

REB DRAFT PERSPECTIVES 1972-73

WAYS TO COMBAT
"PAX AMERICANA":

NIXON'S SCORCHED EARTH POLICY,
PLUNGE INTO STATE-CAPITALISM,
THE NEW WORLD COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY
ORDER, AND RAGING RACISM

- I. The Vietnam War and Global Summitry
- II. Racism, State-Capitalism -- and Global Summitry
- III. The Almost-Revolution and the Almost-Dialectic
- IV. Our Tasks

Pre Convention Bulletin Number One
July 1972

35¢

NEWS & LETTERS 1900 E. JEFFERSON DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48207

4486

REB DRAFT PERSPECTIVES -- 1972-73WAYS TO COMBAT PAX AMERICANA: NIXON'S SCORCHED EARTH POLICY, PLUNGE INTO STATE-CAPITALISM, THE NEW WORLD COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY ORDER, AND RAGING RACISMI. The Vietnam War and Global Summitry

The carnage Nixon has ordered in Vietnam, in the South as well as the North, has resulted in the kind of "mistake" only a mad nuclear world can visit on the innocents -- napalming children! No surrealist painting of wildly imagined horrors could have matched the unspeakable human tragedy as mothers and fathers were running with their naked burned children in their arms. At the very moment when, thereby, we were witnessing the transformation of My Lais into a veritable "way of life", the "patriotic" American way of life, the madman who had ordered ceaseless bombing displayed the further unspeakable hypocrisy by declaring his flying about the world with a head full of blueprints for global realignment, a foundation for nothing short of "a generation of peace!" A press that can report such absolute opposites as if there were a grain of truth in the forked-tongue talk of peace, and that the atrocity in Vietnam is only one more example -- and not an uncommon one -- that "war is hell", is, in actuality, offering proof that we have, indeed, reached the end of "civilization"! And when such a President can be welcomed both in Peking and Moscow, the one-world rottenness smells to high heaven.

An end must be put to this not-so-creeping barbarism! The attempt to close all doors to revolutionaries and call the No Exit sign "peaceful co-existence" cannot change the stark truth: Betrayal by any other name still equals counter-revolution.

In this most savage imperialistic U.S. war in Vietnam, there never has been anything to match the genocidal raids on dikes which, if continued, would be so dehumanized an act as to outdo Nazism itself. Thus far, the Nixon Administration has denied them, but, far from being "propaganda", the correspondent of Agence France-Press, Jean Thoraval, has testified to witnessing the results of such bombings: "The landscape was almost what one would find on the moon." (quoted by Anthony Lewis in the New York Times 6/26/72) The most perceptive and moving reports from Hanoi that Lewis reported were so vehemently attacked by this Administration that they dared call that respectable bourgeois paper "a conduit for enemy propaganda". The bestiality of the Vietnam war both against the people and the land, and not only in the North, but in the South, were summarized in a study by Professors Preiffer and Arthur Westing in the May issue of Scientific American. Since 1965, the scorched earth policy has resulted in 25 million craters on the land surface of a country the size of Montana. From 1965-1971 U.S. forces used 26 billion pounds of explosives, i.e., twice as much as the U.S. had used during World War II in all theaters of combat. Of these 21 billions exploded in South Vietnam. That is to say, in the small country we're supposed to be "protecting from Communism" the millions of craters displaced 2.75 billion cubic

-2-

yards of earth. Now that the U.S. is also venturing into systematic bombing of the dikes, will the "socialist lands" continue to relate to Nixon as, to use Mao's phrase, "less bad"? "Less bad" than what dehumanized brute? That such genocide can take place without any serious intervention by China or Russia puts the seal of bankruptcy not only on "Western" but "Eastern" civilization!

The attempt to cover up the barbarity of the war with the gloss of global summitry makes it imperative to fight, to destroy the triangular "world order", and this cannot be done with "activity" alone; it must equally be combatted with a philosophy of revolution that is a philosophy of liberation. To separate the philosophy of revolution from its reality is to reduce the struggle for total freedom to a matter of choosing "the lesser evil", thereby making the descent to the bigger evil inevitable.

