream of a United States of Europe, it was an attempt to supplement the playing with low tariffs for members and high tariffs for non-members by reducing the conditions of labor to one common denominator set by the state-capitalistic rulers who want to be free to engage in a global war.

Note the kinship of the bourgeois press with the capitalistic view of what "an Atlantic Community" should be like. The year began with top European correspondents singing a new tune about the high standard of living of the European workers. After having been exposed for long, long decades to panegyrics about "the highest standard of living in the world" that the American workers are supposed to enjoy, these great believers in the American dream, have suddenly discovered that, while it is that "the wages" American workers earn are higher than those of European workers, the Europeans have such better medical care and other privileges that "in the end" the high American standard isn't so high after all.

It's peculiar how quickly they found out,—once they feared that the American workers may oppose a "free market" if it means competition on the basis of the lowest paid labor—what they didn't previously know for decades on end. Pardon us, if we remind these penny-a-liners that, whereas it is true that no advance country is more backward in medical care than the United States, it is not true that either the American or the European worker enjoys so high a standard of living, or that there will be no change in the conditions of labor if only tariffs are reduced and the natural rapaciousness of capitalists in competition takes over.

As for the international solidarity, the American workers have no need for lessons by the woid agents of the bourgeois press, State, and bloated monopolies. Nor will they tolerate the utter hypocrisy that permits a whole bunch of lies to cover up a single grain of truth in the hope that this single grain of truth will brainwash the American workers and stop them from continuing with their class struggle. The American as the European and all the world's working class must continue with their struggles if capital is to be stopped from another century of civil war in order to keep the workers from winning a shorter workweek. The workers will not forget the centuries it took to win the 8 hour day, even if JEE continues to rewrite American history by declaring May 1 "Law Day."

In addition to the attempt to sell the workers the idea of accommodating themselves to a permanent army of unemployed, to lower wages and inhuman automated conditions of production, the bourgeois press is busy changing course in midstream on other previously cherished principles—without even bothering to inform any one that the rules of the game have changed. This time the change is on the question of private versus state capital.

Even as the Communist theoretician is practiced in presenting every revision of Marxism as its "timely concretization," so Eric Sevareid has suddenly presented the tug of war between private and state as "false

- 4 -

alternatives": "The choice is not one or the other, but both." Off-handedly he now admits that private capital never will build schools or hospitals or even sufficient highways when and where needed—which, needless to say, shouldn't mean any diminution of their profits. Isn't this after all, the best of all possible worlds? I suppose that under such circumstances there will be no need to have a shotgun wedding between private and state capital; after all, don't we live in the best of all possible worlds and isn't "equilibrium" a good principle to follow and forget all about the nuclear holocaust the whopping budget is preparing for us?

And now, to cap this hard sell comes a utopia that outdoes the one the Communist journalists are playing with. It is by Peter Drucker who in the January 21st issue of The New York Times Magazine forecasts a bright American future for that year chosen by Khrushchev—1960. He tells us that we do not need to worry about Russia outproducing us in steel or electric power or grain—we will in that period change from these to aluminum, electronics, plastics, chemicals—and "knowledge workers" will replace manual workers. That I dare say is superior to Khrushchev's "Congress of Philosophical Workers." Moreover, we will by then have achieved "an international economy."

Needless to say before it gets international we will have an "Atlantic economy" which, of course, will be superior to the Russian bloc. In this one we will all be equals—only some will be more equal than others. For example "we want to continue to sell to Europe more than we buy from it." And of course, in labor relations, the key is to remain "competitive" and while all things are so wonderful let's not forget that we're doing this, not according to some Marxist creed, but wonder of wonders, because of "economic necessity."

Unfortunately, we cannot remain with these "knowledge workers" in the rarified atmosphere of such empty utopias, but must return to the realities of the day—the unemployment; the low wages; the workweek which has seen no basic change since the last century-old struggle established the 8 hour day; the civil rights which Kennedy would like to consign to perdition, but which the Freedom Riders will keep in the headlines long after the day his 93 billion dollar budget has failed in dulling our senses to make us fatalistically resign ourselves to a nuclear holocaust. While the State of the Union Message, the Budget and the Economic Report become a matter of ever new huddles in Congress, the working people must go about the imperative need to change the workaday world of capitalism into something more livable and human.

— Raye

* The General Congress of Labor, which was affiliated with Marx's Workingmen's International Association, passed the following resolution, at Baltimore, as far back as August 16, 1866:

"The first and great necessity of the present, to free the labor of this country from capitalistic slavery, is the passing of a law by which eight hours shall be the normal

3013

3 0 1 4
- 5 -

working day in all States of the American Union. We are resolved to put forth all our strength until this glorious result is attained."

It took another 20 years (December, 1888) before the workers decided to concretize this struggle for the eight hour day by passing a resolution. At its St. Louis Congress, the AFL decided to launch a campaign for simultaneous strikes to take place all over the country on May 1, 1890.

See Marrism And Freedom page 150.

This is the true origin of May 1, which even JFK cannot change by fiat.

(Labor Donated)

3014

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

January 29, 1962

IN MEMORIAM: NATALIA SEDOVA TROTSKY

Dear Friends:

On January 23rd the air waves from France carried the news of the death of Natalia Sedova Trotsky. We were going to press with the last letter from her pen, written to the French press in opposition to their misrepresentation of her offer to go to Moscow if her demand for a serious and full review of the greatest (1936-38) Frame-Up Trials in history was undertaken. The bourgeois write-up gave the impression that Natalia had mistaken either Khrushchev's de-Stalinization or Mao Tse-tung's opposition to Khrushchev, for genuine Marxism. In the true tradition of the Old Bolshevism, these two totalitarian bureaucrats had destroyed, this frail 82 year old Bolshevik had written with the fervor and revolutionary vigor, of a new youthful adherent to Marxism, who is shocked at the lack of integrity of the bourgeois press in presenting Leon Trotsky as "The spiritual father of Mao Tse-tung."

She fired back: "These words don't belong to me at all; they were introduced by the writer of the interview...A great revolutionary like Leon Trotsky could not in any way be the father of Mao Tse-tung who won his position in direct struggle with the Left Opposition (Trotskyist) and consolidated it by the murder and persecution of revolutionaries just as Chiang Kai-shek did...I don't expect anything from the Russian party nor from its fundamentally anti-communist imitators. All de-Stalinization will prove to be a trap if it doesn't lead to the seizure of power by the proletariat and the dissolution of the police institutions, political, military and economic, based on the counter-revolution which established Stalinist state-capitalism."^{*}

This was the first time that Natalia Trotsky had used the expression, state-capitalism, in speaking of established Communism, in China or Russia "or all others based on the latter model."

Over and above the sadness of her death there came over me a warmth and good feeling as I pondered over her intellectual daring and never-ending optimism. For it is the latter which permeated her as it characterized the small Marxist movement who had fought on until the mighty Tsarist empire had been overthrown; had fused with the greatest spontaneous outburst in history, the Russian Revolution of 1917; had not become "pessimistic" when, soon after the death of Lenin, that first workers' state had become bureaucratized and began devouring

^{*} see the full letter in the January, 1962 issue (Vol. 7, No.1) of News & Letters.

- 2 -

the children of the revolution, while killing off the General Staff that had led the November Revolution. Instead they searched for new beginnings on an international scale.

Natalia Sedova Trotsky had first come in contact with the revolutionary movement in Tsarist Russia when she was only 15, had emigrated to Europe to study in its schools only to join the small Russian emigre group there. The modest self-effacing young woman who was a member of the Iskra (the paper of the Russian Marxist group) had been assigned to get a new and promising young theoretician who had just escaped from Siberia and whose name she had not been told, a room. She was also asked that she make sure that he was not wasting time but preparing for his first lecture in Paris. This was the only incident of her personal life that Natalia ever told me during those years (1937-38) in Mexico when Stalin was staging the monstrous Moscow Trials for which he had prepared for a decade but which Leon Trotsky had only two hours to answer, (and that only because the Mexican press would tell us what charges came over the teletype and held the presses open for Leon Trotsky to answer.)

Natalia said that she just couldn't get herself to enter Trotsky's room and deliver the message of the need to concentrate on the lecture. She therefore told the older comrade that she thought he was preparing since she had heard him whistling. Her interpretation of the whistle, however, was not accepted and she was sent back to knock on the door and speak to him. She was blushing and walking slowly toward the room when Lev Davidovitch burst out of it, almost knocking her over. It was love at first sight. She was then 21. She remained his life-long companion. Through the exile from Tsarism, and in Tsarist prisons, through the tidal wave of revolution and in power, in exile from Stalin till the tragic murder parted them.

Twice during the last, lonely, tragic decade, living with the memory of the murder of her husband and her two sons by the GPU, this great revolutionary had also to speak out against those who called themselves Trotskyists and headed the 4th International Leon Trotsky had founded. We just read her statement that is against Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung.

The first of her statements after Trotsky's death came during the period when Tito broke from Stalin and the Trotskyists began their flirtation with him, which was soon followed up by a whitewash of the Stalinist role in the Korean war. There she fought the Trotskyists directly: "Obsessed by old and outlived formulas you continue to regard the Stalinist state as a workers' state. I cannot and will not follow you in this... In 1932 and 1933 the Stalinists, in order to justify their shameless capitulation to Hitlerism, declared that it would matter little if the Fascists came to power, because socialism would come after and through the rule of Fascism. Only dehumanized brutes without a shred of socialist thought or spirit could have argued this way. Now,

notwithstanding the revolutionary aims which animate you, you maintain that the despotic reaction which has triumphed in Eastern Europe is one of the roads through which socialism will eventually come. This view marks an irremediable break with the profoundest convictions always held by our movement and which I continue to share...The Third World War which threatens humanity confronts the revolutionary movement with the most difficult problems, the most complex situations, the gravest decisions...Whoever defends this regime (Stalinism) of barbarous oppression, regardless of motives, abandons the principles of socialism and internationalism."^o

In 1951 when she had spoken out so audaciously she had still refrained from referring to Stalinism as state-capitalism. When I had gone to see her in 1947 I must confess that, despite my great admiration for her, the thought still clung to me that her theoretical development had been willingly stifled by herself because she had subordinated everything in her life to that of Leon Trotsky. I had asked her what about her diary to which Trotsky refers (and from which he quotes in his autobiography, *My Life*.) I offered to help her publish it. She modestly said it was quite incomplete, that it was only done to help Leon Trotsky remember certain events that passed him by too fast and he had exaggerated the diary's value. I felt that in any case she would not publish it as she wished to take no steps that might in any way be construed differently than those Lev Davidovich would have taken.

She turned the conversation instead toward my work. Although I had broken with Trotsky over the class nature of Russia and its defense, she not only treated me as a colleague because of my past association with Trotsky, but was very interested in finding out what were the theoretical reasons for the break. She had me translate for her, word for word, the articles on the Russian revisions of Marx's theory of value.** She refused, however, to take a position on the designation of Russia as state-capitalist. She said that it was implicit in Trotsky's fight against the bureaucracy, that she felt he himself would have reached that position had he lived through to the end of the war and seen the Stalinist exploitation of Eastern Europe. But she insisted that she simply did not know enough theory to venture out on her own when Trotsky had died before coming to such a conclusion. Thus, four years later when she broke with the Trotskyist movement, she still did it on the basis of general revolutionary principles rather than any specific theory.

All this hesitation however, was gone by the time Khrushchev that obedient Stalinist in Stalin's lifetime, dared to picture himself as an anti-Stalinist when his mentor died and revolution broke out in Eastern Europe, first East Germany and then Hungary. Not having learned anything from these counter-revolutionary actions, the Trotskyists now were accepting most of the ground rules that Mao was laying down in his fight for leadership of the Communist orbit. Natalia then rose to her full stature and declared all this "state-capitalism."

* This letter was addressed to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, dated May 9, 1951 and will be republished by us in full in the February issue of *News & Letters*,

** *American Economic Review*, Sept. 1944, Sept. 1945.

which is further than Leon Trotsky ever took his analysis of the Russian bureaucracy.

The death of Natalia Sedova Trotsky marks the end of the generation that made the greatest revolution in history. It has put a period to that other great phenomenon: the role of the women in the Bolshevik movement. One has only to compare an opportunist like Furtsava, the only woman to reach, for a single year, the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party, with a Vera Zasulich—one of the three founders of the Russian Marxist movement—to see the class abyss that divides one from the other. I mention Zasulich rather than the one woman in the world Marxist movement that has made her mark as an original theoretician—Rosa Luxemburg—because, in memoriam of Natalia, I wish to speak of those women who had not gained theoretical leadership and therefore were very nearly disregarded except as faithful wives and mothers. Vera Zasulich, though a leader, was known for her bravery and emotions rather than for any theoretical contributions, although it was her letter to Karl Marx that had produced his answer on the special role that the mir (old Russian agricultural commune existing even in Tsarist days) might play if Russia could find a way "to skip" capitalism in her path to industrialization.

Vera Zasulich was only 16, in 1861 when she was first arrested. She was in and out of jails when she gained prominence for shooting the most hated Tsarist Governor General of St. Petersburg, Trepo, for the flogging of an imprisoned fellow student. The exciting thing was that she had turned her trial into such an exposé of the horrors of Tsarism that even in those days (1878) the jury acquitted her! She was then smuggled out to exile and it is to her place that all who escaped from Tsarism found their way—Martov, Lenin, Trotsky. She was Plekhanov's colleague when he broke with the populists, attacked terrorism, and founded Russian Marxism. Natalia told me that even when they were all convinced Marxists, that is to say, believing that only the mass movement can overthrow Tsarism or capitalism, and writing heated articles against terrorism, they would all feel so elated when some particularly hated Tsarist official was shot, that they would quietly drink to the daring terrorist who had made that attempt.

It was this type of hatred for an exploitative regime, this kind of self-sacrificing daring which would send them crossing the border back to Russia to distribute their precious literature, (and Natalia too went with these messages and found herself in jail,) the all-encompassing devotion to the movement which made it appear as if they had no personal life whatever since none of the personal life ever impinged upon the needs of the movement of liberation that created a very special kind of human being such as Natalia Sedova Trotsky.

I shall never forget the only time I ever saw Natalia cry. News came of the death of her only living son, Leon Sedoff, in Paris. I happened to have been the first to have gotten that tragic news when, as Leon Trotsky's secretary, answered the phone while we were all at the table eating lunch. I did not dare face anyone with that news. Stalin had persecuted her other son whose whereabouts we didn't know. He had persecuted Trotsky's daughters by his first wife as well as the wife herself until death by suicide or torture. And now this—I just sat through lunch, pretending that it was a wrong number, and at the end of the lunch the secretariat got together to figure out who should break the news to Leon Trotsky and who to Natalia. We all decided that only Leon Trotsky could be the bearer of such news to Natalia.

They departed to their room and in a moment came that scream. We did not see them for 8 days. The blow was the harder not only because Leon Sedoff had been their only living child, but also because he had been Trotsky's closest literary and political collaborator. When Trotsky was interned in Norway, gagged, unable to answer the monstrous charges levelled against him in the first (August 1936) Moscow Trials, Sedoff had penned Le Livre Rouge,* which, by brilliantly exposing the Moscow falsifiers, dealt an irreparable blow to the prestige of the GPU.

In the dark days . . . after the tragic news had reached us, when Leon Trotsky and Natalia were closeted in their room, Trotsky wrote the story of their son's brief life. It was the first time since pre-revolutionary days that Trotsky had written by hand.

On the eighth day Leon Trotsky emerged from his room. I was petrified at the sight of him. The neat, meticulous Leon Trotsky had not shaved for a whole week. His face was deeply lined. His eyes were swollen from so much crying. Without uttering a word, he handed me the hand-written manuscript, Leon Sedoff, Son, Friend, Fighter, which contained some of Trotsky's most poignant writing. My eyes set first on this statement, "I told Natalia of the death of our son—in the same month of February in which, 32 years ago, she brought to me in jail the news of his birth. Thus ended for us the day of February 16th, the blackest day in our personal lives... Together with our boy had died everything that still remained young within us." The pamphlet was dedicated "to the proletarian youth."

The following morning the papers carried the announcement of the Third (March 1938) Moscow Trials, scheduled to open within two short weeks of the death of Leon Sedoff. One day shortly after this Natalia went for a walk with me in the woods and there she began to cry quietly and asked me not to let Leon Trotsky know since he more than anyone needed all his strength and our help to answer these fantastic, slanderous charges from the man in the Kremlin who set on murdering the one man (Trotsky) who could still lead a revolution against the bureaucracy and restore the Russian, and thereby the international movement, to its Marxist path of liberation.

* First appeared in Russian as special issue of the Opposition Bulletin (organ of the Russian Bolshevik-Leninists,) edited by Sedoff in Paris.

- 6 -

With the beginning of the Third Moscow Trials, we had to forget everything else and begin fighting the charges.

I shall remember Natalia in that one moment of tears when her thoughts were nevertheless on the movement. It so clearly expresses the personal tragedy that old Bolshevik's do not let interfere with the liberating movement that presses ever forward. I shall remember Natalia as the great revolutionary whose thoughts were as high as her devotion and she spoke out even against those who led the movement her husband had founded. I shall remember Natalia the mother who had brought up her children in the midst of all these hardships to be revolutionaries in their own right. I shall remember Natalia for the legacy she has left us all of the generation that made a revolution, saw it transformed, yet never wavered for a moment in their optimism, their principledness, and the tenderness that shone through, the hard as flint attitude toward the rulers of the world that are leading us to the nuclear holocaust.

The intercommunication through the ages will continue, for death here becomes the beacon to the future.

--Raya

(labor donated)

3020

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

February 5, 1962

JFK'S WILFUL, VICIOUS IGNORANCE OF MARXISM
AND RUSK'S DOLLAR DEMOCRACY AT PUNTA DEL ESTE

Dear Friends:

The "New Frontier" has this past week sprouted two variations of the very old theme of dollar imperialism and its suppression of liberation movements. The first variation can be called Rusk's Dollar Democracy, in recognition of the Secretary of State's spurious performance at the OAS Conference. The second variation must be called JFK's wilful, vicious ignorance of Marxism.

The latter has a somewhat longer history than the Punta del Este Conference. President Kennedy's first attack on Marx was also connected with an attack on Cuba. At the time, Kennedy was addressing a national press conference that he was trying to brainwash to accept censorship. In an off-the-cuff remark Kennedy then made some forced remarks about Karl Marx's dissatisfaction with the New York Herald Tribune which had not paid him for some of his contributions. The implication was that if the press then had treated Marx more kindly, "we today" would not have had Marxism as a world force to contend with. That so-called fourth estate—the press—evidently didn't consider that remark as news fit to be printed. In any case the "brilliance" of that remark shows only for those who heard it. Last week, on the other hand, JFK's remark was studied and intended as "the line" which the press this time eagerly parroted.

One person at the President's news conference gloated at the forced identity between the opposites—Marxism, a theory of liberation, and established Communism, state-capitalist enslavement. It was the son-in-law of Khrushchev and editor of Izvestia, Adzhubei. He couldn't have dreamed of a greater gift than to have the President of the United States gild Communism by identifying it, as do the Russians themselves, with "Marxism-Leninism," and that at the very moment when Latin American Marxists are trying to separate themselves from Fidel Castro, who had diverted that revolution into Communist and cold war channels, and thereby made more difficult their task of fighting for full liberation both from American imperialism and Russian totalitarianism.

At the Punta del Este Conference, moreover, there were those who are not only not as ignorant as is the President of the United States on the question of Marxism, as theory, but also as both practice and organization. For example, the Bolivian Revolution was led by a variety of Marxists from the pale Socialist who heads the state now to the Trotskyists. None would wish to be confused with a Communist, least of all President Victor Paz Estenssoro who is trying at one and the same time to play the Kennedy game and not to lose all mass support in Bolivia.

In any case when Rusk says that there was "unanimity" on the question of "Marxism-Leninism," he is lying. Some Latin Americans speaking against "Communism," are not attacking Marxism but established Communism--in Russia and China--and therefore of Castro who has led the Cuban state into that orbit. Even those Latin American politicians who speak against "Marxism-Leninism" know that they couldn't do so in their own countries without showing a knowledge of a difference between Marxism and Communism. Castro's saying he is a "Marxist-Leninist" does not make it so. The Latin Americans do not take either Rusk's or Castro's word for it. They know that Fidel's proclamation of his being a "Marxist-Leninist" is motivated as much by the masses' aspiration for socialism as by Castro's Communist opportunism.

Rusk would have made the Punta del Este Conference* into less of a fiasco if he had stuck to the one point the Latin American countries were unanimous about, and that is to get economic aid from the United States for other causes than military and cold war politics. Instead, he very nearly forgot the supposed objectives of the Alliance for Progress--agricultural reform, some labor and welfare legislation to keep the population from following Castro into the Communist orbit, and a government willing to submit itself to the electorate. Indeed, any government, no matter how repressive,--from the Haitian dictatorship to the military brainchild of the CIA, Guatemala--could easily win dollars plus designation of "democracy" if only it lined up with the United States in its line of attack on Cuba. Where any government fully supporting the United States was duly elected, like in Venezuela, would it dare submit to an election now?

Not even Rusk could present the states that voted for expulsion of Cuba from the OAS as the "majority" since only one-fourth of the population of Latin America inhabit those 13 lands whereas three-fourths live in the countries that abstained--Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Chile. Thereupon the Rhodes scholar decided to follow his leader, the President of the United States, who does not have so great a scholastic standing but is a most masterful political juggler. Rusk played up the vote against Communism as if it were against Marxism. Thereby he has thrown away the one ideological weapon--the Marxist theory of liberation--that could enable a mass struggle against Castro's channeling the Cuban revolution into the Communist orbit.

Latin America has been the plundered continent that gives the lie to Western imperialism's claim that only because Africa was "backward" was it submitted to the "civilizing mission" of Europe. The Andean was one of the highest world civilizations when it was first plundered by the conquistadores. The Spanish and Portuguese laid waste to a continent that had in abundance both natural resources and a high agricultural civilization. In Peru alone the Inca empire had supported 30 million people in fair abundance as against both the despoliation of land and of people that now characterizes that desolate landscape. The first plundering by the conquistadores was followed by the second plundering by America and Great Britain, and later became wholly American (with the acquiescence of Great Britain.) The Monroe Doctrine that protected Latin America from Spanish invasion and colonization could not, however, protect it from United States

* For the details of that conference see "Our Life and Times" by Peter Mallory in the February issue (Vol.7, No.2) of News & Letters.

dollar imperialism, one commodity crop economy, gunboat diplomacy, and calculated non-industrialization. For it was for this and not for liberation, that the Monroe Doctrine was designed.

The tragedy of Latin America is that its "heroes" freeing the countries from Spanish and Portuguese rule subjected the native populations to the native ruling classes and didn't even exclude receiving British gold in the process. Not even Castro dares yet to expose the true Bolivar, San Martin, etc. who led those first 1820 revolutions for liberation from Spain and Portugal. While these are in a class separate from the two-by-four military dictators that later became vest-pocket presidents of American imperialism, the truth is that none of the famous leaders led a genuine social revolution until the 20th century. (Cuba did not get its freedom from Spain until the end of the 19th century.)

Liberated from Spain and Portugal the Latin American masses were only to be exploited as ruthlessly by a native ruling class. Indeed, the native ruling classes were and are themselves foreigners—like the French colons in Algeria today. It is this semi-feudal "native" (Spanish) oligarchy that manages to be even to the right of Kennedy. Without their displacement by their own working people, the billions that will be poured in will only go further to line their pockets.

The Kennedy Administration's attack on Cuba is only part of the "grand design" to keep all of Latin America from finding the road to genuine liberation. At the same time the attacks on Marxism are directed as much against the workers in the United States as against those in Latin America. Ever since the invasion of Cuba, Kennedy has played a consistent role—that of preparing an all-out attack on the working people and Marxists in the United States. As Marxist-Humanists, we pointed out from the first, (See Weekly Political Letter of April 22, 1961) that Kennedy's discovery of "the new and deeper struggle" was in actuality the first of many attempts to be directed at undermining the American revolution, first of all in the matter of thought, as the proper foundation for gaining acquiescence to a nuclear holocaust, on a world, and not just Cuban, scale.

If you follow all of President Kennedy's speeches, you will quickly see that he has seized "the Cuban question" for that purpose over and above any invasion of Cuba. This explains why Kennedy was so eager to believe Castro on the one point of his declaration of "Marxism-Leninism" though on all others he considers Castro a liar. That includes the one point about which Castro is not lying—that he still has the support of the majority of Cubans.

Just as we will fight Castro's attempt to ape the Communist usurpation of Marxism, so we will not allow President Kennedy to get away with his forced identification of the two opposites. The Administration needs to learn, if not the truths of Marxist-Humanism, then, at least, the reality of the America that refuses to be brainwashed by him. He cannot set the limits for the struggle for the minds of men. He must himself submit to it. We suggest he come better armed with historic knowledge and less transparent in the convolutions of his capitalistic mentality.

—Raya

3023

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

February 12, 1962

THE GENERAL STRIKE, THE CLASS WEAPON, ITS SPONTANEOUS BIRTH,
DEVELOPMENT—AND ABUSE, AS WELL AS ITS RELATIONSHIP TO PEACE MOVEMENTS

Dear Friends,

Two very different events on the world scene today make it necessary to recall our ABC's of what precisely is that all-important, decisive, and strictly working class nature of the general strike. In Paris today there is a mass demonstration which is in the nature of a one-day general strike against the OAS and the police brutality in the previous anti-OAS demonstration. The volatile situation there may lead to a revolutionary situation—or once again be stifled in the manner not alone of dictatorial De Gaulle but the French Communist Party which has long abused the weapon of the general strike.

The second event is really a standstill at New York that, publicity-wise, tried on the look of a grandstand play by calling for nothing short of "A World-Wide General Strike for Peace." Not many of its leaders have ever been in a factory, much less the multitude of factories of a city like New York (let alone the whole country). Nevertheless the brainstorm that made them issue "a call" for a world-wide general strike had them specify that it was to last a whole week.

Had there been the slightest shred of reality to this call, the response to it would have meant the creation of a pro-revolutionary situation which can by no means be created from above since it means an objective reality. Subjectively, moreover, it would have called forth those who intend to hold on to their power—the counter-revolutionary might of the existing state, police, military. And how was the movement prepared to cope with this? Well, the over-sized leaflet calling for a world-wide general strike, and undersized thought that went into its makeup, listed only a post-office box to which one could send a check, an obscure (fm) radio station where one might listen to "strike coverage"—and a bunch of street corners, including the New York Stock Exchange, where, no doubt, one could, at noon, meet one's shopmates.

The general strike is, of course, the ideal of the syndicalist movement that understands one thing perfectly—workers' power at the point of production. Should workers put down their tools in a general strike, nothing whatever could move, and, having given this demonstration of where the real productive power lies, a congress of trades unions could assume power throughout the land without, supposedly, any necessity for political power, governmental or party.

Ever since the development of the trades union movement following the Industrial Revolution of the late 18th century, and especially so since the 1848 revolutions, through a century of struggles down to our day, the aim of syndicalism has been not only to take power away from the capitalists

- 2 -

who have no right to it, but to see that it does not get "diverted" into political channels. Since the general strike, however, is a prelude to revolution—the very highest proletarian politics—the syndicalist ideal has much too much utopianism ever to be realized. Syndicalism, however, does have great achievements to its credit, and Marxists therefore have always treated it with seriousness and comradeship.

In the United States, the Industrial Workers of the World never achieved a country-wide strike, but it was in the forefront of all the greatest class struggles and did lead industry-wide strikes. When the Communist International was first organized, it therefore appealed to the IWW to join it and many of its ranks and leaders did indeed join the Marxist movement then. But the IWW as an organization stood aloof.

Between the brutal persecutions by the government, on the one hand, and the attraction of the Marxists, on the other hand, the IWW declined to where it now is a small, unimportant organization. It does, however, have a great past, and present principles—and wouldn't set its sights on a picket line in front of the New York Stock Exchange.

Those who called for that haven't the slightest concept of what a general strike is.

Historically, the first general strike that was political, and thus the most successful, was the one in St. Petersburg, October 1905. The first Soviet—a council created to coordinate the many strikes that were taking place simultaneously and were, in their development, reaching from economic demands for higher wages and shorter hours, toward the demands for constitutional freedom—very nearly toppled the centuries-old Tsarist regime. (1) To cite but one example of what "participation" means when workers are involved—no less than 50 per cent of all workers in St. Petersburg, irrespective of which industry they were involved took part in the elections to the Soviets. This in a land where the workers were disenfranchised.

The spontaneity of action that produced the general strike; the uniqueness of the form of workers' rule in something called the Soviet; the totality of the demands, economic, political and social; the activity of workers, peasants, soldiers, women—thus was the 1905 Revolution born. This was what was later called the "dress rehearsal for 1917."

Rosa Luxemburg was so enthusiastic over the general strike as the workers spontaneously created and used it that she made it, rather than the Soviet, the road to revolution, creating a new political category out of the "General Strike" her most famous pamphlet. Leon Trotsky, who had first projected his theory of permanent revolution before the outbreak of 1905, found proof of his theory in this spontaneous outbreak, but subordinated both the general strike and the Soviet to the question of gaining state power.

Lenin, who was much more flexible than either of those two revolutionaries, refusing to be bound either by the general strike or the permanent revolution theory, and not yet seeing the Soviet as the form of

- 3 -

workers rule, did bend an ear with such intensity to what the workers were doing that, when in 1917, the Soviet again reappeared spontaneously, knew the road to "state power." It was: "All power to the soviets."

In the period between 1905 and 1917 we had first the Balkan Wars of 1912. Seeing that a world war might come, and fearing the opportunity of the Second International, Luxemburg and Lenin united to offer an anti-war resolution which specified the general strike as a method to be used to stop war should it break out.

World War I broke out, and brought about not only the collapse of the Second International but also the pacifist movement. (2) No general strike occurred anywhere. Henceforward the way to fight for peace became the decisive question. The question of general strike was not the issue as the focus moved from the factory to the battlefield.

Lenin alone then came out with the slogan of the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war. Life proved him right as the first to turn the tide from the war holocaust were the Russian soldiers who refused to continue to fight in the imperialist war. Heretofore Trotsky had thought there was an air of "defeatism" in Lenin's statement that the defeat of one's own country was "the lesser evil." Even after the February Revolution which made the fight for peace and revolution synonymous, Trotsky did not hurry to join Lenin. Between February and November--in August 1917--Trotsky first became a Bolshevik. Peace came to Russia with the November Revolution.

1919 was a great year for general strikes in Europe. While they didn't lead to revolutions, they did stop the imperialist interventions against the first workers' state in history.

The general strike reached this country,--but here it was limited to the city of Seattle. Outside of the general strike at the turn of the century for the eight hour day, the general strikes in this country were limited to a general strike of a single industry, but sometimes encompassed a whole city, as in St. Louis after the Paris Commune and in Seattle in 1919. Wendell Phillips was moved to say ^{once} when you scratch a New Yorker you "find a Communist." The sit-down rather than the general strike created the CIO. But there are times when a single industry is of such a key nature, as the power strike in Pittsburgh in 1948, that the city itself comes to a standstill.

Enough has been said to show that a general strike cannot be organized from above, least of all by those having nothing to do with production. Once its origin is proletarian and the working class elects its Councils, it automatically moves from mere "coordination" of strike actions to a new form of political and total rule, as was seen in 1956 in Hungary where not only the workers but the youth and intellectuals chose the Council as the form of their decentralized functioning as well.

How Lord Russell or Dorothy Day thought they could just call for a general strike and not subject the peace movement to become a laughing

3026

stock speaks tons of their non-working class character. Its wishful "class-lessness" is something that arose with the A-bomb and it is to the post World War II world that we must now turn.

The dropping of the A-bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, followed a few years later by the development of the H-bomb on both sides of the Iron Curtain, brought consciousness to the petty-bourgeoisie that had heretofore concerned itself much with the question of war and revolution. This new bomb, however, wasn't just another weapon of war. It was the ultimate in destruction. The very survival of mankind was at stake. All classes therefore had to fight it. Only in Japan however did the anti-nuclear movement involve the whole population and therefore, of necessity, the working class nature predominated over the petty-bourgeoisie.

In Western Europe, on the other hand, although the cold war had followed so fast on the heels of war that peace seemed only an interlude between wars, the anti-nuclear movement did not grow. The reason was due to the Communist Parties in France and Italy, which adhered to the foreign policy of Russia. The policy at the moment was fight the Marshall Plan, and this involved calling general strikes on any and every occasion, exhausting the proletariat in these all-out efforts which were nevertheless made impotent by their limitation to 24 hour durations. Which is exactly what the CPs aimed at for they had no intention whatever of taking power where the taking was not assured by the "Red Army," as in Eastern Europe, or by a coup which it could control, as in Czechoslovakia. To have come to power in any other way, that is to say, by the proletariat's spontaneous and self-controlled actions would have doomed the CP along with the private capitalists. Therefore the CPs first abused the instrument of the general strike. They then moved away from any strikes altogether unless they could control them. The great Renault strike in 1948 brokeout in spite of their opposition.

When you consider that the Communist Party's actions had no small part in bringing about the situation where a De Gaulle could arise, you can see the frustrations of the French proletariat that is all too eager to come out on general strike against the De Gaulle's dictatorial austerity regime as well as against the OAS and its cancerous, terrorist actions against independence for Algeria.

We have limited ourselves to show how that great weapon of the general strike has been abused by the French C.P. (What will develop there now will be dealt with in detail in the lead for the March issue of News & Letters. Also see "Our Life and Times" in the February issue.)

In Great Britain, however, where the CP had no mass following, the anti-nuclear war movement gained its greatest following. Nevertheless, its petty-bourgeois leadership was a natural to fall into the CP popular front trap, any time the CP willed it. You will recall that when I returned from Europe in 1959 I was shocked at the callous attitude of the leadership toward the workers and youth who had not joined it

because they questioned unilateral action and wanted to see opposition to both sides of the Iron Curtain, and not only to U.S. missile bases. (3)

The CND never quite crossed the Atlantic for here it was limited either to almost cold-war policies like SANE, or wholly pacifist, and in both cases was isolated not only from the working class but from the most vital movement in this country--the Negro struggle. (4) It is no accident that the Negro struggle is the key struggle in this country and explains why we are more active in this movement than in the peace movement that is yet to gain a mass base.

This doesn't mean that we aren't part of whatever movement there is. It does mean that under no circumstances do we allow the movement to play around with the question of the general strike, nor to sow illusions that the way to eliminate war is through such illusions and delusions. The general strike has survived abuse by the CP and no doubt will survive the ludicrous show of the "General Strike for Peace." Nevertheless we cannot deviate from the clear class line on the question of war and peace. Participation in the peace movement, as now constituted, therefore of necessity means that we see to it that our distinctive Marxist-Humanist philosophy of total freedom does not get swallowed by some general abstractions. Truth is always concrete and the ideology of the atheist, Lord Russell which is every bit as fuzzy as that of the Catholic Dorothy Day, could not stand being subjected to the concrete whether it is that of class, a minority's freedom, or the question of the relationship of the state to war. So, once again, it is strike together, but march under separate banners.

--Baya

(1) Pages 156-161 in Marrism and Freedom will give not only a view of the general strike in the 1905 Revolution, but how the Second International's failure to understand undermined that organization.

(2) Indispensable for the period, 1914-1917, and how the question of war and peace affects us to this day is the documentary The Bolsheviks and the World War by O.H. Gankin and H.H. Fisher, Stanford University Press.

(3) See Bulletin "On War and Peace".

(4) Since the CND has grown, even Johnsonites dream of overnight growth and strain, by edict, to force an identity between that movement and the Negro struggle for full equality. As if words can substitute for mass action, they have concocted a new slogan "Ban the Bomb and Racism", reads a leaflet. Then they must have had an after-thought, that really one could not compress the Negro freedom struggle into a mere "and", not even if the "and" were underlined, so they rephrased it positively. They say they stand for "Integration, not disintegration". And while they were in this play-on-words mood, they added jovially, "Meet at Campus Martius"--and, don't forget, "bring the children! These were the people who used to give lectures against "small mass party-ism"! Verily be it said that nothing is so "catching" in the age of state-capitalism, as the leadership complex.

(labor donated)

3028

WEEKLY POLITICAL LETTER

March 5, 1962

JAPAN'S NEW LEFT OF INTELLECTUALS AND WORKERS
POSSIBILITIES OF NEW INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Dear Friends:

Two seemingly separate events in Japan have produced the most hopeful new signs in the world of revolutionary regroupment.

One is the New Left groupings within Zengakuren and among the older generation as well. In the latter category we find the "Association for the Study of Contemporary Thought" (Gendai Shiso Kenkyu Kai) headed by Ikaturu Shimizu. Among the youth we find Kenichi Koyama (of the Zengakuren) who has gone back to the Humanist roots of Marxism to understand the contemporary scene in Japan. As he puts it: "It is not enough to say that Marxist philosophy is materialistic...He placed living human beings in the center of his philosophy instead of dissolving everything into material substance...In this connection, it is vitally important to study the process whereby Marx's thought went from the discussion of alienated labor in the Manuscripts to labor power as a commodity in Capital." And in carrying through the need for a New Left and the examination of our age and separating oneself from Stalin, Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung, he then ended with "The vanguard party, the united front, the Chinese communes--these are some of the areas which must be examined and understood if we are seriously to discuss the future of human liberation."

The second development concerns the "spring-labor offensive". Today's press carries the news that the SOHYO (Council of Japan's Trade Unions) has begun a series of demonstrations for better wages and labor conditions, demanding a 5,000 yen (\$13.89) monthly wage increase. Labor conditions in Japan are among the worst in any industrial country. Laborers work 14 hours a day and get only 2 free days a month. Women textile workers live in barracks and are subject to a vicious espionage system. Conditions in the key industries are not too much better off and the unemployment is staggering. Kaoru Ohta, chairman of the SOHYO with its 4 million members, has declared that these labor demonstrations will continue through March and April. They will be sparked by iron and steel, electric machinery and machine tool industries. If the 10 days collective bargaining does not win them the pay raises, these demonstrations will be followed by a strike by Korokyo (Council of Public Enterprises) workers.

A complication will arise from the sudden support by the Communists who heretofore have fought both against workers' and student demonstrations where these have been directed against the national bourgeoisie and not just against the United States since they have decreed that Japan is a semi-feudal colony like the Afro-Asian countries and the "nation" (including bourgeois and petty bourgeois) must be united in this struggle for "national independence." This time, however Sighar Takeuchi of the Central Committee of the Japanese Communist Party has announced they are supporting the demonstrations as a way of developing the workers' "political consciousness" which to the Communists

means the latest foreign policy of Russia, such as "total disarmament" and "industrial peace," whatever the latter may mean.

The CP is entering the labor field in order once again to stop the serious revolutionary regroupment away from CP influence which has reached mass proportions both among students and workers.

