

National Chairwoman's Perspectives Report
to Plenum of News and Letters Committees
September 1, 1979

Price 75¢

ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE 1980S

AS OBJECTIVE REVOLUTIONARY NEW BEGINNINGS AND AS DEADLINE FOR
ROSA LUXEMBURG, TODAY'S WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT, AND
MARX'S PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION

BY RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA

CONTENTS

- I. The Overview: New Beginnings vs. Decadent Capitalism in Disorder
- II. The World Recession, Oil and SALT II
 - 1) The myriad political-economic crises
 - 2) Without a philosophy of revolution: oil and the PLO gaining a foothold with Black leaders
- III. Objective Significance of "Subjective" 1980 Deadline
OR
Can We Aid the New Beginnings -- the Momentous World Historic Events of Our Decade -- Develop Instead of Abort?

*POSTSCRIPT

APPENDIX. Eyewitness International Reports: From Europe and the Middle East

Published by
News and Letters Committees 2832 E Grand Blvd Rm 316 Detroit, Michigan 48211
5904

5 9 0 5

National Chairwoman's Report to Plenum
of News and Letters Committees, Sept. 1, 1979 --

ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE 1980S,
AS OBJECTIVE REVOLUTIONARY NEW BEGINNINGS AND AS DEADLINE FOR
ROSA LUXEMBURG, TODAY'S WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT, AND
MARX'S PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION

by Raya Dunayevskaya

I. The Overview: New Beginnings vs. Decadent Capitalism in Disorder

The decade of the 1970s is ending with the capitalistic world order in total disorder. When the 1973 Arab-Israeli war led to the 1974 quadrupling of oil prices, it descended upon U.S. imperialism, which already had been creaking because of its imperialist war in Vietnam. The Johnson Administration of "guns and butter" refused to acknowledge that not only the armed might but the economy had been drained. The truth is that the economy had sustained hardly bearable gashes in its very structure -- or, if you wish, nature. This year it has become impossible for the capitalists and their ideologues to predict any sort of boom, no matter how hard they try to play down the recession we're in as "mild", with their computerized gimmicks playing the "future's" game. Nor can U.S. imperialism saddle "others" -- OPEC, or Andrew Young -- with the myriad political crises it is causing very nearly daily.

Quite the contrary. The political crises, like the economic crises, stem from this decrepit capitalistic-imperialist world system, with its two nuclear Titans -- U.S. and Russia -- fighting for single world rule. No matter how hard rulers pretend, with SALT I and SALT II, that they will slow the armaments race, the goal is so clearly preparation for the unthinkable world holocaust that even so bourgeois a paper as the New York Times, which is for SALT II, feels compelled to entitle its editorial, "Arms Control Out of Control" (8/15/79).

If anyone needed any further proof of capitalistic disarray, just take a second look at what happened last month at the last summit, as the technologically most advanced countries-- the six Western nations and Japan -- arrived at a "consensus" and promised to act in common against OPEC's ceaseless rises in prices. Each went its own way to try to conclude a separate deal with the oil potentates, including their opportunistic embrace of the PLO. Making Andrew Young the scape-

5905

-2-

goat for that attempted shift in global politics can hardly convince a child -- and Israel is no child! -- that Young acted alone. After all, before Camp David, long before, Carter-Vance even tried an official deal with both Russia and the PLO.

Not to be discounted is its ramification in the attitudes of Black leaders (with which we will deal later). Here what needs to be stressed is the timing: that it takes place after Camp David, after the actual signing of the so-called Egypt-Israel peace treaty, and after Sadat declared himself all too eager to also fill the Shah's role and be the U.S.'s policeman in the Middle East. What this signifies is an admission of failure of the Camp David extravaganza. What is new is the abysmal depth of the totality not only of the global economic-political crises, but the proliferation of A-bomb know-how in the backwaters as well as the Atlantic-Pacific-Gulf's preserves; witness Pakistan aiming for "a Moslem bomb".

Here, too, no scapegoat, be it India or Pakistan's General Zia, will be able to cover up the fact that the ground for this "advance" in so poverty-stricken and technologically backward a country has been laid by no less a fantastic and unholy amalgam as Mao's China, Nixon-Kissinger's attempt to get that "China card", and the Leftist head of the state, Bhutto, whom his bloody successor, General Zia, hanged after he obtained the secret for making an A-bomb. The U.S.'s present threats to Pakistan may be welcomed by India, which, while busy issuing its own threats, has already built its own bomb -- but that will hardly divert attention from the U.S.'s super-titanic, insane build-up, when it already has enough to kill all of humanity many times over, much less bring "stability" into Carter's ever-wobbly shifts in global dealings. Running helter-skelter has never been a manifestation either of "leadership" or even knowing ^{to} where one is marching. Nor can "anarchists" be conjured up to explain such total chaos and mayhem.

No. So organic -- to the very marrow of its bones -- is the disorder of the decrepit capitalistic-imperialistic system in this state-capitalist age that nothing whatever can help it. It needs to be totally uprooted.

As against these spectacles, at the absolute opposite of this nuclear insanity, there does sprout up from below now, human beginnings. Three events -- one seemingly subjective and two objective -- do illuminate both the month of August which has just ended and the year 1979 which is on its way out. The two

5906

great objective events are the Nicaraguan Revolution and the new phase of Chapter two of the Iranian Revolution, opened up by the most massive demonstrations against Khomeini since the overthrow of the Shah.

That the counter-revolution has also reached a new stage with Khomeini declaring himself Supreme Commander, and unleashing a murderous campaign against the Kurds, can't erase the still ongoing revolutionary resistance. Don't forget that no one expected the Shah to fall that easily, either. The new phase that has just begun is the mass nature of the demonstrations against Khomeini. What the women first opened on International Women's Day has now been both broadened and deepened, not only because both men and women have shown their deep opposition, and not only because it was against any censorship, but because it is clear to all by now that this time the revolutionaries who made the revolution against the Shah and U.S. imperialism are working out new ways of freedom — total freedom. The Kurds are out front and they are not alone.

It is the new beginnings in Latin America and Iran as well as the undercurrent of revolt throughout the Middle East that have transformed that torpid month of August, which has nearly always stood for counter-revolution. The specific August which the mass media are now playing up most is not the infamous day that U.S. imperialism dropped the A-bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which they lightly skim over, but the notorious date of Aug. 24, 1939, which enters the world's history book as the horrific day when Hitler and Stalin signed the pact which gave the green light to World War II. And, within seven short days — 40 years from this very day, Sept. 1 — came the invasion of Poland.

(Permit me one aside. Though not related to the month of August, it is of great importance to the concept of new beginnings, objectively as well as subjectively. No revolutionary, of course, denies the horror of the Hitler-Stalin pact, which at one and the same time released Nazism for World War II and gave proof of the hideous transformation into opposite of the first workers' state into a state-capitalist monstrosity. But, as we fought against it, what we were looking for were revolutionary new beginnings that would arise from within the imperialist war and that came, precisely, at the point where it started, with the Great Warsaw Uprising in 1943 .

We did not wait four decades to declare that event a signal for a totally new stage throughout Europe of its resistance against Nazi occupation. In designating that event as "All roads lead to Warsaw"

we were showing its significance as it happened, and as it "coincided" with the appearance of new beginnings in the U.S., as both the General Miners' Strike and Black uprising erupted in the U.S., the first time there was ever such an occurrence when the country was at war. Chou En-lai, in 1971, tried to whitewash his rolling out the red carpet for Nixon by misusing the Hegelian concept of the relationship of the accidental to the inevitable by saying that "the inevitable in history often occurs through the accidental." But here, in 1943, in Poland it did, indeed, happen. Which is why those new beginnings were, and remain, epochal both in fact and in cognition. All we have to do is unify fact and thought and put them into practice.)

Now then. When we point to new beginnings this August, 1979, it is again in order to show that unless these new beginnings are in thought as well as in fact, we will not be able to meet today's challenge. And it is this which determined the inclusion, among the new beginnings, of the deadline of 1980 as the so-called subjective element. I say "so-called subjective" because the truth is that it isn't subjective. Not only do all the aborted revolutions demand a reconsideration of the relationship of theory to practice but, above all, there have actually sprung up very new types of beginnings in the 1970s. Whether we consider a first bright revolutionary light -- Portugal -- and its relationship to the African revolutions in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau, and to East Timor; whether we consider the Latin American revolts, or the new phase in the Iranian revolution, or even just the new stage of the anti-nuke movement here since the Three Mile Island accident -- the point is that what was "in the air" was caught both objectively and "subjectively".