Because when our age has not been plagued by counter-revolution, it has been plagued by aborted revolutions, we must, once and for all, face the dialectic of revolution: no revolution can be completed without a philosophy of liberation. It is not enough to show our solidarity with the Vietnamese revolutionaries; we must work for the unity of theory and practice of revolution leading to a totally new social order. Therefore, we cannot remain at the stage of total opposition to Nixon alone. We must also expose the way in which, first China, and then Russia have taken Nixon off the hot seat at the very moment that the mass anti-Vietnam war outpouring (following Nixon's 1970 invasion of Cambodia and the Kent massacre of the students who rebelled against it), the intensified stage of the Black revolution, and the economic crisis producing labor restlessness combined to shake the Administration to its roots.

It is necessary to turn back the pages of history to 1970 not merely because that was the year of our last convention, but because that was the year when Nixon chose to transform the Vietnam war into the Second Indochina War with his invasion of Cambodia. So deep and endless were the crises in the year, 1970, that they compelled the Cold War warrior and "free-enterpriser" Nixon, at one and the same time, on to unprecedented global summitry and the equally (for Nixon) unprecedented state-capitalist path at home. The two historic moves -- Nixon's "New Economic Policy" and global summitry with Peking -- are hardly unrelated to his savagery in the Vietnam war while mouthing words of "a generation of peace". Contradiction piled upon contradiction bespeak Nixon's vision of a "New World Order": Pax Americana.

In their totality, the 1970 crises transformed Nixon into a consummate state-capitalist. This process, which took two years to mature, did not at first appear as a process. Rather, it appeared as a shocking overnight development in "foreign policy", which followed quickly after Nixon had been thrust on the hot seat by the ramifications at home of his invasion of Cambodia. While Nixon's very own 20th century Metternich, Dr. (Strangelove!) Kissinger, was devising "new international relations", the economic crises kept growing both at home and abroad, where the

international monetary crisis was the worst since the Depression, and, indeed, the imbalance of payments, trade, deficits had not been seen since 1893. And, along with galloping inflation, came also the decline in the rate of profit. Insofar as Nixon, weighted down by the fear that he would be but a "one-term president", was concerned, a decline in the rate of profit was as threatening to the capitalist system as fear of revolution! The compulsion to do something drastic to save the system was soon to send him, at one and the same time, on a plunge into state-capitalism at home and to fantastic adventures abroad.

On the 1971 preparations for the Peking trip, no one underestimated the historic turnabout by the No. 1 Cold War warrior who, up to then, had chalked up all his political successes from the 1950's to 1971 on the theme that the Democratic Party had committed "20 years of treason" by "losing China" -- which was supposed to have been the result of Roosevelt's "socialistic" state intervention into the economy with the "New Deal" and an endless succession of "hidden Communists" high in the echelons of state power. Few, however, fully grasped the equally shocking plunge into state-capitalism by this "private enterpriser" living in the age of state-capitalism.

Nixon-style state-capitalism was new, not in the sense of being a transformation into absolute opposite -- as was the transformation into opposite of the first workers' state into Russian state-capitalist society, nor was it a photocopy of the Nazi horrors into which a capitalism in total defeat, despair and degeneration had plunged Germany. But it was a descent into the quagmire of state-control of a crisis-ridden decaying capitalism, a discontinuity from the body of private competitive as well as monopoly capitalism. And, just as out of the Great Depression a variety of forms of state-capitalism sprang up to save capitalism from proletarian revolution, and just as the planning of war-time capitalism continued into the post-war capitalism, though West Europe preferred such terms as "indicative planning" rather than the State Plan, so Nixon, heading the crisis-ridden U.S. capitalism of the 1970's, felt the compulsion to plan, to "discipline" the economy. The new in the Nixon-style state-capitalism is its simultaneity, at one and the same time, with raging racism and global summitry. That the global summitry is with state-capitalist societies calling themselves "Communist" changes neither Nixon's concept of the new world order nor the state-capitalist nature of the Sino-Soviet orbit become the Sino-Soviet conflict. As we showed from the start of that open conflict in 1960, the possibility of war between them is not out of the question. This is not, however, the place to develop that. Here we are concerned with the counter - revolution at home. (The two issues of News & Letters, April and June-July 1972, on the trip to Peking and the one to Moscow, are to be considered part of the REB Draft Perspectives.)