The move away from Communist domination I wish here to analyze on the basis of two amazing articles that appear in New Politics (Winter, 1962) — "The Zengakuren" by Kenichi Koyama and "The Intellectuals" by Ikutaro Shimizu. These reflect a movement among independent Japanese Marxists who are the only ones in the world that have a mass following and whose positions on war and revolution, as well as the relationship of intellectuals to workers, parallel our own. Thus Ikutaro Shimizu writes: "The fear of nuclear weapons has obscured the understanding that war is rooted in the capitalist system; the simple wish for peace has become the dominating idea, taking the place of class struggle, revolution and socialism... This ideological armistice corresponded perfectly with the 'united front' tactics of the Communists and their allies. It combined the jargon of the left with the tactics of rightwing opportunism... In the course of these events one striking characteristic of the official left leadership stood out clearly—contempt for the masses."

To fully understand this movement among Japanese intellectuals it is important to bear in mind that the struggles against the Japan-United States Security Treaty has had the same effect in breaking the Japanese movement away from Communist control as the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution has had on the West European Communists who tore up their cards by the thousands and tens of thousands. Despite the slanderous U.S. press the famous 1959 and 1960 demonstrations were not led by the Communists.

Quite the contrary.

The Communist Party denounced the Zengakuren youth which had led these struggles as "agents of American imperialism." The CP opposed the analysis of Zengakuren, that it was not only an anti-American struggle, but an anti-Japanese monopoly-imperialistic struggle. The CP opposed fighting the treaty as a class struggle, insisting on limiting it only to a "national struggle" that could "unite the nation" including even those in the ruling party that opposed Kishi, so long as "the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois" were willing to join the demonstrations as purely "anti-American."

In January 1960 they were so opposed to these demonstrations that they attacked the Zengakuren at the very moment that the Japanese ruling class actually killed Miss Michiko Kanba and refused to participate in the mass funeral for her. This was the blow that climaxed their post-war class compromiser role. The CP's opposition to the 1959 march on the Diet that involved no less than 80,000 workers and students is analyzed profoundly and succinctly by Shimizu:

"In the course of these events, one striking characteristic of the official left leadership stood out clearly—contempt for the masses." And

again: "The reaction of the bureaucrat with a deeply rooted contempt for the masses to an unexpected upsurge of mass action is one of fear." This theme runs like a red thread through Ikutaro Shimizu's article which analyzes how the Communist use intellectuals by expounding slogans for peace that are allegedly beyond class analysis and "beyond the differences in ideologies":

"Paradoxically both the impact of war and militarism prior to 1945 and the impact of peace and pacifism since then have had the identical effect: preventing the intellectuals from doing genuine and necessary creative work toward the transformation of society... Rather than turning to the masses, the leadership of the Japanese left found comfort in the high level negotiations between Russian and American leaders."

Shimizu quotes one CP leader as saying "The mission of the intellectuals is ingeniously to explain how the New Pact will have a direct effect on the kitchens of the masses." And along with this contempt for the masses and their alleged "political apathy", another CP leader, in praising Khrushchev's appearance at the UN in 1960, gave vent to this hypocritical view of the wonders of "total disarmament": "Colonial revolutions will henceforth be an unarmed battle of natives without rifles and knives against imperialists without machine guns and revolvers. Now we have entered this new era."

Shimizu, seeing how the Communists were diverting the only genuine movement of the masses for democracy—"mass upsurge of a people"—addressed an "Appeal to Organizations", organized the "Association for Contemporary Thought", and obviously is trying to regroup along with others who are breaking from the Communist Party, especially the Wengakuren youth. He draws this parallel to the POUM: "Hence Wengakuren suffered the same fate as the POUM during the Spanish Civil War, expelled from the cosy arms of the 'Mass Front', persecuted as 'Trotskyists' and provocateurs, defamed by the Communist bureaucrats, the 'progressive' intellectuals and the official Socialist leadership."

The one weakness in these two remarkable articles, which I recommend that all of us study carefully, is that obviously this New Left has not yet moved its opposition to Communism onto a class basis by recognizing that present-day Communism is state-capitalism. Thus Kenichi Koyama, who goes as far as correctly disregarding de-Stalinization, defending the Wengakuren youth who "dared criticize not only Stalin, but also Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung, and they never accepted even Marx and Lenin uncritically. In the course of this process of self-education, student members began to lead actual class struggles", nevertheless appears to limit his criticism of new monopoly capitalism in Japan, without any reference to the new development of post-war capitalism into state-capitalism on a world scale.

We here face the danger that when the Japanese Communists suddenly begin supporting class struggles as they are doing at this very moment, they will be able to recoup their mass support both among workers and intellectuals, as they have done in Western Europe despite the mass losses

they suffered directly after the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution. It is impossible also to win the intellectuals away from an elitist conception (and many in the Zengakuren follow Lenin's "What Is To Be Done" as if neither Lenin underwent any change in that conception after 1917, and as if the politicalization and maturity of the masses stood still) unless one has fully moved into our epoch of social subjectivity. (2)

I am not saying the Japanese New Left would suffer the fate of the New Left in Europe, much of which was sucked into a sort of classless opposition to nuclear war. The Japanese New Left, live in a country with the greatest mass movement against nuclear war and yet they see this movement's limitations unless it will combine this with a movement against capitalism which breeds war.

Furthermore, the Japanese New Left have had their fill of Communist "theses" which have declared Japan a feudal country, no more than "a colony of the United States" on the order of African colonies, so that a "mass front" was required even with Japanese capitalists and militarists so long as they are anti-United States. This call for "national solidarity which bridges class differences" is precisely the point espoused by these independently developing new intellectuals.

Both in the political and philosophical criticism of Communism, these New Left groups in Japan sound Marxist-Humanist. They have, finally, one advantage Marxist-Humanism in America does not have: mass support in an organized manner. It is sufficient to fire the imagination and believe that it would be possible finally to re-establish international relations in an organizational way. It is certainly of quintessential importance for us to establish relations with them.

At the moment of the assassination of Asanuma, we had sent our editorial (3) to the Socialist Party of Japan, but when we got their material, it seemed all to be couched in terms of big power politics, resulting in such a horrendous statement as alignment with Mao Tse-tung "since we have a common enemy, the United States" as if working class politics could be subordinated to the national struggle on both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains that are struggling for world domination. At the same time the right-wing split-off from the Socialist Party--the Democratic Socialist Party--is parroting the United States State Department line of "democracy" versus totalitarianism as if that could be denuded of its class content.

The present articles by Koyama and Shimizu, on the other hand, which reflect the new groupings away from Communism (state-capitalism) and private capitalism assure that this group will not become white washers of either nuclear power. What is of the essence at the moment, therefore, is to express our solidarity with the New Left in Japan, follow the developments of the class struggles there, listen to those voices of revolt and re-evaluation, working for both the clearing of heads and the new relationship of theory to practice that may assume an organizational form on a world scale.

--Raya

Footnotes

(1) These two essays appear as part of a symposium on "Currents in Japanese Socialist Thought". However the articles by the Socialist Party and Democratic Socialist Party spokesmen are couched in terms of cold war politics, as is the introduction to this series written by Lewis Feuer. Nevertheless, we urge all to get this issue of New Politics and read for themselves.

(2) We have no time to develop this here in terms of Japan, but it would be good if readers consulted the special News & Letters Supplement on "Mao Tse-tung, From Beginning of Power to the Sino-Soviet Rift," in the January, 1962, issue, especially the section on Voices of Revolt and the final section on Two Kinds of Subjectivity.

(3) Cf. News & Letters, November, 1960.

- Labor Donated -

POLITICAL LETTER FROM AFRICA

30
April 25, 1962

THEORETICIANS AT THE CROSSROADS, or Toward A New
Formulation of the Relationship of Theory to Practice

Dear Friends:

In the new, new and yet old, old lands of West Africa we are face to face once again with the problem of the agct: is it possible to answer the "what happens after" revolutions the day before so that what happens after does not reproduce the old but makes a "clearing in the bush?"

In Nigeria I was witness to one exciting meeting held under auspices of the Nigerian Youth Congress, the National Trades Union Congress, and the Lagos Tenants Council (described in my report for N&L) that showed no misunderstanding at all of the fact that their early dreams had been betrayed by "the rogues in Parliament now" and that demanded "socialism now". And yet in one respect they were parroting the same line as Zik, the first by just disregarding 1956 as the year of the Hungarian Revolution and seeing it only as the year of the Suez invasion; and Zik (Arikwe) by cynically, for he knows better, presenting it as work of "the CIA and in any case subversive to the duly constituted government."

Today's Ghanaian Times (Nkrumah's paper) reports that the Chinese Communists have concluded their meeting and shown the most fabulous leap forward in history, with not a single word of any difficulties there, not even as much as official Chinese sources themselves admit.

And Guinea, by far the most astute and independent of the African countries, has promptly moved in on the Sino-Soviet dispute by inviting the Chinese delegation there "to resume and expand old fraternal times."

It is fashionable to think that the tragedy of the Congo could occur only after the Sputnik -- that it was the awareness of Russia as a mighty power which produced both in Africa and in Russia (as well as China), on the one hand, and in America and "the West", on the other hand, a Congo torn in three. In actuality, The Congo in 1960, which brought the 2 contenders for world power, to a sharp climax, could have been anticipated in the French Camerouns in 1946-7. And, if theory had been seriously developed as in Marx's and Lenin's days, it would have been seen from the positive, creative, developing new Subject, and not from the vantage point of the US-USSR struggle.

A new pamphlet by an old specialist, the historian Thomas Hodgkin, ("African Political Parties", Penguin African Series paperback) brings to the fore very negatively what we stated positively on the Camerouns as far back as 1947. In trying to show that what is happening in Africa isn't an echo of the communist line but has ramifications today, he writes: "Moreover, the continuing effectiveness of the old channels of communication -- through the market, the family, the women's associations, the young men, the chiefs and

elders" -- makes it possible to organize meetings attended by the ENTIRE POPULATION of a village or quarter of town, children as well as adults, with a rapidity unknown in the West." (My emphasis, A. D.)

O.K., let's retrace our steps back to 1946-7 in 2 different places in Africa -- French Camerouns and British Nigeria -- and see, and it is important that we do see it with eyes of 1962. In 1946 in the Camerouns we had the population to a man, woman and child appear "in the public square" to decide their fate. (I have now decided it must have been Ruben Um Nyobe, General Secretary of the RDA, whom I must have met in Paris and when he took the train it was not back to the Camerouns, but to Czechoslovakia to get the line.) He was convinced by the CP of the need to organize a "vanguard" and to lead a revolution. (He was killed in 1958 and Felix Moumie who then led from exile was poisoned in 1960).

But in the process of this the cold war developed and "the backward Camerounians" were shedding their blood, not for something entirely new in the world, but a tug of war between Russia "and the West" (for the U.S. was everywhere supporting France). The end result was not only the hybrid we have in the Camerouns, but a different type of hybrid in Nigeria.

After the general strike, the actual taking over of one town in the 1945-47 period, the cold war again entered, this time as Prof. Coleman so non-challantly puts it, "Three old and trusted friends of colonial nationalism cooled noticeably after 1945. The Fabian Society and the Labor Party placed more and more emphasis upon economic and social development as a precondition for political freedom, and the people and government of the US increasingly recognized that expanding Soviet imperialism which thrived on instability in newly independent colonial areas, was a far greater threat to civilization than British colonialism seemingly in the process of orderly liquidation." (NIGERIA, Background to Nationalism, my emphasis, R.D.)

In a word, long before the Sputnik, and long before Russia as such entered the scene, the Communists (directly in the case of Camerouns where the leaders followed the CP international line; indirectly in the case of Nigeria where Asikriwe was most certainly not a Communist, but equally could not see a line genuinely independent of both poles of capital) THROTTLED AT BIRTH THE CREATIVITY OF THE SELF-DEVELOPING MASS MOVEMENT, THEREBY PREPARING THE GROUND FOR THE CONGO, 1960, where only it and the USA, fought it out on UN ground, both, or rather all three, cynically disregarding the indigenous roots. And indigenous not in the sense of drum beats but totally new activity and philosophy.

In between the self-activity of the masses of the 1940's and the power politics of 1960's came to fruition the two newly independent republics: Ghana and Guinea with new intelligentsia at head. It is true that this new intelligentsia was more closely linked to the masses than either that which came to power

* Not to mention that "drummers beat out intermittent messages", or "those meetings in the bush are held in a patch of cleared ground under an outsize baobab" or "a song by the griot in praise of the party and its leaders". All of this is quoted with a straight face in an on-the-spot study of "Five Elections in Africa", Oxford, 1960.

by compromise with the old (in Nigeria the old included not only Western imperialism, but "native" feudalism in the Northern region) or where the old won't let go at all, as in the existing imperialist stranglehold in South Africa, the Rhodesias, the OAS in Algeria. It is not true that the link with the masses is identity with it. Quite the contrary. The State Plan has taken over.

The intellectual, whether a scholar onlooker like Hodgkin or an actual ruler -- and they include the whole spectrum, whether lined up with "the West" or "the East" -- has then taken over by stressing the old roots and yet pointing to the 20th century look of those drums via a "Development Plan." Thus Azikiwe tried to excuse no development of theory -- though he said it certainly "needed to be done" -- by saying that Africa follows "no pattern", that because "there was no landless mass" since the land was "communal" and not private and because there was not as yet ("though it was becoming so") no permanent wage laboring class, that "therefore" socialism was not the Marxian kind in Africa.

Socialism is not the Marxian kind for the good and sufficient reason that it isn't socialism -- it is state-capitalism. The only reason there is no "permanent" wage laboring class is that the unemployment is so vast, especially so in Nigeria, and less so in the countries that adhere more strictly to the State Plan. As for there being no landless peasantry as an excuse for not basing oneself on Marxist theory, that is just humbug. Not only is agriculture very primitive still, but the poor peasants are certainly as poor being "communal" landowners (or what have you) and a great deal more miserable than the Russian peasant when it had the "mir." The good, communal seed, as all else here, is being diverted. And the tragedy is that many of these leaders -- Sekou Toure is one of them -- are truly unaware that there is a world stage of the economy that obeys its world market laws as well as the more basic capital-labor relationship into which the new African countries are being sucked -- no matter how truly pure and idealistic are the motivations of those who think that playing both poles of capital against each other really means only development of the underdeveloped.

Being intellectually alert enough not only to play East against West and v.v., but taking further opportunity to take sides also in the Sino-Soviet Rift will not leave Sekou Toure free to escape the nature of our state-capitalist epoch. The fact that he has eyes everywhere and sees all humanly-set traps doesn't mean it is possible to escape the objective pull of world capital.

In that respect Russia once again is on top of the situation for they do have more Marxism as method ingrained, though perverted. That is to say, knowing the objective pull of economic laws -- and all too willingly submitting to them -- they have now stated that state-capitalism, for Africa, would be a "stage in advance." In their theoretical journals, particularly dealing with Africa, they now are developing the theory of a sort of inevitability, a necessity for state-capitalism.

(A good example of the Russian Communist trap all these African intellectuals are falling into is the case of Dr. K. Onwuka Dike of University College, Ibadan, who is most certainly a great deal more British than African and certainly more "West" than Russian. Yet he very proudly told me that Dr. Potokhin of the Russian Institute of Science heading the African studies

- 4 -

there was his house guest for a week, certainly is "making contributions to the study of Africa" and he would meet with him and other Africanists in December when there will be a world meeting of Africanists in Accra.)

Now after World War II, the Varga controversy in Russia showed that it would be inevitable that a "state-capitalist tendency", one that considered state-capitalism both progressive and inevitable, was arising, first of all in Russia, but the State Plans also in the private enterprise world would inevitably create its adherents there. As it said "in Mao's favor" that at least when he admitted its existence in China directly after the revolution, he at least meant it in the sense in which Lenin said it existed in Russia during the NEP (New Economic Policy which allowed certain forms of capitalism to exist). That is to say, that since the workers had power, political power, such economic capitalism could be controlled, would be of a very temporary nature to overcome the famine and destruction caused by war, and the state would then return to its workingclass path of development economically as well as politically.

Again, were we to view this objective development subjectively in the worst sense of the word, i.e., psychologically, we'd have to find "in favor of Mao" the fact that he realized that it wasn't they who were running the state machine, but the state machine the Communists—hence the nightmarish phantasmagoria of "The Great Leap Forward." We know where it landed China. It must not happen to Africa.

Theory is more imperative for Africa at this stage than even economic help, but theory which recognizes that its relationship to practice is neither so simple as to merely declare what is practice is theory, nor so removed from practice as to think, a la Senghor, that you can indeed pin point the Humanism of Marxism as the theoretic need (more precisely put, call) of the age, but at the same time offer an apologia for De Gaulle.

We now see added to the patchwork of "African socialism" and "communcracy" and "African personality" and "Negritude", not to mention Toure's "Toward Full Re-Africanization", something called "Nkrumahism" which runs the gamut of "uniting" Gandhi and Lenin, the CND and Pan-Africanism, and just plain Osagyefo-ism.

Yet, out of the new independence movements, and the youth and workers who see so very, very clearly here in Africa, that a world can be remade—there are indeed the elements for a new relationship of theory to practice that would transform entirely humanity's path toward nuclear destruction into one of world reconstruction. But for that it will not be able to work in a vacuum, nor to exclude from its practice or its theory the workingclass of the technologically advanced countries. State aid must be subordinated to ideological co-development on both sides of the equator.

--Raya

(Labor Donated)

3037

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River Detroit 4, Mich. TYler 8-7053 Price 20¢ No. 33

POLITICAL LETTER FROM AFRICA

MAY 28, 1962

THE AFRICAN REVOLUTIONS AT THE CROSSROADS:
Role of Labor, The Single Party, Neo-Colonialism, State-Capitalism, and Africa, Africa, Africa

Dear Friends:

There is hardly a day one spends in Africa, especially West Africa, when one isn't torn by such conflicting emotions that he is both at a loss for words and so full of them that every word, literally, has a double meaning. You come to Nigeria and see that there really has been no revolution, just a change in Administration. You therefore listen, inspired, to the opposition -- The Nigerian Youth Congress, the "left" of the Trade Unions that talk of "foreign gold" and wish to break with ICFTU, the young Hausa rebels that talk of how the emirs still rule the North, with "Zik's help" -- the same Zik who had been in the forefront of the continental revolution long before all other "lefts" -- Nkrumah, Toure, Keita -- even dreamed of nationalism. Then, suddenly, you hear the "solution" -- follow the example of Ghana, the single party state, Osagyefo will lead, never mind Europe, what is Hungary to us here where Britain holds on, America holds in, and even the Negro American does not see to return to his "homeland" -- and your heart sickens.

You come to Ghana, and, at first, you are elated for, compared to Lagos, Accra is clean, with wide boulevards where but yesterday there was bush, and the general public does feel it has had more than a change of Administration; there has been a genuine political revolution. Then you pick up the press -- and the adulation of Osagyefo, "the Leader," "our Light," "the all-knowing", "the father of not only our country but all of Africa", "Nkrumahism, our philosophy, our politics, our life, and our song" sickens you all over again, as if you were watching the Kremlin in the heyday of Stalin, "the sun of the Himalayas".

You begin to go deeper into the workers' ranks -- those that struck and had to retreat, work overtime without pay "to make up for loss of time during non-patriotic strike" and now must also, out of their small wage, put 5% to 10% away in forced savings -- and then you meet some in education who refused to have classes in "Nkrumahism" unless at least a pamphlet was produced that told them what it is in black and white, not just in empty oratory; finally you hear it whispered, "Of course, you can't tell Osagyefo, but Russia is awful as a country to live in, their technicians are too expensive to keep and not half as efficient as they would like you to believe; as for the love the Russians are supposed to have for the Africans, forget it, it isn't there."

By the time you hear that Nkrumah is also calling back the head of the United Africa Co. -- the very one against whom, back in the '40's, the strikes were held and the revolution unfolded -- to bring about "higher labor productivity and efficiency" you are ready to write Ghana off, too. Then you meet a South African who has come for aid and gotten it, or a Gambian who has not a single library or bookstore in town, not just reading, but literally "eating up" all books on Marx, easily available here, and once again you are torn apart.

You try especially hard to see the positive aspects of Pan-Africanism in the best example of it -- Sekou Toure's Guinea. Here the press is not so full of the "cult of personality." Rather the numerous quotations from Toure are on a theoretical plane -- and he has, not just an ego like Khrushchev's, but a theory of "full Re-Africanization" so that the single party aspect is palatable, even "democratic" for it reaches into the smallest village level. But in the airport, or at the Ministry of Information, there is the white French CP'er who sums you up in a moment, refuses a visa or follows your every move with such suspicion that even if you had your African-speaking friends who helped you to get down to the people, you really couldn't find out much.

And the brush with the Russians and demand that Russian ambassador be recalled as responsible for stirring up the non-patriotic strikes? Well, if the Russians are in disfavor today, the Chinese are the favorite ones -- obviously Toure thinks that no one can use him -- but that he can use all for he knows where he is going and no one is feeling him -- neither the French CP nor the American capitalists who are also being invited in; neither the Russian sputniks nor the Chinese communes hold out any fear for him who is full of Africa, Africa, Africa. All he needs is labor, labor, labor.

And though that Pan-Africanism is the umbrella that hides not only the unbridgeable gulf between the kingdom of Ethiopia and the Afro-communalistic state of Guinea, but also all three varieties of Pan-Africanism -- Krumahist, Zikist, and the Negritude of Toure -- you meet still another -- Leopold Sedar Senghor, the poet who writes so movingly of humanism, the most learned who quotes with equal ease Marx and Father Chardin, the one who prefers art to "science" but is the most efficient in the administrative angle of the plan, the man of Paris that can live in Dakar because that too is Paris, with its wide boulevards and more majestic Atlantic to substitute for the quiet Seine, but both having the mass of books and endless variety of bookshops, goods, and culture, when just below, begin the slums that rival Ibadan's. You walk with a Woloff friend who says suddenly, as he looks at the white settlers and coffee shops, and more shops and more shops, all French owned and De Gaullist, "When the second revolution will come to Senegal, we will have another Algeria!"

You try to get away -- go into the bush where not just neo-colonialism but full colonialism -- have Britain -- rules -- the colony and protectorate of the Gambia. There you will meet up with the coming revolution, with the first stages of independence, where the nation is one in wanting out, where this oppression and yet the humour is there -- that you even see the international aspect of tribalism, for it is a fact that, whether English or French speaking, each African country speaks that official language only in the cities and only for the whites. Among themselves, not only in the hinterland, but among the sophisticated in the cities, it is the tribal language that conveys the small talk and the big ideas of freedom, freedom, freedom. And you soon find out that it is not only the language of that tribe in that country, but the tribe that was also in the other country and the one further away yet when they had their own wonderful cultures and empires -- and so to this day, Woloff will take you a long way not only in the Gambia but in Senegal, much better than French, in fact, even as Hausa will be better for you not only in the north of Nigeria, but in Dahomey, and Mandingo, and Fula, and Ibo and Yoruba, and Ewe -- whoever told you the Jews were "the rootless cosmopolitans," the "wandering world

figure without a country"—wait till you meet the African—yes, he knows sommas in every part of that continent, East, West, North, South and has a sense of communication with him. Africa, my Africa, how the imperialists have divided you up, massacred and enslaved, robbed you of men and soil, left you with neither roads nor clothes, and illiterate, ah, illiterate—what of the thousands of years of history you can recount if you cannot today read the latest law of the land that tells you you cannot read "foreign" (foreign? and who are these Britishers if not foreign) literature—"subversive," "propaganda-bred hate," "Russian," "Communist," "Marxist."

Well, you are back in stride with your African friends and can say with that wonderful Mandingo who sticks close to his "leader," "Capitalism, imperialism, colonialism—I don't like it. Out, out, out. I want my freedom, my land, and I'll work from 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. for nothing to restore its richness."

Then comes the rude awakening: yes, what of the role of labor? Of course, you hear, we are for labor; we have no other class, but if the unions dare to mix in politics, we ask our members to withdraw their membership. And the unions say, sure, we aren't given credit for it but it was our strikes that compelled constitutional reform, but now that we're facing self-government, the workers have no right to always want to strike!

You return to reason with the intellectual but you get no different answers from those out of power than those in it: first let's get the imperialist out, then we'll talk of which road of the Pan-African roads; you cannot speak of "what after," when we haven't even got independence; oh, yes, I read about Hungary, and even the East German wall, but Russia is not our enemy; Trotskyism well, they can betray "again" (!); the world? my world is Africa, and for that we need unity which means single party; we need to industrialize which means using both sides—no, I'm not asking the price; that too can be talked about later, later, later.

Suddenly you feel you have no common language after all. You thought it was the philosophy—Marxism! But who wants to begin seeing differences between Marxism and Communism? Ah, the youth—yes, the wonderful, high school youth who, God knows where or how—maybe it was through Ghana or Guinea, God preserve them after all—they got hold of Marx, even asked you to speak about your version, talked most knowingly of everything from "surplus value" (I swear it) to Abolitionism, African socialism, humanism—the future, the really true, new human world. Yes, the youth and the strikers—another revolution is on its way.

—Raya

P.S. The pull of the two nuclear powers is not only over the domination over Africa—and neo-colonialism is a fact, not just a dead horse the African leaders keep beating for propaganda purposes at UN sessions—above all, it is a suction process for the world market, world stage of production—stagnated production in its full or "free enterprise" sense. This suction process is the tragedy of the African Revolutions whose leadership is so weighted down with the consciousness of under-development that they cannot see that forced labor is evil even if it is "for the country, your own country, the one that finally belongs to its people, Africa for the Africans."

- 4 -

But I preferred in this letter not to talk in the cold language of economic laws even though production relations are as alive and decisive as any talk of Negritude. For it is first of all necessary for the white to get the feel of black Africa, to take it to its bosom as is, in order together with it, to work out a common solution of world-wide and historic import that will not separate technologically advanced from technologically under-developed. So let's leave statistics for another time. --R.

(Labor Donated)

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River Detroit 4, Mich. TYler 8-7053 Price 20¢ Nos. 34 & 35

Note: The following article will be published in the July issue of Africa Today, in a slightly abbreviated form because of space limitations. However, it was felt that our subscribers especially since some of them may not regularly get this magazine, should not have to wait to read it there, and we are therefore sending it out in its complete version as this special double issue Political Letter.

POLITICAL LETTER

(Special Double Issue)

July 6, 1962

Gambia Close-Up
THE GAMBIA TAKES THE HARD, LONG ROAD TO INDEPENDENCE

Dear Friends,

The Gambia, the last of the British West African colonies, has, this May 31st, attained self-government. This was not the underlying issue in the election held over the past ten days. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, in his report of the 1961 Gambia Constitutional Conference, envisaged "internal self-government" as a result of a general election to be held "not later than May 1962." The underlying issue between the contending parties--the ruling United Party, and the opposition People's Progressive Party--was the unstated one: how near is the road to independence when self-government is weighted down by the Governor's commanding heights over internal security, defense, foreign affairs and the Public Service plus unspecified "reserved powers."

The campaign of the Chief Minister and leader of the governing UP--Mr. P.S.N'jie--gave one answer; "The Gambia is in no hurry." The leader of the PFP--Mr. D.K. Jawara--gave a totally different answer. Back in 1960, when he first went into opposition, he issued an "Independence Manifesto" which called for internal self-government in 1961 and independence in 1962. On May 31 the Gambians made the PFP the majority party, giving it 18 seats plus one for its ally, the Democratic Congress Alliance. The UP got 13 votes, a not inconsiderable minority. A further complication in the election picture is the state of the four non-elective Chiefs whose votes are as valid as the elected members to the legislature. A bloc between them and the UP could make the road to independence as difficult as one to travel as are the impassible roads to the protectorate that got wiped out during the "wet season."

Any one who has watched the campaign close at hand, as this writer has, knows that the election results do not tell the full story. Quite the contrary. As the coming struggles are sure to disclose, the election results are only the consequences of the fact that the parties, concerned with winning power, muffled fundamental issues. The PFP concentrated on stories of alleged bribery by the ruling party "or its agents" while the ruling UP, for its part, reacted to the collection of membership dues by the opposition party by demanding in its Newsletter that "poor people's parting with pennies...be stopped." That each party let the electorate believe many different things became increasingly clear to this reporter as she interviewed both leaders and rank and file members of the contending parties, attended innumerable public meetings, went with each party's truck into the protectorate to watch the party branches outside the presences of the

- 2 -

capital, saw women who voted for the first time cry with happiness, and watched villages turn out festively ~~on mass~~ to cast their votes for the second time in their lives. (Universal suffrage was not extended to the protectorate till 1960.)

To get the full import of the election results, it is necessary to see all the cross-currents and under-currents in this historic election. Besides the political parties, there is the part played by the trades unions which, officially, remained neutral, but whose power was felt in the strikes of 1960-61 when constitutional reforms were wrested from Great Britain. Nor can the observer discount the role of the youth who, in the 1950's met to ask their leaders to form a united party so that the Gambia be not left in the backwaters of the continent-wide struggles for African independence. Some of these, in the present election, are no doubt responsible for the fact that the DCA, under Rev. J.C. Faye, who had organized the first political party in the Gambia in 1951, nevertheless this time won only one seat. This lack of confidence in the ally of the PFP did not come from "the right" but because the youth in the civil service in 1960 expected strike support from this party which, instead, advised them not to strike. Finally this writer chanced upon an additional, unsought, insight into the workings of a colonial Police Department by virtue of having incurred the displeasure of the authorities through some lectures delivered to those too young to vote but who, no doubt, will influence the future development of this enchanting, poor, ravished land which was the first, and is the last, remaining British colony in West Africa.

The Spirit of the Place: "Revolutions Are Going On All The Time"

For the Queen's visit to the Gambia, the British Government issued a beautifully illustrated booklet (published in London, not in Bathurst) which tells us that the capital "has the charm of a quiet seaside resort," and proceeds to perpetrate an old myth: "Geographically and economically the Gambia is an extravagance." This old wives' tale is propagated also by a pretentious, heavy tome titled *AFRICA: ANGRY YOUNG GIANT* by an American journalist, Mr. Smith Hempstone, who likewise fails to tell us why, under the circumstances, Great Britain has held on, with all the regalia of an empire ruling over as rich a land as pre-independent India, and after some 375 years, still fails gracefully to leave it to the Gambians who want their independence. Mr. Hempstone writes profusely of Gambia's "charm and pettiness" -- a rhetorical phrase that is supposed to make the reader forget that he means not only the economy but the people are "backward." To top off the nostalgia for "flower beds of honest English petunias, pinks, daisies ...", Mr. Hempstone alleges that Gambia's "three trades unions" have "less than 500 membership."

The truth is that the Gambia Workers Union alone has over 9,000 paid-up members. This is not denied by the Gambia Labor Union from which the GWU split. Mr. J.R. Forster of the GLU questioned the integrity of the leadership of the GWU but not its militancy nor its membership. Mr. M.E. Jallow, General Secretary of the GWU, denied the accusations of non-integrity in finances, accusing the GLU of "talk, talk, talk, and no action." He said that the GLU had cut itself off from the masses by not participating in the 1960-61 strikes. He proudly told me that in this, the first general strike in the Gambia, the police had made the error of using tear gas on the

3043

- 3 -

strikers and thus rallied the entire population behind them. Following the Enquiry of 1961, the union had won recognition from the Gambia Oil Seeds Marketing Board, and a rise in wages. "Moreover," continued the young, energetic and astute Mr. Jallow, "before the Gambia Workers Union came into existence, things were static. Then political movements really developed, but these do not give us credit for the political development and the union does not endorse any party. But 80 percent of all workers -- artisans, farm laborers, clerks, dock workers -- are in the Gambia Workers Union. We have all workers except the senior grade of civil service. We have a closed shop on the docks."

The secretary of the Seracunda Branch of the GWU -- Mr. C. M. Gabbidon, a veteran of the Burma theatre of war who lives on his small pension so that he can devote full time free to organization work for the union, elaborated upon the victory won in 1961 and recognized by the Labor Ordinance in August: (1) instead of 4 shillings a day, the wage is now 5 shillings and 8 pence; (2) transport must now be provided where before the workers were responsible for it; (3) sick leave is now granted where before it was not recognized a worker's due; (4) workers are now entitled to 14 days' leave per year where before they only got 10 days' leave. The union not only has dock workers and farm laborers but carpenters, masons, tappers of palm trees. Both Mr. Jallow and Mr. Gabbidon admitted that the GLU had been the first union on the scene, back in 1929. They did not exclude reunification with it, but insisted the split was due only to lack of activity, not to differences in the views that divided other African unions between the Ghana and Dakar blocs. Here both unions are affiliated with the IGFTU and do not wish to follow the Ghana model of giving up trades union independence to become an integral part of the Party or the State.

It was also admitted that during the elections there has been some dropping off of membership. It is hard to say how much of this is due to the fact that the political parties thought the trade unions were "interfering in politics" and how much is due to the complaint one trades union official registered: "The workers want to strike all the time. We thought we should wait till after the election and see how close we are to independence."

From old timers I also pieced together the pre-history of the first trades union. When most American and European workers did not know Africa was on the map, there were strikes in the Gambia. The river craft seamen seemed to have been the first to strike "during the troubles following the first world war." Each firm used its own craft plus privately owned cutters to transport its nuts -- the main basis of the whole economy to this day -- to transit stations and each firm exported its own purchases and all the firms united in the Chamber of Commerce and refused the workers so much as an interview when the spontaneous strike broke out. Soldiers were called out who used their gun butts on the strikers who had the sympathy of the population. Then a Commission of Enquiry was established and finally workers got a small increase -- they used to earn only a single shilling a day -- "plus 45 pounds of rice and 8 shillings fish money monthly for each man."

The old timer continued, "The old saying was: 'The sun never sets on the British Empire, and the wages never rise.' During the world depression there were more strikes but the unemployment and misery were such that the workers could not hold out." Then the old timer concluded: "Organizations come very quickly here, especially among the young, and also disappear, but revolutions are going on all the time."

3044

PARTIES, LEADERS, RANKS — and the GROUNDNUT

90 per cent of Gambians are peasant farmers producing the basic cash crop—the groundnut—with the most primitive tools—an axe, a hoe, a sock-sock (kind of trowel). Despite the British Information Office's assurance that "mechanization has been tried in the form of government sponsored tractor ploughing by contract and experiments made with mobile threshers and hulling machinery," many of the farmers do not even have an ox, much less a tractor.

90 per cent of the Gambians are peasant farmers living in the protectorate in primitive villages which consist of thatched houses—more often, just single rooms—that have nothing in them but some hard beds and, perhaps, some hard chairs and what passes for a table. Several of such "houses" make up a compound which is fenced in with woven rush kinting and separated from other compounds and houses by a narrow, dusty alley called a street. There is no electricity, no plumbing, no transport, a single hospital for the whole of the 3974 square miles of impossible roads which, during the rainy season, get completely washed out. Many villages do not even have a well.

These 90 per cent of Gambians are of all tribes. The largest tribe is the Mandinka that trace themselves back to the glorious Mandingo or Mali Empire. But the Wolofa too are mainly farmers and so are the Fulas, the Serahulis, the Jolas. Their lives revolve around two seasons known as "the Hungry Season" and "the Trade Season." As if these were natural phenomena like the rising and setting of the sun, the Gambians relate how, during the Trade Season (which last from December to April) they sell their groundnuts to firms which act as agents for the statutory Oilseeds Marketing Board which pays them so little for all their hard labor that they do not have enough money left for many of the remaining months of the year—May through November. The Hungry Season reaches the most serious proportions just before harvest time and, in trying to live as best they can on a hungry stomach, they depend on the Syrian and Lebanese middlemen to whom they are always in debt. In response to the Hungry Season cooperatives arose, but they are by no means wide-spread. Many a village has asked for one without getting one and these co-ops likewise act as agents for the GOMB, and, while the people go hungry, neither the GOMB nor the middlemen are in want. The British Government remains the biggest single employer, and its top-heavy bureaucracy eats up 50 per cent of the budget. Truly the Gambia is an "extravagance". It is so to the Gambians who must bear the burden, not to the British who pay themselves very handsomely for this extravagance.

In all the centuries of trade—trade in human flesh—followed by agricultural development they were compelled to encourage after chattel slavery was abolished in Great Britain in 1807, the only major development has come with World War II when rice production was doubled. But it still remains a subsistence, not a cash crop, is worked mainly by women, again with the most primitive of tools. The causeways and dykes built in the rice swampland and mangrove along the river are so inadequate that that was the major complaint at all political rallies, no matter under whose party's auspices, which detailed "how we really suffer". Not only has no industrialization of any sort been embarked upon, but even in primitive agriculture, palm kernels which could have been developed, now grow wild.

The British do not even know the Gambia's population—the 300,000 is just a guess since no census has been held since 1952; most Africans feel that they now probably number a half million. The British have concentrated on "the city"—Bathurst which has a population of around 30,000 and is the only big city in the whole country. There the streets, or most of them, are paved. Here there is not only electricity but even cable service. The plumbing is modern, especially if you live in "European" homes or the one plush hotel in town—the Atlantic, which likewise is patronized mainly by Europeans. The British like to say there are only "209 Europeans", but a closer look reveals that the insular British, when in Africa, consider themselves evidently the only "Europeans" for they do not count some 50-75 Frenchmen, not to mention "of course" the 600 or more Lebanese and Syrians who could hardly pass for Africans.

Bathurst also has "the schools"—not only primary but "secondary" (high schools) and, at Yundum, where there is an airport, there is also a teachers training college. Even here however school is not compulsory and there is only 10-11 per cent literacy. The British also point to their "Africanization" that has been going on "for decades", and the civil service, especially in its lower ranks, is staffed by Africans. Here the Woloffs comprise 50 per cent of the population and the Akus—the detribalized "Westernized" minority—help swell the civil service as clerks. Which does not mean that either the Woloffs or Akus are satisfied with the British interpretation of "Africanization."

In one of the major meetings of the campaign, held in McCarthy Square in Bathurst, the Chief Minister and Leader of the ruling UP, faced this electorate and revealed at once the wide gulf between leaders and ranks. In a quiet voice which meant to thunder, Mr. N'jie said, first in English and then in Woloff: "It all boils down to this that the United Party wants evolution, not revolution. Memories are not so short that you should have forgotten the disturbances, the upheavals, the looting in the protectorate. There are those who think self-government means cutting off from the United Kingdom. We are not quarreling with Britain. They're giving us self-government and for a long time we will have to depend on them." He then paused, and with gentlemanly disdain, continued, "The more I look at the Peoples' Progressive Party the more I discover what is foul and filthy in this organization. Their intention is to leave the west and join Ghana and Russia."

This same theme was carried through by all the UP candidates including those running in the protectorate so that, at Jawara, a Mr. Faal told me when I interviewed him, "We cannot hurry up independence. We are starting from scratch and our economy has to be built up first. Political independence does not mean much if we have no economic independence. Self-government will give us more voice in the legislature, and the chance to develop our country. This comes first."