It is a fact that there is so little separation between objective and subjective that the passion for philosophy in the 1970s was, precisely, the bridge to end the separation between objective and subjective. The other new beginnings (like the Women's Liberation Movement) have likewise clearly reached the crossroads. A comprehensive theory is as burning a need as is action itself. The hunger for the working out of Marx's philosophy of revolution for our day must be met. It is by no means just for the Women's Liberation Movement, or the Black Dimension, or Youth, though everywhere they are up front. It is for the total uprooting.

The whole point of tracing the relationship of objective to subjective is not for history's sake, but for today. For it's only when objective and subjective meet that universality becomes real. In that respect, the 1980 deadline

is crucial. That is so, not because it's our Perspectives for the year, nor because it is a book, nor even because we have concluded that it will be nothing short of a manifesto for total freedom. We don't think of manifesto here as if it were a propaganda sheet.

Rather, it is because it is the philosophic preparation for revolution, in a way that the urgency of today's events makes it imperative. We will return to this 1980 deadline at the end, but now we need to become concrete on today's problems, beginning with what is the most critical: the world recession.

II. The World Recession, Oil and SALT II

1) The Myriad Political-Economic Crises

The U.S. capitalist ideologists are working hard in their attempt to present the recession as if it were only a slowdown, soon to be overcome. To put this myth over, when even their figures show that inflation is double-digit and unemployment has risen from 5.8 percent on its way to 7 percent, the auto industry is suddenly presented, not as pivotal, but something quite subordinate.

Actually, while it is true that the West is not as bad off as the mid-West and North-East, it isn't a question of crisis only in the automobile industry, but in aluminum, petrochemicals, synthetic textile fibers. And, as they themselves have to admit, watch how these will be dwarfed by steel layoffs. Watch the next two months for the true picture. Indeed, while the 1974 recession was the worst of the seven post-World War II recessions, not only has this one by no means run its course, but in some respects it is actually worse than 1974. Thus, in 1974 savings were 7.7 percent, while in 1979 they had gone down to 5.8 percent, the lowest in any industrialized land. Unemployment is already 5.8 percent; moreover this "average" is a total fake, because, in fact, it is already 8 percent in industrial cities and it's there that it will rise to 10 percent.

Again, there are no real statistics for Black youth unemployment, which remains somewhere in the neighborhood of no less than 50 percent! In the inner-cities, says Vernon Jordan, it is 75 percent. What is ironic is that, whereas the Bureau of Labor Statistics tried to show that we have got out of that black unemployment syndrome because there was an actual rise in employment in some months, non-governmental economists called this a "statistical artifact", since

-6-

the rise was not really a reduction of general unemployment, but restricted to the age-group, 16 - 19. In a word, it is mostly summer jobs, mostly student youth, and most will disappear in Fall. Once again, watch the next two months.

What ideologues do, as crises deepen, is to invent new words. In the present instance, even "stagflation" wouldn't do, and so a new word was invented, "inflection," which is defined as a "period of recessive business conditions and rising costs." That is to say, the economy is not just stagnant, but retrogressing, and still inflation keeps rising. Clearly, the inventor of that word, "inflection", Wall Street economist James Sinclair (NYT 6/24/79), has a job, a well-paid one. He's among those top economists who tell us this is a "mild recession" which will not become world-wide.

They do admit that Great Britain is also in a recession, but supposedly that need not "count", since Thatcher's government, in its fight against the proletariat, actually wants a recession to "discipline" labor! Which doesn't mean that Britain's working class will give Thatcher a free hand, as can be seen from a series of one-day strikes in engineering industries on August 6, August 13 and August 20. Though they hardly get mentioned in the U.S. press, the last two strikes involved a million workers each, and the fact that they didn't get any union compensation for the strike didn't keep the workers from going out.

While, to the "spets", the question of global becomes restrictive enough to exclude Great Britain, the very economists that say that Europe will get us out of a depression, also have to admit that inflation is bloak everywhere because, as Brookings Institute economist Okun put it, "price stability isn't easy to attain when a country is part of the world economy." (NYT 8/19/79: "While Europe still prospers")

The "mildness" and allegedly non-global nature will persist because of the terrific state of the European economy, especially West Germany and Japan. They will both soften our recession and keep it from reaching their shores, it is claimed. How Japan, which is in deadly competition with the U.S., will stabilize the economy of the mightiest nuclear giant is not precisely spelled out. It is expected (it is not yet so, just "expected") that Japan will experience a 5.7 percent production growth, and the other economic "miracle", West Germany, is aiming for 4 percent, which is a little more than keeping up with population growth, but hardly miraculous. Last year, 4 percent was considered a minimum for

5910

just "cushioning" the depth of a coming recession.

Needless to say, these ideologues, in focusing on the fact that economic growth is better in West Europe than in the U.S., forget the determinant -- class struggles. There are no less than seven million unemployed in West Europe; they are not about to look at the "downturn" in production without reacting to being thrown out of work while inflation keeps spiraling upward.

What tells more than all economists put together is that in West Germany, where supposedly the workers are all "happy" with class collaborationism, the metalworkers in Stuttgart just last week said that they would ignore the class collaborationist decision of the union leadership and push for compensation payments this year to make up for wages lost to higher oil prices.

Lest anyone forget the tremendous mass anti-nuke demonstrations, let's remind all of how freedom struggles do cross national boundaries: Directly after the Three Mile Island near-disaster the German masses held mass protests, shouting, "We are all Pennsylvanians!"

What is really at stake -- and that is is uncontestably world-wide, because it actually affects the capitalistic structure of the economy -- is productivity, or as they always put it, lack of productivity. Promptly they all gang up against the proletariat. If only labor productivity was higher, the U.S. could once again win the competition with Toyota and Volkswagen. Now, anyone on a production line knows that not only is he driven to the limit, but we don't exactly have the highest technique. The main reason that Europe, in the mid-1950s, was under the illusion that they were outdistancing the U.S. was that, once the Marshall Plan helped re-establish capitalist Europe to stand up from the total destruction of World War II, they did not have to go back to the old machinery, which had been destroyed; they started on the basis of the most modern technology.

The full truth, however, is that even now the "lower" productivity of U.S. workers is not in relationship to other workers -- Europeans, Japanese, Latin Americans -- but to themselves in another historic period. In the early 1960s, before the Vietnam War and the resulting blue-collar blues, as well as all the youth demonstrations and the anti-Vietnam War struggles, productivity was higher than it is now. As we long ago said in relationship to Russian workers' low productivity (see Marxism and Freedom, p.234), it is not a sign of their backwardness but an exact measure of the state of revolt. As for U.S. workers, presently pro-

ductivity has dropped from 3 percent annually in the 1960s to 2 percent annually in the 1970s, but U.S. productivity still tops Germany and Japan, where it is only 1.3 percent. (Christian Science Monitor 8/15/79: "U.S. economic watchword: productivity".)

If, instead of investing in gold bars, the capitalists would invest in production — both as to improving the conditions of labor and not relying on obsolete machines while demanding further "investment incentives" before they ever do what is supposed to come naturally to them: expanding production — labor productivity would rise, too. The point of convenient capitalistic forgetfulness is two-fold: first and foremost, Big Business is trying to hide unconscionable mass profit by talking about the loss in the rate of profit in relationship to investment, thus saddling the workers with still further incentives for themselves. Secondly, they are always on the prowl to drive women — and youth — out of jobs. Now the claim is that there are so many more women and "inexperienced" youth in the labor force that productivity has dropped. But if you read the small print in "learned" journals, you find out that, in fact, capitalists have not invested sufficiently in advanced technology. Indeed, you don't have to read statistical journals; all you have to do is take a European or Japanese train instead of an American one.

When the worst, the 1974 recession, occurred after the quadrupling of oil prices, capitalist ideologues showed sudden interest in the Marxian theory of the decline in the rate of profit. The trouble is, once again, that they very deliberately misread Marx's theory. It is true that, no matter how great the mass of profits are, the rate does decline; the point is that thereby it reveals to capitalists their Achilles heel. That isn't anything that can be dolled up with high prices. Rather, it is proof of the fact that so organic, so inseparable a part of the very organism of capitalist production is it, that there is no way of escaping, so long as they keep expanding production with ever-greater use of technology and using relatively ever-lesser amounts of living labor, the only source of all surplus value.