-4-

II. Racism, State-Capitalism -- and Global Summitry

Nixon, the great believer in, planner and practitioner of the shock treatment, brought 1971 to an end with, on the one hand, the finalization of the trip to Peking without the consultation either with Congress or with his international allies, and, on the other hand, announcing, Emperor-like, a 90-day freeze of wages and prices, especially wages. At the same time he suddenly not only slapped a surcharge on exports from his closest private capitalistic allies -- Japan and West Germany -- but, as world trader temporarily turned isolationist, also broadly hinted that all alliances are up for grabs because he now had a vision of a new World Order. Having thus shaken up the whole world, Nixon carried out what was uppermost in his spurious vision at home: having found in racism a way to keep labor divided, he proceeded, at one and the same time, to keep labor in harness, and to initiate still another counter-revolution against every aspect of the Black Revolution.

The "Negro Question" has ever been the touchstone of American civilization that exposed the hollowness of its democracy -- from the very moment of its birth, with the Declaration of Independence that rested on Black slavery, down to the latest Nixon moves to turn the clock of history back on even so elementary a question as education. What is new in the state-capitalist age is that Nixon, having found in racism a way to break up the total opposition of the working class against his "New Economic Policy", is aiming to take control of the very mode of life of all.

The neo-fascist aspects surfaced with Wallace, whose demagoguery created a "mass base" for racism. Nixon, who was quick enough back in 1970 (when the massacre in Mississippi had not brought out any mass outpouring comparable to what the Kent massacre produced) to keep backtracking on civil rights, had, by the time of Wallace's primary victory in Florida, not only felt free to continue with his violation of court orders, but to introduce bills into Congress which would legislate racism, now euphemistically called the "Higher Education Bill" and "delayed busing". Obviously, 18 years on top of a full century after a Civil War still didn't produce "sufficient time" for America's type of "democracy" to work its wonders. (By the time Wallace was chalking up victories in the North as well as the South, Congress gave Nixon what he wanted.)

Whether or not Wallace can continue now that he is physically incapacitated to be the leader of racist counter-revolution; whether or not racism will help elect Nixon; and whether or not the liberals can "reduce" it into a "local" issue, the point is that racism, having always been the Great Divide, has, with state-capitalism, become Nixon's "unique" contribution. Neo-fascism surely has a new face. Nixon has made it as respectable as "lovable" Archie Bunker has made bigotry the "in" thing. We would forget at our peril that Nazism wasn't the only form of fascism nor Quisling the only form of collaborationism; that it was ingrained in "Western civilization" at its highest cultural level, France. Just how ingrained it was can

-5-

be seen in a film, "Days of Pity" (which is still forbidden in France) . Most important of all, it is in our day appearing in all sorts of new "little ways" like anti-busing. When Nixon rolls the clock of history backward on "education", we must not forget that question relates not alone to the 1954 Supreme Court decision, but all the way back to the period of the post-Civil War President Johnson who first violated the victory of the Civil War. Nixon's brand of state-capitalism is not only inseparable from his Pax Americana globalism, but also from the neo-fascist elements in Wallaceism, armed with state-power.

Take, first, the economy -- the 90 day wage-freeze which merged into the not so temporary state control of the economy called Phase Two. The alleged ground for the sudden state intervention into the economy where wages were frozen but profits were free to roam, was supposed to be that the profits would go into capital expansion which would create thousands upon thousands of new jobs so that not only would we have "nearly full employment" but inflation would stop -- not to mention the righting of the balance of payments crisis, which the government was helping through its surcharge. Thus, the private enterpriser put an end to the holy "self-regulating market mechanism", and decreed the state as the supreme planner. The one "principle" that never changes under capitalism, be it privately or state-managed, is the extraction of surplus value, i.e. unpaid hours of labor, euphemistically called "labor productivity". It is that which Nixon made the pivot of his New Economic Policy. Under state tutelage, the economy did, indeed, "turn the corner". Here is how:

1) Profits have skyrocketed. For the first half of 1971 profits after taxes have risen 19 percent as compared to 1970.

2) On the other hand, for "total" wages it has been only 6.6 percent. If even we would forget that "total" means not just wages, but also salaries, and disregard that it thus does not show the pittance it has meant in the rise of factory wages, the increase of "average" profits has been three times that of wages. Not only that. For the 100 largest corporations, profits have risen not just 19 percent, but 76 percent.

3) at the same time, inflation keeps galloping at the rate of 8.4 percent annually! High prices is not an uncommon capitalist trick of cutting wages. Long before Keynesian discovery of deficit financing, 100 years back, Marx had shown that the national debt is the only "wealth" that belongs to the proletariat.