Yet, in fairly impromptu meetings held just a few miles away, a UP organizer spoke with great passion against Europeans in general and the United Kingdom in particular: "You can't manage a country when you are not a citizen of that country. Europeans know their land; we know ours. The British know the United Kingdom; we know the Gambia. A farmer knows how to farm and we know how to manage ourselves. It is time we did. It is time the British learned we intend to." (It should be added that in the protectorate no African,

not even if he knows English, bothers to speak it. Be it said in honor of the tribal languages that these are not just of the region designated by the imperialists but cut across border lines and, if not an international, surely are of continent-wide significance. (In the case of Woloff I found it much more useful in Senegal than French.)

In meeting after meeting held by the UP in the protectorate I heard many stories of hardship of life and labor and lack of hospitals and schools and transport. While there was praise for Mr. N'jie who helped many personally, there certainly wasn't an overabundance of enthusiasm for Great Britain. The meetings were not as well organized, nor were they as enthusiastic, as those of the FPP, but at the UP too the spirit of militancy differed widely from the official party line, even if they may not always have transmitted the pungency of the FPP militant who began with "Jesus took from the rich and gave to the poor, but today those who call themselves Christians take from the poor and give to the rich. Imperialism, capitalism, colonialism—I don't like it."

This time I was in the FPP transport with their energetic, level-headed leader, Mr. Jawara. It would take no time at all to get a mass meeting going. The sight of the FPP truck, a minstrel shouting out that "D.K. will speak", a single drum beat, and in a few minutes, under the bantaba (a shady tree where villagers gather to discuss) hundreds would gather and listen and speak. The meeting may be preceded or followed by an asico—the FPP's own musical invention—a combination of folk and jazz in praise of the leader. A few drums beat out the tune, the leader of the band speaks it, the solo soprano sings it, and the chorus repeats it. It is infectious and exciting and goes on for hours, as do the meetings themselves.

The fact that an American reporter was present produced quite a few references to American history from the War of Independence—obviously the slogan that meant most to the Gambians was "no taxation without representation"—through the Civil War to "today's struggles for freedom." The youth are the most inventive in "sloganizing" and advertising. One youth, for example, had cut his hair so that it spelled out "FPP". I was especially impressed by the high level of discussion of that allegedly most backward African—a Mandinka woman. She seems to be not only a natural orator but, illiteracy notwithstanding, the most intelligent "citizen of the world", as one young woman phrased it, while an elder Mandinka said, "We have waited too long, too long been patient. What we need is freedom now."

I heard no references to Ghana, much less to Russia. Mr. Jawara had a considerable number of the USIS publication, "American Outlook", and he denied leaning toward any particular African bloc, insisting that one cannot think of relations with other countries until one is independent. As Rev. Faye phrased it, "The aim of England is to edge us around to Senegal. The British do not want to free us even now. They are starting to call us an enclave of Senegal, although we were never that under colonial rule." The FPP and DCA favored economic ties with Senegal, and only one single FPP candidate—Paul Louis Baldé—spoke against Senegal, and he stressed that it was his personal position, not that of the FPP: "My view is that if Senegal's independence is tantamount to permitting French influence in West Africa, then I favor reviewing the whole set-up of African unity because I believe West African unity can be achieved by Africans only when they meet as Africans and

- 7 -

are not being influenced by former colonialist powers. If the Senegalese Government feels it can speak of Senegal without dictation from France, then an independent Gambia would do all in its power to cooperate with such a government."

Mr. Jawara himself stuck to the concrete economic question—"the living standards, the productivity and purchasing power of the mass of people—the farmers and manual workers—is abysmally low...It is sometimes argued that because of its small size and its lack of rich resources the Gambia dare not claim its freedom. This argument is not valid as all people, rich or poor, are equally entitled to freedom." Moreover, he continued, the natural resources have not really been tapped "any more than the human resources." And one of the PPP entourage, pointing to the one all-weather road that the British are first beginning and which is supposed to be complete next year, said: "It took the British 375 years plus one to build a single road. We cannot do worse than that."

As for the "upheavals" in the protectorate, Mr. Jawara explained that in 1960 there were a great many complaints by farmers of their economic plight, and the overbearing authority of the Chiefs, protected by the British who called the attempts of the farmers to organize themselves in meetings as "unlawful" assembly." On the "trumped up charge of wanting to kill the alkali"; the police one night swooped down upon the village, raided their homes, collected their tools, arrested the leaders, and created so hostile an atmosphere that no Gambian lawyer dared defend the 30 leaders who were arrested and sentenced to sentences from three to nine months. A lawyer from Sierra Leone was brought in, but no appeal to an authority higher than the court that sentenced them was entertained. I visited one of these villages and heard stories of one chief who had practiced forced labor. From the villagers in the protectorate there is no doubt at all as to which party enjoys the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the people. It is the PPP. The closeness of the vote is due to the rivalry between the protectorate and "the colony", that is to say, Bathurst and environs. Though some fundamental issues were blurred, it was a national election. Neither tribal divisions nor religion—most are Moslems—played any serious role.

AFRICA NYAATO

No one need go back to ancient history and learn of the glories of the old Mandingo or Mali Empire long before any European set foot on African soil to sense the spirit of the modern Gambia. Nor does an analysis of political parties and trades unions in the present stage of history exhaust the spirit of our age. No, it is the youth which reflects, crystal clear, what Hegel had called "a birth-time of history."

No youth has impressed me more than the youth of the Gambia. Here is a land where, in the country, literacy is only one per cent, and in the capital 10-11 per cent. Even "the city" cannot boast a public library or a bookshop, outside of a small mission one. There is no newspaper. Indeed the laws governing their publication make it very nearly impossible since large bonds and securities are required as guarantees against "blasphemous or seditious or other libel." This characteristic of a police state pervades the whole life of the town which is supposed to have "the charm of a quiet seaside

* Village Chief

resort." It may be that, in the case of the Gambia, the police may have less of a terroristic and more of a "paternalistic" character, but there is no doubt that every one feels he is being watched and informed on. Nevertheless, the youth twice invited me to speak, one on youth movements the world over "like the Freedom Riders in America, the Socialist Youth of Great Britain, the Zengakuren of Japan"; the second time on "The Humanism of Marxism: a Philosophy of Freedom."

An interval of a week separated the two talks--an interval during which the Police Department invited me to make their acquaintance. The first invitation for an interview with the Assistant Superintendent of Police--a Britisher named Mr. Hobbs--came the morning after my first speech. The questions ranged from the one concerned with how I knew Africans well enough to be their houseguest to the one informing me that "here" my speech would be "misunderstood." I asked Mr. Hobbs whether it was required that I clear my speeches with the Police Department; I thought attitudes like that produced Communism. His reply was that, while he found my anti-Communism "interesting", what disturbed him was my "pre-African nationalism." He said he would need to report the whole conversation to his superior. I do not know when he thought this would frighten--me or the youth who invited me to speak. But obviously the Police were not prepared for a repetition of "the act."

Bright and early following the morning of the second speech a policeman once again came to fetch me, this time to the Superintendent of Police, an Uncle Tom type of African named Mr. Evans who tried simply to declare my "re-entry" (I had been to Dakar) "illegal". When I made it clear that I had no intention of bowing to a technicality that was discovered only after I had spoken to the youth, I was ushered in to the Commissioner of Police "himself". Once again I was in British hands. Mr. Bates was very polite and no fool. After I stressed that "if it were not for another matter of which the police had full reports, this technicality would never have arisen, I have no intention of bowing to anything so contrived before completing my assignment of reporting the elections." Mr. Bates extended my stay 24 hours beyond the time I requested. My every step, however, continued to be watched. Thus when I was in Kaur--the interior of the Gambia, not Senegal--the Chief Minister's social and propaganda secretary, a Mr. Karayol, who was my guide there, found a not very plausible excuse as to why I should report to the police station there and register. I did. When I went up to the protectorate again, this time with the entourage of Mr. Jawara, I was not asked to participate in any such farcical situation. However, as I would meet the police who supervised the election, I would be greeted with, "O, yes, Madam, we heard you were somewhere in the bush." Finally, although I arrived at the airport one-half hour before departure time, I was greeted with, "You are late. The plane has been in for some time."

I do not know what deprivations will be visited upon the youth groups who had tendered the invitations to speak. I do know that their spirit will not be easily dowed. Far from having "misunderstood" my pro-African freedom views, these youths spoke of Pan-Africanism as an "umbrella" that was presently covering different views, and hoped that the Gambia "will have learned from both blocs of African nations" and make their contribution to "true and full independence." There is no doubt whatever that they will

- 9 -

become a force in the post-election developments. It is this, in fact, which worried the Police Department which, as Mr. Evans stressed; "like the Gambia quiet and intend to see it remain so."

Symbolic of the spirit of the Gambia is the title of a new newsletter, Africa Nyanto. (Nyanto is the Mandinka word for forward.) The small box alongside the name proclaims that it stands for "Workers' Interests and Pan-Africanism." Quietly or otherwise the struggle for freedom did not end with the election. They have just begun.

--Raya

(Labor Donated)

3050

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River Detroit 4, Mich. Ttler 8-7053 Price 20¢ No. 37

POLITICAL LETTER

August 1, 1962

A CRITICAL TURNING POINT IN EUROPEAN HISTORY:
British Anti-Nuclear Movements Come Up Against
State-Capitalism, Russian and Franco-German Varieties.

Dear Friends:

In the Two Worlds column on the Moscow-held "Peace and Disarmament" Congress (NBL, June-July 1962), I dealt with Khrushchev's rocket rattling speech, and asked: "Like the Tower of Pisa, neutralism has been found to lean heavily in one direction. Are we now to witness a transformation into opposite of the people's desire for world peace into nothing but a whitewash of one of the two world nuclear powers?"

Since then I have received the anti-bomb leaflet that the industrial subcommittee of the Committee of 100 tried to distribute in Moscow. Obviously the person who sent it to me (Ken Weller of Solidarity, published in London and supported by Socialisme ou Barbarie, published in Paris) thought I would be impressed. Far from being impressed, I was astounded at the narrowness of the vision which leads an ex-Trotskyist sect to choose this time (1962) and that place (Moscow) for an attack on the Lenin of 1921. The warped mentality which considers that this is what is needed presently in Khrushchev's Russia would be of interest only to psychiatrists if, firstly, it were not for the fact that the ex-Trotskyist sect chooses a sub-committee of the Committee of 100 as the guise for its propaganda at the very moment when Khrushchev had chosen the anti-nuclear movements as the platform from which he would do his rocket rattling and make political pronouncements on the Berlin impasse, the Common Market and similar topics far outside of the scope of the peace movement, not to mention in violation of its very reason for being. Secondly, the repetition of the old slander that Stalinism is the natural outgrowth of Leninism as if it were a "new" discovery (although its "discovery" by the Social-Democracy predates it by over three decades) will help expose the theoretical void in the Marxist movement since the death of Lenin and thus help illuminate its impotence when faced with a new stage of development of world capitalism, i.e., state capitalism.

State Capitalism. (the Russian and Franco-German Varieties) And The Mass Movements

The two basic laws of capitalist development--the law of value and surplus value, on the one hand, and the law of the concentration and centralization of capital on the other hand--are in conflict with each other. This contradiction is at the root of the general crisis of capitalism and prompted Marx to say that: (1)

"The real barrier of capitalist production, is capital itself. It is the fact that capital and its self-extension appear as the starting and closing point, as the motive and aim of production; that production is merely production for capital, and not vice versa, the means of production here means for an ever expanding system of the life process for the benefit of the society of producers."

Under-consumptionism, and hence limitations of the market is inherent in the system and as inherent to it are the constant technological revolutions which compel at one and the same time, ever expanded production of means of production and search for markets. This led to the transformation of competition into its opposite, monopoly capitalism which at the end of the 19th century, brought about international cartels as well as imperialist colonies. The rise of Germany as a technologically advanced country that came rather late on the scene, and which was dissatisfied with the existing redivision of the world among the big powers, led to World War I.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 was proof that the workers held to different ideals and realities about production. Though the capitalists in the rest of the world, who wanted to hold on to their power were shaken up, they did not want to bow to total state intervention, even where the state is capitalistic.

The 1929 Depression brought the capitalists dream crashing down to earth. Again it was faced with threat of revolution on a world scale. This time, to one degree or another, the private capitalists to save the class of capitalists, bowed to state intervention. State Plans girdled the whole globe from the New Deal in the United States to Japan's Co-Prosperity sphere. However, the movement to full state capitalism—that transformation into opposite from private monopoly which no individual capitalist meets with elation—was consummated only in Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany. In the first case it was possible because the private capitalists had long since been eliminated by proletarian revolution; and in the second case because the crisis in Germany was total. State capitalism in a single country was insufficient, however, to solve the crisis; the need for centralization of capital demanded Lebensraum ("living-room") and extended itself to contiguous masses of capital, for example, on a European-wide scale.

Hitler hungered for a subordinate in Europe to help him achieve in the whole of Europe what his fascists achieved in Germany, choosing first to flirt with Great Britain (at Munich), and then with Russia (with the Hitler-Stalin Pact). Because of the antagonism to Russia, the private capitalistic world tolerated and encouraged Hitler. But when it became clear both to Russia and the private capitalistic world that Hitler's attempt at centralization of European capital was only a

stepping stone to mastery of the whole world, they came together as the strangest assortment of Allies (in World War II) the world had ever seen.

World War II put an end to Hitler's ambitions. It only served to rouse De Gaulle's. De Gaulle is taking over where Hitler left off, this time making truncated Germany his subordinate. Let's not forget either that De Gaulle's hallucinations of glory through the nuclear club include his "concept" of Europe's extension "to the Ural Mountains," i.e. into Russia. In ambition, he indeed is on a par with Khrushchev and Kennedy, especially now that he has succeeded in "solving" the Algerian war by keeping Algeria attached to France, while making sure that the OAS is more or less intact somewhere within France and Spain for any possible future use.

J.F.K. may have reason to believe that he can still keep West Europe as a junior partner, because in Europe as in America he alone has total nuclear power, but nuclearly armed Khrushchev knows it as a direct threat to Russia, and has decided to start an all-out campaign against any such consummation as the centralization of all of European capital. Even as Stalin in his day led a campaign against the Marshall Plan, Khrushchev will try to direct all European mass movements to fight the common Market. Of course this, as part of the overall aim of world mastery, is only part, though a central part, of the struggle with the United States all over the world.

This then is the objective situation that confronts the proletariat as well as the peace movements. Now let us see how well these movements are prepared to meet this threat to civilization.

The new stage in the Common Market's evolution caused by the British application for entry has come at a time when the British labor movement has been misled to oppose the Common Market on its own capitalistic grounds instead of by proletarian internationalism present in such slogans as the Socialist United States of Europe.

This is not the first time the European working class has been diverted from true proletarian internationalism in the post-war world. The first misleaders were the European Communists who slavishly followed the foreign policy of Stalinist Russia. The Marshall Plan could not alone have reestablished the capitalistic axis in Europe (not to mention its newest ramification--the De Gaulle-Adenauer axis) if it had not been

-4-

for Stalin's fear of, and hence sabotage of, the proletarian movement's flowering into a revolution.

Stalin fought the Marshall plan purely out of Russian foreign policy considerations and only after: (1) Stalin had let the Nazis destroy the Warsaw Soviet while his armies stood outside Warsaw's gates and let it bleed to death. (2) As victor's booty, Russia took over all of East Europe at the end of World War II. (3) Then, in preference to allowing any revolutionary situation to mature in post-war France, Stalin chose coalition with De Gaulle.

Khrushchev, in his opposition to the Common Market, is following in Stalin's footsteps by judging everything from the viewpoint of Russia's foreign policy interests. He cannot, however, in the Great Britain of 1962 ape Stalin's capture of the CGT in the France of 1945. Being unable to latch on to the British trades union movement, he is latching on to the anti-nuclear movements (CND and the Committee of 100) instead. He feels free to spice his influence with a good dose of anti-German chauvinism. The new De Gaulle-Adenauer axis will make it easier yet to disguise Russian chauvinism as "anti-fascism." Lest, as prelude to World War III, we allow ourselves in for a new horror variety of the Hitler-Stalin pact which gave the green light to World War II, it is imperative that we not only set the record straight on the new stage of world capitalism but point to the sudden appearance of specialised Lenin haters in the British anti-nuclear movements through an analysis of this much-publicized but little distributed anti-bomb leaflet.

The Inspirers of the Anti-Bomb Leaflet

"Politics of the Bolsheviks," proclaims the anti-bomb leaflet, "never allowed the workers to take power over production in their own hands." (2) Obviously not too weighted down by a sense of history or the greatest proletarian revolution in history — the 1917 Russian Revolution — this gratuitous "conclusion" followed another off-the-top-of-the-head statement: "The revolution brought about fundamental changes in property relations. But it did not resolve the central contradiction of a class society, precisely the one between the rulers and ruled in production."

As "proof" of this, the authors of the leaflet jump from the period of revolution to the garbled statement by Lenin during the period of retreat to limited private capitalism — the New Economic Policy of 1921. Obviously

3 1 2 5 5

-5-

these writers saw a parallel between the Russia of 1962 and the Russia of 1921 which, far from being armed with H-bombs, lay so exhausted from world war, civil war, counter-revolution, economic standstill and outright starvation that even a Hoover Commission felt it necessary first of all to help feed the starving millions of Bolshevik Russia.

This is not the first time we meet this particular political tendency which is so eaten up with hatred of Lenin that it can see no other problem. Last year its theoretician, Paul Cardan, rushed to bring out a lengthy statement on "The Meaning of Socialism" which proclaimed that Lenin "was also relentlessly repeating from 1917 until his death that production should be organized from above along 'state-capitalist lines'." (3) We then wrote:

Outside of statements made by Communists and capitalists, I know of no greater lie than the one contained in the quotation from Cardan. If the writing of STATE AND REVOLUTION on the eve of the November Revolution, and the leading of the actual Russian Revolution are not the greatest examples — in theory and in life — of the spontaneous actions of the millions of people tearing everything up by its roots and creating a new society in the vast expanse of Russia and inspiring the rest of the world by this greatest historic creative act, then, just as all words have lost their meaning in Communist hands, so have all actions lost their meaning in the hands of this socialist — and there exists only the convolutions of this one mind grasping the "meaning of socialism" outside of the context of history, of theory and of fact.

As proof of his slanderous statement, Cardan quotes from one of Lenin's speeches ("The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government") those passages (pp. 332, 342, 345 — S.W. Vol VII.) which relate to the possibility of utilizing the "Taylor system." So fantastic would that be a summation of Lenin's life and works that Cardan himself is forced to comment: "We are no better revolutionaries than Lenin. We are only forty years older!"

However, this is said only to give lip service to Lenin as "revolutionary." In reality, this left-handed compliment which is supposed to prove that it is "not a question of denigrating Lenin," serves to make Stalinism seem logically to flow from Leninism. Thus Cardan writes in that same footnote: "We believe these conceptions, this subjective factor, played an enormous role in the degeneration of the Russian Revolution ... we can see today the relationship between the views he held and the later reality of Stalinism."

Cardan is standing everything on its head. No "subjective" factor could ever have produced an objective situation — the new stage of capitalism, state capitalism, and the accession to power of a new class in Russia — where state capitalism had been theoretically pre-

-6-

dicted by Marx 100 years back and discerned by Lenin in reality nearly a half century ago Were we even to say that a single article could sum up an entire revolutionary period, would it still not be incumbent upon the analyst to summarize the whole of the article? That speech consisted of more, a great deal more than those quotations used by Cardan. That speech analysed the principle task of the proletariat to be "the positive or creative work of setting up an extremely intricate and subtle system of new organizational relationships extending to the planned production and distribution of the goods required for the existence of tens of millions of people. Such a revolution can be carried out only if the majority of the population, and primarily the majority of the toilers, display independent historical creative spirit... By creating a new Soviet type of state, which gives the opportunity to all the toilers and the masses of the oppressed to take an active part in the independent building of a new society, we solved only a small part of this difficult problem. The principle difficulty lies in the economic sphere." (Vol. VII p. 315)

A few months after the publication of our analysis we received a letter from Paul Cardan asking for the privilege of a "brief reply." We assured him we would be only too happy to publish anything he wrote in his own defense. However, no manuscript arrived and we never heard from him again.

The only thing that has happened in the intervening year is that he changed the quotation from Lenin from one he uttered in 1918 to one he made in 1921, and changed the place of distribution of his original (sic) interpretation of Lenin from London and Paris to Moscow. The preoccupation with anti-Leninism is so paramount to the author that, for its unveiling in Moscow, he chose to single out for attack the Lenin of 1921, rather than the Khrushchev of 1962. O.K., let's get to this man's concept of the "original sin."

"In 1921 Lenin wrote," continues the leaflet, "It is absolutely imperative that power in the factory be concentrated in the hands of management. Consequently, the direct intervention of the trade unions in the management of the economy must be looked at as absolutely harmful and forbidden." This is typical of the whole ideology of the party leadership in this period. Therein lies the roots of Stalinism."

Although the authors of the leaflet went to great length to find the Russian text to back its more famous quotation of Marx on the primacy of production relations, no reference is made to the text from which Lenin's statements are taken. I have found no such quotation in the works of Lenin for the year 1921, but the 1922 Central Committee Statement, on "The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions under the Conditions of the New Economic Policy" does contain parts of it.⁽⁴⁾ The first sentence about the need of concentrating power in the hands of management, upon which the "consequently" of the second sentence is based, is not in the Statement. Moreover, it should have

-7-

believed the authors of the leaflet at least to explain that "management" of production, even if it concerned the newly-allowed small capitalistic enterprises, had reference, not to a capitalist, but a workers' state. Indeed, the whole basis for allowing the retreat to some private enterprise free trade in this critical period of the life of the young workers' state, was based on the fact that "the commanding heights" — the political state with its soviets — remained in the hands of the workers. In the Statement, however, the stress is on the new conditions created by the NEP. The single sentence as it appears in that Statement, reads: "Under these conditions every direct intervention of the trade unions in the management of the enterprises must be considered unconditionally harmful and inadmissible."

The very next sentence, however, which the authors of the anti-bomb leaflet, did not feel obliged to quote, reads: "But it would be absolutely incorrect to interpret this indisputable truth in the sense of a rejection of the trades unions in the socialist organization of industry and in the management of state industry." It then proceeds to list the forms of trade union participation: "...the trades unions must especially be schools of management of socialist industry (and later gradually in agriculture) for the entire working class and then for all toilers."

The authors of the leaflet, however, are in so great a hurry to assign the "roots of Stalinism" to "Bolshevism" that they make the single sentence "typical of the whole ideology of the party leadership in this period." This, despite the fact that (1) contrary to the Stalinist monolith, the Central Committee in Lenin's time included their favorite leaders of the "Workers Opposition", (Kollontai), not to mention (2) that "this period", which they label 1921, includes the most famous of all trade union debates, the one between Lenin, Trotsky, and Salyapnikov (3), which debate Lenin based on the thesis that "Our present state is such that the entirely organized proletariat must protect itself and must utilize the workers' organizations for the purpose of protecting workers from their own state...." (6)

Instead of dealing with specifics of either yesteryear or today, these quotation jugglers find it easier, via a "magical" leap of four critical decades, to act as if nothing of fundamental importance happened between 1921 and 1962. After all, if one is preoccupied with "general principles" how can he be interested in the specifics of such crucial years as the 1929 crash which brought on a new stage of world capitalism, or the Stalinist counter-revolution which transformed the workers' state into a state-capitalist society, much less Khrushchev's fake de-Stalinization and claim to return to "Leninism"? Having "established" Lenin's guilt in 1921 to their satisfaction, they feel no compulsion to deal with fairly contemporary features such as the Hitler-Stalin Pact which gave the green light to World War II, the world war itself which brought with it the development of the A-bomb and the present division of the world into two, and only two, nuclear giants, much less Khrushchev's anti-German chauvinism.

3057

Should the innocent think that it's only because the leaflet would, of necessity, have had to be mimeographed in London before departure, not in Moscow directly after Khrushchev had spoken, let them remember that anti-German chauvinism was not a new product enunciated by Khrushchev on July 10th. Quite the contrary: there it was muted to sing more loudly the anti-American Berlin stand. The chauvinist poison has been spread by Khrushchev for some years and is especially aimed at the anti-nuclear movements since these have attempted to limit their interest to "disarmament" and "peace" and, in Khrushchev's view, will accept anything which may be made to appear to go in that direction.

Let the record show that the leaflet did come out against all bombs and did appeal for international solidarity, to the Russian proletariat above the heads of their leaders. But "Anglo-Saxons" thought 1921 so relevant to today as to drag it into a leaflet against the bomb for no accidental reason. They are well aware of the fact that the Russian is steeped in Marxism and Leninism, not because Khrushchev compels them to study it, but because they are the sons of the Revolution, in and out of Stalin-Khrushchev prisons, as the 1953 Vorkuta revolts revealed all over again. These leaflet writers should at least also have been aware of the fact that the complete works of Lenin are available to the Russians, and they will not easily be misled by one sentence quoted out of context. On the contrary, they will question the veracity of the leaflet writers, especially as many of them are involved in opposition to Khrushchev's reguarade as a "Leninist," as well as daily fighting the State Planners in production.

The ignorance of the underground movement in Russia (again both in prison and in the factory (?)) by no means exhausts all the blank spots in the minds of the leaflet writers.

The urgency of the times that hold over civilization the very question of its survival demands that they stop using other movements to accomplish sectarian ends, if only for reasons that for such "popular front games" the Russian Communists are expert and will much more easily "take over." Better face the movements with the threat of a live Khrushchev than a dead Lenin.

The anti-nuclear movements who fight the mad onrush of the rulers of the world towards a nuclear holocaust, as well as the working class which daily opposes the automated speed-up set by the capitalist class, must pause to consider the coincidence of both the powerful Khrushchev and the powerless sects swarming into the movement to use it for their purposes. All — whether in Britain or Russia, the United States or Africa, India or Japan (where the schisms in the nuclear movement has appeared precisely on the point of break with Communism and return to the original Humanism of Marx and the Leninism of "State and Revolution") — all fighters for a new society on truly human beginnings must face the now in our atom-ridden world. There is no Marx to ana-

lyst the latest stage of world capitalist development. There is no Lenin to analyze the new problems in state and revolution caused by the existence of H-bombs and global rockets. Surely we need to some better armed to face the totality of the crisis of this epoch than the tattered dress in which those leaflet writers revived an old debate. Far from thereby clearing up the part in a manner to illuminate the present, they only exposed their own nakedness. in theory and in fact.

"At the penalty of death" -- to use Marx's expression of the need to resolve the crisis in capitalistic production -- men must face with sober senses the relations of man to man at the point of production and in society in 1962, not 1921.

— RAYA

FOOTNOTES

- (1) CAPITAL, Vol. III, p. 293.
- (2) Since the leaflet was sent to me in Russian I am translating f... it back into English and the phraseology may therefore not be the same as in the original English.
- (3) It is about time that the use to which Lenin put the expression -- state-capitalism -- be not deliberately confused with its modern usage. Lenin used the expression to stress that the nationalization of industry can be done either under capitalist system or under a workers' state. Thus he called the NEP "state capitalism" and said there was nothing to fear from it since "the commanding heights", i.e. state power was in the hands of the workers. On the other hand, when he feared that the bureaucratization of the state apparatus and "komchvanstvo" (Communist lies) may lead "back towards capitalism", he did not use the expression, "state capitalism." In all cases, he was talking, not about theory but about the actual state of affairs in his lifetime. What the post-Lenin generations have been witness to is state capitalism as it was, theoretically, envisaged by Marx as the ultimate of capitalist development when the concentration and centralization of capital reached the point of concentration "in the hands of one single capitalist or one single capitalist corporation" and as it actually came to be, not only in Stalinist Russia, and Nazi Germany, but a world phenomenon without any "commanding heights" controlled by workers. The author of "The Meaning of Socialism", as all radicals, are well enough aware of the fact that its current usage is different from its usage by Lenin, but insist on muddying the waters for their own narrow purposes.
- (4) Lenin, Collected Works. Vol. 27, p. 151, 1937 edition, Moscow, in Russian only.

(5) MARXISM AND FREEDOM, Ch. XII, What Happens After?

(6) Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. IX, p. 9

(7) For the revolt in the forced labor camps read "Yorkuta" by Joseph Schöner; for the continuing revolt of the Russian proletariat against the Russian State Planners, read Ch. XIII, "Russian State Capitalism vs. Workers' Revolt" in MARXISM AND FREEDOM. Let's also not forget China. (See Special Supplement on Mao Tse-tung, January 1962, News and Letters.)

The "de-Stalinization" campaign itself was due to the fact that, both in Russia and East Europe as well as in the new continent in revolt --Africa--, the masses were finding their way to the Marxism and Leninism before they had been transformed into their opposite--the Communist totalitarianism of our day. No one seems more adept at putting blinders on himself than the old radical who limits his concept of "new", not to the objective world, but to his subjective "discoveries" about what "really" happened in the old disputes.

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River Detroit 4, Mich. TT-8-7053

SPECIAL DOUBLE ISSUE POLITICAL LETTERS Nos. 38 & 39.

WHICH WAY NOW? West Africa Under the Impact August 15, 1962
of Communism and Neo-Colonialism.

(Editor's Note: Again we are publishing for our readers the full version of the articles on Africa that will be published in abbreviated version in AFRICA TODAY in September. This will conclude the series on Africa that were written from Africa during Raya's stay in West Africa.)

Dear Friends:

The traveler in West Africa who is at all sensitive to freedom's call is under a compulsion from the surge of the liberation movement to become "engaged in the struggle." The dynamism of "Freedom Now" infuses even old ideas with a force capable of piercing through any shield of apathy.

Whether one is in Ghana, the "oldest" of the newly-independent African states, or in the Gambia, which has just embarked on the road to independence with its attainment of internal self-government on May 31st, the observer is swept into the tide of independence. He stops looking down on the tribal languages as restrictive and, instead, gains an enormous respect for them as a weapon which forged African solidarity despite the divisiveness of the English and French languages. When asked his homeland, an African friend simply wrote "African", refusing to specify which country in order not "to conform to the divisions set up by the Europeans."

A mild American demurrer that there are "too many tribal languages" brought a heated response that there is always some African who knows the other tribe's language. Indeed, the sound of a single drum beat, or the sound of a truck with party flag flying, brings out an entire village. In less time than it takes the European traveller to get out of the truck, all tribes have assembled, with a minstrel present to transmit loudly for all to hear, without benefit of wireless, the voice of the most bashful of any tribe. In a flash the bantaba becomes transformed from a place of gossip to one charged with political discussions lasting far into the night. On many occasions I have had cause to doubt that Africans sleep at all!

Despite the exhilaration of the mass mobilization it is necessary to probe the bleak reality of what is coldly called "the problems of the underdeveloped economies"—the general poverty that is not restricted either to "the bush" or the city slum, but embraces also the elite as well as the earth itself. It would be easier to get under the umbrella of "African socialism" and to see "no need for the bitter polarization of socialist ideas that is part of European history." (1) But it is impossible to write of African socialism when one dismisses the division between Casablanca and Monrovia, and compounds this error by isolating himself from a confrontation with the opposing forces within the newly independent African nations. The truth is that the African Revolutions have reached the crossroads so early in their development that even the reporter who evades an answer must at least pose the question: "Which Way Now?" (1)

No doubt the impact of the world struggle between the two nuclear world titans has hastened this repercussion on the African continent. As the recent strikes in Ghana showed, however, not every development can be attributed either to the Cold War or to the machinations of outsiders. (2) The strikes revealed an internal dualism which vitiates the designations of Left, Right, and Center within the independent countries. The "Left" has become "Right" in its attitude to labor.

Ghana is a sobering experience. No sooner had this reporter been on the verge of deciding that the leadership of this country has crossed the Rubicon over to the Communist orbit, than she would meet Africans, from countries that are still colonies, who speak of Ghana as the haven for those fighting for independence. One then becomes oppressively aware that neo-colonialism is not a myth invented by Communists, but a palpable fact of life throughout Africa. It thus becomes impossible to write of the impact of Communism without also writing of the reality of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

Just as Fan-Africanism covers up, rather than discloses, the reason for the existence of two different African blocs, so African socialism, by which both

the intellectual and the worker swears, beclouds rather than illuminates the opposition between Marxism and Communism. The popularity of Marxism among the wide masses, and the leadership's tendential fall into the Communist orbit, is not one and the same thing. Far from these two forces pulling in the same direction, as they did during the struggles for independence, leaders and ranks now pull in different directions. They may not yet have developed into two opposing class forces, but they have already emerged as varying attitudes giving different answers to that crucial question: Which Way Now?

The superior air of the non-Marxist who speaks of the "deceiving simplicity of Marxian dialectics"(3) has deliberately closed his ears to the rules announced by the participants. The proof lies not in the claimers or disclaimers of the efficacy of Marxian Dialectics. The proof lies in the actualities of the African development. The outside observer who speaks of Marxism—a theory of man's self-emancipation—and Communism—the practice of state-capitalist exploitation—as if they were one and the same phenomenon bars an objective, rational approach to the African reality which is contradictory, complex, pluri-dimensional.

In the struggle for the minds of men, the only kind of struggle that can be won in this nuclear age, the veritable conspiracy between the United States and Russia to force an identity between the two irreconcilable opposites—Marxism and Communism—binds the hands of "the West," but does not bind the hands of Russia which, at one and the same time, uses the Marxist language of freedom and practices the Communist technique of power. The Communists have chosen two major areas of concentration: (1) the trades unions, and (2) the educational field, with special emphasis directed to the Africanists.

Moscow and Accra Versions of the AATUF

The Casablanca group which, last year, set up the All-African Trades Union Federation (AATUF), has given Russia its first chance since the Congo crisis to expand its foothold in Africa. Russia hopes thereby to rely on a more lasting weapon than Moscow gold (though this is available as needed), and that is the affinity of minds at this specific juncture of history.

Ghanaian trade union officials act as if the May 1961 Casablanca Conference setting up the AATUF is a direct outgrowth of the December 1958 All Peoples Conference decision to set up an African trades union body. No explanation is made why it took three years to consummate so simple a decision.

The World Federation of Trades Unions (WFTU) led a most barren existence

3 1 6 1

-4-

during the four-year period, 1957-1961, when 21 African nations gained their independence without any help from Russia. WFTU had not so much as held a convention throughout all these years. However it hurried to send out a call for a world convention when Casablanca established the AATUF in May, 1961. The convention was held in Moscow during December, 1961. While WFTU offered no explanation for not meeting since its 1957 convention in Leipzig, it was full of explanations as to why there had been a three-year lapse between the decision of the All-African Peoples' Conference of December 1958 to set up an all-African trades union group, and its actual formation in 1961. This, Moscow explained, was all due to the "intrigues and machinations" of the International Conference of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) which had forever called "counter-conferences." On the very dates planned by the "independent national democracies" to set up this independent movement, the "neo-colonialists frustrated all attempts. It "follows" the Casablanca method of calling the overwhelming majority "the splinter group," and the minority of five, "the unifiers."

The manifesto of the WFTU, which met in Moscow December 4-15, 1961, reads: "The WFTU considers the creation of the AATUF a great victory for the forces fighting for unity of the African trade union movement. The fight for unity of the African trade unions based on anti-colonialism against the new forms of colonial oppression, against imperialism, feudalism and reaction, deals severe blows to the splitting elements represented by imperialism and the ICFTU. The AATUF can rely on the sincere friendship of the WFTU which extends a helping hand to them."

No sincerometer has been invented to gauge Moscow's friendship. There is no doubt, however, that if it didn't inspire the creation of AATUF it certainly conspired to influence its direction thereafter. Ibrahim Zakaria, Secretary of the WFTU, discovered a similarity between the stand of the AATUF and Khrushchev's 1960 UN speech which had been made the thesis of the 22nd Russian Communist Party Congress. He summarized it in the main speech, "For the Abolition of Colonialism." (4)

"Against Neo-Colonialism" became the pivot, the very reason for the existence of the African trades unions whether they were in independent countries or otherwise. With this, WFTU saw its chance to lead the struggle from the "inside" against the "outsider" ICFTU. The overly-willing insider chosen for this role is Ghana.

"The New Structure" of the Ghanaian TUC

Nothing is said now, by either Accra or Moscow, about the fact that Kwame Nkrumah himself addressed the first African Regional Organization, an arm of the ICFTU, in Accra in 1967. Nor is anything said that, after the union body was

3 0 6 5

talked about, it was never as one that would have no international relations. Far less is any mention made of the fact that the Ghana Trades Union Congress was itself affiliated with the ICFTU, and its General Secretary John K. Tettegah was a favorite there for his regular attacks on the WFTU as a "world threat."

The assassination of Lumumba, and not the 1958 decision for an all-African congress of trade unionists, motivated the establishment of the AATUF at Casablanca. This did not win over the majority of the majority of the independent African states. Meanwhile, the internal developments within the newly independent nations had brought about a division between the leadership and the ranks of the workers who had heretofore been united in the struggle for national liberation.

When I got to Accra, in April 1962, the massive strikes had ended. John K. Tettegah had been relieved of responsibility for the "internal affairs" of the Ghanaian Trades Union Congress, and had been sent to Lagos to find headquarters for the AATUF. These two inseparables—discipline of your own workers, and "leadership" over other African countries—are, of course, the determining factors in the country's development internally and its foreign relations.

The April 7th issue of the Ghana Trades Union Congress News Bulletin reports that the "new structure" the trades unions have adopted is "based on Marxist principles." They turn out to be a typical Communist stratification of the trades unions, their "merger" with the governing party, in this case of course the CFP. Since Kwame Nkrumah is never quite satisfied with something as non-personal as "Pan-Africanism" or African Socialism, the trades union congress was organized under the banner of "Toward Nkrumaism." The News Bulletin assures us that "Osoyefo himself" launched that slogan, but fails to tell us what Nkrumaism is. When I interviewed Mr. Magnus-George I did not ask for further enlightenment on that question, but limited myself to questions as to the loss of independence of the trades union movement with their merger with the CFP. A blustering individual, Mr. Magnus-George spoke belligerently, "We do not see the reasons why people in Europe always ask us why we are an integral part of the CFP. It is not their business to tell us what to do. We're living in a free country and can do what we like. We're an integral part of the CFP and have no separate trade union card. We're going to step up productivity with the Three Year Development Program (July 1961 to July 1964) and we don't come to the point of American wildcats."

The last remark was in response to my interruption which pointed to the recent strikes in Ghana and intimated that perhaps the Ghanaian workers were following the example of the American workers who, when their trade union leadership refuse to authorize a strike for legitimate grievances, "wildcat." "It will be very interesting for you to know," continued Mr. Magnus-George with an air of discovery, "that any time there is a misunderstanding with the state and

-6-

workers down tools, when their grievances are redressed, they work free to make up lost time." He then proudly pointed to a letter of his that appeared in that day's press which congratulated the workers in the Kade Match Factory who, "guided by the spirit of duty-consciousness, patriotism, and love for the nation, voluntarily worked overtime to increase the out-put of production from the factory." Evidently, in line with the spirit of "Osagyefo the President" Mr. Magnus-George had also contributed his "humble donation of L5 with which the workers of the Kade Match Factory can have a social party for enjoyment." Rockefeller with his charitable dimes didn't do less!