And the structural changes are a result not only of this relationship of C/V (constant to variable capital), but of the fact that so much production has gone into militarization — a type of production that is good only for destroying, not for growth. In a word, the present stage of decay in the U.S. and world economy began, not in 1973-74, but with the Vietnam War and LBJ's lie that

we could have both "guns and butter," all the while as he deepened the war -- both destroying Vietnam and increasing the poverty in the U.S. In a word, his so-called war on poverty was as great a lie as the Tonkin Resolution.

Militarization in these "peaceful times" has not the least decreased. Look at SALT I and SALT II. You will recall that the Draft Thesis shows that: "Far from that stopping nuclear armaments growth, here are the facts: In 1972 the U.S. had 5,700 nuclear warheads ready to fire at Russia, and Russia had 2,500 ready to fire at the U.S. Though that was quite sufficient to kill us several times over, the U.S. now has 9,200 and the Russians 5,000. That isn't all. Quite the contrary. Since the only way the Pentagon was to have agreed to SALT I was to make sure that anything that was already on the drawing board could not be stopped, nuclear development never stopped inventing more proficient killer capability, and the agreement was signed only when both sides agreed not even to face control of offensive weapons; the limitations were strictly applied to 'defensive' (!) nuclear arms."

That is how militaristic dreams of the MX missile kept the Salt II Agreement from being signed, as scheduled, in 1974. Now watch how all the prices are going up; we haven't got the MX but already the \$30 billion assigned to it has become \$35 billion. As if that weren't bad enough, don't forget the \$50 billion for space war. At the end of August, the misnamed Secretary of War (called Secretary of Defense) Brown will present a plan as to how to deploy the 200 MX missiles in Utah and Nevada. The so-called "racetrack" will run into plenty of opposition from both local people and environmentalists. And as if it weren't bad enough that Carter asked for \$135.5 billion for "defense" budget, the Pentagon and the Munns and the Jacksons are demanding a 5 percent raise above that. Even they do not know how they are going to spend it; they just want it.

Let me cite just three other far-away events to give you a peek into the myriad crises. Any one of them may very well explode later, though at this moment they do not reach the headlines. First, is the sighting of a Russian A-sub that entered Aden, the South Yemen port that dominates Middle East tanker routes to Asia and the Pacific. U.S. Naval intelligence describes it as "a cruise missile-carrying Echo II-class boat", which is something like that "Ethan Allen-type American sub, one of the Navy's biggest and fastest nuclear craft." What worries the U.S. most is that they didn't know whether the submarine at Aden was "on a temporary assignment" or whether it represented a Russian attempt to estab-

lish a new naval base.

Second, if we go to Havana this September 3 - 7, we will find the so-called non-aligned countries meeting. ^{It} goes without saying that the PLO will be there with a much stronger resolution than the one they presented at the UN, since they are very sure none there will grant Israel's right to exist. That, however, is not the main point on that crowded agenda, which will deal with "all" world problems -- and from that non-aligned Russian (pardon me, Cuban) point of view.

There is going to be one thing completely new. Tito, who was founder of the "non-aligned" countries back in 1955, will now appear in a new role, warning the assembly that it isn't only U.S. imperialism that must be fought but also "hegemonism". He will try to show where Cuba-Russia has extended its presence in Angola and Ethiopia. Tito, who is 87 years old, is worried enough about what Russia will do to post-Tito Yugoslavia that he is presently tilting toward both China and West European countries to help East Europe keep its independence from Russia. Toward this end, Tito had met with the foreign ministers of these "non-aligned" countries last summer and supposedly has got India, Sri Lanka, and perhaps also Algeria, to agree with him to draft a different type of statement, or so amend the one that Cuba will present as to show no unanimity.

What is interesting about Tito is that he gave an interview to his own Party's paper, Borba, on Aug. 16, where he spoke openly about strengthening his country's defenses so that "whoever contemplates moving against us will think twice before starting."

Whether he will or will not succeed in getting them to talk against "hegemonism" which is, after all, the Chinese anti-Russian euphemism; or whether, on that agenda, Syria and Iraq will succeed in getting Sadat's Egypt expelled; whether you take your point of departure to be all against U.S. imperialism, or against Russian "hegemonism", not to mention anti-Israel and the attempt to expel Egypt, or for that matter go to Western Sahara -- there are certainly plenty of crisis points.

Now let's get back to the oil lanes and look at the smallest of all African countries -- in fact, it's just a port, but a very strategic and important port -- Djibouti. In June, 1977, when it first got its independence, we pointed

to the fact that neo-colonialism—judged by the fact that, even though France granted it independence, it would also continue "protecting" it; that is to say, have its military arms there — would in fact continue. The only thing new since then is that France is not alone. It has become one of the most notorious "bar-cum-brothel" ports, where no less than 5,000 French engineers are there, where everyone from France to the U.S., from Russia to the Arab oil states, as well as Ethiopia and Somalia, has a listening post. The whole reason for all that attention to this poor little country is, of course, due to the fact, as the Toronto Globe and Mail puts it (5/18/79): "With the Soviet navy now occupying all the Ethiopian sea ports and rapidly turning South Yemen, 20 miles away across the Bab el Mandeb straits into a satellite, Djibouti has become of vital strategic importance to the West."

Naturally, no one can know when or where something new erupts or whether the incident that sets off a holocaust is over Middle East oil, or some raw material from Africa, or something in Asia. What we do know is that the major nuclear powers are primed all over the globe for a global confrontation. And what is clear, beyond any peradventure of a doubt, is that, whether we return to oil and recession in relationship to the U.S., or whether to the British recession which supposedly doesn't "count" because that's what the government wants, there is no way that capitalist politics and economics can be separated from workers' revolt, national revolution, women's opposition, youth who do not want to go to an imperialist war and will oppose being drafted. After all, didn't U.S. capitalism think it had it all made in the Middle East once it had the Shah building a military machine like crazy, as if he really was re-establishing the old Persian empire plus nuclear power, as the U.S.' willing policeman in the Middle East? Weren't Nixon and Kissinger so happy with that that they did encourage the Grand Illusion of the Peacock throne becoming a global power; and didn't it all go down the drain, not only in Iran itself, but the whole of the Middle East that has never been in greater turmoil?

But without a philosophy of revolution, the Left is vulnerable to defeat while decadent capitalism lives on.

2) Without a Philosophy of Revolution:
Oil and the PLO Gaining a Foothold with Black Leaders

Oil, on the one hand, and the PLO gaining a foothold with Black leaders, self-styled and otherwise, on the other hand, are the hot-spots at the moment among the myriad global crises. In order, however, fully to grasp the new in these developments, we need to focus on the whole age of state-capitalism as the two nuclear Titans, U.S. and Russia, struggle for single world rule; and on the national-chauvinist conflict within each world domain.

Although, ever since the Sino-Soviet conflict first broke out into the open in 1960, it should have been clear that, far from being just an ideological struggle, it was the proof that state-capitalism meant rebirth of reactionary nationalism from within so-called Communist lands, this was not the case. This nationalism was not just a variation of Stalin's "socialism in one country." It was that, all right; but it was also chauvinism that went outside national boundaries in so total a degree that the two Communist giants themselves -- Russia and China -- could go to war.

The new shocker this year was China's outright invasion of Vietnam. Deng's excuse for the invasion had the characteristic "Big Brother" imperialistic sound. China, said Deng, was out "to teach Vietnam a lesson." Though one can say very nearly the same thing about Vietnam's invasion -- and no doubt a good part of that would be true/ nevertheless, the difference in the two invasions is quite marked: Vietnam's invasion did have the support of a good part of the Cambodians and it was directed against the most genocidal -- genocidal against its own people -- Pol Pot regime.

One pivotal point of identity, however, predominates over both: it is the testing time for a possible Sino-Soviet outbreak. (Not that this totally excludes a "reconciliation"; there is no end to double crosses in a state-capitalist age.)

The two state-capitalist giants calling themselves Communist are, indeed, testing for the ultimate war. Whether that final confrontation is as a 1:1 holocaust, or with the U.S. having the China -- or the Russian! -- card, there is no way that any rational being can take sides in that madness, if humanity survives at all! There is just no way out except total uprooting of this racist, sexist, exploitative system, on either side of the Atlantic or either side of the China sea.