4) Finally, and most unbearable, instead of anything remotely resembling "full employment", there has been no lowering whatever of the unemployment. Not only that, the average 5.9 percent is a complete fake. Take, for example, veterans; unemployment among them is 8.1 percent and for the young among them (20 to 24 years) it is 10.4 percent. Or take the Blacks -- it is double that. Or take the Black youth -- it is so high, they have stopped keeping records!

Each of these results compounds the contradictions besetting U.S. capitalism. Thus, the very fact that, capitalistically, production has "turned the corner" and profits are rising while unemployment refuses to go away, only proves that the unemployed army comes to the fore not only during economic crises, but

has, in fact, become a permanent feature of automated capitalist production, even as inflation comes with "prosperity". There is no other way for capitalism to shift to the shoulders of the masses the burden also of such "non-profitable", i.e., destructive production (which cannot possibly cede capital accumulation for expanded reproduction) as \$30 billion annually on the never-ending Vietnam War, not to mention the fantastic type of nuclear militarization now being demanded for TRIDENT, ULM, and all other offensive nuclear weapons for this era of "peaceful co-existence."

The greatest fraud perpetrated by Nixon's summitry in Moscow is the so-called Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty which is so full of loopholes that there is nothing that couldn't slip through it. First, of course, is the fact that it doesn't destroy anything, though there is enough nuclear weaponry on each side to kill the other ten times over. Secondly, in "holding" it at the level achieved, there is nevertheless no limitation either on the number or power of warheads that can be affixed. In a word, each warhead can and will "suddenly" expand, as, indeed, the Russians are doing to catch up with U.S. MIRV, and the U.S. is doing to catch up with Russian submarines. At the same time, not a word was said either about the 500 U.S. so-called tactical fighters in Europe, or, for that matter, in Thailand or Guam or wherever -- nor about Russia's 700 medium range ones whether aimed at Western Europe or China or wherever.

As if all that, and more, are not sufficient loopholes, Laird is busy calling for greater military expenditures and calling any one in Congress who dares question, would-be traitors who are "raising the white flag of surrender". The fact that Nixon can deny any contradiction in his Defense Secretary Laird's statement that, if Congress fails to approve the extra billions for nuclear weaponry he would oppose the SALT agreement, is proof of only one thing: for Nixon, words have truly and fully lost all meaning. After all, he of the forked-tongue is the one who ordered the holocaust against Vietnam at the very moment he pontificated about a "generation of peace."

At the same time, lest anyone think that Nixon, being a great believer in profits, would give full freedom to private capitalism to proceed on its path also of world trade, Nixon made sure to let both Big Business here, and Russia, know differently. Thus, just when U.S. business, on the one hand, found its mouth watering as, last December, former Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans returned from a visit to Russia and talked enthusiastically about possible new trade ventures with Russia amounting to no less than "billions"; and, on the other hand, Russia had its visions for easy credit and U.S. computer know-how raised to such heights that they were turning their eyes the other way as Nixon mined Haiphong on the very eve of his departure for Russia, Nixon made sure that nothing of the kind happened at his Moscow summit.

that,

The press was right to report/, instead of a trade bombshell coming out of the Moscow summit, out came a popgun. But it only showed that it, itself, was brainwashed to think that this was a material question, be it enormous Tsarist debts or "complexities" of present trade. No, Nixon was completely political about "trading". He wanted nothing short of Russia helping him not just to

"save face" in the Vietnam War, but actually to have it ended on his imperialistic terms: Pax Americana. And, at the same time, he was teaching his capitalists the full implications of state intervention in the economy as it applies to them. They must learn to recognize the state as the new regulator of the economy, and to obey the state injunctions in world trade. In a word, not only does he hit out against workers, which you expect of him as a good capitalist, but against any separation of economic^s from politics by capitalists, which is precisely what state-capitalism is.

The one word of truth the President uttered as he asked Congress to approve SALT on his return from the Moscow summit was that three-fifths of the world's population have lived all their lives under frightful nuclear terror. What he failed to add is that they will hardly take the word of the male witch that he is, as to how to end that nuclear terror, much less help him give life to it by further "scientific" buildup.