Magnus-George's paternalism extended to the Negro Americans though they were not Africans--"They don't have land here, do they?"--but for whose benefit Ghana nevertheless fights America for "its color discrimination." In his attempt to deny that the pattern of both internal trade union and party structure as well as in relations to other independent African countries, Ghana followed the Moscow pattern, the Deputy Secretary first stated "We have always collaborated with Yugoslavia" as if that proved they were not communist but "socialist, adapted to African realities." Somehow he failed to include in that also East Germany, although it is its "free" trades union's slogan--"Produce more in the same time for the same money"(5)--which is most slavishly copied in Ghana. He did cite one example which did not bow to the Communist line: "We collaborate with Histadrut(6) even though it is a member of the ICFTU; we work as equals with them; we don't have to affiliate to them. They teach us trade union structure and don't ask questions about Communism, as the AFL-CIO always does. (You know that George Meany offered us some scholarships, but we refused. We don't want our people always plied with questions about communism)."

On the decisive question of the relationship to labor, the loss of independence of their trade union organization, the opposition to the austerity budget and forced savings, the complaints of poor housing and bad working conditions, the trade union official would not budge at all from the position that it was not for "a European" to question. "Americans always write lies anyway."

Casablanca and Dakar

In the interval between the Casablanca Conference and the adoption of the new trades union structure by the Ghanaians, a gathering of African trades unionists from the Monrovia bloc, plus Tanganyika which had just gained its independence, met at Dakar. The venom of Casablanca knew no bounds. In the interview I had with Mr. Magnus-George, Deputy Secretary of the Ghana TUC, he bellowed that "Tom Mboya was a lackey of the ICFTU which established itself

-7-

as part of neo-colonialism...if the Nigerian trade union doesn't join the AATUF, we shall interpret that as a stab in the back." Lest I may have thought that his venom was limited only to Kenya and Nigeria, he handed me the official organ of the Casablanca trades union group, "The African Worker."

Its edition of January-February, 1962, is wholly devoted to the Dakar meeting. The front page editorial is prefaced by a quotation from "Business Week" to the effect that "The cold war has made the work of the big U.S. unions virtually a State Department enterprise." (The ICFTU, for their part, make the same type of amalgam in reverse.) (7) This Kremlin-like amalgam is then carried through thus: (1) The Dakar conference was a result of "imperialist inspired provocations of some of our brothers" ... "A handful of puppet African trade unionists" were involved in a "Conspiracy with the ICFTU, the most venomous specimen of neo-colonialism in action."

No fewer than three cartoons carry out the same theme with the African "brothers" being depicted, for the most part, in white faces, each holding a bag of American dollars. The caption reads: "Workers of Africa, beware of neo-colonial INFESTED areas!!" (The double exclamation mark, and the extra-large lettering for the word INFESTED are from the original--in both English and French at that.)

Another kind of crescendo is reached in attacking the Tunisian delegate, Ahmed Tlili, whom it calls "the Judas of imperialists" and whom it addresses as follows: "We hear your IFTU confederation of so-called African Trades Unions promises 'moral, financial and legal support for detained Ghanaian trade unionists'." The "letter" goes on: "Who are these 'renegades of your ilk through whom you think you can achieve the wicked and diabolical machinations assigned to you by the ICFTU rascals against Ghana and Africa.'" It finishes off with a typical Stalinist stool pidgeon act: "And by the way are you a loyal citizen of your own country--that is if ever you care less about the whole of Africa?"

I didn't get to Tunisia to interview Mr. Tlili, but I did get to Dakar and interviewed Alioune Cisse, of the Senegal TUC, who is presently Ambassador to Guinea. He tried to assure me that "Toure, Senghor, Nkrumah are all friends. This (pointing to the copy of the "African Worker" I had been given in Ghana, and handed to him) is mere propaganda. The trouble is that, though the Casablanca group are only five, and at Dakar 41 organizations from 30 African countries in West Africa, East Africa, Madagascar, Tunisia and Libya, were present, the five want to speak for the whole of Africa ... But our orientation is Pan-African, and we will all get together and work matters out."

Whether such scurrilous writing can be dismissed as "mere propaganda" that will disappear, the truth is that the relationship of the trades unions to the mass of the workers is the nub of the question.

-8-

The "new trade union structure" brings into focus how organic is their affinity to established Communism, that assumed name of contemporary state-capitalists. Under the circumstances it is only fitting that this section on the trade union structure end with a quotation of the much maligned African trade union leader who heads the Gambia Workers Union, M.S. Jallow: "Believe me what has happened (the attacks of Casablanca trade union leaders on those who met at Dakar--rd) is worse than the worst done by ordinary politicians. We aren't interested in Mboya and Tlili as individual leaders. But they have great masses of workers who follow and respect them and for whose interests they fight, and when you attack them in such a manner...I have the highest respect for Presidents Toure and Nkrumah as fighters; they are trying to adapt socialism to African realities, but, to be realistic, the AATUF was built up for ideological reasons. And now in Ghana they call workers' strikes 'labor indiscipline.' We will never bow to such an attitude to labor. I think the workers' interests come first. In the Gambia here we stay neutral as between the political parties. We would oppose any proposition to give up our trade union independence. We fight for workers' rights and that is the function of all trades unions. We will not bow to an organization that calls workers' strikes 'labor indiscipline.'"

Nigerian Independence Vs. Neo-Colonialism and Communism

Some there may have been who were startled by Nigeria's accusation of "subversion" by Ghana, and Ghana's choice of appending to her denial of subversion the designation that Nigeria was nothing but a "neo-colonized regime." Others, no doubt, will consider the accusation as proof of their thesis that Ghana is one of the centers of "Russia's Gamble for Africa." (9)

President Sekou Toure, on the other hand, thinks the problem is easily resolvable and has offered himself as peacemaker. Since Nigeria and Ghana are most certainly not planning a shooting war, some "peace plan" will succeed. Which doesn't mean that the underlying issue will have been resolved. The flare-up between the countries is only a reflection of an inner irreconcilable contradiction.

When people speak of the impact of Communism in West Africa, they have in mind the countries of the "left." I, however, found its impact as strong at the "center," and "right." Independence in Nigeria was attained at the expense of many compromises, including leaving intact (1) feudal relations in the Emir North, and (2) vested foreign interests.. The youth especially complain very bitterly that, "We've only had a change of administration, not a revolution."

There is a fantastic situation in the role of Dr. Nnamde Azikiwe. For decades he had led the revolutionary struggles for independence, for Pan-Africanism, and for socialism. Now, however, in his capacity as Governor-General, he says, "We must safeguard our Emirs...It is obvious if Northern Nigeria is to be stable, then the role being played by the Emirs and their Councils must be appreciated and safeguarded." (10)

It is small wonder that so "unfinished a revolution" has given birth to a small open Communist Party. What is strange is that those who are not Communists and recognize the existence of neo-colonialism fail to grapple with the problems created, and prefer instead to "placate the Left" by appearing pro-Russian.

I found it especially difficult to understand the role of the newspaper The West African Pilot, which is certainly not Communist. It is a sort of independent federalist paper. It has had a glorious past in the 1940's and 1950's. Presently, however, it carries on a curious combination of editorials for the Federal policy against the Awolowo group, with a set of "special articles" which parrot the Communist line on many topics, from the series praising Russia, to the "foreign gold" (unidentified but very pointedly American nevertheless) that is being sent in "to make captive leaders" in the trades union, demanding that the "outside relationship" (again unidentified but just as obviously ICTFU) be terminated.

Not a single word was said about "Moscow gold" (and there is plenty of that around from the many scholarships to students, women, trade unionists, ordinary and extraordinary special trips).

The paper ran a very nearly endless series of articles called "From Ebute Metta to the Kremlin" by P.A. Curtis-Joseph who assured us that, "I have not been briefed by anybody to do this," but, "The Soviet Union, the pivot of socialism" somehow turned out to be so great that even its churches were superior to those in Nigeria: "The surprise I got was that nobody I had the opportunity of discussing with in Moscow had not a Bible...Most of them had read it through and they regard it as a very rich book." (11)

When I interviewed Dr. Azikiwe, he said, "The labeling of ideologies -- I don't think that is a sign of progress in America which is supposed to be a shrine of democracy. It tends to stifle thought when you proscribe Communists. Our Constitution gives everybody the right to hold what views he pleases so long as it doesn't violate the law. Here, I'll read you Chapter III, Section 23 of our Constitution. We are flexible," he went on. "We will look into all ideologies and take what suits Africa."

"I cannot divorce theory from practice," he continued. "What philosophy we have has not been systematized in such a way as to make it appreciated outside our shores. Let me give you the basis. Our way of life is tied with land tenure. There it is communal -- the implication is that every person has a stake in the land. He cannot sell it but his sons are heirs. It belongs to them. You don't own it as individuals in the sense that you can sell it for profit and it became communalistic. They hold the land in common. Thus we have no landless peasantry ... and there is no permanent laboring class, although this is becoming so. Since there is no landless peasantry, nor a permanent wage earning class, Marxism socialism doesn't apply to us; African, Nigerian socialism does. No doubt the theory should be systematized, but it has not yet been done."

He concluded: "Welfare state, our own brand of socialism, is not Communism or Marxism or Fabian guild, but something to suit our way of life. To this we will stick. Welfare state is rooted fundamentally in socialist beliefs. Most of our people believe in free enterprise but not that it should mean profit at all costs."

The complaint of the opposition outside of parliament was that it obviously did mean profit at all costs, and at the expense of the working people especially whose standard of living, they claimed, has gone down, not up, since independence.

I was present at a rally called by the Nigerian Youth Congress and trade unionists to oppose the new austerity budget. The speech that got the biggest applause was this: "If we unite, we shall force the hands of those we put into office. No guns, but we can move forward. The seeds of revolution in this country have been planted."

The feeling that Nigeria, not only by size but by right of its long struggles, should be a leader of independent Africa was both stated from the platform and was evident from what was unstated. For example, many of the slogans were against Prime Minister Balewa, and one speaker shouted, "We are going to say so loud a 'No' to the austerity budget that Balewa will hear us in his palace." But no one singled out Governor-General Azikiwe except to bemoan the fact that "when Zik was our revolutionary leader we were moving ahead," or "Zik was a socialist when we voted for him. What is the use of being free? What are we free for? We are poorer than when Britain was the exploiter."

-11-

The most encouraging development in Nigeria is the freedom of expression in and out of Parliament, in the press, and in the rise of many political organizations. This is no single-party state. The impact of Communism, however, is there and can be seen implicitly and explicitly: (1) The fact that the Emirs in the feudal North retain their strength makes it a natural breeding ground also for the Communists who are most active in that region; (2) The fact that the federal government encouraged both the unification of the trades unions and the "expose" of "foreign gold," implying American gold without saying a word about Moscow gold, resulted in the fiasco that the unity congress turned out to be; consequently they were compelled to the other extreme of blaming it all on Ghanaian "subversion." (3) In the educational field, as we shall see below, they fall prey to pro-Russianism because they do not face the real challenge of neo-colonialism and the students' rebellion against it.

Despite all these inroads of communism and neo-colonialism, I met many Africans who fully believe that, as the largest country, Nigeria does have the best opportunity for finding a truly independent road to African reconstruction.

Field of Education

Left, Right and Center, the impact of Communism is having its most resounding effect in the educational field. Despite Communism's concentration in the trades union field, its successes are more apparent than real. First, labor is more attracted to Marxism than to Communism. Secondly, the establishment of the AATUF not only represents a minority of the independent nations but, now that these leaders are meeting their first serious challenge from the working people themselves, they must now grapple with the differences between idealism and ideology, aspirations and accumulation. Thirdly, the AATUF was a withdrawal from Europe in which Russia was included; that is to say, members were asked to drop all international affiliations, WFTU as well as ICFU. The WFTU has a right to feel the victor by virtue of their "personal" relations with the leaders and the obvious anti-Westernism that came to an emotional climax with the assassination of Lumumba. But they have by no means crossed the Rubicon into the Communist orbit.

In the educational field, on the other hand, the right-winger as well as the fellow-traveller, the professional anti-Communist as well as the one who flirted with Communism without ever going to any Marxist source — all either fall readily into the trap, or are pushed into it unceremoniously. On the part of some it is an admiration for the Communist "know-how", technique of getting things done. On the part of others it is either the adventure of "slumming" or, to put it more unkindly yet, a cheap way to appear "left" under conditions

when the student opposition to the University administration is strong. Still others are so blinded by their organic anti-Communism that they underestimate the impact of Communism's Marxist language.

Whatever the reason, I found such opposites of the political spectrum as the left-wing well-known English Africanist, Thomas Hodgkin who presently heads the Africa Institute at the University of Ghana, and the conservative principal of the University College at Ibadan, Nigeria, Dr. K Onwuka Dike, looking gleefully forward to meeting Dr. I. Potekhin, head of the Africa Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, at the forthcoming conference of Africanists in Accra on December 12th. Dr. Dike told me proudly that Dr. Potekhin had been his houseguest the last time he was in Nigeria, had invited him to give a course in Moscow, and he hopes he will be able to do so in the next academic year. At the same time he admitted knowing so little of the Negro American that that same academic year they would first begin a course on the subject at the University and bring out an American to teach it. Dr. Hodgkin, who, when he was in Moscow in 1958, was very impressed by the fact that they were now translating obscure Hausa texts into Russian that had not yet had a Western translation, told me that Dr. Potekhin "as a Marxist" would "pose the right questions," that is to say, questions that "We (bourgeois) academicians wouldn't think of."

The fact that this Communist hadn't posed "the right questions" throughout Stalin's long heyday, and his major work on Africa is cast in that intellectual wasteland while he himself bows to the "the great master of materialist dialectics, the coriphaeus of science, J.V. Stalin" seems hardly to concern our academicians. Much less would they be moved by the fact that genuine Marxists reject that Communist either as a Marxist or as an independent scholar would do anything he was not assigned to do by the politicians in power, in this case Khrushchev. At the forthcoming Accra conference, Potekhin will not only pass for a Marxist. I predict he will be the star who will shine as the most original contributor to the study of Africa. This despite the fact that many a learned thesis has been written in the West as to how backward Russia has been in the field of African studies; how they must leapfrog now by translating books by Western scholars in order to catch up with the West. Since what has been achieved in the study of African history, both past and as it is being made today, is little enough, the man with a purpose and a method outshines all others.

One minor incident on the impact of a Moscow imprint may cast some illumination here. In 1953 there came to my attention a remarkable manuscript by a Kikuyu, Mbiyu Koinange, entitled, The People of Kenya Speak for Themselves. Since it was the period of the Mau Mau and no publisher or academic institution or individual scholar would touch it with a 10 foot pole, some friends got together and had it printed on their own. The reviews it rated in 1955

could be counted on less than the fingers of one hand. In 1956 Moscow published it. (I don't know whether the translation was just their usual steal or they got the author's permission.) Promptly (though it meant you now had to hire a Russian) it rated not only reviews, but analytical articles as to whether that analysis, or some other, would have proven Moscow's "objectivity." So far as I know no bourgeois scholar has bothered to ask himself: "Why hadn't he seen its value, for good or evil, before the Moscow imprint?"

A curious thing about the forthcoming conference is how it came to be and who sent out the invitations. Moscow claims the date was set at the last Orientalist world congress in Moscow last year, but I know some who were present there and they were neither aware of the present meeting, nor were they invited to it. One Ghanaian who is anxious to have some independent Marxist invited ("And yes, why not Hegelians too, since Kwame claims to be one?") told me he felt absolutely powerless to influence this "new breed of Africanists."

I repeated this statement to a student in Accra and, at first, he said he'd rather not speak about the "mess in education." Later he relaxed and spoke out against the sending of so many Ghanaian students to Russia. They are being sent as if it were to some paradise when, in fact, living there is both too dear and too hard. "And however did the fairy tale arise that Russians like Africans!" As for the universities here, he continued, either they still follow "the useless classical English model" or this "new breed of Africanists" serve up some "undigestible concoction of Marxism, Pan-Africanism and Nkrumahism. There is nothing we can do but grumble—and that only to ourselves."

The Communists will come armed with scholarly theses on everything from the Bantu languages and the Zulu wars to the early trade union struggles in the Gambia and the Arabic influence in the Sudan—whatever topics they choose to impress the conference with. They will come ready to play up everything in present-day Africa from the originality of the path to socialism through industrialization and communalism to the African personality. Where they cannot bribe, they will flatter; where they cannot flatter they will see that the economic development that is so much aspired to is not left only to those charged with execution of the Plan, but is taken under advisement by "objective scholars."

Above all, they will make friends, and even more "contacts" so that long after the convention is over they continue to influence the development of education on the African continent from the first grade until they finally can get them on scholarships to the Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow. They will succeed not because the Africans have no ideas of their own but because the ideas they have will have been met, not by scattered individuals who live in the ivory towers of education, but by politicians who have the sense to know that a little Marxism sprinkled with a lot of power goes a long, long way.

In turning to the non-academic field to see how the challenge may be met, I interviewed President Leopold Sedar Senghor of Senegal. His views were given to me in answer to questions I put to him, but since it makes a poetic whole, I will not break it up to include the questions:

"This for us is the actual crime, that the world is divided into two ideologies. You have the Communist and capitalist ideologies, but in essence they are the same. The program of the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR is like that of the USA—completely materialistic—a civilization of fridges and TV's. You have Communism, you have American free enterprise and you have the plan in Western Europe.

"Each ideology has a truth, but only in part. Where is the ideology which is not all materialistic, which permits room for the spiritual? That is our ideology. I think I should say in all justice that we use the socialist method. We are socialists and use the democratic method which preserves liberty. That is why here in Senegal we have a dual direction:

"(1) Economically, it is the direction of the plan.

"(2) Culturally, we are for the Negro African blending with that of Europe. Here (turning to the wall of his presidential suite) is a beautiful painting that is authentically African, but the Senegalese artist is a product of the Ecole de Beaux Arts de Paris.

"I think that the division between Monrovia and Casablanca is a superficial division. We are for the unity of the two African blocs. The vocabulary they use now is that of East and West, but in Africa the problem is not one class, or state capitalism. The problem which is supreme is the new cultural existence. We want a culture that is African. The division between Monrovia and Casablanca is not the real problem. The real problem is struggle between the USA and the USSR.

"When President Bokou Tore calls for full re-Africanization, the problem is one of Negritude. But Africa is economically greatly retarded and the need is for the scientific technology that Europe has, the efficiency of the American. We have a dual problem, a situation of underdevelopment and the problem of Negritude. It is a problem of method. It is necessary to have a method with which to approach this reality.

"Negritude isn't pure resurrection. It is a modern adaptation of African history and culture. We take the technique of Europe in order to permit the creation of a new civilization for the Africa of the 20th century.

"There is a socialism, but the socialism in Europe is depasse because the African reality is spiritual. In Marxism there is determinism, scientific and discursive reason and humanism. The revolution is scientific and it is philosophic. Einstein is 20th century, but so is the artist 20th century. The 20th century culture is more than scientific. Communism is not the whole truth. It is abstract and scientific. In this, capitalism resembles communism.

"The culture which today finds a method for Black Africa where we can take science from Communism and capitalism, and from Africa poetry and knowledge is the culture we need. From this point of view, both in the

United States and the Soviet Union there is not this sense of reality. We want a culture that is African, the conclusions of the PHENOMENOLOGY of Teilhard de Chardin."

To this writer the trouble with President Senghor's humanism is that it is general and abstract where it should be concrete and specific. The opposition to the policies of the Senegalese Government does not arise from any position on art and religion, but precisely from the African reality, from the fact that material conditions have not changed significantly for the great masses since independence. Senegal follows de Gaulle France all too closely both in foreign policy and internally. The truth is that the relationship of worker to management at the point of production and the relationship of the great masses as consumers to the petty trades is pretty much what it was before political independence was achieved. Indeed, one African friend was so infuriated as we walked from the beautiful wide boulevards of Dakar into the back street slums and, on the way, passed the markets where ownership remains in non-African hands that he said bitterly, "As we embark on our second revolution, these white settlers will make of Dakar another Algiers."

Just as Ghana has not yet crossed the Rubicon into the Communist orbit, so Senegal is by no means in a position comparable to Algeria, neither now when it has gained independence at last, much less in the 7 year torturous civil war which saw the exorcisms of reaction: the fascistic OAS. Along with Senegal's political independence, the trade unions maintained their freedom. Not only have the trade unions not been incorporated into the state, as they have been in Ghana, but they exercise (as well as maintain) the right to strike. Although the Communist Party has been declared illegal, the other opposition parties do function. The fact that Dakar was the showpiece of French imperialism has given it the advantage of more industrialization, more schools, more wide boulevards, more travel the world over, greater experience in political functioning. Pan-Africanism and Marxism are freely discussed, and Marxist books are easily available. No one need take the official interpretation of Marxist Humanism, and many don't. Therein lies hope for the future.

The measure of the human development in Senegal must be analyzed in terms of the same conflicts and contradictions which we have examined closely in Senegal's neighbors. Future articles will analyze the emerging trends as they become more explicit and the actual struggles answer concretely WHICH WAY NOW.

--Rays

- (1) Basil Davidson, West Africa, April 21, 1962.
- (2) It is true that there were also strikes in Guinea, but they were not all-embracing and Sekou Toure was able to blame "outsiders" for the teachers' strike and have the Russian Ambassador recalled.
- (3) Christopher Bird, "Scholarship and Propaganda", Problems of Communism, March-April 1962.

(4) Zakaria, Ibrahim, "For the Abolition of Colonialism", 5th World Trade Union Congress, December 4-15, 1961, Moscow. The Resolutions of the same congress were printed at the same time in a parallel pamphlet.

(5) There is always some "Free" German Trade Union propaganda around in Ghanaian trade union offices. The one I read while I was waiting in the ante room (No.2/62) featured "Defeat the imperialists by economic accomplishments" through "the productivity pledge movement."

(6) The April 5th issue of The Ghanaian Times included a special 8-page pamphlet, headlined "Half A Century of Socialist Achievement--the Histadrut of Israel." On June 18th, however, Presidents Nkrumah and Touré once again met with President Nasser and once again signed a warning against Israel's technical aid as "imperialist penetration of Africa." The fact that the African leaders did not follow through on their first manifesto with Nasser and may not do so this time only highlights the unprincipled nature of the so-called left to themselves as well as to their varied allies.

(7) Free Trade Unions in the Fight for African Freedom, an ICTFU and AFRO (African Regional Organizational) publication, Brussels, Lagos, 1961. (by John Riddell, H.P. Adebola, and Omer Becu.)

(8) Mr. Jallow is one of the Africans that appeared white-faced in the cartoon of the African Worker devoted to the Dakar conference. This, however, does not exhaust the not-so-funny farce in the specific case. It seems that one of the issues of the paper had played him up as an AATUF organizer. Mr. Jallow told me that Mr. Tettegah claimed a ticket was sent to him to attend the Casablanca conference, but he had never received it. He had, however, received a telegram of how disappointed and "betrayed" they felt at his non-appearance.

(9) A series of articles by Aidan Crawley, Sunday Times, London, beginning April 15, 1962.

(10) West Africa Pilot, Dec. 8, 1961.

(11) Ibid., April 12, 1962.

3 0 7 7

NEWS AND LETTERS 8751 Grand River Detroit 4, Mich. Titer 8-7053 Price 20¢ No. 40

POLITICAL LETTER

August 17, 1962

(Note: This completes the subscription series. No annual subscriptions will be offered beginning this fall. However, the letters will continue to appear irregularly, and can be subscribed to 5 at a time for \$1; individual copies are 20¢ plus 5¢ for mailing.)

THE NEGRO AMERICAN: Worker and Youth vs. "Talented Tenth"
on Questions of Labor, Civil Rights and African Revolutions

Dear Friends:

In a few months' time (January 1963) we will bear witness to a spate of centennial articles and oratory about the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. Though no one could possibly call a 100 year span a race with time, the Administration and the talented tenth will speak breathlessly about "the great progress achieved, especially in the last decade." At the same time, the originator of the phrase, "talented tenth", (W.E.B. Du Bois) will proclaim the nothingness of the achievement and point, instead, to the Russia-China axis as the alternate road to true freedom, as if the African nations achieved independence via that road!

Each of the disputants will become an easy target for attack by the other. It is easy indeed to argue against "nothingness." The Administration, that is to say the ruling class through the Government apparatus and its intellectual hangers-on, will point to "the principle of freedom" — without mentioning why this principle first needed assertion in 1863, two full years after a bloody civil war very nearly tipped the military scales for the slave states, and very nearly 100 years after the Declaration of Independence. Instead, it will begin citing figures on the many "new opportunities" opened to Negroes so that, in the professional and clerical fields, there has been a 300% to 706% rise in employment for Negroes. Like all politicians, they are expert in making figures lie. When you begin to break down the "3-fold" or "7-fold" rise in white collar employment, you easily find that the phenomenal percentages mean nothing. Since there had been no employment in those fields at all, the few now employed loom high only because the base for the 90 preceding years had been nothing. The total rise amounts to only 2 to 5 per cent of the labor force.

On the other hand, when it comes to unemployment, the unemployment rate among Negroes is 11.4% — more than double the unemployment rate among whites. Of the employed, fully 75% remain mainly in the unskilled category.

Should Reuther be too fast to call attention to the fact that the Negro would never have gotten there, had it not been for the CIO, let us assure him that it is true, but in reverse. Industrial unionism would never have succeeded had it not been for the Negroes who constituted the pivotal section of the unskilled who were the backbone of the movement. Since the merger

3077

with the AFL, neither organization of the unorganized South, nor breakdown of discrimination within the craft unions has moved forward an inch. Unfortunately, neither the TULC within organized labor, nor the NAACP on the sidelines, have done anything to break this down because both work only from the top of their respective organizations to the top of the AFL-CIO. In the case of the NAACP it may even be no more than a diversion from the civil rights fields now that the latter has a mass base, especially in the South.

One thing binds all three together -- the Administration, the labor bureaucracy, the leadership of the established Negro organizations -- it is fear of the masses. Reading Reverend Martin Luther King's "March to Freedom" on the Negro Bus Boycott in 1956, one would think it was he, not Rosa Parks, who refused "to move to the back of the bus." Her act plus spontaneous action of the youth who came to her defense not only transformed that act of one into a cause of all Negroes, but elicited a new quality that became the pattern for the struggle in South Africa as well as South USA.

The same feeling of "we" did it instead of they, the masses, did it, characterizes the NAACP and CORE on sit-ins and freedom rides. The CORE, it is true, organized them from the North, but it is the South which gives it the mass proportion and the ramifications, even as the individual Freedom Riders add to it new national and international dimensions.

What everyone from JFK to the NAM, from the UAW and TULC to the NAACP and the U.S. Supreme Court, wishes the people here and the world over to do is to mistake a few select show-pieces "to stand for" freedom for all. The greatest scourge right now is precisely this TOKEN-ism in employment, in housing as in travel and in education, North as well as South. The "talented tenth" has come down to accept the 1% facade.

This is what makes it easy for W.E.B. Du Bois to speak of nothingness here and everything "there". Yet, thought poles apart, he is of the same world as the leadership here -- the administrative mentality of middle-class intellectuals living in the age of state capitalism; they will Plan as never before; the masses will work all the harder, as always before.

It was not a sheer accident that DuBois felt impelled to develop the concept of the talented tenth. He never looked to the masses, not even when, at the turn of the century, he founded the Niagara movement. Though he stood for full equality for Negroes, the masses seemed always, to him, to depend on the elite to lead them there. Not only that. The elite were the elite because they were the elite. That is to say, the masses were not the ones whose judgment would suffice to establish whom they wanted as leaders. Thus, when in the post-World War I period the first great Negro mass migra-

-3-

tion met with all the frustrations and none of the freedoms in the "free North", these Americans, by the millions, joined a "back to Africa" movement led by Marcus Garvey. Du Bois opposed — and asked the State Department to deport Garvey!

No doubt Du Bois's Pan-Africanism was of a very different variety — but so was Lenin's conception different from either. Nevertheless, because Lenin had his ears attuned to the masses, he grasped the significance of the "Nationalism" of the American Negro whose culture was as American as his land, but whose skin singled him out for double oppression. (1) W.E.B. Du Bois never saw the Nationalism in the black masses until after the Africans gained power in the post-World War II world.

It was not the Marxist period that attracted Du Bois to Russia. Long after Marxism there became transformed into its opposite — Communist state-capitalism — and considerably after the Negro turned away from American Communism because of its demand that the American Negro forget his struggles for equality and answer the wartime call of "The Yanks are coming", W.E.B. Du Bois suddenly found Russian Communism an attractive philosophy. In turn, it chose to use the Marxist language in vying with the U.S. for domination over the newly-independent nations of West Africa that had won their freedom without the help of either pole of world capital. So, while Communism never regained the allegiance of the mass of American Negroes, it did win the 90 year old supreme representative of "the talented tenth."

[An indication of the affinity of minds of the talented tenth, whether they follow American State Department or the Russian foreign policy statements was seen with the publication of Gunnar Myrdal's "American Dilemma." So constant is the dilemma of the Negro intellectuals that it did not matter whether they were of conservative or liberal persuasion, near-Marxist or rabid and professional anti-Communist — all not only gave of themselves very freely — but allowed Myrdal to superimpose his value judgments on their writings, which he cut to fit. (2)]

The Negro intellectual and Negro worker have never lived in worlds further apart than right now. But the gnawing question is: why do the Negro worker and the student youth seem to be similarly far apart?

The most significant fact in American life remains what it was in 1936. The rise of the CIO changed the industrial face of the nation. It unionized the mass of unskilled and semi-skilled factory labor. The overwhelming majority of Negroes fall into that category. In the last decade, due to automation, production workers declined by no less than 15%, and in some industries, such as mining, by as much as 33%. Again, the Negroes were hit hardest. Employed or unemployed, however, their lives revolve around the

-4-

factory and thus the union. It is here they find that the established leadership talks big on "civil rights" though they do not practice it in seeking either skilled work for the Negroes or leadership in the union.

At one period (during the war) the Negroes flocked by the thousands into the NAACP, trying to transform it from an organization fighting only legal battles to one that could fight for them on all fronts, from upgrading to housing. The bureaucratic reality made the mass of Negroes leave the NAACP almost as fast as they joined it. In an organized manner, like the March on Washington, they fought for FEPC, and in a spontaneous manner, like 1943 mass demonstrations in Harlem, in Chicago, in Detroit, they broadened the fight to all areas from housing to ending Jim Crow in the Army. Again, the achievement was at a tortoise pace.

By the 1950's Automation began to take its toll and wildcatting with white workers seemed the only way open to fight not only management but the bureaucracy. On the whole, however, recessions held development in check.

The student youth in 1958 that began the sit-ins had its impact on the Negro worker but did not move him as did the Freedom Rides in 1961. The Freedom Riders on their part began to concern themselves with all civil rights and the reverberation in Africa was heard. (The FREEDOM RIDERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES pamphlet is a very significant sign of this as well as of the relationship to labor.) It is at this point also that, recently new caucuses are appearing within the union to fight for upgrading. It is a good sign for the awakening at the point of production remains the most potent force for fundamental change in all the rest of society.

The confluence of these and the development of the African Revolutions (3) was dealt with by Charles Denby in his article on "Race and Class" (4). All these emerging signposts do not yet meet the challenge of the times because a critical missing link is still missing. It is organization governed by a philosophy which would build on the spontaneous movements that have taken place separately and unite the civil rights and labor fronts for a fundamental change in society such as took place in 1936, but on the higher historic level of the 1960's and therefore with a total philosophy.

It may have been sufficient for the 1930's to change the industrial face of the nation, although then, too, those who built the CIO thought of more

than higher wages and better working conditions, as was evident from the
new method, untrammelled from above, spontaneous sit-down. It certainly
will not suffice today when the African Revolutions achieved, in but a few
years, what the Negro American has not achieved in one hundred — destiny
in one's own hands. (The development of this point will be central to the
new book.)

— RAYA

FOOTNOTES

(1) For the 1920 Thesis on the National Question see V.I. Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. I; for the discussion of Negro Americans at the 4th CI Congress, 1922, see Resolution and Minutes.

(2) See "Negro Intellectuals in Dilemma", 1944, reprinted in News and Letters, February, 1961.

(3) See "Nationalism, Communism, Marxist Humanism and the AFRO-ASIAN REVOLUTIONS" by Raya Dunayevskaya

(4) See News and Letters, June-July 1962

POLITICAL LETTER

October 25, 1962

**MARXIST-HUMANISM VS. THE U.S. BLOCKADE OF CUBA, THE
RUSSIAN MISSILE BASES THERE, FIDEL CASTRO'S "SELECTIVE"
PARTY, ALL PLAYING WITH NUCLEAR HOLOCAUST**

Dear Friends:

My preliminary (Oct. 23) statement on the newly-created brink-of-war situation as result of JFK's blockade of Cuba, NK's missile bases there, and the impotence of the UN the minute the two nuclear titans decide to unleash a war holocaust, correctly stressed the following: "In opposing war, we make it clear that we are opposed to both nuclear giants: Russia and the U.S. Under no circumstances do we get ourselves maneuvered into a position where we, for a single moment, sound so much against either one of them that we appear to be for the other. ABOVE ALL WE OPPOSE WAR NOT ONLY AS 'AGAINSTERS' BUT PRIMARILY BECAUSE WE ARE FOR A TOTALLY NEW SOCIETY, ON NEW, ON HUMAN EGGIN - NINGS, FREE FROM EXPLOITATION AND DISCRIMINATION, WHERE THE POPULATION TO A MAN HAS THE DESTINY IN HIS OWN HANDS, BEGINNING WITH THE WORKERS AT THE POINT OF PRODUCTION."

Here I wish to develop this position on two levels: (1) the objective situation and nearness of war; and (2) ramifications of this crisis for our existence both as an organization and as a body of ideas, both on the question of continuous activity and writings, beginning with the next issue of the paper.

I. Before the Blockade

A good deal of illumination on both these factors can be gained if we take it out of the present moment of crisis and see that which was inherent in it the day before. It happens that, on the basis of the REB discussion on Cuba on October 8th, Inez gave a report to the Detroit local on October 19, in which she said: "What is new in Cuba today is that Russia is there, not in spirit but in guns, tanks, missiles with nuclear war-heads facing the U.S." This was before JFK's "discovery", timed to election politics. Then Inez continued: "What is a year old, but has been new for the American movement ever since the fiasco of the U.S.-sponsored invasion of Cuba, is that our basic rights and freedoms have been jeopardized, and these will become more circumscribed. In opposing any invasion or war against the Cuban people, we cannot, however, let Khrushchev get away with playing "the champion of peace" just because he defends Castro who has taken away the rights and freedoms of the Cuban people as Khrushchev has of the Russian people and Kennedy of the American people. All three are ready to shed blood to preserve their power."

At that same meeting -- and it is necessary to keep in mind that this was held 4 days before the announcement of blockade of Cuba -- I stressed that what was wrong with people who pretend that Russia is not in Cuba is that they thereby cover up the fact that Russia is the greatest exporter of

counter-revolution. It is easy to see counter-revolution when it is as direct as it is in the outright squashing of a Revolution, as the Russian destruction of the Hungarian Rev'n . It is not easy to see counter-revolution when it is a question of planned exploitation of the proletariat in his daily life. Yet these Russian "technicians" have been sent there, among other reasons, in order to compel the Cuban working people, who are resisting anti-labor laws, fighting the diversion of the Cuban Revolution from its announced humanism to state-capitalist channels, to compel them to produce more and more for less and less, and at the same time leave their political destiny to "the party and its leader."

Finally, those who can't get away from the spurious ground for argument established by Communists for the special benefit of the liberals, to the effect that if the U.S. has a "right" to bases in Europe, Russia has a "right" to one in Cuba, fail to see that the Russian arms imported into Cuba are not one-tenth of the threat to the U.S. **THAT THEY ARE TO THE CUBAN PEOPLE.** Small Cuba, even when armed by Russia, is no match for the U.S. might, but it is a power against the unarmed revolutionary underground, **AND IT IS FOR THIS PURPOSE PRECISELY THAT THEY ARE INTENDED.**

II. The Blockade and the Movements Opposed to It

Out of the clear blue, a few short days after he himself argued against Republican opponents who urged a blockade, J.F. Kennedy made the shocking, unilateral, warlike pronouncement of blockade. Outside of Khrushchev's break-up of the summit as a result of the U-2 plane spy incident, when the two nuclear giants were pitted against each other with no intermediaries, the people of the world were never closer to the brink of nuclear holocaust. The present confrontation is not limited to verbal threats and busted summits. It is now clear beyond peradventure of doubt that both Kennedy and Khrushchev are mad enough to plunge the world into thermonuclear war. If a summit meeting should result and stave off the day, it clearly will be only a delaying action. It is likewise clear that Cuba has become the possible locale of the outburst, as Berlin has been and remains to this day to be another focal point, **BUT THAT WHAT IS INVOLVED IS THE UNITED STATES - RUSSIAN COMPETITION FOR DOMINATION OF THE WORLD.**

It is at this point that the movements opposing war show their own negative character. The falling into a trap is inevitable when one does not view positively what they are fighting for, instead of only what they are fighting against. Thus though the CND (and Committee of 100) are supposed to be for banning the bomb, they had not a word to say against its spread to yet another country, in this case Cuba. Obviously, the Trotskyites, along with the Communists, are not the only ones who think of "good" bombs (Russian) and "bad" bombs (American). The professional nuclear disarmament people have now discovered that, in Cuban hands (or at least on Cuban soil for these are not really in Cuban, but in Russian, hands), it inspires them to the following

slogan, "Viva Fidel, Kennedy to Hell."

O.K., let's take up Fidel. Even without bomb, he has moved so far away from the revolution he led that it is hard to see what he is making of Cuba other than a satellite of Russia, and I don't mean it only as a storer of missile bases, but as an outpost of single party state capitalism. In the misnamed speech, "Marxism-Leninism", delivered on December 2, 1961 -- nearly a year ago, that is -- Fidel expounded his conception of why an "integrated revolutionary organization," that is to say, a single party in which the Communists and what was left of the July 26th movement merged. From urging his comrades "to overcome (their) scorn for military academies" through his love of The Plan ("I always had a plan.") as against the "anarchism" represented by opposition to him ("I am not going to ask what Manolo Fernandez represented, because I believe he represented trash; he was a 'mad anarchist'") to his glorification of Khrushchev ("one has only to read Khrushchev's report to the 22nd Congress ... The building of socialism follows a well-beaten path by now.") this petty-bourgeois idiot sees the truly independent third road -- against both US and Russia -- and for a new humanist society as an incursion of the "strict standard of selection" which must characterize "a party of leadership." Now if only the workers will continue to work, only harder, and agree that "The Ideal System of Government is the Party System", he can continue to lead "collectively" -- a la Khrushchev in Russia.