-13-

The inseparability of politics from economics, be it East or West, or be it within each of those domains, the contradictory national-chauvinistic interests, whether acknowledged or otherwise, sticks out all over. Take, for example, the recent "Western" summit in Tokyo and the supposed unanimous decision to act as one in relationship to OPEC. It no sooner ended than each country went in, not only for separate deals for oil with the oil potentates, but with the PLO which was the one dangling oil or the ability to get special deals on oil.

As can be seen from the latest trip of Strauss to the Middle East, the U.S. was ready to introduce a UN Resolution "of its own" to amend Resolution 242. As for France -- be it Vichy France, de Gaulle's France, or Giscard d'Estaing's -- it never pretended to be any friend of the Jews, except for the one time when it helped Great Britain, allied to Israel, launch the Suez War in 1956. Since 1967, it has been running for Middle East oil with a special calling card: salesman for everything, including nuclear reactors. Certainly it made no change in its behavior because of the Tokyo summit. Quite the contrary.

As Arafat put it, "Because France needs us and we need it, we expect at least as much from it as we have received from Austria." And to make it even clearer in relationship to how France will benefit, it was not only of oil that they spoke, but of the arms that will be bought by Syria, by Iran, by Iraq, by Saudi Arabia, and on and on.

Now, then -- West Germany. "A" West German met Arafat in Lebanon. This was no private citizen from West Germany; this was a high West German parliamentarian, Juergen Moellemann, who was close to none less than Germany's Foreign Minister, Hans-Dietrich Genscher. The plan was most concretely spelled out: West Germany -- indeed, he once said all of West Europe -- is ready to recognize the PLO as "the sole legal representative of the Palestinian people." (CSM 8/8/79)

And while it supposedly asked for "recognition" of Israel's right to existence, West Germany made it clear that that, in turn, depended on an independent Palestinian state. Moellemann left no doubt that, by Palestine, he meant "the whole area of pre-war Palestine," that is to say, it is not restricted to the occupied territory, but includes the whole of Israel. Naturally, Israel found that so galling, and let West Germany know it, that Helmut Schmidt rushed to deny that any of this had any official sanction.

5917

-14-

This means nothing. Everyone is testing, and that includes Israel. Israel has no more justification for keeping the lands occupied as booty from the 1967 Arab-Israeli War than the PLO has a right to want to be the "sole representative of all Palestinians." Of course, the critical point is the question of Palestinian rights, including that of self-determination. No leader needs to be appointed to speak for the Palestinian masses who speak very well for themselves. Freedom remains the only way out of the Middle East crisis. But that will not be achieved by tail-ending any state power, be it Israel or Egypt, be it the Middle Eastern kingdoms and emirates or Arafat. Choosing the lesser evil has always brought the bigger, and the biggest ones are the two nuclear giants, Russia and the U.S.

Oil, oil, oil; the militarized machine is insatiable; they -- the rulers -- are always preparing it for a war just around the corner. But what has that to do with the relationship of the PLO to the Black leaders?

It is true that Ambassador Young's resignation served as a catalyst for the appearance of the Black Caucus into the Middle East debate. It is not true that that is why it has a momentum of its own. Nor is it true (whether Young knows it or not) that some of the Black leaders are just following out Young's position. No, they, too, are using him for something that has very different origins. Its direction presently will give us some indication of what that is -- if your memory is good enough to go back to the year 1972 when the First Black Convention was held in Gary, Indiana.

Or perhaps we'd better begin with the PLO in the 1960s when they first approached the Black Panthers. There they found enthusiastic believers who were glad to follow, but they could not get the Black masses to do the same. And this was not because supposedly only "bread and butter" questions interested them. They made that clear enough by being in the anti-Vietnam War movement; their concept of freedom was by no means narrow. What kept Blacks suspicious of anything and everything not Black was that their white student friends' discovery of the anti-Vietnam War meant total subordination of the Civil Rights Movement. Moreover, that "total" commitment to the anti-Vietnam War movement brooked no criticism of itself whatever.

On the other hand, we, who had published American Civilization on Trial to demonstrate that the Black dimension had, throughout history, been the touchstone of forward movement in the U.S., now (in the mid-1960s) related this to the anti-

5918

-15-

Vietnam War movement, in which we were, of course, active participants. What we told the "New Left" was that, to exclude self-criticism only proves all over again that, to them too, the Black dimension has become "secondary."

Now turn back to 1972 and follow the rhetoric about Black, Black, Black; indeed, no whites were allowed except in the galleries as observers. The masses who came — and there were about 10,000 present — certainly did think that they came to form a Black Party; they thought they were through with both Republicans and Democrats, and wanted to strike out on their own. Why then was it a stillbirth?

First, everyone saw the Black Muslims in a totally new role. They who had heretofore concentrated on the subject of religion were the most active politically. To the rank and file this surprising turn reached the point of total non-recognition when the Black Agenda spoke of recognizing "the Chinese model for fundamental political and economic transformation of African and other Third World societies" ("The Black Agenda: White Realities, Black Choice"). It is hard, at first, to think there was a connection between the PLO and the Black Muslims. Neither the PLO nor Arab "moderates" were anywhere around.

But then there was no end of surprises — and confusion — there. The most shocking was the opposition to busing. So much rhetoric poured forth trying to draw a distinction between their opposition to busing and Nixon's retrogressive step in the same direction that those shocked workers held that "they wouldn't be surprised to see Black Nazis, here in this country, vote for Nixon in the coming election" (News & Letters, April, 1972: "Black Gary convention: a new party?" by Charles Denby).

The something that was rotten at Gary, Indiana, March 12, 1972, was the fact that the Nixon-Hao extravaganza had just spilled over into it. And just as Nixon-Kissinger tilted toward Pakistan, so the Muslims here, with some hefty unacknowledged oil money (we first now learn), were tilting toward the PLO (or was it the Arab "moderates"?). The First Black Convention went nowhere because of the unbridgeable gulf between the rank-and-file and the feuding Black leaders whether they were among those who walked out (the Michigan delegation) or those who were still looking for a "unified position" on something they had never spoken about openly. (1972 was, in any case, a bad year to present the Arabs in any favorable light, as it was the year when the Arab guerrillas masacred the Jewish athletes at the Munich Olympics.)

5919

In the 1970s, the tilting on the part of Nixon-Kissinger as on the part of Mao was so topsy-turvy that it was impossible to see where one was heading except that it definitely was 180 degrees the opposite of where Nixon had been going all his reactionary life. This drastic global change occurred at the very time when the totality of the crisis in the U.S. faced a tremendous pressure from the Youth, from the Blacks, from everyone against the total degeneration and insanity of Nixon's unprovoked bombing of Cambodia. Yet the super-revolutionary Maoists were whitewashing Nixon, taking him off the hotseat, not only of the Vietnam War, but covering up the retrogressive steps he was initiating in the U.S., especially in the Black area. As we fought both the Maoists and Russian Stalinists in this unholy alliance, we headlined the analysis: "Vietnam, not Taiwan, was sold out" (NEL, April, 1972).

Just as we warned the white "New Left" in the 1960s against subordinating the Black dimension, so we wrote of the leadership of the First Black Convention that, by failing to look where the global Nixon-Mao extravaganza was leading, they were, in fact, like the white "New Left" of the 1960s, too much concerned with leadership, leadership, leadership, and paying no attention to the Black masses. It is not "leadership" or Party that is the "vanguard," we insisted then and now; the Black masses are vanguard.

In presently passing four Resolutions: 1) in support of Ambassador Young; 2) in insisting on the right not to be restricted to "ghetto politics" but taking positions on foreign policy; 3) in asserting the right of the SCLC to have initiated a dialogue with the PLO; and, above all, 4) in separating themselves from some Jewish so-called friends who had, in fact, retrogressed on civil rights in both the Bakke and Weber cases — some leaders have suddenly recalled 1972. Unfortunately, it was only for purposes of contrasting the lack of unity in 1972 to the "cohesion" in 1979, and contrasting themselves against "the kids in the dashikis (who) were always talking about unity in the 60s and never achieved it." Bayard Rustin called the unity a positive "miracle." Dr. Kenneth Clark called it nothing short of "our declaration of independence" (NYT 8/24/79).