III. The Almost-Revolution and the Almost-Dialectic

We do not mean that we are on the road to world revolution when the counter-revolutions flourish and when not only state-capitalist societies calling themselves Communist block every road to social revolution that emerges spontaneously, but also the independent Left continues to wear blinders even though "the world revolutionary" Mao Tse-tung had just laid out the red carpet for Nixon, and the "revisionist" Brezhnev proclaimed that there is "no alternative to peaceful co-existence" with Nixon who had just mined Haiphong. Just as the struggle to end the U.S. bombing of Vietnam cannot be considered "tactic", so the expose of China's and Russia's role is an imperative step to the ability to unfurl a totally new freedom banner, without which self-paralysis will surely set in.

It isn't true that the blinders about the "socialist" betrayal have only been put on now because "first" the Vietnam war must end and the U.S. began that. World War II and its end has put these blinders on the Left because so integral to our state-capitalist age is the administrative mentality that it refused to see the bipolar world for what it was, not a struggle between "socialism" and "capitalism" but a battle between two capitalisms fighting for the mastery of the world. The fact that it has now become a tri-polar world at least potentially is itself manifestation of the Big Divide in the Sino-Soviet world become the Sino-Soviet conflict. That conflict arose when a whole new Third World was born without the aid either of Russia or China, and each wished to dominate that new independent world. Instead of seeing that the concept of world-revolution had thereby disappeared as anything concrete, instead of turning away, therefore, from either pole and starting a new page of freedom by listening to the voices from below who had spontaneously upsurged in revolutions, and from that practice were moving both to theory and a new society, the new intelligentsia has attached itself to one or the other of the existing Communist state-powers.

By the time of the almost-revolution in France, May 1968, the New Left seemed to learn from it that theory cannot after all be left to be picked up "en

route". So overpowering, however, was the New Left's illusions about Mao's so-called Cultural Revolution, as if that were the realization of Marx's theory of the permanent revolution, that none set down to work out a new relation of theory to practice, the dialectic of thought, rooted in the new spontaneous outbursts. Instead, the dialectic of revolution itself was reduced, at best, to "strategy" as if that were the equivalent of Marx's philosophy of liberation, and, most often, to "tactics" as if it had been merely a question of which corner to turn at to reach the battlefield, to erect "the barricades." The almost-dialectic, like the almost-revolution, left thought in an unfinished state as were the aborted revolutions. Thus, the shock waves set off in 1971 by Mao's invitation to Nixon failed to disturb even so theoretical a Communist Party breakaway as Italy's Il Manifesto. Instead, it maintained that "because" "we in the West" had not "made the revolution", we "forced" that "world revolutionary Mao" to embark on the "tactic."

Chou En-lai was so happy with such an attitude to the objective situation that he proceeded to use the dialectic to whitewash the U.S. as if he were meeting, not Nixon, but with "the American people", pontificating to reporters about how "The inevitable in history often comes about through the accidental." Of necessity, and by premeditation, this almost-dialectic about the relationship between the accidental and the inevitable left out its relationship to development through contradiction, to transformation into opposite, and, above all, to the negation of the negation, that is to say, permanent revolution. Though the Cultural Revolution began with the order "to bombard the Party headquarters", and ended with a Constitution that proclaimed this to be the "era of world revolution", the only concrete results were the removal of the one anointed to become Mao's successor -- Defense Minister Lin Biao -- followed by the summit with Nixon who had theretofore been called "the lord of the plague and war" who headed U.S. imperialism, "Enemy No. 1" of the masses of the world.

It was no accident that, once the first workers' state was transformed into its opposite, a state-capitalist society of the 1930's, Stalin followed up the objective movement with the subjective proclamation of "the laws of the dialectic" by eliminating its soul -- "the negation of the negation", i.e. the continuing, the permanent, the world revolution as developed by Marx and Lenin. Nor was it an accident that, when in the midst of World War II, Stalin suddenly admitted that the law of value did, indeed, operate in Russia, he demanded that the dialectic structure of Marx's Capital not be followed. (After all, if one studied Capital as Marx had written it, he would have found in the very first chapter, which Stalin was so anxious to skip, that not only was the value-form distinctively capitalistic, but the only way to strip off the fetishism of commodities is to be free.) And it was no accident that, once Mao in the mid-1930's had decided upon a nationalist road to power, he would denude the dialectical principle, contradiction, of the class nature Marx saw in it, as in life. Inexorably, the substitution of petty bourgeois subjectivism for objectivity led to replacing the thought of One for the "masses as Reason" -- and the super-structural "Cultural Revolution" for Marx's concept of the incompatibility of economic enslavement with political freedom and vice versa, and, therefore, the need for the "permanent revolution."