Any one can -- though it must be admitted that Fidel doesn't do it very well -- repeat generalizations of Marxism on the role of the working class. The proof, the only proof, that it is a way of life, not a mere weapon of propaganda, is its realization in life. No such thing is true in Fidel's Cuba where not a single organ -- from the trades unions to the peasant unions, from the state to the party -- is any longer controlled by the working people. Nevertheless, because so many in the nuclear disarmament movement have been forged as "againters" rather than as proponents of a totally new society, the Communists can set so fatal a trap for them that they forget what their very reason for existence is -- opposition to nuclear armament -- and shout "Viva Fidel."

On this life-and-death question, at this life-and-death moment, we can under no circumstances allow ourselves to be swallowed up by this curious movement. If nothing else can be left unquelled, let's at least make sure that our Marxist-Humanist ideas remain the beacon for future generations as they are for ours. Therefore we must unfurl our banner, and proceed with our opposition to both poles of world capital, putting in its rightly subordinate place, those who "follow the leader", be that NK or JFK.

III. The Testing Point

At the same time, we cannot minimize the totality of the crisis by considering that JFK, having finally exposed himself as no different from the Republicans who had urged blockade before and now urge invasion, things will be in any way easier for the building of a Marxist-Humanist movement. It is

- 4 -

not only the Birchers that will take upon themselves the role of extra "enforcers". The hysteria created by the Administration is much more eminent than that by a McCarthy who had no such power as JFK. Whenever a political position was proven wrong, there were those among the Marxists who tried to misuse a Marxist statement about the whip of the counter-revolution helping the revolutionary development. Its ultimate tragedy was Stalin's idiotic statement, "After Hitler, us." First, the statement of the whip of the counter-revolution referred to it urging the revolution on WHEN IT IS ALREADY IN PROCESS BUT HAS NOT YET REACHED FULL FRUITION, as say, between February and before October, 1917 when the Kornilov episode exposed Kerensky and allowed the full development of the revolution. In a non-revolutionary period, the problems confronting Marxist-Humanism are made harder, not lessened, by the blockade, for the man who has the means to start a nuclear holocaust does not forget for a moment his power to press down upon the opposition to his war-provoking policy.

Take even the minor question of JFK's timing his announcement of nuclear bases in Cuba to when it would be most useful to the Democrats running for election. 2% one way or the other may win him the election of a Governor or a Congressman. Once won--or lost--however, he has to be concerned not with 2% margin but with the fact that over 60% of the American people are opposed to invasion of Cuba. As the capitalist ruler he is, he then turns the power against his own people. Everyone who is not for his suicidal policy becomes "the enemy."

Of course, we increase our activity, not lessen it. Of course, we know the universal opposition to war and can build on that. Of course, we build our organization along with developing our ideas comprehensively, but we can do so only by being fully conscious of all the obstacles in the way. This is why the preliminary statement emphasized that:

"we have no power other than those of ideas even as the working people have no arms other than those of their labor power. Therefore it would be folly to act as if by opposition we mean the kind of arms that only the bourgeoisie has. THEY--both JFK and NI--have arms and ships and missiles and prisons and jet bombers. They can afford to play games as to who is the 'aggressor' and 'deceiver' and who is the violated and deceived while they jockey for best position to attack. We refuse to get into any such arguments...Our position must be as unique as it is, not either 'popular frontist' or pretense to power."

Let no one try to confuse Castro's single party with that in many African states. In the latter case, it was an outgrowth of a spontaneous revolutionary movement that was cemented by the unity of opposition to the imperialist conqueror and unity in revolution. In the Cuban case, the Cuban Communist party was playing with Batista and not helping Castro any --not before he had already won power and they had something TO TAKE OVER; and it is this party that has always taken its cue from Communist Russia and has swallowed up what there was left to swallow of the July 26th

- 5 -

Movement which has now become the single party in the style of all of Eastern Europe where unification of Communist and Socialist or other popular front parties were effected by virtue of outright occupation of their country by the Russian Army. Even with Fidel's discovery that he had read Marx's CAPITAL "up to page 370" before he declared himself a "Marxist-Leninist", it still remains an incontrovertible fact that Marxism mattered very little to him—until he discovered that, in its perverted Communist form, he can hold on to power.

It would be valuable to consult our past writings on Cuba:

February, 1959 — News & Letters-lead:

"Cuba's Revolution Highlights Mass Unrest In Latin America"

January, 1960 — News & Letters-lead:

"Cuba Jolts State Department Domination of Latin America"

December, 1960 — News & Letters - Two Worlds

"The Cuban Revolution: The Year After"

April 22, 1961 — Political Letter:

"Preliminary Statement on Crisis Over Cuba"

On the other hand, everything we now do—whether that be a frontpage, a pamphlet, an educational, activity in a strike or picket line—must bear the positive stamp of Marxist-Humanism and the totally new foundations for a truly human society. Johnny put it succinctly when he said that we must learn to express our ideas clearly "in 25 words or less." that is to say, with full consciousness that our time is not unlimited.

While we are under no illusion that times of such heightened crisis are propitious for building a mass organization, we are sure that the new sense of urgency is just the impulse needed to intensify our activity in a way that the meeting of the movement from theory with that from practice will not be left to chance. It is a time of testing of individuals as well as ideas and organization.

—Baya

SEE ALSO:

May, 1961 -- News & Letters Editorial: "The Kennedy Administration and Castro's Cuba".

Nov., 1962 -- News & Letters Editorial: "Kennedy and Khrushchev Bring the World Close to the Point of No Return."

Nov., 1962 -- News & Letters Two Worlds : "Ideology and Revolution: A Study in What Happens After ...".

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River, Detroit 4, Mich. Price 20¢ New Series N o. 2

POLITICAL LETTER

December 8, 1962

THE CHINA-INDIA WAR IN A NUCLEAR STATE-CAPITALIST AGE:
Relationship of Imperialism to the Ideological Struggles

Dear Friends:

The sudden, spontaneous unity of the Indian people, born out of opposition to China's invasion of their borders, has no doubt been instrumental in staying the hand of Mao, at least temporarily. The fact that this may have coincided also with his original military plans to invade on two fronts, one for bargaining and gaining support from "the uncommitted nations", and the other front for keeping as part of China, can in no way diminish the significance of the new factor of Indian unity from below, unled, and emerging despite the attempted brainwashing by the Nehru-Menon apologetics for Mao's China, over the entire period since independence.

In The Christian Science Monitor (11/27/62), Sharokh Sabavala writes: "Contributions to the defense fund in cash, gold, and work continue uninterrupted. On this front, it is interesting to note that it is the poorest in the land, the outcasts, the dispossessed, and the underemployed who lead the queues of contributors, giving, in many cases, all their meagre savings to prove that freedom, even without bread, is a most precious heritage." (My emphasis.)

This very love of freedom compels the drawing of a balance sheet of 15 years of Indian independence during which bourgeois India has proceeded in its plodding way, (as China has proceeded with "leaps") without regard for the creativity of the masses which made independence from imperialist rule possible, and is presently saving India from the collapse upon which Mao counted.

I do not mean immediate and utter collapse — not even Mao could consider a border war to cause a whole sub-continent to buckle under; I mean the kind of chaos and confusion which would have made possible "very fruitful work", within India, for the Maoist wing of the Indian Communist Party.

Instead, it brought about a national unity not seen except in the struggle for independence from British imperialism, and so popular a revulsion against China and a self-sustaining resistance, "even without bread", that not only Menon had to resign, but Nehru remains in power on the condition that, instead of laying down (and erratically at that) Congress Party policy, he now follows it. In a word, it may consolidate capitalist India, bring it into the Anglo-American imperialist orbit, have a prolonged war with China, which, whether victorious or otherwise, would once again change nothing fundamental in the relations within the country, so that neither freedom nor bread will be the possessions of the courageous Indian people.

Whether in the American orbit, or the Chinese, or "neutral", India must answer the question: what happens after? Why did independence from British rule not lead to a non-exploitative society in India and fraternal international

-2-

relations with the peoples of the world, instead of resulting in continued class rule and a "neutrality" that acquiesced in China's conquest of Tibet and all its consequences, ideologically and militarily. That has now made it possible for Mao to claim Ladakh as needed "defense" for his new road linking Tibet with China, not to mention the propaganda theme against India for "tying itself to the war chariot of United States imperialism."

The obvious aspects of the China-India war -- the fact that China did the invading, and that India was compelled to go to "the West" for military aid (even as she is still trying to get some from Russia) cannot change the objective fact that the entry of American imperialism means that the Sino-Indian relations will never be the same whether or not the war is resumed.

The point at issue, however, is the class nature of India itself,

India Since Independence

India was the first country to gain its independence from British imperialism and thus, in 1947, open a new third world that was to stretch from Asia to the Middle East, and from Africa to Latin America. Since all newly-independent countries born in the next decade, or 13 years, had all emerged out of national movements striving to free themselves from Western imperialism, the unifying link predominated over the divisions within this post-war world and seemed indeed capable of forging a new path for all mankind.

Both because it was one of the richest in culture and past traditions, and the first to gain its independence, India seemed destined to play a central role on the Asian continent. As the African continent also sought to use Gandhism (1), or the non-violent mass resistance method to gain freedom, India's world role shone so brightly that it dimmed the other truth, that no fundamental change in human relations followed independence. The dominant Congress Party, which had succeeded in uniting all classes in the struggle against foreign domination, first began showing its true class nature by leaving production relations, in the city or the country, basically unchanged.

India continued to be the land of villages, with an outmoded agriculture, overladen with an entrenched landlord class, and a halting, partial industrialization that was grafted on top of the semi-feudal relations. It was further both overburdened and undermined by the Hindu caste system that has remained changeless through the millenia. Back in the 19th century, Hegel designated it as "the philosophy of unfreedom."

It is true that, politically, there was both independence from Britain, and a parliamentary democracy established so that, in law, caste is not "recognized". In life, unfortunately, it remains dominant so that slums in the city, with their countless unemployed; the hungry villages with their sacred cows and unsacred disregard for human lives remain the most characteristic features of "the Indian way of life."

Every leader in the new third world seems to consider himself a "socialist" --

from Menon to Nasser, from Mao to Nkrumah, not to mention the "Marxist-Leninist-till-the-day-I-die" Castro. But, obviously, it is not the HUMAN difference these leaders are concerned with, but the State Plan and some statistics about the "rate of economic growth." Even that admirer of the Indian way of life, Barbara Ward, admits: "large programs of public investment under the Plans ... has given Indian private enterprise the best decade in its history." (2) But the standard of life remains the lowest in the world — \$60 per capita per annum; the average span of life is a mere 26 years; and the unemployed are countless. Even with the lush profits, Indian investment is only about half of the Chinese rate of investment (10% as against 20% of national income).

China After Independence

It is here that the entry of China, 2 years after India's independence, quickly took away from India its status as a "beacon for the underdeveloped lands". It is true that in Mao's China, the state, and not the people, rules over production, in agriculture as in industry. But, once it drove out Chiang Kai-shek, China did experience an agricultural revolution, and did not have to compete with private vested interests when it established its Five Year Plans. Above all, it had what the Indian rulers did not and could not have — an usurped banner of Marxist liberation. Up to the "Great Leap Forward," which turned out to be state regimentation in forced barrack-like "communes" — or, more precisely put, up to the failure of the Great Leap Forward in 1959, there was no doubt that on every front, from agricultural reform to rapid industrialization, from the prestige of its own hard-won victory through guerrilla war to encouragement of national liberation movements, stretching from Algeria to Cuba, armed with the banner of Marxist liberation, China was winning as against India, both the struggle for the minds of men and actual adherents in this new third world. (3)

We need not stop here to demonstrate how false is the claim of Mao to any "Marxian." Friends should reread the special supplement on "MAO TSE-TUNG, From the Beginning of Power to the Sino-Soviet Dispute" (4) to get new insights into the present war with India, as well. All I want to say here is that, despite China's setback, she does not fear, at this moment, economic competition from India. Those who think that, if it were not for the defeat of the fantastic attempt to leap to 20th century industrialism in a single year, Mao would not have embarked on his present imperialist adventure, will once again be caught blindfolded both as to the expected fair harvest this year and, above all, the possible breakthrough in the nuclear field in 1963.

Once India acquiesced in China's conquest of Tibet, the road linking Tibet to China which caused the latter to cross India territory to build, seemed a "natural." Nehru disputes that they had crossed Indian territory to build it, but the truth is that, following the old line of imperialist secrecy, the seemingly endless correspondence between himself and Chou En-lai, over the years, on that one point remains hidden from the masses. Whatever the truth, it was done behind the backs of the masses, Chinese and Indian, and Nehru's illusions about Mao's intention have nothing to do with objective reality.

-4-

Takasi Oka, writing about the "Paradox in the Himalayas" (5) compares Mao's present Chinese empire to that existing "1300 years ago, in the spacious days of the Tang dynasty ... The Chinese Communist armies have already filled out the boundaries of Imperial China at its zenith, except Outer Mongolia and Siberian and Trans-Pamir areas lost a century ago to Russian Tears."

The Sino-Soviet Dispute

Offhand, it may appear that the Sino-Soviet dispute has no relationship to the China-India war. Or, if it has, Russia is "on the side of India." Nehru is not the only one that wishes to leave that impression. President Kennedy's special emissary to India, Averill Harriman, appeared on NBC this Sunday, and approved of the role Nehru is trying to play. This is not only a question of "tactics". Ever since the Sino-Soviet dispute started, many "specialists" have seen a possible realignment of all "advanced industrial countries" against Chinese pretensions.

Indeed, everyone from DeGaulle to Toynbee has had such contradictory "reasons" as West Europe "extending to the Urals" and Communism being "part of Western Christendom", for clinging to the view that Russia and China will be in opposing war camps at the final showdown. Mao, for his part, has, ever since the "Great Leap Forward", presented himself as "the true Leninist" against "the revisionist" Khrushchev. This has reached its own type of climax during the Cuban crisis when Peiping's analysis of Russia's withdrawal of missiles amounted to an accusation of betrayal and acting the role of "an appeaser" of American imperialism.

Nothing could be further from the truth. We will limit ourselves here to those three critical points in the Sino-Soviet dispute which affected India. The first is the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, the so-called de-Stalinization congress, which first elaborated the "peaceful co-existence" policy calling attention to "the emergence in the world arena of a group of peace-loving European and Asian states which have proclaimed non-participation in blocs as a principle of their foreign policy" thus creating "a vast peace zone."

Mao acts as if "peaceful co-existence" was a "revisionist" invention of Khrushchev. In fact, however, both the policy of "peaceful co-existence" and its underlying class-collaborationism -- "the unity of four classes" -- was in effect throughout the Sino-Japanese war when Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek collaborated in a "national front." When Mao refurbished this policy in 1954 for the Bandung conference, Khrushchev took notice of it not alone because it was against Western imperialism, but also because he read it as Mao's declaration that the whole of the Afro-Asian world was now declared to be his "sphere of influence." Khrushchev's trip to India followed and the following year, Russia elaborated "peaceful co-existence" as its own theory. Mao, in turn, read it as Russian "interference" into the Afro-Asian world. Nevertheless, it was through no accident that the two Communist powers came to the same policy of "peaceful co-existence": it was organic to their state-capitalist class-collaborationist nature.

The re-establishment of Sino-Soviet unity later that year in order to put down the Hungarian Revolution, and the launching of Sputnik No. 1 in October 1957, created grandiose illusions in Mao's China both about its ability "to skip directly

into Communism", and its view that Russia was now strong enough to risk all-out nuclear war with that "paper tiger, the United States." Khrushchev's opposition to both proposals makes Mao refurbish the much misused Marxist revolutionary lexicon, tailored to the Afro-Asian-Latin-American worlds. The power conflict is transformed by Mao into a "theory of revolution" while Khrushchev moves both theoretically and practically to compete with Mao for this Afro-Asian Latin-American world, frowning upon Mao's incursions into Indian territory, elaborating a theory of his own on the new "uncommitted world." This Khrushchev presented at the UN in 1960 first, and then as the Party platform. In 1961, he won a seat at the UN for Outer Mongolia.

The period of 1957-61, the period of rivalry within Communist orbit, however, showed what could and always does, unite them: it is opposition to the United States. The U-2 spy plane incident in 1960 served as the unifying ingredient then, even as India's acceptance of military aid from the United States will soon become that unifier again.

The reason it appears otherwise is that the Cuba crisis paralleled the India-China war and was used by Mao as pretext once again to appear the "Marxist revolutionary", placing Khrushchev in the role of "appeaser." The conflict between Russia and China is as real, and as power-driven, as is the rivalry within NATO. And, just as the latter unite in any showdown with the state-capitalist orbit, so does the state-capitalist orbit, calling itself Communist, unite in showdown of which of the two nuclear titans will dominate the world.

Two Opposing Ideologies?

Strangest of all blindfolds is the one that covers Nehru's vision. Now that his "neutrality" principle lies as shattered as Bandung's "Five Principles of Co-Existence", co-authored by himself and Chou En-lai, he has suddenly discovered that Mao wishes "to destroy the Indian way of life". He rolls that phrase off his moral lips as if it were some class-less phenomenon instead of so class-ridden and contradictory a chain over so unfinished a revolution that the strains and stresses in the Indian body politic gave Mao the illusion he could have as easy a victory within India as the military victory on its borders. The fact that the invasion, instead, united India as a nation should give no illusions to Nehru that the masses will forever be satisfied with a sham freedom and no bread.

The truth is that it was not the classlessness but the sameness of the class -- that of State Planners -- which united Mao and Nehru at Bandung. The respect for "sovereignty of nations" and "non-interference in internal affairs" meant no foreign interference in class relations within each country so long as the third world could be a single unit against "the West." Mao still thinks that, on that basis, he can get acquiescence to his grab of Indian territory by many of "the uncommitted nations," as indeed he seems to be doing at the Colombo conference meeting presently in Ceylon.

But if his imperialist ambitions are all too clear, do Nehru's lesser ambitions constitute a different class phenomenon? The moment of independence was the moment also of the fratricidal war with Pakistan. (That unresolved conflict was another element in the temptation of Mao to attack.)

There is no doubt that British imperialistic maneuvers and their eternal attempt to break up a country at the moment of independence so as to continue its rule over it helped set up the division between India and Pakistan. It is as true, however, that once the countries did separate each had a right to its own existence. Gandhi became a martyr when he fought to end the "holy war" and build up fraternal relations. Nehru chose Menon as his "holy man" to proclaim Pakistan "Enemy No. 1" for all these 14 years, keep two-thirds of the Army at the Kashmir site while leaving the borders to China unprotected from that "ally".

Despite its "period of glory" -- the 1947-48 Kashmir war, Nehru had not allowed the Army any decisive role in the Indian pattern of life. Despite the fact that he allowed the ultra-conservative Sandhurst-educated officer class to have the Army under its command and play some old imperialist roles -- in Korea and in the Congo, Nehru's concept of the role of the army made it subordinate to the civil authorities. In this he fundamentally differs from Mao, who, even in the Communist (read: state-capitalist) orbit holds to a special militaristic position. The Chinese Constitution is the only one where not only the "Party" but the Army is made synonymous with the state authority.

This one element that would have created at least the semblance of an ideology in opposition to that expounded in China is now itself in question since the Anglo-American aid will not only come with political strings attached but inevitably create its own image internally by raising the Indian Army to a new status. Since Nehru's good anti-military instincts were not backed up by a proletarian class position he will inevitably give way both to the Anglo-American advice and Indian Army ambitions.

It is true that he is still holding out one hope of not completely falling into the orbit of Western imperialism by counting on Russian aid, but insofar as the Indian masses are concerned, does it really matter whether it is the Russian or the American nuclear orbit? Even as a foreign policy, a military line is a derivative, rather than a determinant, of the class relations within the country. IN THIS LIES THE DANGER THAT INDIA MAY STILL CAPITULATE EITHER TO COMMUNIST TOTALITARIANISM OR TO A MILITARY CLIQUE.

Nehru's unique authority in India does not stem from his creation of new relations with the great mass of the Indian people who must bend both to his State Plans and to the private capitalist and entrenched landlord interests. He has been a leader of the struggle for independence from Britain, and he has now been attacked by his Communist ally, and the Indian people have saved him from downfall. His desperate attempt first now to search for a new ideological banner and come up with "the Indian way of life" will create no new world apart from both poles of world capital -- the Russo-Soviet or Anglo-American orbits -- fighting for world domination. To cling to the class-ridden "Indian way of life" is only one more way of saying "the old cannot be changed" -- and, by losing the struggle for the minds of men, losing both India and the new third world.

It was no accident that in the 15 years since independence, in the 13 year alliance with Mao's China, in the 7 years of "Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference", plus the innumerable "neutralist" conferences since, Nehru failed to condemn Russia either for its counter-revolutionary role in putting down the Hungarian Revolt in 1956 or for its unilateral breaking of the nuclear moratorium;

acquiesced in China's conquest of Tibet and bowed sufficiently to the UAR's stand on Israel not to open an embassy there although he had been among the first to hail its independence. The opportunist, the short-sighted, the self-righteous, the ambivalent in foreign and military policies, was the counterpoint to the so-called socialist, but actually capitalist, exploitative relations internally. The Indian people who have pushed him off his "neutrality" for the Sino-Soviet orbit, must now see that he doesn't merely shift over to the Anglo-American orbit, leaving production relations and ideological banner as unchanged as the changeless caste system of "unfreedom."

— RAYA

- (1) Gandhism means both much more, and much less, than passive non-violent mass resistance. From Gandhi's first introduction of *santughara* and the resulting British massacre at Amritsar in 1919, which coincided in world affairs with the Russian Revolution and the attempts in India to start a Marxist movement which he fought, to Gandhi's role in the post-World War II movement he finally led to victory and thus became the prototype of the new nationalist revolutionary in Africa — there lies a quarter of a century in need of analysis. This is not the place to attempt it.
- (2) Barbara Ward, "The Rich Nations, the Poor Nations."
- (3) "Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions."
- (4) News & Letters, January, 1962
- (5) Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 26, 1962
- (6) One other role for which Gandhi will go into history is hardly ever mentioned, and yet it will endear him more to future generations than the role he is famous for. This "hidden" role is his recognition that "The Party" in power is corruptible. Though he passed on his mantle of leadership to Nehru, he himself refused to take a position in power, and urged that others too must stay out of power and look at the ruling Congress Party, their own, with "outside" eyes.

NEWS & LETTERS 8751 Grand River, Detroit 4, Mich. Price 20¢ New Series No. 3

POLITICAL LETTER

February 12, 1963

DE GAULLE'S CHALLENGE TO KENNEDY:
A New Franco-German Axis as
a Dominant World Power

Dear Friends:

The underlying similarity between the opposite personalities of the dead Hitler and the living De Gaulle, stems from the economic compulsion of the imperialism of state-capitalism. Ever since the Depression sealed the fate of competitive capitalism, capitalism has tried to hold on to its power through some form of the State Plan. Rich countries like the United States could hold on through a comparatively mild admixture like the New Deal; defeated and poor countries like Germany could not stop short of fascism and even then only on the promise that it would not remain within the confines of a single country but extend itself to all Europe. Only on this expanded foundation — the centralization of European capital — could the "master race" hope to challenge the U.S. dominant world position. Hitler would have liked to have created a German-British axis before undertaking the world task of destruction. He almost succeeded at Munich. When that failed, he went it alone, never feeling himself that Vichy France was a substitute for England.

Now that De Gaulle France has automated its industries, centralized its capital, and, through a Common Market, rather than by a blitzkrieg, accomplished the same for part of Europe, DeGaulle dreams much more fantastic dreams than Hitler ever did, not because he belongs to the 19th century and dreams of past glories, but because he is of today and dreams of future conquests. Without Hitler's armed might, plus his "secret weapon", indeed disdaining the nuclear might of the United States because it has been brought to a standstill by the equal might of Russia, he is, by sheer daring (Mao has as much gall when he challenges Russia) laid down his gauntlet and demanded that Kennedy — Kennedy, not Macmillan or even "continental Europe" — pick it up.

Here is a man with an elephantine memory which goes back not merely to the France of Louis XIV or Napoleonic France when French culture held sway, but to the beginnings of civilization. To him France is not just France, nor even "just" Europe; she is the finest European flower of Graeco-Roman culture, that is to say, of all of Western Civilization (and was there ever any other that wasn't absorbed by it, including Egyptology?).

He remembers everything, but has learned nothing. He is blinded by his culture, his state, his military and his class, and fails to recognize the disintegration of class civilizations, from the fall of the Roman Empire to the collapse of France in 1946.

Yet it looks like he will get away with it all in capitalistic Europe. The pathetic part of the American press is the control it exercises over itself. After all, De Gaulle the invincible is a creature it invented when, in post-war years, it transformed the junior general whom Roosevelt had spurned during the war, into the hero who "had saved France from Communism" in 1944-5 and from "chaos" in 1958. Therefore the underlying motif of even the strongest present criticism is "Keep cool with Kennedy." And Kennedy is "keeping cool" by privately searching for means with which to undermine De Gaulle, and publicly saying that De Gaulle couldn't possibly mean what he openly says he means since it is all based on "reliance on U.S. nuclear power to deter Russia." It is allegedly because De Gaulle "takes the United States for granted" in this crucial sense that he allows himself the glory stance.

Let's see.

THE IMPERIAL PRONUNCIAMENTO OF JAN. 14

A few hours prior to President Kennedy's appearance before a joint session of Congress, where he was to deliver an address on the State of the Union, integral to which was his concept of the "Atlantic Community", De Gaulle summoned a press conference at which he presented himself as an alternate, and, naturally, the superior leader of Western Civilization. It was also the eve of the signing of a Franco-German Treaty that would guarantee mutual consultations on everything from language courses in elementary schools to military defense of Europe, if not the world. Yet the cultured Fuhrer -- the face was as cynical* as that of Hitler, but his French was impeccable -- timed his unilateral exclusion of Britain, not just from the Common Market but from Europe itself, to precede both the new Treaty and Kennedy's address. Only those who go in for a cheap neo-Freudianism about "father image" could possibly imagine that De Gaulle meant to do other than what he was doing: challenging USA leadership of the "West" and spitting in the face of his new found love and bride-to-be, so that she should know from the start who is master in the "new Europe."

The man who condescends to admit that he is not immortal stated at that same Jan. 14th "press conference" that, "in 50 years" provided that in the meantime she has broken from her "dependence" on the United States and recognized the primacy of France, Britain may earn membership in Europe. But by then "I will without doubt no longer be here."

God rested on the seventh day; De Gaulle will not until he is dead.

Will he even then? Unless he is sure of living until the ripe age of 122 years, he must mean, either, that he is a prophet, or that he is confident that the totalitarian institution he calls a parliament "above parties" would carry out his line until glory comes; and crucial to that concept is that the U.S. be declared entirely beyond the pale.

*This is the man who, at the end of the war, demanded the "internationalisation" of the Ruhr and the Rhineland.

A few years ago he had called the United States Europe's "daughter." Obviously, she is not a favorite of the self-proclaimed leader of all Europe and he warns all and sundry that the United States is coming to Europe only to prey on it. Since Africa and Latin America cannot pay for American products and Europe can, America has nowhere else to go but to affluent Europe**. But, declares this oracle, Europe will not stoop to conquer. The U.S. will have to lose its immaturity and rise to be conquered. Europe will not give up its great culture for the mess of pottage represented by U.S. nuclear might brought to a standstill by the nuclear power of her protagonist, Russia, a Russia that could become part of Europe if only

As we see, far from De Gaulle acting as he does only because he is a junior partner that can depend upon the U.S. for nuclear protection, he is acting as he does because he thinks that that nuclear protection is very nearly worthless because of the nearly equal might of Russia. Moreover, De Gaulle thinks he can win over Russia -- and from "the yellow peril" at that! (see 1959 speech below)

If this is madness, as it is, it is not, however, the madness of an individual egomaniac. It is the madness of the state-capitalist age that has exuded a Mussolini and a Hitler and failed. De Gaulle is ready now to embark on equally fantastic misadventures.

To understand De Gaulle, we need neither psychology nor "dependence" on Kennedy and the American bourgeois press. What is essential is that we turn back the pages of history to the Depression in the year after the rise of Hitler, and to the attempt of native fascism to take over in France.

TURNING POINTS IN FRENCH HISTORY, 1934-37: AND 1947 - 48

On February 6, 1934, the fascists in France attempted to overthrow the government and themselves take power. The riots to that end found the established government, as usual, powerless. But the proletariat rose up spontaneously against the fascists, battled them on the streets and, within 6 days, came out on general strike, putting an end to the fascist pretensions. The proletarian victory was followed up, in 1935, by the formation of a popular front and general elections in which the Socialists, for the first time, won a clear majority. Even then the proletariat did not let power slip from its hands but followed up the parliamentary victory and ascension of Leon Blum to the Premiership with SIT-DOWNS which covered the whole of France. The following legislation was quickly enacted: the 40 hour week, rise in wages, vacations with pay. Then the Socialists rested on the laurels of the "French New Deal" while, as men who now wielded state power, they turned their backs on the Spanish Revolution. As they declared themselves "neutral" and refused to arm the revolution although Marxists armed the counter-revolution, the stage was set for Russian Communism to arm the Popular Front at both a high price and with massive enough political strings to strangle it.

** Considering that France's annual budget is hardly more than GM's, there is, after all, a good reason for talking not merely as France but as all Europe.

What was the French military brass, including its not-so-junior officers, doing during those three critical years? We have the revealing French pundit's book (The Grave Diggers of France, by Pertinax), written to expose the rottenness of the French general staff, and to play up the Junior General De Gaulle as the head of a free France. When the foundations for French fascism were openly being laid in 1934, but were met by "a veritable popular revolution", Petain, states the January 1935 diary of Pertinax, "was cut to the heart by the fear of social upheaval which in so many a conservative had silenced every feeling of patriotism." (p.423) Petain was for Laval and Laval, ever since 1935, was for a Franco-German rapprochement. And what was General Charles de Gaulle doing? He was arguing with the General Staff, but it was not about any opposition to native fascism. The French general was arguing as a military man who considered the "defensive doctrine" futile, and wanted to mechanize the French Army.

When World War II broke out in 1939 De Gaulle felt himself vindicated, as if tanks would have won the war! The truth is that he was part and parcel of the bourgeois army and bourgeois class which was undermining the French Republic ever since 1934. "The impact of socialism on the Republic," writes Pertinax, "unsettled, from one end of the community to the other, the propertied classes, both those long established and those of recent date." It is these fascist beginnings that came to full bloom during the "phony war" when General Weygand demanded an armistice be signed because "I do not want France to run into the danger of falling into the anarchy which follows military defeat ... (and) disorders spread throughout the army and the population."

Again Petain thought France needed Laval, and Laval thought France needed Hitler! Petain came to power in France to make it an adjunct of Nazi Germany.

How the miserable role of the bourgeoisie repeats itself in history! During the Franco-Prussian war in 1870 Marshall Bazaine surrendered at Metz -- and then asked the Germans for permission "to save France from herself." As Karl Marx put it then, the "Government of National Defense" turned out to be the "Government of National Defection." When the Parisian proletariat saved Paris and established the Commune, the French bourgeoisie found much more in common with their German enemy than with their own working men and women, and appealed to it for help to put down the Commune!

In 1940 Leon Blum was arrested and Petain's nephew, General De Gaulle, left peacefully for exile. In his Memoirs, De Gaulle speaks softly of Petain, as if the betrayal of Vichy France was due merely to the fact that "old age is a shipwreck." The nephew's defense of his uncle is not out of any family loyalty. The reasons are objective. The defeatist Petain and the glory-seeking De Gaulle may be opposite personalities, but they are of the same class, the same military caste, representatives of the very same, corrupt, decadent bourgeois society.

3 0 - 7

-5-

In that sense, and that sense alone, they are Bonapartists. When French fascism was rebuffed in 1934, they turned, not to the workers who rebuffed it, but to the sword that would oppose any attempt of the workers to rule themselves. "The sword," wrote De Gaulle, "is the axis of the world, and greatness cannot be shared." When Nazi Germany over-ran France, the general with an army capitulated to Hitler, and the general without an army went, temporarily, over to the Allies.

The Allies paid little attention to De Gaulle until the proletariat in France organized an underground. The Allies then recognized him as the French government in exile -- in order to make sure to foist him on the National Resistance as "its leader." The fact that the Communists were willing, upon instruction of Stalin who feared independent proletarian rule, to use their prestige as Resistance fighters toward the same end, assured De Gaulle the presidency of the provisional government after liberation. Without them, in 1944, he would have been as powerless as he was in 1958 without the OAS. This was not because he didn't try to establish his own type of fascist party. He founded the "Rally of the French People", but, as in 1934 the French proletariat would have none of the Croix de Feu, so it would have none of the Rassemblement in 1947. (When I was in Paris in 1947 I had occasion to experience that the Rassemblement which was supposed to be "above parties" was not above fascistic anti-Semitism.) The strikes of 1947 and 1948, especially the latter, were independent as well of the Communists who wanted anti-Gaullism controlled to suit the Moscow line of the new cold war which made the Marshall Plan rather than native capitalism the main villain. Once again De Gaulle retired himself, this time to nurse his hatred of the Fourth Republic and its new Constitution.

AUTOMATED PRODUCTION, STATIFIED PRODUCTION, COMMON MARKET PRODUCTION
AND THE NEW IMPERIALISM

The democratic Constitution of 1946 which crowned the new, Fourth Republic, and was to have assured it against the rise of new dictators was most profoundly analysed, not by those who usurped the name of Marx -- the living Communists -- but by the dead Marx. One hundred years back, in The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, he wrote of the "constitution-making, pure republicans" and the rise of little Napoleons "They sought to cheat destiny by constitutional cunning... Such was the Constitution of 1848, which on December 2, 1851, was overthrown not by a head, but fell at the touch of a mere hat; this hat, to be sure, was a three-cornered Napoleonic hat."

Those who would substitute "constitutional cunning" for rule of the masses have never yet failed to produce their Napoleons (I and III), the Mussolinis and Hitlers, the Adenauers and De Gaulles. Analogies, however, are no substitute for

* All the "intellectual" outcries that one cannot use the term fascism except to describe a petty-bourgeois mass party a la Nazim forget (1) that Mussolini's fascist Corporate State was not quite the fascism of Germany either in the state or the type of party; (2) that once Nazism was defeated, it would surely not reappear in the same form, especially when the crisis comes not from a depression, but from the prosperous imperialism of state-capitalism; and (3) that by no accident did fascism call itself National Socialism. It was only after it achieved total power that its true visage of both centralization of capital and concentration camps developed into the horror the world knows.

varied historic epochs. Each era has its own economic reasons for being and ours cannot be seen outside of the latest stage of capitalist production — Automation — and its specific imperialism, seen in this instance in France's changing relations to Algeria.

After a decade of intrigues, in and out of Parliament, De Gaulle came out of "retirement" to assume full power in 1958. Big Capital, the top brass of the Army — Petainists, Gaullists, and more openly fascist generals — and the OAS conspired to bring the "Big Man" in to put an end to the Fourth Republic. Everyone knows about De Gaulle's "double-cross" of the OAS and the bitter generals. Few remember that Hitler went through a much greater blood purge of his "radical wing" than De Gaulle did of the OAS which remains quite intact for future use, provided they will learn why and how Big Capital backed De Gaulle for this "double-cross." With the First Plan for Modernization and Equipment which went into effect in 1947, heavy industry had retooled and was ready to rid the French economy of the plague which kept it from getting out of the small leagues — the small shopkeeper, small landowner, small groceryman, the entire petty bourgeois that failed to understand the monopoly stage of capital reached as far back as World War I. From the point of view of De Gaulle, it was even more urgent to "modernize" the French state, and that meant to get rid of the "small men" who could not see that the Algerian war ran counter not only to the winds of change and the implacable national liberation movement, but even to neo-colonialism which knew how to grant nominal freedom to its colonies so that it might be free for the leap into the truly new imperialism — state-capitalist world domination.

The imperialism of state-capitalism is the key to the understanding of the present stage of imperialism all over the world. It is the capitalism which extended its imperialist domination from the technologically backward lands to the most advanced, as Hitler had done in his blitzkrieg of Europe. It is the imperialism which refuses to abide "by the facts", that two, and only two, Big Powers remained standing at the end of World War II in place of the several big powers which had divided the world among themselves previously. It would rather pretend to act as buffer between them, not by being a buffer, but by belonging. De Gaulle is asking Europe to belong to him, or to the new Franco-German axis, not merely because of glory hunting or prestige politics, but because of hard economics.

It is true that, as a single country, France's annual budget is not much more than GM's annual budget. It is equally true that, as Europe, the countries very nearly match U.S. production. Moreover, France experienced an annual 4.5% rate of growth in the past decade as against the U.S.'s 2.5%, and the Fourth Plan that got under way in July of this year called for a 24% increase in overall production and annual rate of growth of 5.5%. Italy's rate has exceeded France's, and Germany's has exceeded Italy's. West Germany which is all "private enterprise" has reached an annual rate of growth of 7%, but since it is slowing down, it is looking at France's plan, especially since it is "voluntary", that is to say, Big Business enthusiastically supports it for its profits have never been higher. Indeed, Kennedy, too, sent a team of experts to look into it and see whether he could make such a plan palatable to his capitalist class.

Kennedy and his Brain Trust may have thought De Gaulle's manner of ending the Algerian war was sufficient to transform the general into a "democrat." They must now reap the fruit of that delusion. If only they had judged De Gaulle by their own motivations, instead of the OAS's, they would have recognized both a kindred soul and an enemy. It is true the United States acted as a collective capitalist, and on a vast, hitherto undreamt-of scale when it introduced the Marshall Plan to save capitalistic Europe. The "ungratefulness" of De Gaulle is that he knows the U. S. had to do it, if it was going to challenge the only other giant to come out of World War II -- Russia. His only concern now is that neither Automation, nor the State Plan, nor the Common Market, can substitute for nuclear power. This then is the Achilles heel of De Gaulle's hard economics and new Bonn-Paris axis. Let's see whether, in recognizing his vulnerable point (through which Kennedy hopes to regain dominance of Europe) De Gaulle has become vulnerable, not in the heel, but in the head.

NUCLEAR POWER AND INTELLECTUAL CHAUVINISM

When De Gaulle came to power, he began his first flirtation with Khrushchev, Khrushchev was so eager to listen to an enemy of NATO within NATO that he travelled to Paris to tell De Gaulle he even "understood" his Algerian position! This was not the only surprise of the year 1959. De Gaulle's analysis of this flirtation passed the test of insanity itself: "No doubt Soviet Russia ... recognizes that nothing can change the fact that she, Russia -- a white European nation ... is face to face with the yellow masses of China ... casting their eyes about them on the open spaces over which they must one day spread."