The significance of their meeting is not the alleged unanimity achieved. Actually, the SCLC that had met with the PLO and rejected Israel's designation of it as terrorist, while they, as Rev. Lowery put it, "put no conditions" to their proposal to the PLO to "give consideration" to "recognizing the nationhood of Israel", did not find their position shared by many of the others. As for Julian

Bond's attempt to prove that the sympathy of Blacks for the Arab masses is reflected in the growth of the Islamic religion in the Black community, all one can say is that the timing was certainly wrong, coming at the very moment when Khomeini's Islamic revolution is heading in a quite counter-revolutionary direction.

No, what brought some cohesion was precisely the revolutionary nature of the Black dimension, even when it is middle-class. What is pivotal is the fact that they criticized not alone Israel, but the backward move that the middle-class Jews were making here on the question of both quotas and so-called reverse discrimination -- the Bakke and Weber cases. In the process of so doing, they made the most profound analysis of the neo-conservative because they, indeed, smell in it a rationale for the abandonment of the civil rights cause by many whites. Indeed, if you look at all the glories of the so-called "New Philosophy" and at Raymond Aron's In Defense of Decadent Europe in France, you will see that the neo-conservatives here are not only the Jewish bourgeois chauvinist ideologues in Commentary but, on a different and global scale, decadence is suddenly becoming a complimentary word. It has gained new respectability with the publication of In Defense of Decadent Europe. It's not only a journalist like James Reston who praises Aron's book (NYT 6/24/79), but one who knows the halls of power and is probably expecting to return to them on the shoulders of the Republican Party, Henry Kissinger, who called it "one of the most important intellectual statements of our time."

So pervasive is this so-called "New Philosophy" that it challenges the Left, too. But it is impossible to destroy those neo-conservatives and retrogressionists without a philosophy of liberation -- Marxist-humanism -- which does not separate itself from the revolution itself.

III. Objective Significance of "Subjective" 1980 Deadline, or
Can We Aid the New Beginnings -- the Momentous World Historic Events of
Our Decade -- to Develop Instead of to Abort?

The Perspectives Report began with an overview of the decade of the 1960s as it reached its end in a world recession-in-the-making, with the myriad crises pointing toward a possible nuclear holocaust. Totally different new beginnings, however, were sprouting out in revolutions in Iran and Nicaragua, as well as undercurrents of revolt in East and West Europe, in China as well as in Russia, and new forces, though not in a pre-revolutionary situation, nevertheless active in the U.S. That was by no means limited to the Black dimension, which remains central, but includes labor, as well as the Women's Liberation Movement, and most important, youth. It was by no means "accidental" that our Internationalist Marxist-Humanist Youth were born autonomous at the very time that, far away, the need for youth autonomy was being demonstrated in Iran, where those who were tied to Khomeini could find no way to express all the great things they were for, beyond anti-Shahism, as they encountered Khomeini's retrogression. The weight of these forces, when they are faced so soon with counter-revolution, even in outright revolution, made it necessary to trace the relationship of objective to subjective. From the start, we said we were doing this, not for history's sake, but for today as philosophic preparation for revolution.

One of the unexpected ways that we were suddenly tested was the manner in which one aspect of the Black dimension, SCLC, in entering the Middle East debate, seemed not only to give the PLO support, but to do so uncritically. That certainly is light years away from the philosophy of its founder, Martin Luther King. I am not referring to the question of violence/non-violence. That, though serious, was no more than a tactical question. No, I'm referring to the underlying philosophy of humanism which, though it wasn't in a Marxist-Humanist context, but in Euber's "I-Thou" philosophy, nevertheless designated a very high stage of non-alienated human relationship, whereas the SCLCers' 1979 "new form", as projected in the Middle East debate, appeared, if not as a variant of anti-Semitism, thoroughly opportunistic.

But, in truth, once the discussion continued among themselves, i.e. with other Black organizations -- NAACP, Urban League, A. Phillip Randolph Institute, Black Caucus and others -- then the prescient sensitivity of the Black dimension to racism led them to see it in the neo-conservative philosophy in such stark ways that the Blacks took their opportunity to expose it. Whether expressed by conservative Jews or non-Jews, neo-conservatism was rejected, and a new ground for struggle was sought.

which is why we stress, over and over again, that without a philosophy of revolution, there just is no way out of the myriad crises. Without a philosophy of revolution, that is to say, the total uprooting of the exploitative, capitalistic, racist, sexist decadent system, there is no way for new beginnings to develop. Imperative, therefore, becomes the task of concretising and deepening Marx's philosophy of revolution for our day. That is why we set the 1980 deadline for Rosa Luxemburg, Today's Women's Liberation Movement, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

In the 1972 Draft Perspectives -- and please reread "Ways to Combat 'Pax Americana'" -- we were relating subjective to objective by showing, at one and the same time, in the section on the "Almost-Dialectic, Almost-Revolution", the pull that Mao's Cultural Revolution exerted on the "New Left", while the Chinese revolutionary youth themselves rejected it, as seen in Sheng Wu-lien's activity and document, "Whither China?" This, furthermore, had a very strong philosophic foundation, so that we could work it out in Philosophy and Revolution in Part II, "Alternatives." That is to say, we could show that any deviation from Marxism, even when it came from within Marxism -- as in Trotskyism, Maoism, or Castroism -- or from that "Outsider Looking In" -- Sartre's Existentialism -- are false alternatives. And we could, in Chapter 9, show the failure of focc-ism, which, when successful, only ends up in tail-ending a state-power -- Russian state-capitalism calling itself Communism.

It is, however, much more difficult to try to spell out the new book-to-be because it isn't -- not even in outline form. Nevertheless, I believe that we can get a foothold into it, first, by seeing how the title changed from being Rosa Luxemburg and Women's Liberation Theorists to become -- and become pivotally -- Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. And note, please, it is connected to Revolution not by a mere conjunction "and", but the very soul of Revolution.

And, secondly, -- and this "secondly" is actually primary and crucial -- by taking a look into two projected (at least, projected in my head) historic periods and historic relationship on such absolute opposites as revolution and counter-revolution, at which point we will turn to Marx's writings, 1848 and 1851, on the one hand, and 1871 and 1875, on the other.

The change in the title also was both objective and subjective in the sense that the crossroads which today's Women's Liberation theorists encountered

pointed to a theoretic void, not only in the Women's Liberation movement, but everywhere among the so-called "orthodox" old Marxists, and the "New Left" and in Black dimension being busy misinterpreting Frantz Fanon, while each state power exercised its pull as the totality of the crisis deepened.

What was exciting, on the other hand, was that I felt the need to change the title in the very process of working on the book on Rosa Luxemburg, because it was there that the relationship between 1848 and 1905 was developed by Rosa Luxemburg and by Lenin in their struggle against the Menshevik retreat from that revolution. Therein lies the creativity of historic dialectics called Dialectical Methodology.

Let us look into the future developments in the book which will cast further illumination on that 1980 deadline for the new book, as well as on why we must work out the deadening effect of the counter-revolution arising in the midst of, and from within, revolution. First, along with the study of Marx in, and about, the 1848 Revolution in Germany, we will probe into Marx's 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, as he analyzed Napoleon "the Little's" coup in 1851. The 1848 Revolution has special relevance for us today both because it was creatively related to the 1905 Revolution by the Marxist revolutionaries for the Russian and Polish Revolution, and because, in our day, it made it possible to grasp its relation to the ongoing revolution in Iran today.

Indeed, because I felt the new beginnings in the 1950s -- the East German and Hungarian Revolutions as well as the Black Revolution in the U.S. -- must reunite with Marx at the very beginning of his discovery of a new continent of thought, I decided that the division between Marx and Lassalle at that "Turning Point in History" was so pivotal to our age that I singled out that chapter in Marxism and Freedom and made nothing short of a separate part for it, all by itself. (Its relevance for today was further emphasized by an Iranian revolutionary when he chose that chapter to translate into Farsi.)

The reason it is imperative to study the 18th Brumaire, parallel with the study of the 1848 Revolution, is that Marx's theory of proletarian revolution was brought into the work of the coup because Marx always used the highest point of revolution as his point of departure, even when he was analyzing a counter-revolution. And it is in the 18th Brumaire that he contrasted proletarian revolution to bourgeois because the former stop to criticize themselves, instead of rushing un-

critically ahead. As against bourgeois revolutions, wrote Marx: "Proletarian revolutions ... criticize constantly, interrupt themselves constantly, interrupt themselves continually in their own course ... deride with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltriness of their first attempts ... recoil anon from the indefinite prodigiousness of their own aims, until a situation has been created which makes all turning back impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out: Hic Rhodus, hic salta!"