Put briefly, the more "Marxism-Leninism" is bandied about, the less it is practiced.

To this day, none has grasped the methodology as worked out by Marx on the basis of the Hegelian dialectic and re-discovered by Lenin when the undialectic, vulgar materialism of the Second International led to its collapse at the outbreak of World War I -- though it was that methodology, just that dialectic, which was Lenin's theoretic preparation for the actual, the only, the historic proletarian revolution. As if the transformation of the workers' state into its opposite, state-capitalism, which brought about the abandonment of world revolution for "socialism in one country", was not as drastic a deviation as that of competition into monopoly which brought the downfall of the Social-Democracy, none of the New Left to this day have done more than to keep adding "facts" to Lenin's Imperialism, precisely on the basis of the underconsumptionist methodology (now called Consumerism) that Lenin had rejected. None have grounded their studies in his dialectics, "the dialectic of history", "the dialectic of revolution", digging "deeper and lower", though it is our age that has witnessed a movement from below that has simultaneously been a movement to theory as well as a new society -- a movement not from "the vanguard party", not from theory, but from practice.

(While this is not the place to detail what, comprehensively, can only be done in book-form, as in Philosophy and Revolution, one should at least realize the simple fact, that to treat Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks as mere "jottings" is to enter into a veritable conspiracy with the bourgeoisie who disregard that work, ostensibly for its non-professional philosophy, but in fact because it is philosophic foundation for actual revolution.)

If we are not to continue with endless almost-revolutions that only allow the counter-revolution to succeed, we must put an end both to the empiricism and the degradation of dialectics to "culture". If ever the intellectual wished a serious revolutionary role, one that is not elitist, but indispensable because without the philosophy of liberation the revolution itself is aborted, this is the time for uniting with the proletariat, for self-discipline, for starting where the workers are, where the new passions and forces for reconstructing society on totally new beginnings are already on the move.

The advantages we do have are that there is an anti-Vietnam war movement; there is a continuous Black mass revolt, both in the factories and out; and that among intellectuals, too, there is a hunger for philosophy so that even the questioning "what is my role?" has been raised not in an elitist, vanguard party to lead sense, but as a question of how to unite with labor.

There is very little time in a nuclear world, but we do have a little time provided we hurry, provided we do not dilly-dally, provided we under no circumstances whatever allow any division to creep in between philosophy and revolution. There can be no successful social revolution without a philosophy of liberation, a Marxist-Humanist perspective.

Our Tasks

Our tasks are clear, have already begun with the new type of activity within the Movement where we will no longer separate the projection of Marxist-Humanism from our activity. The battle of ideas must by no means be restricted to our own press. Instead,

1) the very concentration on the factory and proletarianization of the organization demands that the work in rank and file caucuses as well as leaflets distributed must project Marxist-Humanism in as concrete a way as the actual struggle both against management and against the labor bureaucracy on specific issues the workers raise.

2) a special appeal must be made to intellectuals whom we have heretofore pretty much disregarded. The very fact that the anti-Vietnam war movement is at an impasse, has very nearly simply substituted "End the bombing" for "Bring the boys back home" creates opportunities for projection of Marxist-Humanism that is so total as not only to develop the theory of state-capitalism as a world stage and as an expose of Russia and China, but also to show its incompleted stage where it is inseparable from Marxist-Humanist philosophy.

3) the projection of the Black masses as vanguard remains central to all our work, but this must now be supplemented by engaging in a direct battle of ideas with the "Talented Tenth", where these hang on to one or the other of the state-capitalist societies calling themselves Communist.

4) the Youth, Women's Liberation, the work with Chicanos and Indians as well as Blacks, must be concretized and, at the same time, we must practice projecting Philosophy and Revolution. Before its publication is the time not alone to practice its dialectic, its type of analysis of the current and constantly changing scene, as well as working it out as organization. It is the organizational expression of Philosophy and Revolution which will help speed its publication not only as book, but as the form of activity that will change reality.

Finally, (5) each country has its two worlds -- workers and capitalists -- and none more so than the U.S., even as none other has its enemy more imperially engaged in war right now. But this concentration on the home front can under no circumstances be separated from the projection of the concept and activity for world revolution.

* * *