Before we too eagerly run to the conclusion of individual insanity, however, let's remember that his putrid white chauvinism, so characteristic of the late 19th century and its "white man's burden", reappeared in De Gaulle neither through his reversion to the past nor by accident. This too is characteristic of the "new" imperialism. He knows, as well as any neocolonialist, that this is not the way to speak to a colony that has just gained its liberation, but, ah, amongst "us, the have powers", well, then, are "we" going to let the underdeveloped technologies bring us down to their level? Remember, also, that the same intellectual chauvinism reappeared in the January 14, 1963 press conference when De Gaulle referred to the United States as getting tired of giving their goods to Africa and therefore wanting to get in on the thriving European Common Market where they can sell their goods.

Now then, in 1959, he also maintained that "only France knows that peace or war will be decided in Europe" and that this "will decide the destiny of the world", stressing that Europeans "on whichever side of the Curtain they find themselves, want to establish concord among themselves, then peace will be assured. But if Europe remains divided in two opposed factions, war will sooner or later destroy the human race." (My emphasis.)

Whether it is De Gaulle's intellectual chauvinism or France's central geographic position which has led him to play for the very highest stakes — forcing Kennedy (or Khrushchev) to play power politics according to the tune he, De Gaulle, calls, does not matter. What does matter is that he has, with the Treaty of Adenauer, created a new, a powerful, a frightening axis in Europe. Frightening because, despite the dissimilarities of our "prosperous" times against the depression of the 1930's, despite the dissimilarities of the personalities of Hitler and De Gaulle, despite the dissimilarities between the Nazi terror and the French democracy, there is more than merely a reminiscent analogy between the present axis and Hitler's.

There is, first and above all, the same objective economic compulsion for the centralization of European capital, and, inseparable from it, the new imperialism of the age of state-capitalism which seeks domination of Europe only as stepping stone for single world domination. There is, secondly, the Adenauer part of the De Gaulle axis. That is why, as attractive as Khrushchev finds De Gaulle's anti-Americanism, he does not do in 1963 what he did in 1959: flirt with De Gaulle who might very well have promised to put his independent nuclear "deterrent" in the hands of some German neo-fascists.

"Touched in the head", or otherwise, De Gaulle, as we see, has found the vulnerable point in both the Anglo-American axis and "the Warsaw powers", including the Sino-Soviet orbit. All the outcry in Europe against one-man domination has been words, just words. So have been the criticisms in the American press which, even when they go to "the extreme" and do counterpose the De Gaulle "grand design" against Kennedy's, still speak of the general as a man of "the past" and his design as "introverted," i.e. only European. That this is sheer nonsense, they themselves expose as they become apologists for De Gaulle and in the same articles, or articles on the day after, swallow their words of disenchantment and even their American chauvinism "to keep cool with Kennedy" in order to advise the latter that after all, De Gaulle does "have a point" not only in his adherence to European "independence", but also in the value his "little bomb" could have, etc., etc. They are so eager to give in to the myth they themselves have created — the invincibility of De Gaulle — that one is almost tempted to turn away from it all with a "they deserve what they get."

Unfortunately, these madmen are playing with the destiny of mankind. The elephantine memory of De Gaulle is, after all, neither just French, nor just a memory. It is an instinct, the class instinct to hold on to this decadent society absolutely at all costs. The newly rich, as well as "the old" Big Two have now proved that they are ready both for totalitarian savagery, and for the nuclear holocaust.

Let us then warn them that neither DeGaulle-Adenauer, nor Kennedy^{or} Khrushchev, has found a way out of their kind of chaotic productive and perennial war system which has brought us to the razor edge of mankind's extinction. Automated production remains value production, brought to an extreme by the fact that the violent

and incessant technological revolutions are constantly throwing out the only surplus-value creating substance: living labor. The Kennedys, Khrushchevs, De Gaulles, Adenauers all want to suppress that creative force -- the working class, and the penny-a-liners are too eager to forget the fact that the terror is rooted in the relations of production and the need to control workers which ends in building ever greater concentration camps. The totalitarian savagery of a Hitler is not overcome just because in its embryonic form it has as its representative a cultured De Gaulle, as the white terror in Algeria* which was by no means just OAS-made, should have proven to them.

Because the terror is rooted in the relations of production and the need to control the working class, only the working class can destroy it, at its root. De Gaulle may have found the weak point in his own class, but he has never yet found he can hold power when the working class en masse turns against him, as they have done at the past turning-points in history, which did away with outright fascist pretensions in 1934-5 and De Gaullian ones in 1947-8. It will do so again. No one else can.

-- RAYA

* The white terror in Algeria by "free French" De Gaulle during the war, was not the only instance he showed the stuff white imperialism is made of. The massacre in Madagascar was carried out directly under his command.

POLITICAL LETTER

April 15, 1963

AMERICAN CIVILIZATION ON TRIAL, As Statement
of Our Views and as Basis for Follow-Up Studies
and Articles

Dear Friends:

It is seldom that any of our Political Letters deal with internal rather than external events. This one will do so for two basic reasons, which are of the utmost importance for our organizational growth: (1) it is imperative that each and every one of us internalize American Civilization on Trial so that we can, at a moment's notice, make a comprehensive presentation of these views to outside groups and individuals; (2) it is equally important that we do not consider this pamphlet as a "finished work", but that we constantly expand it, reinterpret it, and bring it up to date.

For example, on the day -- Friday, April 12 -- when I was to make a presentation of it to the Detroit local, news dispatches announced that Switzerland had expelled one Erich Rajakovic, Adolph Eichman's right-hand man, who had been responsible for the murder of 110,000 Dutch Jews, including Anne Frank. Despite all the tears that had been shed over the "Diary of Anne Frank", as a book, as a play, as a movie, which may have equalled the tears shed over little Eva trying to escape over the ice as she was pursued by the hound dogs of Simon Legree, the Storm Trooper Rajakovic easily melted into the crowd at Munich and made good his escape; while, at the same time, in our South, the savage use of savage dogs against the Freedom Fighters of today made it impossible for any of them to escape that dragnet. In a word, not only does the todayness of history make possible the presentation of American Civilization on Trial as a living document, but the one-worldedness of today allows for its application on an international scale.

Toward both these ends, I wish, first, to present the title and contents page of the pamphlet in its final form as it is now going to press:

100 Years After the Emancipation Proclamation

AMERICAN CIVILIZATION ON TRIAL

Negro As Touchstone of History

INTRODUCTION: 1- Of Patriots, Scoundrels and Slave Masters
2- Compelling Issues at Stake

PART I -- FROM THE FIRST THROUGH THE SECOND AMERICAN REVOLUTION

1- Abolitionism, First Phase: From "Moral Suasion" to Harper's Ferry
2- Abolitionism, Second Phase: The Unfinished Revolution

PART II -- THE STILL UNFINISHED REVOLUTION

1- Northern Labor Struggles to Break Capital's Stanglehold, 1877-97
2- One and a Half Million Forgotten Negro Populists
3- Populism and Intellectual Ferment

PART III -- IMPERIALISM AND RACISM

- 1- Rise of Monopoly Capital
- 2- Racism and Plunge into Imperialism
- 3- A New Awakening of Labor: the I.W.W.

PART IV -- NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

- 1- The Negro Moves North
- 2- Garveyism
- 3- Marxism

PART V -- FROM THE DEPRESSION THROUGH WORLD WAR II

- 1- The CIO Changes the Face of the Nation and Makes a Break in Negro "Nationalism"
- 2- March on Washington
- 3- The Communists Oppose Independent Negro Movements

Part VI -- THE NEGRO AS THE TOUCHSTONE OF HISTORY

- 1- Urbanization of Negroes
- 2- The Two-Way Road to African Revolutions

PART VII -- FACING THE CHALLENGE , 1943-1963

- 1- The Self-Determination of People and of Ideas
- 2- The New Voices We Heard
- 3- What We Stand For and Who We Are

Please note Part VI. Instead of being a sub-section under "What Now?", "The Negro as Touchstone" has not only become a full part, but it is no longer restricted to the American scene. That is to say, by including the section on the African Revolutions here, we are able to present the international role of the Negro. I hope many friends will wish to expand this section by various articles in News & Letters. The main points of expansion, however, will come on the American scene. In this respect, I would like to single out one of the additions I made in order to encourage others to take advantage of the condensed form of the pamphlet to elaborate on other phases of American development that we couldn't possibly go into, in tracing the dialectic of history that has never before been traced from a Marxist-Humanist viewpoint. I am referring to Part II -- "The Still Unfinished Revolution" -- where it was necessary to take note both of the economic determinist view of the Civil War as an "economic revolution", and to argue against the attitude that the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln tradition is fundamentally different from the "other" tradition:

The new phase of Northern capitalist development had, of course, been a motivating force for the Civil War. But, the economic determinist view notwithstanding, it was not the propellant. The Second American Revolution was more than an "economic revolution." Much as the industrialists wished to break the monopoly of commercial over industrial capital, of Ameri-

can slavishness to British textile manufacture, "cash and compromise" was too ingrained an element of American capitalism for the industrialists to venture forth into civil war. Only the most prodigious revolutionary exertions by slaves, Abolitionists, and, in many of its stages, labor, could tear apart the powerful link of cash and compromise that bound together cotton and textiles; cotton-growers, cotton shippers and financiers. "If Lincoln has grown," wrote Wendell Philipps, "it is quite natural. We watered him!" Yet it was no accident that Lincoln chose Andrew Johnson as his running mate for the second term, in place of retaining the Vice-President, Hannibal Hamlin, who was a friend of the Abolitionists. The objective compulsion of capitalist industrialization won over the freedom forces. The Civil War brought to a climax and summed up the whole paradox of the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln liberal tradition.

In office, Jefferson and the Jeffersonian were fulfilled Hamiltonians. In office, Jacksonian democracy turned out to be something very different than the rule of farmer and the mechanic as against the Eastern finance capital. In the same manner, Lincoln, in office, developed the "American System" more in line with the concept of the "Great Compromiser", Henry Clay, than in the spirit of the Second American Revolution....

It would be excellent if someone could develop the differences between the Abolitionists — wholly devoted to an idea, the idea of freedom, without wanting anything for themselves — and the Populists who fought for limited rights and could produce so contradictory a character as Tom Watson. But, above all, where expansion is needed is in Part VII: FACING THE CHALLENGE, 1943-1963, especially the final section on "What We Stand For and Who We Are."

In this way, American Civilization on Trial will bring to organizational consciousness the underlying philosophy of both the movement of history and its todayness.

— RAYA

(Labor Donated)

3106

POLITICAL LETTER

(To be considered part of the pre-plenary discussion)

July 14, 1963 (Bastille Day)

THE CHALLENGE OF THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON:
Development and Divisions in Negro Leadership
VS. Mass AND Marxist-Humanist Concepts of Freedom NOW.

Dear Friends:

The objective situation has been so totally transformed since Birmingham Police Chief "Bull" Connor unleashed the vicious dogs against Negro teenagers on May 3rd, that new categories are needed to convey these new dimensions of the Negro struggle. Because the murder of Medgar Evers in Mississippi occurred After Birmingham, even the foul-mouthed Gov. Barnett, who incited this murder, had to look for ways to separate himself from it by declaring it to be a "dastardly murder", finding the murderer, and going through all the motions of pretending to bring that cowardly racist to "justice." Contrast this to the reactions at the murder of Moore and you'll grasp the full impact of the consequences of a mass movement.

After Birmingham the Administration could no longer allow itself the luxury of pitting a Boston "gentleman" (the Attorney General) against a Mississippi cracker (Governor Barnett) in a game of wits. The massiveness of the resistance at Birmingham undermined the President's predetermination about "no further civil rights legislation" being needed. The global outcry against Southern barbarism would not be stilled merely because the Commander-in-Chief was willing to use the Army only to make possible the entrance of single individuals into Southern universities. And towering above the global compulsion for the Administration to change its ways was the internal and many-sided pressure of Negro revolt which rent asunder the President's mealy-mouthed legalisms. Kennedy was compelled to admit that "a rising tide of discontent" does indeed demand of Congress immediate action on civil rights. Needless to say, this does not mean that the President's weak civil rights measure meets that "rising tide of discontent", much less assure that he will back the Negro demands for full equality.

Quite the contrary. Already he has asked the Freedom NOW movement to stop the very demonstrations which compelled this cool cucumber to feign concern for the Negro on the excuse that Congress "cannot be forced." Nevertheless, there is no turning back to mere legalisms or mere moral pronouncements. After Birmingham, only actions have the right to speak.

Leadership and Ranks

The momentum of the struggle which has wrought this transformation has, however, also brought the movement itself to a turning point. Leadership and ranks face each other, not in what the bourgeois press likes to call "a competition for leadership", but on the relationship of philosophy to action. The danger, indeed,

-2-

lies not in competition, but in a unity brought about by fear that the mass movement cannot be controlled. Despite the multiplicity of organizations, such a unified leadership would be subject to pressure by the Administration rather than its own ranks. A test case will be the March on Washington which could either join theory to practice in a way that concretizes Freedom NOW to mean reconstruction of society -- or separate the two and thus confine it to "a request" that the President's Civil Rights bill be passed. Which will it be?

Let us first see what it is at the moment by following both the development and the divisions in the Negro leadership in relationship to the mass concepts for Freedom NOW. Whether we take as our point of departure the youth compelling such old and conservative organizations as the NAACP to embark on some militant actions, or take as our vantage point the more militant CORE as the youth is propelling it forward from actions calling for individual martyrdom to actions of the multitude transcending a few of the impediments of constantly turning the other cheek; whether we look at the Trade Union bureaucracy North, who attempt to buy their way into the movement, or the black nationalists marching with integrationists although they are separatists; whether we immerse ourselves into the activities of SNCC and the SCLC who are most deeply involved in the Negro revolt of the South -- the fact is that the dimensions of the mass actions have made imperative a confrontation of philosophy and action. It is this which brings out both the negative and the positive aspects of individual and collective behavior. We turn first to Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., whose self-development reflects most poignantly the development of the movement itself from 1956, when it first propelled Rev. King into the leadership of the Montgomery Bus Boycott, up to 1963 when this movement has enveloped the whole South, gone North as well as South, and, finally, at Birmingham, its passion, perseverance, drive, courage, pent-up force and thought-development exploded into the new dimensions and total challenges to the status quo. Both the leap forward, and the process, can be traced in the letter he wrote on April 16th from a Birmingham Jail just before the mass confrontation of fire hoses and police dogs*.

Rev. King's Letter to "Fellow Clergymen"

This remarkable letter has a dialectic of its own. In rejecting the "wait" policy as if there were "something in the very flow of time that will inevitably cure all ills", Rev. King has moved to a class position: "...when you see the vast majority of your 20 million Negro brothers smothering in an air-tight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society ... when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of 'nobodiness' -- then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait." This lashing out against the middle class even included the "few Negroes in the middle class who, because of a degree of academic and economic security, and because at points they profit by segregation have unconsciously become

* Rev. King was put in jail on Good Friday, which did not stop some clergymen who pass for liberals down South, from issuing their public statement April 12 calling the continued demonstrations "unwise and untimely." Rev. King's April 16 answer was not given wide publicity by Northern liberals until after the white barbarism of the Bull Connors and Ed Lingos shook even the White House to its foundations. (The Letter From Birmingham Jail is printed in the New Leader of 6/24/63)

insensitive to the problems of the masses."

In refusing to confine the freedom movement to legalisms, Rev. King tells his "fellow clergymen": "We can never forget that everything Hitler did in Germany was 'legal' and everything the Hungarian Freedom Fighters did in Hungary was 'illegal'. Naturally this calls for a confrontation with the power structure." (My emphasis.) Here Rev. King praises "creative extremists": "wherever the early Christians entered a town the power structure got disturbed" — and criticizes today's religious community which is "so often the arch supporter of the status quo." In rejecting "the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress", Rev. King strains for a total philosophy: "To use the words of Martin Buber, the great Jewish philosopher, segregation substitutes an 'I-it' relationship for the 'I-thou' relationship and ends up relegating persons to the status of things."

I do not want to give the impression that Rev. King's self-development toward class positions whose underlying philosophy would be that of full human development is a straight line to Marxist-Humanism. Far from it, his letter is punctuated with appeals to his fellow clergymen: "I am thankful to God that some noble souls from the ranks of organized religion have broken loose from the paralyzing chains of conformity..."

The question that rises naturally is: if the mass movement finally does compel some civil rights actions from those in power, will the leadership move away from the masses and the philosophy of total freedom?

Let us consider the overriding question of "relegating persons to the status of things" and move it from the field of segregation directly to the point of production.

Trade Union Leaders

Unfortunately, it is not only the established labor bureaucracy — the Meany's, Reuther's, McDonald's, Carey's — who either simply send financial contributions to the movement, or who march Sundays but do nothing Mondays to Fridays. Thus far the NALC (or the TULC which is really the outlet of the NALC in Detroit) has done little more than talk. Even when challenging straight segregationist unions, they have shied away from doing anything directly on the job. Yet it is there, and only there, that the momentum gained by the general Negro struggle against segregation could develop into any significant challenge either to management or to the political authorities. The imperative need is for the concretization of the Freedom NOW movement, not alone for its sake but for that of white labor. We expressed it one way in the Editorial in the June-July issue of News & Letters, and in another way in the drafts for leaflets which could be distributed at plant gates if a rank and file committee were willing to take up that cry for trade union and racial equality:

Hear ye, then this -- and learn your lessons from that Sunday March in Detroit and all the battles for Civil Rights, South and North. First, you are cutting your own throats because, without the unity of white and black workers, management can ride all over you, even as they did when you launched Operation Dixie and it proved to be just a still-birth.

Know ye, further, that the end of discrimination, even more than charity, must begin at home, and home for working people is the Union. BEGIN THERE.

Begin NOW to put an end to lily white departments.

Begin NOW the retraining and upgrading of Negro workers who now, as before unionism, are still the last to be hired and the first to be fired.

Begin NOW to tell the white workers the truth of their own conditions of employment and unemployment. For the truth is that, while percentage-wise, Negroes have more unemployment than whites, it is they, the white workers, the majority of Americans, who are still the majority in absolute numbers of those unemployed.

Let us put our black and white muscles to the wheel in fighting management, not each other. Reuther, you have begun contract negotiations a year in advance, with management. How about beginning to talk to us, your black brothers, 25 years after we helped to create the CIO?

The March on Washington will be one type of test for the Negro leadership for the demands of the Freedom NOW movement is not for a unified leadership that would stifle it, but for a unified organizational expression that would refuse to stop short of total freedom. The March on Washington will also put the Trade Unions to the test of getting out white labor. To do less is to isolate itself far more than it isolates the Negro. It is no easy matter to uproot the labor bureaucracy. There is an imperative demand for the radicals in the trade unions to give up their old "transitional programs" for union caucuses, and begin anew on the foundations laid by the Negro.

-- RAYA

(Labor Donated)

POLITICAL LETTER

July 24, 1963

II

The New Sino-Soviet Conflict

Dear Friends:

What is new on the world scene is, of course, the rupture between Russia and China. It may not appear to us to be new since we dealt with it no less than 20 months ago (Special Supplement of News & Letters, Jan. 1962) and to this day, some of what we have written is still not openly admitted, and may never be. For one thing, neither camp yet admits that the division began over the Great Leap Forward in 1958 and not, as both claim, after the 1960 Statement of 81 Communist Parties, which both signed. Nevertheless, a qualitative change in the Sino-Soviet conflict has taken place since we last analyzed Mao's China. This is by no means due only to the difference between an admission and non-admission of conflict. Rather it is that the fig-leaf of Marxist terminology is no longer adequate to cover up the non-viability of state-capitalism as a "new" social order. The insatiable imperialist appetites of Mao's "new order" will be seen best against the background of the first split in the Communist state-capitalist world -- that of Yugoslavia in 1948 -- so let's begin by contrasting the two:

Where, in 1958-61, the new split within the state-capitalist orbit seemed to be a variation of Yugoslavia's 1948 break from Russia, that is to say, the appearance of nationally independent state-capitalism, the 1962-63 development is a challenge for international leadership. The new, qualitative change is proclaimed, in bold red lettering, in the very title of the "letter" (June 14, 1963) of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party (CC of the CPC) to its Russian counterpart: "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement".

Where the Tito break from Stalin did not depart from class terminology, the geographic area from which the Mao challenge originates predominates over the class generalities: "The Wind of the East prevails over the Wind of the West." Should anyone be so naive as either to think that "the West" means the West of private capitalism, or the East means "only" the Orient, the Chinese racist policy was spelled out in practice at the Tanganyika Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference where the Chinese told the Russians "whites have nothing to do here."

Where the tiny state power of Yugoslavia, fighting the giant Russian state power, could not allow itself any new glory roads a la DeGaulle in the Western camp, Mao's delusions are as vast as the Chinese continent -- and not only as it is now constituted, but as it was at the height of its imperial glory under the Yuan and Ming Dynasties when China conquered Burma, Thailand, Indochina Peninsula, debarked troops to Indonesia, imprisoned the king of Ceylon and once even imposed annual tribute from the Moslem world or at least from the Holy City of Mecca. Up to 1962 only Nehru had questioned the map included in "A Manual of

3111

History" which was published in Peking in 1954*, and which shows a great part of the Soviet Far East as well as the Republic of Outer Mongolia, North and South Korea, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaya, Burma, Assam (about 50,000 miles of Indian territory, in fact), Butan, Sikkim, Nepal, the island of Sakhalin as well as some islands in the Philippines, as having been part of China.

When, however, Khrushchev dared to quip at Mao's phrase about "cowardice in the face of the imperialists" by saying it ill-behoves Mao to speak so when he is doing nothing presently to drive the imperialists from "his own territory — Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macao", the People's Daily and Red Flag hit back with: "Certain persons would like us to raise the questions of unequal treaties here and now ... Have they realized what the consequences of this might be?" Whereupon the Chinese began explaining "the imperialist encroachments on Chinese territory (1840-1919). Period of the Early Democratic Revolution." And, in expanding themselves on what Tsarist Russia took from "old China", the present Chinese rulers included territories taken from Emirs and Khans who most assuredly did not consider themselves vassals of the Emperor of China. (Nor, for that matter, did Mao's dream of China's past glories stop itself from designating as an "imperialist encroachment" Thailand's becoming independent; that too "belonged" to China of the Emperor and he means "to redress" some day the borders of what the CC-CPC designates only as "old China.")

Mao opts for nothing short of mastery of the world — of the Communist world to begin with. Though, for tactical reasons, and because of the withdrawal of Russian technical aid, China had to fall back on a variation of "the theory of socialism in one country" ("Every socialist country must rely mainly on itself for its construction." p. 45**), the CC-CPC challenges not only Russia but the majority of the presently constituted Communist world. It warns that "one should not emphasize 'who is in the majority' or 'who is in the minority' and bank on a so-called majority..." (p. 47) In the place of following majority rule, he proposes the rule of "unanimity", that is to say, China's right of veto over policies formulated by Russia and the majority of other Communist Parties!

Thus, the Sino-Soviet conflict differs fundamentally not only from Yugoslavia's conflict with Stalin, but also from Mao's own differences both in 1957 when he willingly — because of "solidarity" with Russia in crushing the Hungarian Revolution and because of the tremendous economic aid Russia poured into China — recognized Russia's priority in the socialist world, and, in 1960, when the conflict had grown and he unwillingly was pressured by the overwhelming majority to affix his signature to the Statement of the 81 Communist Parties.

* This map is reproduced in the New Republic of 4/20/63 in an article, "China's Borders", the third of a series of articles by J. Jacques-Francillon. The other articles appear in the issues of 3/16/63 and 3/23/63. (See also B. Shiva Rao's article in the National Observer of 7/23/63.)

** All page references are to "A Proposal Concerning The General Line of the International Communist Movement", the June 14 letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in reply to the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of March 30, 1963 (published by Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1963).

The new in the Sino-Soviet conflict is the culmination of the crises within China following upon the collapse of the 1958 "Great Leap Forward", the 1959 opposition to the Camp David spirit between Khrushchev and Eisenhower, and the unilateral 1962 Sino-Indian war. The power politics now engulfing Russian and China began when China proposed to "skip over socialism" and go "directly to Communism".

Khrushchev challenged Mao's claim to be able to achieve in a single decade what it took Russia four decades to attain -- industrialization. He opposed any "skipping of stages" which would lose Russia its priority in the "socialist world." And he feared "Mao's Thought" might become a new polarizing force for the whole Afro-Asian-Latin-American world which would certainly be attracted to a scheme like the Communes with the simplistic slogan, "One day equals 20 years." Though such hallucinations, far from bringing the millennium, brought the Chinese masses to near-starvation, Khrushchev would no longer be moved to continue with any massive aid to China.

Mao then turned to what he can do best -- plan armed attacks. It is not that the imperialist features of state-capitalism are anything new either to Russia or China, though it is certainly new for one "socialist" leader to lay the foundation for claiming a good part of the Soviet Socialist Republic in the Far East as "belonging" to China! It is Mao's total disregard of the fact that since "little wars" may bring on a world nuclear holocaust, Russia must be consulted before China embarks on these adventures with all the fanfare of "the cause of world socialism." Mao is banking on the fact that "in the end", that is to say, when the USSR will have to face the USA, the "socialist camp" will need to be united, and he means now (by which he means not tomorrow, but yesterday) to establish China's claim to "world leadership", read: dominance.

China's industrial development may lack everything from steel to dams and atomic energy. Its Army, however, has everything from overwhelming numbers to military equipment. In the first instance, it is the largest land army in the whole world, and in the second instance it is the most modern equipment on the Asian continent. In any case, after the collapse of "The Great Leap Forward" and the withdrawal of Russian technical aid, there was nothing to fall back on but military adventures. The Russian "underground" humour may have pinpointed Mao's historic image when it says history will record him "as an athletic failure in the broad jump." But he was no failure in the Sino-Indian War.

And, as "Mao's Thought" thrives on military engagements, it has given birth to yet a new crop of "theories." These are developed with much subterfuge and great wordiness in the 61 page June 14th "letter." They add up to a single and total ambition for world "leadership", i.e. mastery.

First comes a substitute for judging what "the touchstone of internationalism" is. (p.10) "Now that there is a socialist camp of 13 countries," says the CC-PC, it should no longer be the defense of Russia.

Secondly, building on what the state-capitalist world, calling itself Communist, wants the proletariat to believe -- that the class struggle in any country must be subordinated to the division of the world into two camps -- "the

socialist countries" and "the capitalist countries". This having become the overriding consideration of "Communism", whether in Russian, Chinese, or any other national dress, Mao now proclaims: "If anybody ... helps capitalist countries attack fraternal socialist countries, then he is betraying the interests of the entire international proletariat and the people of the world." (p.10)

Thirdly, following the accusation of "betrayal" -- unspecified, but all too clearly a reference to Russia and its failure to support China's invasion of India -- there is a reference to "a step back in the course of historic development", which is tantamount to "doing a service to the restoration of capitalism", which names Yugoslavia as the culprit but, clearly, instead, means Russia.*

Fourthly, and despite the fact that Mao built his second and third theses on the Communist conception of "two camps" -- "Socialism" and capitalism -- he moves away from this premise to return to his old "four class policy", broadening his concept of the people to include "also the patriotic national bourgeoisie, and even certain kings, princes, and aristocrats who are patriotic." (p. 15) All this for the purpose of concluding that "since" the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are "the storm centres of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism", therefore "the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggle of the people in these areas" (p.13)

No doubt, Khrushchev has a point when he says that thereby "the Chinese comrades wish to win the easiest way to popularity among the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America." The far greater truth is that the setting of policies for the colonial world was precisely what Mao demanded on the very first day of his conquest of power in mainland China as his due as well as his price for allowing Russia to remain head of the Communist world in "the West." Now that Mao is out for mastery of the world, he adorns his espousal of colonial and semi-colonial struggles with a quotation from Lenin at the Second Congress of the Communist International. Thus, the imperative duty of the proletariat of the technologically advanced countries to unite with the colonial masses struggling against imperialism, is reduced by Mao to a matter of competition with Khrushchev as to who will be master not only over which "spheres", but over the entire world.

Fifthly, and finally, among the many theses Mao expounds in the June 14th distribe, which he has published in about 20 languages and which is, in fact, his international manifesto, is this one: "for a very long historic period after the proletariat takes power" (p.36), "for decades or even longer after socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization" (p.37) have been achieved, "the class struggle continues as an objective law independent of man's will". (p.36) This holds true in all "socialist countries." Now whatever the subjective impulse for concocting this -- all too transparently it is meant to lay the foundation for opposition to the 22nd Russian Communist Party Congress which enunciated that Russia

*As Khrushchev, of course, sharply pointed out when he got around to answering the June 14th letter on July 15. Tass distributed the English translation which appeared in The New York Times of Monday, July 15, 1963.

was on the road to Communism* — it is the most serious of all theories of retrogression. We now have not only the retrogression of capitalism to fascism, but the retrogression of socialism, that is to say, a classless society, to one in which "there are classes and class struggles in all socialist countries without exception." (p.40) Surely no more deadly deviation has ever been proclaimed "a principle of Marxism-Leninism."

The objective compulsion for such "theories" flow, of course, from the most brutal form of state capitalism characteristic of China. Just as the bankruptcy of capitalism in general was accompanied by the bankruptcy of its thought, so the bankruptcy of the misnamed "Communes" is accompanied by "Mao's Thought", the true end of any philosophic method. Where Stalin, when admitting that the operation of the law of value in his "socialist land", felt compelled to force a separation between the law of value and the law of surplus value in order to try to deny the existence of classes under socialism, Mao proclaims it loudly as "A principle". And yet, despite this totally capitalistic concept of socialism; despite the concrete and total exploitation of the Chinese masses; despite the concrete Chinese invasions against other lands, Mao's abstract revolutionary thunder gets the support of militants, especially intellectuals, in and outside of the Communist Parties. It is a sad commentary on our times and exposes how totally lacking in any confidence in the self-activity of the masses are today's claimants to the title, "Marxist-Leninist"; their militancy gains momentum only where there is a state power to back it up. It is the mark of our state-capitalist age that our "revolutionary" petty bourgeoisie can not act without the State Plan and fears the self-mobilizing proletarian masses even more than do the powers that be.

Adept in the use of Marxist terminology to clothe his territorial and other ambitions, Mao is counting on bringing about splits in the CPs of the East and "the West." From Ceylon to Italy, and from France to the US, Mao indeed has support of "left" splits. And he has also captured the non-existent imagination of the Trotskyists who, despite IM's historic and theoretic fight against Mao, have all become "Maoists" to an embarrassing degree.

Whatever further brainwashing may be needed for Communists, "left" independents and Trotskyists begging to be intellectually raped, the reality of Mao's abstract revolutionary thunder will be a rash of little wars — from Laos, Korea, Viet Nam, to a third edition of the Sino-Indian war, not to mention subversion in Indonesia and Latin America. Naturally what concerns American imperialism most is Mao's influence in Latin America where he is indeed making headway. The high price Khrushchev had to pay to win Cuba to his side in the dispute will not stop "the natural" inclinations for easy victories through terrorism and guerrilla adventures. No doubt some of these will be to aid genuine revolutionaries, say, in Portugal's Africa or South Africa. But anyone who willingly blinds himself to Mao's purposes sets himself up for self-destruction.

* We didn't need Mao's "revelations" of course, to see the 22nd Russian Communist Party Congress for the state-capitalist manifesto it was. See the three letters on the RCP program (August 2, 9, and 14, 1961 Weekly Political Letters, Series 1)

-9-

Russia hopes to put some limitation to Mao's ambitions and conceit. To have the time to do it, not to mention the time he needs "to solve" Russia's own agricultural crisis, Khrushchev is willing to undertake a pause in the Cold War. And while Kennedy and Khrushchev pause, the world's working class can expect greater blows from both poles of capital as well as a lot of balderdash from Mao's China.

— RAYA

Please Note: Pagination of this letter begins with "page 4" instead of "page 1" because it is included in another bulletin.

(Labor Donated)

3116

POLITICAL LETTER

September 26, 1963

(Dear Friends: A word of explanation is, perhaps, needed to explain why a "book review" should constitute a Political Letter. The particular book under consideration — Sartre's Search For A Method — presents an intellectual's attempt to keep Marxism hemmed in within the confines of Communist approved "polycentrism." That is to say, to take the marxist theory of liberation and transform it into the Communist practice of exploitation through an elaborate philosophic labyrinth which is supposed to disclose "different roads to socialism," but is, in fact, a rationalization of existing Communism. Because it comes garbed in Marxist clothing — the Existentialist philosopher, Sartre, claims to be a Marxist now — it presents a new danger to the Freedom NOW movements, searching for a philosophy of freedom. It is best, therefore, to face this new challenge in philosophy at its very first moment of appearance. — RAYA)

* * *

SARTRE'S SEARCH FOR A METHOD TO UNDERLINE MARXISM

I.

In 1957 Sartre had written an essay which he had entitled "Existentialism and Marxism" and published in the Polish journal Tworczość. Later, he tells us, he altered it "considerably so as to adapt it to the needs of French readers" and published it in his own journal, Les Temps Modernes. In 1960 the essay reappeared as the Introduction (111 pages) of his massive (755 pages) Critique de la Raison Dialectique, Volume I, and was entitled Search For A Method*. In this form it has now been published as a separate book (181 pages).

It is difficult to know what to make out of Search For A Method. In part, and only in part, this is due to the fact that it is Introduction to a work we do not have in English and which has, in any case, not yet been completed. Yet it is no accident that the book under consideration here had undergone three different types of publications before, in its sixth year, it came out at an independent work. Sartre himself felt that it "logically" belonged at the end of the Critique since it comprised the method for which the Critique laid the foundations. As a philosopher, Sartre knows well that methodology is the most concentrated expression of theory, a result of a complex interaction of the spirit of the times, class base, theoretical analysis, practical activity, including a struggle with rival theories, rival praxis, rival methodologies. In a word, to use one that is a favorite with Sartre, it is a "totalization." By this it must be judged.

* Search For A Method by Jean-Paul Sartre. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes. (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1963)

And, indeed, the difficulty in understanding what Sartre is trying to say is, fundamentally, not related to the book being only an introduction to a work that is only half finished. Rather the difficulty arises from the fact that Search For A Method is weighted down by contradictory statements.

Take the central thesis, that Marxism, and only Marxism, is the philosophy of our age, while Existentialism is only "an ideology", "an enclave inside Marxism." (p. xxxiv) It is stated. Period. The argumentation that follows over the next 181 pages contradicts this either directly or indirectly. For, while Existentialism has, "in general", been demoted to a "parasitic system which lives on the margins of real science", specifically it has moved forward while "Marxism stopped." (p.21) This is supposed to refer, not to the "Marxism of Marx" but to "today's Marxists." Nevertheless, as we shall see, it is not "today's Marxists" Sartre is undermining. "Today's Marxists", a very loose expression at best, becomes, in the hands of Sartre, a cover-all not only of Communists, Trotskyists, ex-Trotskyists, and independent Marxists of all sorts, but of Marx himself insofar as his theory, says Sartre, is only "in its infancy." (p.30)

Nevertheless, this book is of the essence to the new Sartre, the one who proclaims himself a Marxist, properly de-Stalinized ("Stalinized Marxism assumes an air of immobility ..." p.125) ; properly condescending to "revisionism" ("As for 'revisionism', this is either a truism or an absurdity." p.7); and, in his own eyes, sufficiently de-existentialized: "I consider Marxism the one philosophy of our time which we cannot go beyond." (p.xxxiv)

The central core of all of Sartre's criticism of "today's Marxists" rests on the accusation that they have become "dogmatists" who fail to see the particular individual, the given events, the facts, the concrete experience, the new; in a word, reality, and have therefore caused "the temporary arrest of Marxism." (p.89). Since the essay was originally written in 1957 for a Polish periodical, we shall start with the reality of that historic period — the crushed Hungarian Revolution. It is, moreover, the only current event Sartre deals with; all the rest of the book concerns itself with such pressing realities as the Great French Revolution at the end of the 18th century, literature in general and Flaubert's Madame Bovary in particular, anthropology, microphysics, psychoanalysis, and other analyses by "today's Marxists" — or else it is on a subject "today's Marxists" have failed to analyze.

Sartre's Distorted View of Reality

Sartre rises to ever new heights of indignation against "today's Marxists" who had, before "the second Soviet intervention" (p.23), on November 4, 1956, already made up their minds, thereby displaying their method "in all its nakedness" to be one "which reduces the facts in Hungary to a 'Soviet act of aggression against the democracy of Workers Committees.'" (p.34) Sartre bemoans this fact as well as the fact that, even though news, "a great deal of news" poured forth only afterwards, "I have not heard it said that even one Marxist changed his opinion." (p.23)

Although Sartre himself had opposed the bloody suppression of the Hungarian Revolution by Russian might, at least on the ground that it was "not necessary", nor enhanced the "security of socialism", he here pours forth his indignation,

not against the Russian counter-revolutionaries, but those of "today's Marxists" whose "method in all its nakedness" was used to make a new category of the Workers' Councils as "a democratic institution": "one can even maintain that they bear within them the future of the socialist society," Sartre continued, "But this does not alter the fact that they did not exist in Hungary at the time of the first Soviet intervention; and their appearance during the Insurrection was much too brief and too troubled for us to be able to speak of an ORGANIZED democracy." (p.24, my emphasis, RD)

Because the Workers' Councils were not an organized democracy, neatly packaged for the modern Kierkegaardian of the "unsurpassable opaqueness," (p. 9n), because the spontaneous, self-organization of the Councils had a life that "was much too brief and too troubled", (p.24) this consequence of their forced suppression becomes the sufficient ground for the dramatist Sartre's preference of speaking about the Hungarian Revolution as "the tragedy" rather than the elemental creativity. Sartre wants us, not to build a philosophy of freedom on that reality, on that "unsurpassable singularity of the human adventure", on that unarmed mass facing the armed, organized, state might. We are supposed, instead, to follow Sartre in donning a full suit of administrative armor to cover up Existentialism's distorted view of reality, in all its nakedness.

We have already quoted Sartre's gratuitous remark on "revisionism."⁽¹⁾ The myriad of new tendencies — whether expressed by Hungarian revolutionaries or Polish non-revolutionaries, by intellectuals or workers, by youth newly aspiring to "socialist Humanism", or old Communists like Imre Nagy upon whom freedom fighters suddenly thrust new leadership — one and all of these living forces, the true human dimension, get head-shrunk into a non-differentiated category, "revisionism", and shrugged off with a "despite their good intentions..." The fact that the appellation was not theirs, but that of "Other", their tormentors, Khrushchev and Mao, who have long since transformed Marx's theory of liberation into state-capitalist enslavement does not seem to disturb the philosopher of existence. Though those who fought for freedom from Russian Communist overlordship were the real "existents" in the Poland of 1957 whom Sartre was addressing, the philosopher of "the individual" didn't take time out to personalize a single one — unless the questionable choice of that time and that place for launching an attack on the only truly original Communist philosopher who finally got swept up by the revolution in his native land — George Lukacs — can be called "personalization": "It is not by chance that Lukacs — Lukacs who so often violates history — has found in 1956 the best definition of this frozen Marxism." (p.28)

Now it would be easy, all too easy to discount Sartre as a mere fellow-traveler. We would then, however, miss the main point: the compulsion for Sartre's first return to philosophy since the publication of Being and Nothingness twenty years ago. The totality of the crisis, on the one hand, and the uncompromising stands of the Freedom NOW movement, on the other hand, demand that we face reality not one-sidedly but philosophically, as a way of life and as a comprehensive view.