Now we come to the second point which I said was, in fact, primary, as we anticipate the new book. The most critical and greatest achievement of the proletariat in Marx's day in the very first proletarian revolution ever -- the Paris Commune -- went hand in hand with a historic new achievement in thought as Marx analyzed it in The Civil War in France. In "rewritten form", as some stupid Marxist called Lenin's State and Revolution, it laid the philosophic foundation for nothing short of the November 1917 Russian Revolution. It is such a "rewriting" for our day which is necessary for the American-revolution-to-be.

But even in Marx's day there was no direct road from it, both as actual revolution and as revolution in cognition, to the next revolution. Quite the contrary. Though for Marx, it was at once made integral to his greatest theoretical work, Capital, as it was amended in the 1875 French edition, that same year those who considered themselves Marxists in Germany -- the Eisenachists -- were uniting with the Lassalleans to form a united party at Gotha where they penned their new "program."

Marx's Critique of the Gotha Programme has yet to be analyzed in as thorough -- I mean thoroughly creative -- a form as Lenin did of Marx's Civil War in France. Marx's Critique of the Gotha Programme -- as all his works are critiques -- is never just a critique, an opposition, but is always projecting the absolute opposite in an affirmative way -- seeing the future in the present class society. Thereby, Marx projects the absolute transformation of labor from what it is under capitalism as a value-creating process to what the very activity of laboring becomes when it is not just a "means" of creating surplus value for the exploiter. It becomes the "first necessity of life" because it is then both Force and Reason as one, mentally and physically, thus creating a new Man/Woman in a class-less society.

-22-

And yet, and yet, so anxious was Marx not to stop the formation of a "united organization" because it was a movement, that he did not make this criticism public. It remained in a letter to the Marxist leaders. And even as these leaders finally created, after Marx's death, a fully Marxist party, at Erfurt more than a decade later, they resisted Engels' wish to have it published as critical to any "Erfurt Program." It is true that Engels' relentless fighting to get it published did finally succeed. But was it grasped philosophically as well as organizationally when Lassalleans were nowhere around?

What we have to do, long before the book works this problem out, is to grasp the necessity for the 1980 deadline as our responsibility, a responsibility that cannot be shifted to other shoulders. It is ours alone because we alone have made unique contributions in re-establishing the Humanism of Marxism for our day, with the publication of Marxism and Freedom and that new form of journalism which unites theory and practice also in its "daily" struggles in News & Letters.

I'm going to take advantage of the fact that we will have an Organization/News & Letters Report, and all will have nearly a whole day to discuss it, not to go into the strictly organizational conclusions, from classes to mass activities, as they were pointed at in the Draft Thesis. But two matters cannot be left to them. One is the creation of an autonomous youth group which already has given proof of its life and thought, and not alone in the English language, but Iranian. They, I'm sure, will discuss it tomorrow. I simply want here to tie it to the question of form of organization -- that burning question of our day about the relationship between spontaneity and organization.

The Draft Thesis was pointing to this when it called for a new form of organization in rejecting the Party-to-lead. Though the Thesis made clear that it was not only News and Letters Committees that we were referring to, but the whole question of form of relationship of the two types of organizations -- the form of one that you can never anticipate because the workers are quite creative and themselves don't know whether it will be a soviet, a committee, an enjumeni. All they are absolutely sure of is that it will be theirs, and new, and the immediate response to what is happening there and then.

The second -- just as important -- is the one that maintains the continuity between Marx, himself, and that discovery of a new continent of thought, of

proletarian, social revolution -- and all the rich experiences in the near century since then, not fearing to openly face the many retrogressions. To this end the 1980 deadline, as our responsibility to execute, makes it necessary to internalize its objective significance.

What makes the 1980 deadline significant is not its direct relationship organizationally. Much less does deadline mean the actual going to press. No, the subjective assigning of the deadline flows from the objective, the objectively new, that arose in the mid-1970s. So, allow me to stress that the Portuguese Revolution, for example, gave birth to a totally new category -- apartidarismo -- which has something to tell us, some indication of a road to follow, though they themselves seem not to follow while we have been hewing out such an independent role ever since in breaking through on the Absolute Idea as a movement from practice as well as from theory, we reunited the two not only in theory and not only in practice, but organizationally as well as News and Letters Committees that sharply opposed "the party to lead" without turning away from an organizational expression of the philosophy of Marx's Humanism in committee-form.

Look even at the Nicaraguan Revolution, where the revolutionaries did come from guerrilla struggles, and you see there was a sharp departure from both focc-ism and "Leader Maximus." There is a new danger, of course -- Popular Frontism, i.e. class collaborationism. And there is no way of telling to what extent Nicaragua will be held back by the strings U.S. imperialism attaches to any aid. But they have started something new, very new. Not only is it the first revolution in Latin America since Cuba's, 20 years ago, but it has international relations that are by no means limited to Russia, as was Cuba's. The something new is in being both urban and peasant; in always challenging the seat of power, like occupying the Parliament Building instead of individual murder and terrorism, which solves absolutely nothing.

The point of all this is: we must not allow the new beginnings to wither away, or abort. No, the task of Marxist revolutionaries is to concretize Marx's philosophy of revolution, where it, itself, becomes force for revolution.

This is our task for the 1980s.

* * *

-24-

POSTSCRIPT, Sept. 4, 1979

No sooner did I begin, this first day "away", to translate Rosa Luxemburg's speech at that crucial 1907 Congress, where all the Marxist tendencies in Russia met to discuss the 1905-06 Revolution*, then my mind turned back to the magnificent Plenum that had ended the day before. It was the question of Form of Organization we had wrestled with in the Perspectives Report as well as in the News and Letters Committees/News & Letters Report; indeed, that came out in all other Reports as well, not excluding Finances which truly proved the end of all dichotomy between philosophy and organization.

The wrestling is, at one and the same time, against any "circle spirit" that might seek to substitute itself for the totally new relationship of spontaneity and the committee-form of organization that maintains the link of historic continuity with the Marxism of Marx; and philosophically against what Hegel, in his way, tried to transcend: "SELF-ABSORBED UNCOMMUNICATIVENESS."

I hope the above makes clear that it is not only because I do not have a single note of any of my summations, all of which were spoken spontaneously, that I beg not to include the Summation asked for the post-Plenum bulletins. Instead, permit me to express the following, in lieu of Summation.

Raya

* * *

I'm sure you all know very well that philosophy is not outside of the world; its presence may be a bit different, but it is definitely in this world. What you may not be as oppressively aware of, and therefore may not have practiced, is self-criticism; the emphasis is on self.

Let me, therefore, in conclusion -- because that will be the proof of carrying out the responsibilities this year of preparation for the 1980 deadline -- spell out what "critique" meant to Marx. Marx titled very nearly all of his works Critique: of Political Economy; of Hegelian Dialectics; of Capital as both a Critique of Political Economy and Fetishism of Commodities. In the Communist Manifesto itself he made a critique of all other tendencies.

* It is precisely that revolution, and not the 1903 Congress, that became the determinant for dividing Menshevism from Bolshevism, and escapism from revolution. Remember that it was in that very same period that Lenin wrote: "I am hurt by this degradation of the most revolutionary doctrine in the world." (It was about the only time Lenin ever spoke "personally".) If only he had also broken with the concept of "the party to lead."

5928

Let's spell out what "critique" meant to Marx. It had a three-fold meaning:

- 1) self-criticism
- 2) critique of others — and others meant not just as enemies or as other tendencies, but those who claimed him as founder — consider the Critique of the Gotha Programme we have been talking about.
- 3) critique as foundation for action. Or, put another way, that very distinctive praxis, as Marx broke from philosophy as contemplation plus bourgeois idealism and transformed it into proletarian revolution and theoretical praxis.

Thus, philosopher became journalist without ever ceasing to be philosopher, but this time, philosopher of revolution. Just recall the events in 1843, when Marx threw his lot with the peasants who stole some wood. Hegel, too, felt it crucial to be journalist; it was the WHO, WHAT, WHERE, WHEN that Hegel was spelling out when he described Napoleon's entry into Germany as he was finishing the Phenomenology.

Just as Marx's work, from the start of his adult life, was governed by, aimed at, and practiced social revolution, so does our work and life. That is what the 1980 deadline we have set for ourselves will prove, I am confident, as we unite history as living; philosophy as dialectics; and organization in its committee-form. Who we are and What we stand for, as Marxist-Humanists — and Why we put the 1980 deadline as our goal — can be summed up in three words: preparation for revolution.