As Sartre Sees Himself Now, and As He Is

First, it must be stated that Sartre's "Question de methode" (wrongly translated⁽²⁾ as Search For A Method) is not a search for, but a pronouncement of, a method. Sartre expects the whole world to sit up and listen because our age

"demands a new rationality. Because nobody has been willing to establish this rationality within experience, I state as a fact" — Sartre loudly proclaims — "absolutely no one, either in the East or in the West, writes or speaks a sentence or a word about us and our contemporaries that is not gross error." (p.111)

Sartre's declaration that "nobody ...absolutely no one" knows how to utter anything that is not "gross error" directs its sharpest arrows against "today's Marxists." Not only does the Marxism of Marx, however, remain, supposedly, inviolate, but the rarity of "the periods of philosophical creation are rare" is stressed: "Between the seventeenth century and the twentieth, I see three such periods, which I would designate by the names of the men who dominated them: there is the 'moment' of Descartes and Locke, that of Kant and Hegel, finally that of Marx." (p.7) As against the creative philosophy of Marx, which remains valid for our day, Existentialism, says the founder of French existentialism, "is a parasitical system living on the margin of Knowledge, which at first it opposed but into which today it seeks to be integrated." (p.8) The very last words of the book reiterate this thesis: "The comments which we have made in the course of the present essay are directed — to the modest limit of our capabilities — towards hastening the moment of that dissolution."(p.181)

Despite this most categoric statement, Sartre fails to act out his commitment. It remains altogether unclear, for example, why he doesn't do what "today's Marxists" seem incapable of doing. Instead of rising to the challenge to resuscitate Marxism in its original state, Sartre not only holds on to the autonomy of French existentialism but also parades proudly its origins in Kierkegaard. This, despite the fact that Sartre attributes the reappearance of "the Dane", at the beginning of the 20th century, to the fact that it was a time "when people will take it into their heads to fight against Marxism by opposing to it pluralisms, ambiguities, paradoxes ..." (p.15)

Nor does Sartre flinch from using himself as an example of Marx's dictum, that the ruling ideas of any epoch are the ideas of the ruling class. Indeed, he goes so far as to say that what the students of his day did to oppose "the sweet dreams of our professors" was to become proponents of "violence": "It was a wretched violence (insults, brawls, suicides, murders, irreparable catastrophes) which risked leading us to fascism ..." (p.20) The war, however, "shattered the worn structures of our thought" and they "discovered the world." (p.21) They were then "convinced at one and the same time that historical materialism furnished the only valid interpretation of history and that existentialism remained the only concrete approach to reality."(p.21) Though the contradiction in this attitude is now so apparent to him that he wants existentialism "to be integrated into Marxism", Sartre takes considerable time out to show how "Marxism, after drawing us to it as the moon draws the tides ... abruptly left us stranded, Marxism stopped." (p.21)

Again, the reference to Marxism is supposed to be the Marxism of "today's Marxists", "lazy Marxism". Again, Sartre gives no reply to the obvious question, why didn't the existentialists "totalize" their experiences and integrate them into "the whole." If we are to find out why, we will have to do our own digging. It is necessary to begin our journey downward into Sartreist ideology by making sure that we do not allow his general oath of allegiance to Marxism to

- 5 -

blind us toward the profusion of his specific departures from "dogmas", that is to say, the heart and soul, sinews and bones of Marxism.

the tale." (3) Somewhere D. H. Lawrence wrote: "Never trust the artist. Trust a careful reading of Sartre's book will reveal quite a tale as to why Sartre didn't, and couldn't, restate the Marxism of Marx for our age.

3121

Marx's Theory of Knowledge and the Fetishism of Commodities

Although Sartre always capitalizes Knowledge when he is referring to Marx's philosophy to signify that this is "the whole", in which Existentialism is but an "enclave", Sartre, in a footnote (pp.32-3), states that "the theory of knowledge continues to be the weak point in Marxism." Sartre draws this conclusion after he has quoted one sentence from Marx on the materialist conception of history, and one from Lenin on consciousness as "reflection of being", after which Sartre remarks triumphantly: "In both cases it is a matter of suppressing subjectivity; with Marx, we are placed beyond it; with Lenin on this side of it." (p.32n) That this baseless generalization flies in the face both of all Marx wrote and all Marx did does not deter Sartre. He stubbornly maintains that the sentence he quoted from Marx — that "The materialist conception of the world signifies simply the conception of nature as it is without any foreign addition." — amounts to nothing less horrific than this: "Having stripped away all subjectivity and having assimilated himself into pure objective truth, he (Marx) walks in a world of objects inhabited by object-men." (p.32n)

And, one again: "Both (the reference is again to the single quotation from Marx and the half of one sentence from Lenin) of these conceptions amount to breaking man's real relation with history, since in the first, knowing is pure theory, a non-situated observing, and in the second, it is a simple passivity." (p.32n) These straw ideas that Sartre has just strung up and attributed to Marx and Lenin he labels "anti-dialectical", and "pre-Marxist" (p.33n, emphasis is Sartre's). He notes condescendingly that "in Marx's remarks on the practical aspects of truth and on the general relations of theory and praxis, it would be easy to discover the rudiments of a realistic epistemology which has never been developed." (p.33n) Previously he had assured us that the "sclerosis" in Marxism did "not correspond to normal aging ... Far from being exhausted, Marxism is still very young, almost in its infancy; it has scarcely begun to develop." Despite the fact that Sartre has proclaimed Marxism to be "the one philosophy of our time," and despite the fact that it will, quite obviously, take a Sartre to develop the "rudiments" for an epistemology in Marxism, Sartre considers his whole work, even after the infusion of Existentialism into Marxism to be "a prolegomena" to any future anthropology. We, however, must follow the logic here as he leaves Chapter I, entitled, "Marxism and Existentialism."

By the second chapter, "The Problem of Mediations and Auxiliary Disciplines," Sartre will stump — and this time not only in footnotes but directly within his main text — where angels, at least knowledgeable ones, would fear to tread — the domain of one of Marx's most original discoveries — the fantastic form of the appearance of production relations among men as exchange of things: the fetishism of commodities.

Here is what Sartre writes: "The theory of fetishism, outlined by Marx, has never been developed; furthermore, it could not be extended to cover all social realities. Thus Marxism, while rejecting organicism, lacks weapons against it. Marxism considers the market a thing and holds that its inexorable laws contribute to reifying the relations among men. But when suddenly — to use Henri Lefebvre's (a "today's Marxist rd) terms — a dialectical conjuring trick shows us this monstrous abstraction as the veritable concrete...then we believe

that we are returned to Hegelian idealism." (p.77)

One would be hard put to match the number of errors Sartre succeeds in squeezing into less than four sentences. Judged by them, Marx has wasted the arduous labor he put into the creation of the three volumes of CAPITAL, which aims at establishing that both the pivot of his theory, as well as the actuality, of capitalism is not to be found in the market — the favorite hunting ground of utopians, underconsumptionists and capitalistic buyers of labor power — but it is to be found in the process of production, and only there.

But, first, it is necessary to deal with attitudes rather than content. For the moment, therefore, we'll set aside its vast accumulation of errors, and consider only the superficiality of Sartre's approach. Contrast it to Marx's attitude that, despite a quarter of a century of labor that went into the completion of CAPITAL, led him to introduce some fundamental revisions in the second edition of his work, and precisely on the two points raised by Sartre: the fetishism of commodities and the inexorable laws of capitalist development which go to make up its "law of motion." Between the first edition of Volume I, in 1867, and the second edition, in 1872, nothing less historic occurred than the Paris Commune. This brought about, "at one and the same time" — a favorite phrase of Sartre's whenever he is about to force a unity between two irreconcilable opposites, but which we use purely factually — Marx's profound historical work, The Civil War in France, and a new edition of his greatest theoretical work.

In Civil War in France Marx elaborated a new theory of a workers' state, rooted in the reality that the Parisians had "stormed the heavens" and "at last discovered the political form in which to work out labor's economic emancipation." The new form of human relations established during the Commune — though its existence too had been "too brief and too troubled" — had so illuminated Marx's conception of the whole question of "the form of value", i.e., the fetishism of commodities, as well as the "inevitable" collapse of capitalism, that he decided to make fundamental additions to CAPITAL. These he considered of such great significance that he asked those who had already read the work, to read the new edition since it contained "a scientific value independent of the original." In the Afterword to the French edition, he calls attention to the fact that he changed the section dealing with fetishism "in a significant manner." We assume Sartre has this edition since it is the standard one and we hope he also has an 1867 edition. A comparison of the two will show that, where in 1867, Marx laid the main emphasis on the form of value giving the relations of men in production the fantastic appearance of a relation of things, in the 1872 edition Marx shifts the emphasis to the necessity of that form of appearance because that is, in truth, what relations of people are at the point of production: "material relations between persons and social relations between things."⁽⁴⁾

This, by no means, completes the history and significance of the changes Marx introduced into the French editions, changes which included, in an expansion of those "inexorable laws" of capitalist production, a prediction about the ultimate form of centralization of capital which we today call state-capitalism.⁽⁵⁾ Here, however, we must limit ourselves to the relationship of the question of fetishism to the personalities Sartre chose to attack in that footnote on "subjectivity." The only one, besides Marx, who was singled out for attack was Lenin. Now it happens that, while Lenin wrote many profound economic studies of capitalism's "inexorable laws", both in theory and in the Russian actuality, his

philosophic works were quite superficial, and with the 1908 major study -- Materialism and Empirio-Criticism -- he gave the green light to vulgar materialism. This is the one Stalinists, Khrushchevites, Maoists, and fellow-travellers base themselves on.

No serious student of Marxism, especially not a philosopher, has any right to disregard the break in Lenin's philosophic thought at the time of the collapse of the Second International. For it is this fact, at the outbreak of World War I, which led Lenin to reread Hegel and reconstitute his own very method of thought. It is then, and only then, that he began fully to appreciate the inseparability of Hegelian philosophy from Marxian philosophic and economic categories. As Lenin himself expressed it in his new (1915) PHILOSOPHIC NOTEBOOKS: "Aphorism: It is impossible fully to grasp Marx's Capital, and especially its first chapter, if you have not studied through and understood the whole of Hegel's Logic. Consequently, none of the Marxists for the past 1/2 century have understood Marx!"

That Lenin included himself among the Marxists who had not fully grasped CAPITAL, "especially its first chapter", which includes the section on fetishisms, is, however, in this instance, not half as important as the continuous stress he put on the theory of knowledge, and the role of practice in the theory of knowledge, both in Hegel and in Marx. It led Lenin to this phenomenal conclusion: "Alias: Man's cognition not only reflects the objective world, but creates it." For some one in 1963 (or 1960, if you wish to consider only the French publication date) to write as if, to Lenin, consciousness was only the reflection of being "at best an approximately accurate reflection" and on the basis of that half sentence run, helter-skelter, to the wild conclusion that "by a single stroke he (Lenin) removes from himself the right to write what he is writing" (p. 32n) speaks very poorly indeed for Sartre's "comprehensive" method, not to mention his scholarship.

Now then, to return to the content of those four sentences by Sartre from page 77 which contended that it was "a dialectical conjuring trick" to consider "this monstrous abstraction" -- reification of the relations of men -- to be "the veritable concrete." First, let us note that Sartre is standing Marx on his head when he continues blithely to talk of the market's inexorable laws where Marx demonstrated the inexorable laws to arise out of production. They are, of course, manifested in the market, but they cannot (can not) be controverted any place but in production, and only by human beings, specifically the laborers, who had been transformed into appendages of machines but whose "quest for universality" had given birth to "new passions", thus making them the forces for the overthrow of capitalism. The market, no doubt, contributes something to the mystification of human relations since the only things that relates men in the market place is money. But that was not Marx's point.

On the contrary, Marx insisted that in order to understand what is taking place in the market it is necessary to leave it and go into the factory. It is there that relations among men get "reified", made into things. It is there, at that "process of suction"⁽⁶⁾, that capital grows monstrous big, but, far from being an "abstraction", is the "veritable concrete" which "sucks dry living labor", and makes it into a thing. Far from this being the result of "a dialectical conjuring trick", it is the literal truth of relations of men at the point

of production. The "inexorable laws" that arise out of this, out of this and not out of the market, make inevitable the collapse of the type of insane productive system that makes man into a thing.

Marx states and restates all this in a thousand different ways, in thousands of places throughout all his works — philosophic, economic, historic, and even in the analysis of the relations of works of art to the specificity of history. Marxist theoretical battlefields are strewn with the bones of those, including the martyred revolutionary, Rosa Luxemburg, who thought that this talk of labor as capital was not reality, but only a matter of "language." Marx, on the contrary, states over and over and over again, that unless one grasps this, just this, there is nothing to distinguish "scientific" from utopian socialism, proletarian democracy from "a workers' dictator like Lassalle", or the new (Marx's) humanism, which unites materialism and idealism, from both the vulgar materialism of "vulgar communism" and the de-humanized bourgeois (Hegelian) idealism, which, despite the revolutionary dialectic, had to lapse back into a vulgar idealization of the Prussian bureaucracy. "Thus," concluded also the young Marx, "nothing need be said of Hegel's adaptation to religion, the state, etc. for this lie is the lie of his principle."

And thus also, the chapter in Sartre's book which is supposed to be a plea "to reconquer man within Marxism" (p.83), ends, instead, with a plea for integration of intellectual disciplines — and from "the West" at that! "We have shown that dialectical materialism is reduced to its own skeleton if it does not integrate into itself certain Western disciplines," concludes Sartre. "Our examples have revealed at the heart of this philosophy a lack of any concrete anthropology The default of Marxism has led us to attempt this integration ourselves ... according to principles which give our ideology its unique character, principles which we are now going to set forth." (pp. 83-4)

III.

The Dominant Dogmatism of Sartre

It has taken Sartre some 17 years to return to the field of philosophy. No matter what one thought of BEING AND NOTHINGNESS — and this writer considers it a manifestation of the disintegration of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois thought under the blows of Depression, Fascism, and the Fall of France — the book was a carefully elaborated, closely argued work. This is not true of Search For A Method. Where not totally wrong, its argumentation is perfunctory. It jumps all over vast fields of thought — from philosophy to science, from literature to anthropology, from economics to psychoanalysis, from analyses of revolutions to those of the Proletariat (the capital P is Sartre's), and from history to the time of day. But it lands nowhere.

Its rootlessness leaves a deep gap in the book, which is not due to the fact that we have not seen the whole work. Rather it is of the essence to the whole work. The abyss opened up here (Search For A Method) will be the more glaring in CRITIQUE DE LA RAISON DIALECTIQUE, Vol. I. Let's follow the indications in the work we're reviewing. "Sade's pessimism," writes the uniquely equipped dramatist Sartre, "joins that of the manual laborer, to whom the bourgeois revolution gave nothing, and who perceived at about 1794 that he was excluded from the 'universal' class." (p.117)

Now, Sade's pessimism "joined" that of the manual laborer neither in theory, nor in life; neither in the specificity of the act, nor in the given situation. Nowhere, in fact, except in the head of the Existentialist Sartre could "the lived hope of a noble, outlawed by his class" (p. 116) "join" that of the manual laborer who by the very fact of being "excluded from the 'universal' class", would gain that "quest for true universality" which would lead him, not to sadism, but to revolution.

All that Sartre reveals by intellectually forcing the unification of the irreconcilables is that he is a true son of bourgeois society dominated by the dogmatism of the concept of the backwardness of the masses who are supposed to be incapable of thinking on their own, and therefore must be managed, led, and made to work the harder and produce the more. By his insistence on the particular against the general, the concrete — "incident by incident" — as against the "abstract ideology of universality", the historic event against the a priori judgment, "absolute empiricism" as against dogmatism, Sartre may have destroyed as many dogmatisms as he claims. But one, unstated, yet all-pervading dogmatism continues to be the underlying motif of all Sartre thinks, writes, does. It is the dogmatism of the backwardness of the masses.

Sartre seems to revel in "revealing" that the Proletariat is not "an abstract ideology of universality", but a concrete separateness: "There is more than one Proletariat, simply because there are national groups which have developed differently." (p.89) Or Sartre will ask rhetorically: "Wasn't Thermidor rendered possible by the growing dissension between the sans-culottes and controlling faction of the members of the Convention?" (pp.120-1) And then the shocking conclusion: "It is true that the people supported the Revolution and true, too, that their distress had counter-revolutionary tendencies." (p.121)

He sees "counter-revolutionary tendencies" everywhere — except, of course, in himself, and in the Communist Party, which even when it perpetrates actual counter-revolutionary acts, continues to remain "the only revolutionary Party." He held such a position during the Resistance, where, as against the Communist Party which knows where it is going, he holds that the non-Communist Resisters had but one theme: "We are fighting the Germans, but this does not give us any right over the period which will follow the War." (7) He held such a position after liberation, as the quotation from his 1946 writings testifies to his misconception of the CP as "the only revolutionary party." (8) Ten years later, during the actual Communist suppression of the Hungarian Revolution, Sartre's opposition is restrained by thoughts of "the security of socialism" (sic!). On the other hand, although the most exciting page in the history of the late 1950's and early 1960's is that written by the African revolutions that, in less than a decade, literally reshaped the map of the world, the philosopher of existence writes that "societies of repetition" are "without history" (sic!) Since no reactionary could have uttered a more condescending lie — and Sartre is a "progressive" who strongly opposes colonialism —, here is how he tried to extricate himself by inventing a distinction between historicity and "living historically"; "Man should not be defined by historicity — since there are some societies without history — but by the permanent possibility of living historically the breakdowns which sometimes overthrow societies of repetition." (p. 167n)

Here we see the results of Sartre's "comprehensive", "Progressive-Regressive Method." It is time we turned to the method itself and its underlying theory.

IV.

"The Progressive-Regressive Method" and the Theory of Scarcity

"The Marxist method is progressive because it is the result — in the work of Marx himself — of long analyses," writes Sartre. "Today synthetic progression is dangerous ... Our method is heuristic; it teaches us something new because it is at once both regressive and progressive." (p.133)

For a comprehension of this method we must comprehend the theory it expounds. We must, therefore, first retrace our steps to the section on "Marxism and Existentialism", at the point where Sartre first introduces to his "new" theory, the outworn, pre-Marxist "theory of scarcity." (9) The sentence followed the one which said he supported "unreservedly" Marx's thesis, that "The mode of production of material life generally dominated the development of social, political, and intellectual life." Straightaway after this "unreserved" approval, however, Sartre wrote: "But Marx's statement seems to me to point to a factual evidence which we cannot go beyond so long as the transformation of social relations and technical progress have not freed man from the yoke of scarcity." (p.34) Sartre follows with still another quotation from Marx about the "reign of freedom ... beyond the sphere of material production proper", after which Sartre concludes: "As soon as there will exist for everyone a margin of real freedom beyond the production of life, Marxism will have lived out its span; a philosophy of freedom will take its place. But we have no means, no intellectual instrument, no concrete experience which allows us to conceive of this freedom or of this philosophy." (p.34)

On a first reading, this appears to be a restatement of Marx's contention that we who are living pre-historically, that is to say in a class society, cannot write a blueprint for a class-less society. Since, however, Marxism is a theory of liberation, Sartre's shocking phrasing, "a philosophy of freedom will take its (Marxism's) place" compels a rereading of the Sartrean interpretation, alongside the full passage from Marx who defined the reign of freedom as "that development of human power which is its own end, the true realm of freedom which, however, can flourish only on the realm of necessity as its basis. The shortening of the working day is its fundamental premise." (10)

Failing to perceive alienations as manifestations of class contradictions, Sartre stands everything on its head and has alienations "give birth" to these contradictions: "In a socialist society, at a certain moment in its development, the worker is alienated from his production ..." (p.178) "...the new alienations which give birth to the contradictions of socialist society and which reveal to it its abandonment; that is, the incommensurability of existence and practical knowledge." (p.179)

Since, to a philosopher, an "alienated existence" is an analytical phrase rather than an exploitative reality, it becomes easy for him to think that introducing another idea, such as the notion of "future", therefore means the

achievement of a "synthetic transcendence" rather than the giving up of the today for the tomorrow. Thus, Sartre writes glibly: "For the man in China the future is more true than the present." (p. 97) And how can the existentialist jargon about "the incommensurability of existence and practical knowledge" compensate "the man in China" for "Its (socialist society's) abandonment"?

Why is this master of language so slippery, ambivalent, contradictory, confusing on the warp and woof of Hegelian and Marxian philosophy — the theory of alienation — where he should, as "a philosopher of existence" get along so swimmingly? The Humanism of Marxism is grounded on this theory. Here Marxism transcended Hegelian dialectics, stood Hegel "right side up", and at the same time separated itself from what Marx called "quite vulgar and unthinking communism" which was "only the logical expression of private property" and "completely negates the personality of man." (5)

As against Marx's concept of any property form, including communal, being "the logical expression of private property", Sartre not only makes this the specifica differentia between capitalism and socialism, but is himself so much the prisoner of his theory that he extends it to "going beyond a situation": "For us man is characterized above all by his going beyond a situation, and by what he succeeds in making of what he has been made — even if he never recognizes himself in his objectification. This going beyond we find at the very root of the human-in need. It is need which, for example, links the scarcity of women in the Marquesas, as a structural fact of the group...." (p.91)

No doubt for the author of Being and Nothingness who rooted man in desire, anguish, dread, finding "the root of the human — in need" is new. But this, too, was long ago answered even by the young Marx who took psychology to task for this, just this: "What should we think of a science (psychology) where such an extensive realm of human activity (labor) says no more to it than what can be said in one word: 'Need, common need!'. And his answer was this: "Private property has made us so stupid and one-sided that any kind of object is ours only when we have it, i.e. when it exists for us as capital, or when we possess it directly — eat it, drink it, wear it, live in it, etc. — in short use it ... in place of all the physical senses, there is the sense of possession, which is the simple alienation of all the e senses. To such absolute poverty has human essence had to be reduced in order to give birth to its inner wealth!"

Since, however, Sartre conceived of "need, common need" as the root both of capitalist and socialist society, he moves away from fundamentals to the epiphenomena: "Exploiter and exploited are men in conflict in a system whose principal character is scarcity. To be sure, the capitalist owns the instruments of labor, and the worker does not own them: there we have a pure contradiction. (11) But to be precise, this contradiction never succeeds in accounting for each event." (p. 127) "Whatever men and events are, they certainly appear within the compass of scarcity ..." (p.132) "The object of existentialism — due to the default of the Marxists — is the particular man in the social field, in his class, in an environment of collective objects and other particular men Lazy Marxists make use of it (synthetic progression) to constitute the real, a priori ... They can discover nothing by this method of pure exposition ... Our method is heuristic ..." (p.133) "This means that it will attempt to clarify the givens of Marxist Knowledge by indirect knowing (that is, as we have seen, by words which regressively denote existential structures) ..." (p.181) "Furthermore, in order for notions like reification and alienation to assume their full meaning, it would have been

necessary for the questioner and the questioned to be made one ... But before Marxism, itself a product of the social conflict, could turn to these problems it had to assume fully its role as a practical philosophy — that is, as a theory clarifying social and political praxis. The result is a profound lack within contemporary Marxism." (p. 177)

The solution? "That the Marxists allow themselves to be duped by mechanical materialism is inexcusable," writes Sartre, "since they know and approve of large-scale socialist planning." (p.97) Just as Smith and Ricardo, despite their discovery of labor as the source of value, became prisoners of "the fetishism of commodities" because they could not see capitalism as anything but a "natural order", nor labor not only as "source" but as "subject", and there met their historic barrier, so Sartre met his in the State Plan. And, as Smith and Ricardo tried explaining away labor alienation as a "feudal blemish", so Sartre seeks to explain away labor alienations under "socialism" by his "theory" of scarcity — scarcity in this over-productive, state-capitalist, automated, "microphysic," atomic age of ours! It may not be much of a theory to explain the ills of capitalism in the United States or Western Europe or even Japan. But, obviously, when he first dragged in the "yoke of scarcity" (p.34) in talking of Marx's analysis of the reign of freedom and claiming that "we have no means, no intellectual instrument, no concrete experience which allows to conceive of this freedom or of this philosophy", Sartre was thinking of "socialist societies." Before therefore we jump to the conclusion that Sartre's new theory of scarcity reveals more a scarcity of thought than a material scarcity, let's remember that new reality which did not confront Marx, the state-capitalist societies of Russia and China which he calls socialist. Consciously or unconsciously, it is for these he created the theory of scarcity. No wonder then that the Communist theoreticians, who are so well acquainted with Marx's writings and their own claims to a society superior to capitalism, societies of scarcity prior to the Industrial Revolution, to do anything but laugh at his theory, remind us that "there is another" Sartre, one who "leans towards socialism in his practical activities." (1)

One need not agree with the view of the translator and enthusiastic admirer of Sartre, Hazel E. Barnes, that, with the publication of Being and Nothingness, "Sartre was recognized as the proponent of the most radical view of human freedom to appear since the Epicureans." (p.vii) It is obvious enough that this writer holds no such view. But it was at least true that, despite the fact that a beatnik existentialism seized the slogan-like statements of Sartrean philosophy — There is no moral law. Man is a useless passion. Life is meaningless. The world is a nauseating mess. Hell is other people —, to Sartre these emerged only after arduously working out his philosophic categories of Being-for-itself (man's consciousness) and Being-in-itself (the objects of conscious, or non-conscious reality) in order to see if the individual could be free. In a sort of purgatory, created by the "Nothingness", the void between consciousness and the objects it was conscious of, the struggle between the "for-itself" and "in-itself" were first to confront the true "No Exit" in the "for-Other", that is to say, relations with other human beings.

Now it is true that Sartre's pervading pessimism and deep cynicism led him to conclude, to use his own expression, that "respect for the Other's freedom is an empty word." (12) And no doubt George Gurvitch has a strong point when he says that the philosophic categories Sartre created are "bereft of con-

sequences and a sense of history." (13) Surely, Sartre's theory of human relations that are bound hand and foot and confined to but two "fundamental attitudes" — the equally deplorable extremes of masochism and sadism — can lead to nothing but anguish, loneliness, frustration in a sort of an infinite regress. But it is also true that this fantastic and totally false theory of human relations is in conflict with Sartre's other theory, that of individual freedom. (14) Indeed, by the end of Being and Nothingness the conflict has reached so impossible an impasse that Sartre himself attempts to force an exit, or point to one in a footnote (p.412) at least: "These considerations (the attitudes tending toward masochism and sadism) do not exclude the possibility of an ethics of deliverance and salvation. But this can be achieved only after a radical conversion which we cannot discuss here."

It was, no doubt, symbolic of the vent that the Resistance created for itself as Being and Nothingness went to press in Nazi-occupied France. Surely Sartre, as an individual, tried the Kantian, moral way out in the period after liberation, even tried, in some instances to oppose both capitalism and communism, although even in his best independent days, he was all too ready, as we saw, to throw a halo around the "Communist Party is the only revolutionary party." However, whatever it is that Sartre, the committed intellectual who presently claims to be an adherent of Marxism, believes in and bases his activities on, Sartre, the Existential philosopher is following a straight line of "inspiration" from defeats and only defeats. Just as, in the 1930's, it was neither the sit-down strikes in France which destroyed the pretensions of fascism in his native land, nor the Spanish Revolution in the other Europe, but rather the proletarian defeats by German and Spanish fascism that set the mood for Being and Nothingness, so it is that, in the 1950's, it is neither the Hungarian Revolution from Communist totalitarianism nor the African Revolutions from Western imperialism that set the mood. Rather it is the victories of the counter-revolutions that set the mood for Search For A Method and the Critique of Dialectical Reason.

In any case, in his return to strictly philosophic works, we got, not the promised "Ethics", but the work at hand which simply escapes from resolving the conflict between his theory of individual freedom and his theory of human relations by shifting from man the individual to man in the mass. Here "Hell is other people" becomes "Hell is the practico-inerte." In a word, the division between the "passive" masses and the "active" elite which has stood capitalist production and its philosophy of rationalism so well from its beginnings to its state-capitalist stage is given a new coat of philosophic paint. This is the remorseless logic of the failure of seeing creativity in the proletariat.

In his Critique Sartre states that his new work could not have been written if the free air created by De Stalinization had not taken place. We can only guess what will happen when the Khrushchev-Mao conflict reaches total rupture. What casts a better illumination on the compulsions for the work is this: the very intellectuals who were blind to the "new roads to socialism" that were opened up in life by the June 17, 1953 East German Revolt, which first put an end to the myth of Stalinist invincibility, were the ones who rose to the debate once Khrushchev had given the green light in February 1956. They are also the ones who recoiled when the Hungarian Revolution in October 1956 showed that DeStalinization and "polycentrism" were neither merely academic debates nor limited to ending "the

cult of personality", but were questions of life and death. The retreat led to the elaboration of a rather meaningless "Progressive-Regressive Method" which seeks nevertheless to undermine Marxism through infusion into it not only of Existentialism but also totalitarian Communism.

The anti-Stalinist, anti-capitalist, contemporary petty-bourgeois intellectual, himself the victim of the absolute division between mental and manual labor, the climax of centuries of division between philosophers and workers, is all too ready to hand over the revolutionary role of their self-emancipation into the hands of the Communist Party and its philosophy of the elite who will continue "to lead" the workers while the latter must continue to labor as before, only harder. In the Critique Sartre creates a veritable mystique about the "political group" which fights the "inertia" of the masses; he even glorifies terror: "The communal freedom creates itself as Terror." We need not wait for the appearance of that work in English to begin to expose it. For the methodological foundation for the new Communist metaphysics has been laid by Sartre here in Search For A Method, and it is at its foundation where it must be uprooted.

Detroit, Michigan
September, 1963

— Raya Dunayevakaya

Footnotes

(1) Due appreciation for this is tendered Sartre by no less a personality than the chief philosopher for Polish Communism: "Sartre's ideas on revisionism are of interest. The term is, he says, either a truism or an absurdity." (p.37) "This thought of Sartre's goes far beyond the shallow but loud propaganda of the revisionist miracle-makers, and, in my opinion, deserves a deeper analysis. So we see that Sartre not only avows Marxist philosophy but attempts to defend it from attack." (p.38) (Adam Schaff, A Philosophy of Man, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1963, \$3.25)

(2) While the imprecise translation of the title is due to poetic analysis rather than to any lack of knowledge of the French language or the Sartrean philosophy, it is also true that Miss Barnes is unacquainted with the Marxist terminology and translates such famous concepts as "the fetishisms of commodities" as "the fetishism of merchandise." I have therefore disregarded her translation of passages in Marx that Sartre quotes and used, instead, either the standard English translation or, in the case of the Early Essays of Marx, my own translation.

(3) Studies in Classic American Literature

(4) CAPITAL, Vol.I, p.84. (Chicago, Charles H. Kerr and Co.)

(5) The analysis I made of state-capitalism — and it was the first ever made from original Russian sources of the Five Year Plans — appears in my MARXISM AND FREEDOM, which includes, as Appendices, Marx's Early Economic-Philosophic Essays 1844. It is this translation which I use in all passages cited above from the young Marx.

(6) In the Russian edition only of the Archives of Marx and Engels, Vol, II (VII) p.69. This is from the chapter that was originally (in manuscript form) to have been the ending of CAPITAL, Volume I.

(7) Sartre par lui-même by F. Jeanson, quoted b. M. Cranston's Jean-Paul Sartre, p. 38.

(8) "Materialisme et revolution" (Les Temps Modernes: Vol.I, Nos 9 and 10, June-July, 1946) In 1947 the old periodical, Politics, translated this essay on "Materialism and Revolution". It reappeared as Chapter 13 of Sartre's Literary and Philosophical Essays (New York, Criterion Books, Inc.) in 1955. This edition bears a footnote by Sartre, which reads: "As I have been unfairly reproached with not quoting Marx in this article, I should like to point that my criticisms are not directed against him, but against Marxist scholasticism of 1949. Or, if you prefer, against Marx through Neo-Stalinist Marxism." The truth, however, is that the article couldn't have referred to "the Marxist scholasticism" of 1949 since it was written in 1946. Nor could it have been directed against "Neo-Stalinist Marxism" which did not arise until after Stalin's death. Sartre, at the time of writing his original article in 1946, (which duly quoted Stalin as an authority on Marxism) was such a millenium away from thinking about "Neo-Stalinist Marxism" that the chief target of his was -- Frederick Engels. Instead of being then wrought up about "Neo-Stalinism" which was yet to appear historically, he couldn't find it in himself to resist footnoting even the favorable mention of Marx's Humanism as follows: "It is, once again, Marx's point of view in 1844, that is, until the unfortunate meeting with Engels". It is one of the marks of our state-capitalist age that our intellectuals seem more adept at re-writing history, than at writing it.

(9) It needs no Marx to answer this excuse for class exploitation. The "scarcity theory" -- basis of primitive societies -- and the "buying cheap and selling dear" idea of pre-Industrial Revolution societies were answered by classical (bourgeois) political economy of Smith and Ricardo. The Marxian theory of surplus value, which said Marx, was really implicit in the Smith-Ricardo theory of value, is based on the assumption and the fact that the technological revolution put an end to any "theory" of scarcity as an excuse for the maldistribution of income or the cause of crisis.

(10) CAPITAL, Volume III, pp. 954-5

(11) The very first sentence of Marx's Private Property and Communism states: "But the opposition between the lack of property and property is still an undifferentiated opposition ... So long as it is not conceived as the opposition between labor and capital it is not yet a contradiction."

(12) Being and Nothingness, p. 409

(13) It is part of the discussion appended to A Short History of Existential by Jean Wahl (N.Y. The Philosophical Library) p.39.

(14) For a rather fine analysis of this point and other of Sartre's book Jean-Paul Sartre by ~~Richard Wright~~ (N.Y., Grove Press, Inc. Evergreen Books, 95c)

M. Cranston

POLITICAL LETTER

November 18, 1963

THE FORTHCOMING PAPERBACK EDITION OF MARXISM AND FREEDOM:

Dear Friends:

The New Introduction to the forthcoming paperback edition of Marxism and Freedom that we reproduce below speaks for itself. The reason for this prefatory note relates, instead, to the new chapter, "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung", which we cannot reprint since it takes up no less than 33 pages. Here is its contents page:

A: Communist Counter-Revolution

- (1) Of Wars and Revolutions As An "Eight-legged Essay"
- (2) Voices of Revolt
- (3) "The People's Communes"

B: The Dialectic of Mao's Thought From the Defeat of the 1925-27 Revolution To the Conquest of Power

- (1) Defeat of Revolution — Struggle Against "Dogmatists"
- (2) The 'Philosophy' of the Yenan Period: Mao Perverts Lenin
- (3) "Three Magic Weapons"

C: Oriental Despotism, Brainwashing — Or the Economic Compulsion of State-Capitalism

- (1) In Agriculture
- (2) Military and Industrial
- (3) Brainwashing

D: CAN There Be War Between Russia and China?The Non-Viability of State-Capitalism

- (1) 1960-62: Preliminary Sparring
- (2) New Dateline: Peking, June 14, 1963: "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement"
- (3) Back to "Wars and Revolutions": Russia and China at War?

IN PLACE OF A CONCLUSION: TWO KINDS OF SUBJECTIVITY

Footnotes

* * *

As you see, it is not only the newsiness that has made us choose China rather than the African Revolutions or the American Civilization on Trial pamphlet as the subject. Rather it is that our preoccupation, now as during the original publication, is with the challenge to work out the new relationship of philosophy to reality.

Two events have led to make The Challenge of Mao the crucible also for philosophical rebirth: (1) the appearance of the new world of independent African countries led, at one and the same time, to Communism's "discovery" of the national revolutions and to the rift within that Communist world which proved its non-viability: (2) the fact that the disputes within Chinese Communism have always been

philosophical, rather than on the economic or political levels in the technologically advanced countries, meant that at this stage of world development, they were more in consonance with the methodology that is of the essence to Marxist-Humanism.

At the same time, the very fact that most of that chapter was written two years in advance of the headlines is the best proof there is of the dynamism of Marxian dialectics as a method of analysis of the history of today, as of yesterday.

The subtitle, From Marx to Mao, is itself a manifestation of the toughness of our philosophy and our opposition to the transformation of the Marxist theory of liberation into the totalitarianism of reigning Communist powers.

Finally, the fact that the new Introduction had, of necessity, to be brief, and could only indicate rather than develop the events that happened during the crowded years, 1958-63, required that the new chapter on state-capitalism and workers' revolts have greater space for development.

The organization will have the opportunity to prove its own mettle in the manner in which they will make this paperback edition the center of dialogues, disputes, organizational challenges and organizational growth.

Yours,

RAYA

* LABOR DONATED *

3134

3 1 3 5

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EDITION OF MARXISM AND FREEDOM

By Raya Dunayevskaya

"Only that which is an object of
freedom can be called an idea."
— Hegel

The first edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM went to press as Sputnik No. 1 went into orbit. That same year, 1957, the Little Rock riots shared headlines with the scientific phenomenon. In 1962, two similarly different events were held in unison in men's consciousness. This time James Meredith's courageous entry into the University of Mississippi took the lustre out of Walter Schirra's six-orbital entry into space. An age in which "a little thing", like school desegregation, can hold in tow such scientific milestones is an age in which men's consciousness is preoccupied, not with scientific conquest, but with human freedom.

This new edition appears when our life and times impart an urgency to the task of working out a new relationship of philosophy to reality. Thought and deed cannot forever stand apart. Somewhere, sometime, they must meet. Throughout history the forces that have produced great social revolutions have also generated great philosophic revolutions. It was true when John Lilburne expressed the motive power of the British Revolution of 1648 as: "The poorest he in England has a life to live as the richest he." It is true when, in 1963, James Baldwin speaks of "a glimpse of another world I speak of change not on the surface but in the depths -- change in the sense of renewal." 17th century British Leveller fighting for equality, or 20th century Negro fighting for freedom now, pull strenuously at the intellectual tendency to resist the compulsion to original thought on the very eve of social revolutions that demand philosophic reconstructions.

The two features which characterize great periods of upheaval are, one, that a new subject is born to respond to the objective pull of history by making freedom and reason the reality of the day. And, two, a new relationship between theory and practice is forged. This is true for the past -- levellers in 17th century England; the sans culottes in the French Revolution of 1789-1793; the runaway slave impelling the United States to the Civil War of 1861-1865; the St. Petersburg proletariat in the 1905 and 1917 Russian Revolutions. This is true for the present -- in the Hungarian Revolution against Russian totalitarianism, no less than in the African Revolutions against Western imperialism. This does not mean that each of these historic periods has given birth to a totally new philosophy. An original philosophy is a rare creation, born after much travail only when called forth by a new stage in world consciousness of freedom. It does mean that a viable philosophy must be capable of meeting the challenge of human experience, of the new revolts symbolic of the lack of specific freedoms.

To this author it meant that, no matter what the reasons were that caused the transformation of the Marxian theory of liberation into its

-2-

opposite after the Russian Revolutions failed to realize, that is to say, put into practice this philosophy of freedom (See Chapters XII and XIII), a return to the original form of the Humanism of Marxism became imperative. Because Marx's Humanist Essays were not available in English at the time MARXISM AND FREEDOM came off the press in 1958, I included these writings as an Appendix.* Since that time there have been several English translations of these Essays as well as many commentaries on them. It soon became evident, however, that this was done, not to re-establish the integral unity of Marxian economics with his philosophical humanism, but only in order to exorcise the ghost of Karl Marx and then rebury him, this time as a Humanist. It cannot be done. Marxist Humanism will remain alive so long as a new world on truly new, human beginnings has not been established.

Totalitarian Communism understands this so well that the counter-revolutionary suppression of the Hungarian Revolution went hand-in-hand with the suppression of thought. The subsequent Khrushchev-Mao designation of Marxist Humanists as "revisionists" and the denunciation of "revisionism" as "the main danger" did not, however, deter the American "ideology specialist" from taking over the term, "revisionism", and similarly using it against the opponents of the ruling bureaucracies who had not only revised, but vitiated, Marxism. The very intellectuals who had lost their collective tongue during the period of McCarthyism now found their individual tongues to attempt to fragmentize Marx.

The debate around the Essays degenerated into a question of first-edness as if it were a college debate held for scoring points. As I stated during the discussion in 1961: "The dispute over who was the first to translate Marx's 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts into English is a meaningful controversy only if it has a substantive relationship to the spirit of those Essays and of our times. I was compelled to be the first to publish these Essays in 1958 because for the 15 years previous I had tried, in vain, to convince other scholars, writers, and publishers of the cogency of these Essays. When in the period between the East German Revolt and the Hungarian Revolution, the Russian Communists openly attacked those Essays (Voprosy Filosofii, #3, 1955) I once again began my round of publishers. This time the Essays were part of my book. I held that the Russian Communist attack on them was not academic, but a foreboding of revolutions to come. The following year the great Hungarian Revolution raised the Humanist flag clearly. Because Marxist Humanism, to me, is the only genuine ground from which to oppose Communist totalitarianism, I felt the compulsion to show that Humanism is not something invented by me, but came directly from Marx as he fought what he called 'vulgar Communism', writing that 'communism, as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society.' "

* That appendix has been dropped from this new edition because the Essays are now easily available in English. The official Moscow publication (1959) is marred by footnotes which flagrantly violate Marx's content and intent. The preferable translation is T. B. Bottomore which, with other primary materials is included in Marx's Concept of Man by Erich Fromm. (Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1961.)

Skepticism also greeted my statement, in the first edition, that the road to a new society, opened by the Hungarian Revolution, was no less illumined by the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Since then the Negro struggle has become all-rounded and so engulfed the North, as well as the South, that the phrase, "Negro Revolution", has become almost a cliché. Yet the fact that a revolution can be treated as a mere journalistic phrase only further reveals the failure to grapple with the truth that the American Negro has always been the touchstone of American civilization which had an ever expanding frontier but no unifying philosophy. Nor has the challenge been met when the call for a unifying philosophy comes from an altogether new source: the scientist (Dr. William E. Pickering) who first succeeded in sending the American Explorer into orbit. In speaking of the fact that mankind was "only one-half hour away from total annihilation", Dr. Pickering said that mankind was in need, not of more destructive weapons that the scientists invent, but of "a new, unifying philosophy."

This same period saw the emergence of the African Revolutions under their own Humanist banner.** It was indeed the birth of this new world independent of the Communist orbit that both led to the Communist discovery of this "third world" and to the rift within its own orbit. (On the Sino-Soviet Rift see Chapter XVII.) Because the dynamism of ideas escapes American "ideology specialists", they do not pick up the gauntlet for the struggle for the minds of men. Instead, they act as if any ideological battle, if even it concerns the very survival of humanity, is only rhetoric. It is not that they do not know as well as anybody that, far from rhetoric, this is the overriding fact in a world of H-bombs and ICBM's. Nor is it that they held their breath any less than the rest of us when, in October, 1962, J.F. Kennedy told N. S. Khrushchev that the United States was ready to unloose a nuclear holocaust unless Russia removed its missiles from Cuba. It is rather due to their belief that their aging views toward ideas would somehow magically dissipate the class struggle, and the racial struggle would thereby become bite size.

Where some reviewers wished to return Marx's Humanist Essays to the archives, others questioned my theory of state-capitalism, saying that I had paid insufficient attention to the changed conditions in Russia since the ascent of Khrushchev to power. They pointed especially to "the abolition of the forced labor camps." Curiously enough, this criticism came, in large measure, from those who denied the very existence of the camps until Khrushchev declared them abolished. That the worst of the concentration camps have been eliminated does not mean that there are none. It only means that "corrective labor" has taken a different, a milder form. Neither United States "free enterprise", nor Russian "Communism", has changed the fundamental Marxian theory of value and surplus value, or capitalism as an exploitative relationship of capital to labor. After the Russian admission, in 1943, that the law of value operates in Russia, there was no further point to continue the detailed analysis of their State Plans. My analysis

** See my pamphlet, Nationalism, Communism, Marxist-Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions. (News & Letters, Detroit, 1959; Cambridge, England, 1961.)

-4-

of the Five Year Plans, therefore, stopped with World War II, and thereafter focused on the Russian assault on Marx's CAPITAL and his ECONOMIC-PHILOSOPHIC MANUSCRIPTS (see Chapters III and XII). There is no reason to revise my analysis.

What is fundamentally new now are the developments in the Sino-Soviet orbit. My analysis of the rift was originally elaborated in 1961 as part of a new book I am writing on world ideologies and the technologically underdeveloped countries. Because "The Challenge of Mac" has a special urgency for today I brought it up to date after Japanese friends asked to include it in the edition of Marxism and Freedom they are preparing for publication in Tokyo. It is included as Chapter XVII in this new American edition as well. Both editions are going to press as we approach the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the International Working Men's Association in London, 1864.

November 7, 1963
Detroit, Michigan

Raya Dunayevskaya

- Labor Donated -

3138

POLITICAL LETTER

June 7, 1964

**GOLDWATER PRIMARY VICTORY IN CALIFORNIA:
or Under the Backlash of Counter-Revolution**

Dear Friends:

Senator Goldwater's victory in the Republican presidential primary makes it imperative for the "outside" as well as the "inside" to come to grips with the problems of the crisis in American civilization. It will not do to point to the fact that he won only by "a hair's breadth" from "the liberal Rockefeller" who might well have won if it were not for the birth of the child that reminded the populace of his divorce all over again. Nor will it do to point to the fact that "only Republicans" were involved, and the Democratic Party is still the majority party, and, moreover, both elections were only primaries which means that the "independent" voters, the bulk of the population, were not represented.

The simple truth is that 1,089,133 voted for Goldwater in a single state. Moreover, this came at a time when, in addition to this mesly-mouthed open-shop segregationist, Wallace had chalked up 650,000 outright segregationist votes in "liberal Wisconsin", Indiana and Maryland. Furthermore, very nearly the only reason he hadn't won outright in Maryland was the vote of the minorities -- Negroes, Jews and others. In a word, white "truly native" America would have fully turned the clock of history 100 years back with eyes wide open.

The Terrifying Objective Situation

Goldwater's victory was by no means merely the result of \$2 million spent on campaigning, nor only the cowardice that comes as easily in a closed booth as it comes when only one side -- its own -- is armed with state power, unleashed police dogs, tear gas and prisons. This was the capture of the Republican Party by the Birchites, an organized, arrogant, fanatic reaction that did not let itself be stopped even by the assassination of John F. Kennedy. No sooner had it been established -- a surprise even to the Birchers who had created the atmosphere for murder -- that it was not one of them who had pulled the trigger of the gun that shot President Kennedy, than they were back at the same type of McCarthyist propaganda as before the murder -- only worse. It was no longer a single individual, like McCarthy; it was an organization that was represented by the Illinois professor who had the gall to write that the assassination was provoked by the fact that JFK had not been rapid enough in following "the Communist timetable for taking over power in the USA." They -- the Birchites -- most assuredly have their timetable. It will not be stopped by any such incidence that might, for opportunistic reasons, make of Goldwater a king-maker instead of actual king, and "bow" to the public by accepting a moderate to do the actual running for the presidency.

The terrifying reality is that here was a man -- Goldwater -- who is not just the old run of reactionary on every subject from open shop to segregation, from "isolationism" to aiming at "victory" (American imperial rule) the world over, but who has

actually proposed that the A-bomb be used right now, in South Vietnam, "merely" to clear the foliage -- never mind the people, including American soldiers who would be getting the fallout -- and to reveal "the enemy". Yet, so callous, indifferent, fanatic have over 1 million Americans in a single state become, that not only did this fail to stop them from voting for him; rather, he became a "hero" to them. What is this pursuit of "victory" for? Does it differ in any essential manner from the "victory" Mao aims at when he insists that the reality of nuclear war should be discounted for the sake of "revolution"?

In facing this terrifying objective situation, we must also recognize three other unpleasant facts: 1) Wallace's invasion of the North met with success not only among the middle class, but also among some white labor; 2) On the other hand, Negroes were used by the capitalists, who always know how to divide and rule, to help break a strike in formerly lily-white Hillsdale, Michigan; and 3) Student youth were at the same time breaking a strike in West Allis, Wisconsin. Here, again, it will not do either to discount Wallace's gains by pointing to the greatness of the Negro Revolution which won its first representation in Wisconsin. Or to counter this fact with another -- that there were as many white strikebreakers as Negro at Hillsdale. The point is that the racism injected there was used to good advantage by the class enemy. Moreover, though Roy Wilkins made a good statement against the use of Negroes as strikebreakers, he made it in the form of an appeal to Gov. Romney to close the plant, not to his own organization to picket the plant against the strikebreakers.

Under the circumstances, the UAW labor bureaucracy, which has done nothing to clean its own house and work for the upgrading of Negroes, did, on this issue, send out some Negro workers to try to picket, and thus once again appear as the only ones who can "handle" labor. The liberal petty-bourgeois white may think that he is "superior" to the proletarian, because he allegedly has fewer prejudices. The one thing the petty bourgeois white forgets is that the Negro worker in the shop knows very well how hard it is for a minority to win where it does not have at least the quiet support of the white workers. The Negro worker therefore sticks to the white worker and does not go hunting for Negro racists "to lead" him.

CORE, likewise, had nothing to say on this matter. Although nationally they have by far the best position -- as a socialist, Bayard Rustin has always worked for the unity of the Negro revolution with white labor -- they were unable to intervene in this local situation which had gained national attention precisely because they do not work within the framework of a total philosophy, but only issue by issue, so to speak. The result has been that national issues become localized, so that the death of the white Rev. Bruce Klunder, crushed by a bulldozer in Cleveland during a demonstration, is not taken up by all the chapters throughout the land; while local issues are claimed as national victories, such as some housing laws which were passed in California merely through flukes, not through mass action, and are therefore in danger of being defeated now that the Birchers there have taken the initiative to upset them.

Finally, when student youth in Wisconsin have the brutality to wear boards with open nails under their shirts so that any strikertouching them would unceremoniously bleed, there is no point, either, for the liberal whites who have at last become

active in the Negro revolution to pride themselves on not having become "dogmatic", i.e. espousing a total philosophy, one which would have fought for the minds of these petty-bourgeois youth on more than "multiple issues". All the liberal has done by not being "dogmatic" is give up principles and vision for immediate results and an "intellectual" isolationism which can only result in victories by the counter-revolution which does not limit itself to fighting only against desegregation, but aims at nothing short of world power.

The Ossification of "Western" Thought

The tragedy of today's radicals and liberals alike lies in their abdication of thought, and therefore their failure to fight comprehensively. Just as the hardest thing for intellectuals is to see their own fragmentation, so the hardest thing for "activists" -- worker or intellectual, white or black, yellow or red -- is to see the need for theory.

The dismissal of this need and its reduction to "dogmatism" is not only in the way of the Negro Revolution to rise to its full historic stature; it is an impediment in the way of all freedom movements from the USA to China, from France to Africa, from Russia to Latin America, from Europe (East and West) to India. If living Trotskyists, who have the heritage of Leon Trotsky and the Russian Revolution, can have degenerated to veering between support of Malcolm X and Mao, what, exactly, can this state-capitalist age with its concomitant administrative mentality offer the liberals other than ossification of thought?

Let those to whom it may appear far-fetched to switch to this subject when considering the situation created by Goldwater's primary victory, Wallace's invasion of the North, on the one hand, and, on the other, the weakness of the freedom and labor movements as expressed in the incidents in Hillsdale, Michigan, West Allis, Wisconsin, Cleveland, Ohio, stop for a minute to consider the following:

1) Why do Western intellectuals who know better, call Mao Tse-tung "a dogmatist" -- Mao Tse-tung, the most non-dogmatic, wild, independent, guerrilla warrior, who has never relied very heavily either on Marx or Lenin until after he himself won power and is attempting to extend it?

2) Why do some of these same intellectuals (read Daniel Bell's "Plea for a 'New Phase in Negro Leadership'" in the May 31, 1964 New York Times Magazine Section) not only offer gratuitous advice to the Freedom movement about "responsibility" but get the youth to follow them? (And this youth is "the sophisticated left" in the Negro movement who are trying to shift the fight from the single issue of desegregation to "multiple" issues!)

3) Why does "Western" thought, even where it attempts to see "Humanism" (without class struggle!) help Khrushchev rebury Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks? Please reread the section, "The Objective Compulsion to Thought" in the Two Worlds column in the February, 1964 issue of N&L on that subject:

"The point is this: the compulsion to break with this philosophic past, with vulgar materialism, came from objective conditions. The compulsion to thought was brought about by a world war, the first world war, a crisis in Western civilization, a crisis in all men's lives. Our post-World War II situation, with its little wars, The Cold War, threat of nuclear holocaust, is a daily reminder of the deathroes of an older order, the birth pangs of a new one, the near-insoluble problems of this titantic conflict. In that respect, Lenin's Notebooks can shed greater light than the 'sophisticated' theses of today that keep philosophy hemmed in a tight little circle of the learned isolated from 'politics'.

"Far from being 'dated', Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, as method, are as urgent as today's headlines. Far from being 'Russian' they are as lacking in boundaries, in thought, as are the ICBM's in life. These are not only political problems. They are a challenge to thought as well as to life. As that encyclopedic mind of Hegel's said most profoundly when the philosophy of his day did not accept the challenge of changing times, did not grasp the French Revolution, as Idea, 'It is the nature of truth to force its way to recognition.' A philosophy that fails then to reorganize its very structure turns the learned into 'representatives who are like the dead burying the dead.'

"Lacking such an attitude to objectivity, Western thought flounders and therefore falls into quantitative measurements instead of the measure of Men, the human aspiration, the thought that can lay the foundation for a reorganization of society. Khrushchev, and, yes, Mao, have a state reason for burying Lenin's Notebooks -- the preservation of their respective state-capitalist tyrannies demands that the idea of freedom be buried along with freedom. But where, at least on the surface, the learned of the West need not be state philosopher, is it not time to end their ignorance of Marxist philosophy? ...

"Instead of helping Khrushchev, in the 35th year since the first Russian publication of Lenin's Notebooks, once again to perpetrate a live burial of these dialectic notes, isn't it high time finally to come to grips with their challenge to today's thought? Without such a meaningful encounter, the ossification of Western thought is sure "to outdistance" Communist putrefaction."

No greater putrefaction in thought than that contained in Bell's article can be found anywhere.

Reread also the editorial article on the assassination of President Kennedy in the December, 1963 issue of N&L, and see the basis for the unholy alliance of Right and "moderate":

"It is no accident that the groundwork has been laid for an unholy alliance between the forces of reaction and the moderates, not only in Congress, but also in the press, to create a new hysteria about 'Reds.'

"This is what must be stopped. This is the real tragedy. There is no sur-
- cease from the reactionary forces who, on the centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation, are trying to turn back the clock of history. The hatred is already in the

lifblood of this country. All the speeches cannot change this, precisely because they are only speeches....

"What therefore, becomes of paramount importance to Marxist-Humanists is to see that continuity is not the continuity of the unfinished revolution which forces of reaction are determined to keep unfinished. Continuity is, rather, the continuity of the Humanist and American roots of Marxism in the full Abolitionist tradition that will, once and for all, act on the truth that time has indeed run out on all compromises, come they from the Far Right or only "near" Right. The road to embark on, the task to dedicate oneself to, is the movement that will tear up racism at its root in the capitalist exploitative system. For only the reconstruction of society on totally new, on truly human beginnings can make Freedom Now a reality."

Ever since the Birmingham events of a year ago, we have been stressing the fact that those events might become prologue to revolution. We should now add that either they do, or there will be retreat to a situation in which the moderates will unite with the counter-revolution.

If activists do not see easily the need for theory, what they do see is need for organization. It is true they narrow this to "there is strength in many" rather than organization as the place where intellectuals and workers are a single unit, or organization where theory is not separated from practice. Nevertheless, need for organization is more than just a bare, quantitative type of many vs. one. It is also, at least, the recognition that policy, wisdom, results from the counsel of many.

In a word, there is a combination of many and the policy resulting from these many practicing a principle, say that of integration, which is, moreover, not limited to a single trade, as is a union. And since there are other organizations doing the same, one must, of necessity face the question of how to effect policy -- militantly or legally, in the streets or in the courts, etc. etc. At this very moment, the Communists and socialists, though very different from and opposed to each other, do pose the same question of "multiple" vs. "single" issues.

There will be no way to expose the Communists who have their own motives and can drop any policy they expound at the behest of forces outside the movement, except to pose the total philosophy and thereby answer what is the socialist alternative to capitalism -- destiny in one's own hands, self-activity of masses who want to do their own thinking. This will of necessity bring them to a new concept of organization -- that unique combination of worker and intellectual that signifies News & Letters Committees, and is manifested in Marxism and Freedom no less than in the paper. In any case, we must begin to pose that question in our work in the Freedom movement, in the work in the mines, in the work among campus youth.

There is no substitute, it is true, for the self-activity of the masses and the Negro masses have no intention whatever to continue the horrible co-existence with the Wallaces and Bernetts -- or Goldwaters. It is equally true that unless there is a unity of the movement to freedom with the philosophy of freedom, the forces for world war will swallow up everything. A Goldwater hand on the atomic trigger, even

if it is only a wish thus far, is too close for comfort. The capitalists have always been militantly class conscious, have always known how to divide and rule, and are now growing so impatient for world domination that they are ready to do business with the new Hitlers. Appearances change. Quiet Goldwater-types replace the ranting maniacs. But quiet or otherwise, new appearance changes nothing in the content. We must remember that automated prosperity will always have unemployment as a concomitant and war as the only alternative. The one thing that is new is that state-capitalism has become so degenerate that it turns to "extremes" even though there is no economic depression for it.

Ever since DeSaulle came to power in 1958 in prosperous France, we have seen this new face of fascism which settles for nothing short of the aim of world power, but speaks, oh, so eloquently. Algerian wars are "settled" so that one can challenge United States atomic power for "co-leadership." Yesterday's "yellow peril" becomes today's pleasant partner so that one has some protection against the nearer enemy, "Europe of the Urals", i.e. Russia.

And in the United States, a Texas conservative "wars on poverty" and appears as a veritable fighter for "the great society" when placed alongside a Birchized Goldwater.

As for the civil rights bill, by the time Attorney General Robert Kennedy has gotten through compromising with Senator Dirksen, none of those who are fighting for civil rights in the streets will be able to recognize that as their aim.

The time to achieve unity of theory and practice is now.

-- RAY

(Labor Donated)

May 5, 1966
Marx's Birthday

PO MAO'S and DE GAULLE'S PRETENSIONS TO NEW WORLD
ROLES CHANGE THE INTERNATIONAL BALANCE OF POWER? :
The State of the World Economy and the Theory of
Retgression

Dear Friends:

At first glance it would appear that the third world of newly independent states of Africa, Asia, Latin America that signified the opening of a new era in 1960 has, by 1966, "perished". In place of either a new force from below, or a new ideology, we are confronted with a whole series of military take-overs and, from above, an opportunistic choosing of sides between the two nuclear titans who are heading for a new war for domination of the world. The ones who seem to be making the real challenges to U.S. and Russia are not new emergent forces but old, other rulers -- De Gaulle in Europe and Mao in the Orient.

It goes without saying that any serious analysis of events cannot ignore these world developments. In turning, however, to the economic foundation for these political developments, we must also bear in mind the following facts: (1) The resistance within the U.S. and within South Vietnam has, for the moment, halted the rush of the war hawks toward a war with China, the new contestant for world power. In the process, the U.S. has gotten so bogged down in Vietnam that it has very nearly forgotten Europe. (2) We now hear Gromyko adding his voice to that of De Gaulle for U.S.A. to get out of Europe. But it isn't only anti-Americanism which is the cement between these two strange "allies". That always is central, and no sooner had De Gaulle got power in 1958 than Khrushchev rushed to take advantage of the General's opposition to NATO. Where Khrushchev failed, Gromyko seems to be succeeding because, among other things, to anti-Americanism is added anti-West Germany. (3) Let's not forget, either, that this means De Gaulle's attempt to forge a new world axis via a Franco-German alliance has likewise "perished" once again -- to use that significant Hegelian phrase, which means both dead and yet preserved. (It would be good to reread not only the statement in News & Letters, October 1964, on the fall of Khrushchev -- and we were the only ones who related the fall to Germany which remains the key to Europe -- but also our analysis of the Franco-German axis in News & Letters, March 1963.) (4) Finally, Mao's China is a bit overconfident about "Mao's Thought", i.e. the predominance of politics over economics and too undisturbed about what the proletariat will do to his "philosophy" that it is their sweat that will build up a "new civilization" (sic!) on the ruins of what is left after a nuclear war "even if" it takes "one generation or two or three."

"TOO LIMITED CAPITAL", AND TOO MUCH RETGRESSION

The one sentence in China's accusation that U.S. was planning an Asian war that no one paid any attention to is, in fact, the most significant one. It relates to the state of the U.S. economy. The Jenmin Jih Pao Editorial (printed in the New York Times, April 7, 1966) buttressed its position that the U.S. might be "not all that much" and that it was "ready for a beating" if "simultaneously several anti-U.S. storms rise in the world" by this amazing statement: "U.S. imperialism has too limited capital...."

It would be all too easy to laugh at so poor and technologically underdeveloped a country as China saying to the richest and most technologically advanced land that the latter has 'too limited capital'. Instead of giving in to that temptation, let's disregard China's ulterior motives for playing down the nuclear titan as a "paper tiger" in order to induce all except the Chinese to fight U.S. imperialism -- to the last Vietnamese, Korean or Russian (if only they could get them to fight!). Let's get down to the root of the matter -- the U.S. does have "too little capital" -- too little capital to undertake serious industrialization of the technologically underdeveloped countries.

The objective world reality, capitalist world reality, is that the U.S. plutocracy, even with the "whole West" (including Russia in that "West"), cannot industrialize the technologically backward lands on whose super-profits it has lived so long, and which it is now drawing into the vortex of the world market only to impoverish them further. This is precisely what Marx was predicting in the twenty years he was studying the capitalist economy and showing that if it will continue on this crazy basis of building ever more machines and using ever fewer workers, the only source of surplus value, its law of motion is its law of collapse. Only an entirely different mode of production of value and surplus value could possibly change the direction of crises and collapse.

As matters stand now, the capitalist state cannot control its own capitalist corporations to invest, even with a guaranteed profit -- the political situation is too "unstable" and they get quicker and better profits in the more developed countries -- their own and those in Western Europe. This is precisely what De Gaulle has against American corporations. Which poor country could compete with GM? See "American Business Goes Global" in The New Republic, April 30, 1966. Or, better yet, look at any U.N. report on Africa, Asia (with the sole exception of Japan) or the Middle East or Latin America, and you will see that every one-crop economy is subjected to such strong winds from the world market that it not only is not better off since political independence; it is poorer. Hence, the military takeovers in Africa. What they seem not to know is that it will not help them a single bit economically, though politically, i.e. militarily, these regimes may be propped up -- till the next world crisis, or next war. That's all.

But, if it is true, as it is, that the rich countries are getting richer, and the poor poorer, what does Mao propose to do? The world already knows the disastrous consequences of Mao's "Great Leap Forward", its militarized labor, the slogan of "1 day = 20 years" -- which ended in near-famine

-3-

conditions for 650 million human beings. The point is that what sounded so revolutionary and was so retrogressionist was not seen even by us as the new theoretic foundation for his global aims until 1963, when we wrote: " By the time Chinese Communism reaches the fifth and final theme of its international manifesto of 'never, no, never again Russia' -- this time directed against Russia being ' a state of the whole people building communism' -- we are suddenly confronted with the most sinister of all theories of retrogression." (Marxism and Freedom, p. 320-1) Don't forget, however, that "theory" could appear revolutionary to others because it counterposed, to 'peaceful co-existence', Africa, Asia, Latin America as the "storm centers of revolution", which Russia was bent on subordinating because of its 'cowardice' when faced with U.S. atomic blackmail.

It is altogether different in 1966.

First of all, it should be made clear beyond the peradventure of a single doubt, that Mao's China knows it is absolutely impossible for China to achieve full industrialization in China, much less any part of the global power he aims for, without having the aid of at least some industrialized countries. This is so, despite all Mao's theories of villages "outflanking" cities (and thus avoiding proletarian revolution); and despite the latest theoretical statement by Marshall Lin Piao (September 3, 1965), extending Mao's theory to the world as a whole. That is to say, the "new universal" held that the underdeveloped countries, as "the world village", would "encircle" the technologically advanced countries, as the "world city". Furthermore, if the "East" is to prevail over the "West", it is Japan, as the only technologically advanced country in the Orient, and not China, that is crucial. Hence, although Mao "allowed" North Vietnam to be present at the 23rd RCP Congress, he would not allow the JCP to do so. This, although the world knows that the JCP had in fact fought for "united action" between Russia and China on the question of Vietnam. Indeed, all Mao's cards have been placed on Japan ever since, in October 1964, he exploded the A-bomb and moved the next August to have the JCP break up the World Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs at Hiroshima. But " the East wind will prevail over the West" sounded a lot more convincing before the disastrous admixture of opportunism and adventurism led to the collapse of the Djakarta-Peking Axis.

* (Footnote to p. 2) Anyone acquainted with our writings on Ghana will know that we have not only been most critical of Nkrumah, but that criticism came directly from African workers speaking for themselves. But it is utterly fantastic to make it now appear that it is the corruption alone, or even his superego that led to Nkrumah's downfall. Compared to Nigeria, for example, there has been a real revolution in Ghana and it was felt as such by the masses. There has also been more industrialization -- from the Volta project to some diversification away from total dependence on cocoa prices. But it could not go on within the context of the imperialist world market, especially when Nkrumah had gotten so isolated from the masses. It was then that he used that most precious source of human energy and 'miracle weapon' only as "matter" and not as thought. It was then that he forgot the power of ideas on a world scale. In their place Osagyefo put his playing high politics with but one pole of world capital, and Mao's "theories". He felt, but the ones who replaced him will even less be able either to keep Ghana truly independent or industrialized.

This being a nuclear age, Mao's China has had to be more crude and brutal and reveal his inhumanity to man, to mankind. Thus, as Defense Minister Chen Yi put it, "With the help of the atom bomb one may destroy one or two generations of people. But the third generation will rise to offer resistance..." In other words, because Mao's China seems to have made up its mind that 'Western Civilization is finished -- and the faster he can induce a war between the U.S. and Russia the quicker that will be achieved -- he cares nothing at all about sacrificing three generations of mankind.

Finally, there is the constant reiteration of the class struggle continuing for generations on end without, however, being permitted to fight against the state capitalist exploiters, which very obviously means that the workers are "to build up" -- capital! As Marx expressed it, when he discerned, under classical political economy's concern with accumulation of capital, their underlying philosophy that history had stopped with the bourgeois revolution: "Accumulate, accumulate! That is Moses and the prophets! ... Accumulation for accumulation's sake, production for production's sake; by this formula classical political economy expressed the historical mission of the bourgeoisie and did not for a single instant deceive itself over the birth-throes of wealth." (Capital, Vol. I, p. 652)

Obviously, although Mao too does not deceive himself as to the birth-throes, he is still deceiving a good part of the left, since it is very easy to be for proletarian revolutions in countries other than the one you rule over. Where, during World War II, when retrogressionism made its first appearance, the German section then expounding it claimed that the proletariat had so "retrogressed" because of Nazism, that the workers had first to learn "capitalist democracy" all over again, Mao's claim now is "revisionism" had "softened" Communism, which must continue to labor and labor harder, and the workers the hardest. The truth is this: What led to the moving backwards, not of the proletariat, but of Mao and Khrushchev, is the sight of the proletarian revolution demanding freedom from Communism and, by raising the banner of Marx's Humanism, spelling that out as Workers' Councils, or workers' control of production away from the centralized state.

In a word, the Hungarian Revolution showed so new, so high a stage of workers' consciousness, so free from any brainwashing by totalitarianism, so courageous in face of superior military might, and so confident that they knew how to do it better, in production, and in society, that both Khrushchev and Mao planned, first, a "retreat" -- one to deStalinization, the other to the "100 flowers" campaign." It was only when both methods failed that they split apart, each devising their global aims, sans consideration of the proletariat or the peasantry, or the revolution.

THE POLITICS OF THE SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT

Each day's news brings new accusations against Russia by China, the latest being its designation of Defense Minister Malinovsky as a "liar" for having stated that China had sabotaged the sending of Russian war materials to North Vietnam. The virulence of these statements have been played up in the daily press since the 23rd of March when China refused to attend the 23rd Congress of the RCP. The impression given is that the Congress marks the new stage of conflict. (See The New York Times, March 24, 1966, for the official text of the CCP statement as well as the "secret letter" of the RCP published in Die Welt in Hamburg.)

Actually (as I have shown in the article, "Are the United States and China Heading for War?" May 1966, News & Letters) the new stage of the Sino-Soviet Conflict is very nearly a year old, having begun on September 29, 1965, the eve of the September 30 coup in Indonesia. What is a great deal more important than any date is the new quality characterizing the conflict.

It is not a new stage within a certain orbit that may yet see a drawing together in face of any attack by "the main world enemy, U.S. imperialism", as they did in 1960 when 81 CP's, including the CCP, could still issue a "unanimous" statement. It was not only a question then of the fact that the U-2 spy plane over Russia united the two combatants as the missile crisis over Cuba in 1962 did not. On the contrary, the latter case only hastened to bring the "ideological" struggle to a climax the following year by the challenge the CCP issued to the RCP on June 14, 1963, for the leadership of the Communist world. Nevertheless, the height of the ideological struggle stopped short of any accusation of actual betrayal; possible betrayal was implicit, of course, but it was all "theoretical".

Above all, the fall of Khrushchev and the explosion of an atomic device in China, on the one hand, and the actual, outright bombing of North Vietnam by the U.S., gave rise to the illusion that there would be a softening of the conflict -- at least to the point of joint action in defense of their joint "socialist ally", North Vietnam. Instead, there was not only a hardening, but the conflict moved both from an ideological plane and that of different national power politics, to one of different global aims, those global aims not being restricted to the Communist world.

When the counter-coup in Indonesia succeeded and the massacre of the Communists began, Mao's China did not at once give up all hope of a Djakarta-Peking axis to challenge both the West and Russia, as witness its attendance of the World Conference Against Foreign Bases that was held in Djakarta. They even stood still as the police marched in and arrested the "native" Communists in attendance! And when in the following weeks there was no longer any doubt whatever that Indonesia, as Ben Bella's Algeria, were now lost to any realignment of "new Emerging Forces" in the

world, the line against Russia hardened to the point of accusation of actual betrayals.

Thus, the September 29th statement of "possible coordination of Soviet actions in the North of China with aggressive war of the U.S. against the Chinese People's Republic" was followed, on November 11th, by a statement of Kao Kolin in Lanchow: "We must be prepared at any time to ward off a combined attack from U.S. imperialism, modern revisionism and the reactionaries of various countries."

Thus, in the manner of the General Statement on June 14, 1963, the Peking Review on Nov. 12, 1965, devoted no less than 12 pages to this accusation: "They serve as a fire-brigade for U.S. imperialism, trying to stamp out the flames of revolution." It was entitled: "Refutation of the New Leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on 'United Action'". (I was in Hong Kong then and heard that this was issued as a separate pamphlet as well.)

Thus ended the attempts of "the new leaders", i.e., Brezhnev and Kosygin and the Central Committee of the RCP, which had begun with the fall of Khrushchev in October 1964. On February 1965, when Kosygin headed the delegation to North Vietnam that stopped off at Peking, it did appear that there would be a change of line. But instead this was followed the very same week with such incidents as Chinese demonstrators acting "on their own" in the various demonstrations ostensibly against the U.S. involvement, but actually against Russia, as witness the demonstration at the Russian Embassy in China.

During the whole month of June, the Chinese press devoted itself to playing up "Great Victories of Indonesian CP's Marxist-Leninist Line", reproducing not only Communist Aidit's speech, but President Sukarno's which had advised them to be "genuine Communists and not false Communists," i.e. Maoists and not "revisionists". Delegations from China went to Indonesia and from Indonesia to China to celebrate the 45th anniversary of the Indonesian Communist Party.

The following month Mao's China left the Joint (with Russia) Institute for Nuclear Research. We have seen the crescendo that the attacks had reached by fall when the accusations changed from mere attacks on "revisionism" to refusal for joint action on North Vietnam, and finally the accusation of "collusion" with U.S. imperialism against China itself.

This new quality the "secret" letter of the RCP correctly summarized: "The subdivision of the world into two contrasting systems, the socialist and the capitalist, has disappeared from the materials of the Chinese press..."

"The facts show that the CCP leaders today are directing their foreign policy activity not so much against the imperialists as against the Soviet Union ..."

"From all this it becomes clear that the Chinese leaders need a lengthy Vietnam war to maintain international tensions, to represent China as a 'besieged fortress'. There is every reason to assert that it is one of the goals of the policy of the Chinese leadership in the Vietnam question to ori-

ignite a military conflict between the USSR and the U.S. so that they may, as they say themselves, 'sit on the mountain and watch the fight of the tigers'."

"THE BALANCE OF POWER"

Naturally, Russia has no intention of obliging China. And it hopes that the U.S. is not so totally lacking in common sense as to interpret the Sino Soviet conflict as giving it a free hand in Vietnam and thus "accidentally" triggering World War III. At the moment, it is readying itself to receive General de Gaulle, and, in the process, teach the U.S. a lesson on where "the key to the international situation" lies: at the center of Europe.

Russia didn't succeed in its attempt to upset the balance of power, or, as it was more correctly called, balance of terror, by placing missiles in Cuba. But it certainly could by forging an alliance with France.

I do not believe France is prepared for any such deal. But if it isn't, it too can't upset the balance of power such as it issued from World War II. Though, with its Vichy collaborationists and its economic destruction, France had then lacked all power, not to mention "grandeur", whereas now it is the "new Europe" that was revived by the Marshall Plan, gained "grandeur" with De Gaulle, and has since so automated itself as to want to shake off U.S. domination -- it still is no new world power. Its nuclear capacity may be less laughable than Mao's, but it has still a long way to go to challenge either Russia or U.S. De Gaulle's dilemma is that only with Russia's nuclear might can he challenge the U.S., and only with the U.S. "nuclear umbrella" can he withstand, if anyone can withstand, Russian missiles. All he hopes really to achieve is "to shake up" U.S. complacency and arrogance. Only Mao, who has just enough of appreciation of the power of ideas to delude himself that his threadbare philosophy is that "miraculous" force, can think of wanting to take on both the U.S. and Russia.

It is too late in the life of fat, affluent, corrupt, senile capitalism for a third orbit of capitalist powers to rise to challenge the powers that be. And it is too late for the richest and/or the most nuclearly-armed to aim at single rule over the entire world without blowing it up.

The only way out, and the only third world is the one that came onto the historic stage in 1960 -- not only, however, the world of Africa, Asia, Latin-America, but also the world of youth, Negro, labor within the advanced countries -- East and West. The fatal illusion of world capitalism would be to think that Africa's or Latin America's or the Middle East's restlessness and dissatisfaction ended with the military takeovers and the

-2-

"recognition of the fact" that the poor are getting poorer and the rich richer.

On the other hand, though a new wave of revolutions -- social and not only political revolutions -- is sure to rise up, it would be total blindness for any New Left to think these would meet with success "if only they appreciate the value of organization." The African revolutions were organized, organized to death, with the single party, the vanguard party, the organization of their whole lives. What the new epoch should have taught us is that no revolution can succeed when philosophy does not "join" revolution not merely as its underlying theory, but as an overriding fact.

-- RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

POSTSCRIPT: In the two weeks between the time this letter was written (as a follow -up to the lead article in the May issue of News & Letters) and today. May 20, 1966, the civil war in South Vietnam has finally erupted into the open. It goes without saying that it is impossible to compress, into a post-script, an analysis of so momentous an event. And yet it is impossible to delay commenting, no matter how briefly, on the totally new situation. It is quite clear that nothing, no matter how base, including genocide, is beneath U.S. imperialism's puppet, General Ky. The already naked neocolonialist nature of Johnson's war has by now a clearly fascist character, that is to say, total disregard for humanity; world domination is its only preoccupation.

There is only one way to compel the U.S. military to leave South Vietnam. It is the way of self-development of the revolution. This is what the Buddhists know and fear. The key question, therefore, is: will the fear of a self-developing mass revolt, with its own dialectic, so inhibit the Buddhist leaders that they will once again channelize the civil war into support of yet another military junta?

The NLF too must enter the situation in a new way. The question is will the NLF continue on a divisive path which gives the impression of "choosing sides" between China, Russia and the U.S. instead of fighting for true independence from all? Will it now unfurl a banner which espouses a philosophy and a practice of freedom, thus uniting the nation at last?

Only under such conditions can an appeal also be made to the American GI's. Let's not forget that American troops were brought to Russia during their Revolution, but refused to fire on the indigenous revolutionaries. The American GI's showed the same attitude at the end of World War II when they demanded immediate return to the U.S. The Administration was compelled to carry out the fastest demobilization in history. It can also be compelled to withdraw from Vietnam now.

The essence of Marx's Humanism is, precisely, this vision of self-acting man as the axis for all else, including the military. Not only can such aspirants for world power as De Gaulle and Mao be undermined, but the nuclear titans can also be stopped in their tracks. But to achieve this, a revolutionary force must know how not to separate its mass might from its struggle for the minds of men -- all men who want freedom, total freedom.

R.D.

3152