* * *

REPORT FROM EUROPE by Kevin

If the crisis of revolutionary thought and organization in the midst of revolution is evident enough in those two world focal points -- Iran and Nicaragua -- it gapes like an open wound in Europe today, especially in France. This is because there are no mass movements of the 1960s to cover over the theoretic void. It's not that the masses are inactive. As I hope the lead (News & Letters, Aug.-Sept. 1979) showed, the contrary is true: the masses, from steel workers to immigrant workers to women and youth, are in motion in ever new ways.

But the Left organizations and independent intellectuals have little or no relationship to these masses, especially in France. Take the Communist-dominated union, the CGT. On Aug. 17, they organized militant workers' demonstrations which blocked railroad cars transporting coal in Lorraine. But rather than revolutionary activity, this represented instead the narrowest nationalism: the CP was demonstrating against importing "German" coal, in order to "protect" French jobs. Although they claim to be Marxist, George Meany and his "buy American" would understand them completely.

Or take the Communist Mayor of Gargas-les-Gonesses, a working class suburb of Paris where several hundred mostly North African immigrant workers have been camped outside the hostel from which the riot police evicted them in June. They told me bitterly how Cuckerman, the CP Mayor who "supports" them, also says publicly that "30% is too many" -- referring to the 30% immigrants already in his town, which he regards as a "burden" on the French workers.

A Moroccan worker camped outside the hostel told me about the daily life of Africans in Paris: "The police always stop you on the subway. If they see a Black face, they demand identity papers. There are extreme rightist groups which murder immigrants. 'Dirty Arab' is a word you hear everywhere." He seemed amazed when I told him that some American Blacks thought France was less racist than the USA. I was referring especially to James Baldwin, and then showed him John Alan's column on racism in Europe.

If the immigrant workers' struggles are the dialectical opposite of such bureaucratic opportunism, so are the women workers, over 100-strong, who occupied a textile plant which was about to go out of business in Saint-Etienne. Once the police evicted them, they set up picket lines, which the police also

broke up. Some will remember the name Saint-Etienne from the historic struggles of French miners there -- and as a Marxist-Humanist, I'm sure there's a connection there, even though one Paris intellectual told me the week before that Saint-Etienne was no longer important in the class struggle in France.

Or take the independent Left and ex-Left intellectuals such as Sartre, Cohn-Bendit and Glucksman. They found time in June to have lunch with right-wing President Giscard d'Estaing, along with some rightist intellectuals. All "agreed" that France as a humanitarian country should help the Indochinese refugees, and while they did quarrel over how many to admit, none were tactless enough to raise the question of either steelworker layoffs or expulsions of immigrant workers. This helped give Giscard just the liberal humanitarian cover he needed to continue deporting immigrant workers, to have continued the massive layoffs in steel, and to have just mercilessly raised the cost of living to the point where even right-wing papers think he has now gone too far.

Or take the Trotskyists who argue over whether Vietnam is the vanguard of the world revolution or whether instead Pol Pot's Cambodia was also a workers' state. In Italy, the ex-Maoist independent Left has degenerated into autonomia who applaud terrorism even while criticizing certain tactics, while in England there is a refusal to recognize the seriousness of Thatcher's victory.

What we're talking about here is the disintegration of revolutionary theory on a world scale. In Germany, the situation is not so obviously in crisis -- in fact, both youth and women's liberation movements remain relatively intact and continuous from the 1960s, as compared to either the U.S. or France. But this is also the problem.

Not having fully perceived the 1960s as a defeat, they do not therefore see the need to reorganize themselves theoretically and organizationally. Thus, for all of its independence from state powers and anti-vanguardism, the best of the German Left still does not see the need for reorganization theoretically and organizationally to prepare for the 1980s. And they are not -- at least not the spontis -- quite so far from the "New Philosophy" in France as might appear to be the case at first, or from the Italian autonomia.

Thus, whether you're talking about sponti "alternative life styles" reminiscent -- even down to playing the same records we had 10 years ago -- of Berkeley in the 1960s, or whether you refer to more social democratic-type

alternate electoral slates -- all their daily Left papers, bookstores, anti-nuclear movement, etc. still run the risk of falling into the same errors as Kautsky and Bernstein, even though they appear worlds apart politically, i.e. theory is nothing and "the movement" is everything.

It is with this in mind that a Marxist-Humanist intervention in Western Europe becomes crucial. Of first importance in this kind of intervention is the publication of Philosophy and Revolution in French and German. While the German edition of P&R appears secure for 1980, there are still problems there, as in the ridiculous idea of changing the title to "From Hegel to Mao." Although we do already have a French edition of Marxism and Freedom, as of now there is no French publisher for P&R, even though some are still considering it. Especially in Germany there was also great interest in Indignant Heart: A Black Worker's Journal and I think we have a good chance to get a publisher there very soon.

It was the degeneration of the Left in France as exemplified by the New Philosophy which led directly to the problem we're having in finding a French publisher for P&R. The same mentality which would in 1973 have called P&R too critical of China or Sartre would now attack it for not saying "Marx equals Gulag". In Germany we have nothing yet in the German language so you can imagine the difficulties of having theoretical dialogue with people there.

However, while some new relationships were formed in France, but, unfortunately, outside Paris both with intellectuals and students in Besancon and with immigrant workers, the best ongoing relationships we now have are in West Germany. This is reflected in the literature sales this Summer: over \$300, almost all of it in Germany which included 16 IH, 8 P&R, 9 M&F, and 20 N&L subs, both new and renewals. And that's not including the 8 bookstores in Paris, Frankfurt, Berlin, Hannover, and Bremen which made literature orders, in some cases quite large. The kind of visibility N&L now has in Germany is illustrated by my walking into the Karl Marx Buchhandlung in Frankfurt last weekend and seeing no less than 4 different issues of N&L in the racks. It can also be seen in the fact that the German weekly Informations Dienst will soon carry a short review of IH, including our Detroit address, to its over 4,000 readers.

The review was written by Richard H. in Frankfurt, who has known N&L for 10 years, both in Detroit and in Germany. Richard also wanted to discuss with

me very seriously how News and Letters Committees is able to have actual rank-and-file worker correspondents and editors such as Denby, Felix Martin, and John Allison. This came up because he had formed some new relationships with Turkish immigrant workers in Germany, who are in the forefront of nearly every class struggle and the victims of savage racism.

Yet even here, the dimension of women's liberation reveals a still deeper layer than the Turkish men who work in industry. As reported recently in Die Tageszeitung, a new spanti daily paper, Turkish fascist gangs who for years have terrorized the workers, youth and Left movements in Turkey, have also moved their activities over to Germany. They specifically single out Turkish women who try to break with "Muslim ways" for vicious attacks on the street. The paper this week reported the story of a Turkish woman who refused to wear a scarf covering her head, and who didn't send her children to Koran school. She was living alone, having left her husband because of his brutality toward her.

This is West Berlin, in the old working class neighborhood of Kreuzburg, and not Iran or Turkey, remember. When the woman dared to talk back to the gang of men who daily tormented her at her doorstep with the most vulgar abuse for not living according to "Muslim ways", she was badly beaten and is now in the hospital. But she remains firm in her commitment to live her own life and to raise her children in a different way -- and has, at the risk of death, given newspaper interviews and prosecuted her attackers from her hospital bed.

In both Germany and France, at almost every turn the old relationships renewed or new ones formed were with people who related to part of what we as Marxist-Humanists see as a totality: the thought and activity of women, youth, Blacks and workers united with a Marxist-Humanist philosophy. Thus, an American women's liberationist studying in Berlin, Marx (especially the Ethnological Notebooks), Hegel and women was especially drawn to the projected new book, as was an Italian women's liberationist from Milan who also works on Hegel. Both are reading not only Working Women For Freedom and the new chapter, but also P&R.

Thus, two Africans studying in Berlin bought P&R -- one Zimbabwean and the other Tanzanian -- both recognized the need for theory as the most pressing problem of the African movement today. There were also new relations developed with Poland, Latin America and Iran -- again on the basis of P&R.

In both France and Germany, it was with the Africans that there was the

most immediate sense of comradeship. This is because no one can match what we have done on theory drawn from African and American Black struggles over the last 26 years, and because of the high points those African revolutions reached, only to perish in the end. If you will, there was a "shock of recognition" both with the Black African students in Berlin and with the North African workers outside Paris. Who else in the whole world regards Fanon and the African struggles not only as crucial for the Third World, but at the center of the Marxist dialectic today, as spelled out in P&R? And the same can be said for how the new book and the way in which we see women as central to revolution and to philosophy enabled me to have important dialogue with women's liberationists.

Aside from the general foundation of M&F, P&R, the new book and 24 years of News and Letters Committees, the political-philosophic basis of this trip was worked out especially in the week I spent in Detroit in June. But really, it goes back over 40 years to the birth of our Tendency. As some of us learned only a few years ago, it was the Spanish Revolution of the 1930s which formed the positive within the negative of Stalinist state-capitalism in that decade. This was crucial, although not stated explicitly, to the early writings by Raya on Russia as state-capitalist society, but you can find it in E&R: "Depression in Economy and Thought."

Ten years later, in 1947, there was Raya's trip to Europe where, as in 1979, the French Marxist intellectuals could not catch the new coming from the dimension of color: in 1947, it was the Camerounian speaking for the new African revolutionaries (see P&R, p.216), and today it was the immigrant workers outside Paris. That 1947 trip also involved debates by Raya with Ernest Mandel at the Trotskyist World Congress on state-capitalism. At that time she also warned the Marxists that existentialism as an alien philosophy had to be answered and not just dismissed as outside the labor movement, just as in 1977 right here she warned some French intellectuals who did not listen that the New Philosophy was no passing phase, and would have ramifications for the whole revolutionary movement.

In 1956, there was Raya and Bessie's trip to Italy and France after the publication of M&F, at a time when De Gaulle had just come to power in France. The dialogue was quite serious, but fell apart when independent Marxists who had accepted state-capitalism viciously attacked the idea of humanism. In the 1960s, Eugene made several trips to Europe, one of which resulted in his magni-

ficent pamphlet on France 1968, and he, Bessie and Mary returned in 1977 to report on and establish dialogue with women, workers and Left groups in Portugal, Italy and England.

At the time I remember thinking and stating that they were too critical of the Portuguese and Italian Left, but today the collapse of the Left in both of those countries has borne them out and especially our critiques of sexism in the movement in Italy and Portugal. Today that very sharp critique enabled me to establish dialogue with two Italian women's liberationists who were also disgusted with the Left, and yet not anti-Marxist.

And, of course, immediately preceding my trip was Mike's trip last year -- and since then he has worked closely with me in preparing for this one. So you can see that the foundation for the trip was really quite extensive.

Within Germany as a whole, we now have fairly solid relationships with people in 4 cities: Frankfurt, Berlin, Hannover, and Bremen. We also have on-going and new relationships and exchanges with groups such as the new daily Die Tageszeitung and the weekly Informations Dienst.

Part of the reason why West German Leftists are more open to hearing "outside" opinions than the French is that it's hard to have confidence in your own roots if those include Nazism. Thus when one young German began to call us "bourgeois humanists" for defending Israel's right to exist, I simply told him that the Jews after World War II wanted to leave racist European civilization where, as Fanon wrote, "they are never done talking of Man, yet murder men everywhere they find them," and that the last thing they wanted to hear were "lessons" from the German Left.

The result was that the conversation then became more serious and we were able to discuss racism, sexism and the labor movements in Germany and the U.S. at length. On the other hand, in France, one Professor became outraged when I suggested that many or most had for a time collaborated with the Nazis after 1940. In France, romanticizing the past, whether that of the Resistance or 1968, becomes an excuse for not reorganizing your thought.

In France, our periphery is far more tenuous -- especially in Paris -- and this is something we have to try and correct since Paris is not only France but a world center of revolutionary thought. (Or today, one might better say, of the degeneration of revolutionary thought.)

But even in Germany, there is no one individual and certainly no organization I would call close to the totality of our form of Marxist-Humanism at the present time. In fact, as great as the lit sales were, the conversations did not so often get to theory, rather tending to remain at the level of what's happening in the mass movements in our respective countries. This was reflected in the very high sales of IH and the relatively lower sales of P&R, even though IH is only in English. The best theoretic discussions were with non-Europeans.

Only once we get P&R in German will we be able to see who is really close to us and who is not. As is evident from the above report, I believe the situation in Europe calls for a continuing, at least yearly, presence by News and Letters Committees members, if our resources make this possible. The deep, deep sexism, racism and anti-philosophy of even the "best" of the Left creates a gulf between them and precisely those "new passions and new forces" which are the backbone of the revolutionary movement today, alongside the proletariat. I refer of course to the immigrant workers, to the women's liberationists, and to the new youth.

The new youth are not only anti-nuclear power but also anti-war. A dramatic example of their total view against all state powers was the Brussels to Warsaw anti-war caravan this Summer. As these youth attempted to cross into East Berlin from the West, after having already been denied permission to demonstrate in East Germany, they were set upon simultaneously by West and East German police, while American MPs watched approvingly. The picture Die Tagzeitung carried of these 3 groups of police surrounding the anti-war youth was accompanied by a caption which contrasted these genuine forces for peace with the "peaceful co-existence" along the border between East and West. The Polish government, bowing to the mass movement there, did not dare to bar the demonstrators, and they were able to have important dialogue with Polish youth in Warsaw.

Far from disappearing, the W. German anti-nuclear movement shows every sign of renewed mass activity in the Fall, just as the Social Democratic Schmidt government shows no sign of backing away from nuclear power. As one subscriber told me, this is one movement Schmidt can't bargain with like he so often does with the labor bureaucrats.

And the last week I was in Frankfurt, Kurdish, Iranian and German students demonstrated against Khomeini and in support of the Kurds fight for self-determination.

I found no one in Europe who fully measures up to the theoretical challenges the new mass movements raise, and in many cases, especially in France, the Left actually functions as an obstacle to the genuinely revolutionary forces in that country. This is what gives the translations of P&R and the ongoing dialogue with others by Marxist-Humanists in Europe all the urgency embodied in the phrase we used at last year's plenum: Time is running out.

REPORT FROM THE MIDDLE EAST by Azadkar

The renewed attack by Khomeini's forces on the Kurdish revolutionaries and the savage manner in which he carried out that attack, together with his full-scale crackdown on the press and political parties, reveals very clearly the fullness of counter-revolution hiding itself under revolutionary names and religious dress. By now, this should have awakened those ignorant "intellectuals" who thought Khomeini has no political and governmental knowledge, and therefore will step down in favor of the National Front.

Ever since the February insurrection that toppled the Shah and, to a large extent, reduced U.S. imperialism's control over Iran, especially its oil, the counter-revolution has tried using all means to put an end to the revolutionary spirit of the masses. In order to reproduce the old bourgeois relations -- this time under an autocratic "Islamic Republic" -- the government has found it necessary to establish "law and order", even at the price of annihilating a national minority. Yet if this last effort by Khomeini against the overall democratic rights of the people fails to reproduce the post-1953 coup atmosphere of repression, in which the revolution was delayed for more than a quarter of a century, the overthrow of his regime is foreseeable within months.

These efforts were begun right after Khomeini and his appointed Prime Minister Bazargan took power, when they chose the first Saturday (after Bahktiar fled) as the day to end the general strikes and, by that, to end the revolution. But the continued struggle of the workers as well as the women, the national minorities as well as the students, was to spit in the face of Khomeini, who is intent on establishing 1,400-year-old Islamic laws as the superstructure for a developing capitalist country, dependent on world imperialism for its basic economic, not to mention political and cultural, needs.

It is true that the Iranian masses have long been under the repressive rule of monarchy, and that Asian despotism has been effective in holding the struggle down in Iran's history. But that in no way means an end to an ongoing revolution. The spontaneous mass movements that had developed into the shoras during the fight to overthrow the Shah showed the self-creativity of the Iranian masses, especially the youth. This self-creativity has continued ever since, by the women's liberationists, unemployed workers, peasants and students. What did not develop from, and in correspondence with this spontaneity, is a theory

of revolution, and that is unfortunate.

The majority of the Left are still unable to understand the counter-revolutionary role of the clergy. They have given a "classless" character to the clergy and have failed to re-examine its negative aspects, both in history and as an alienating factor of the masses. In both the Revolution of 1906-1911 and the mass uprisings of the 1950s to nationalize oil, the clergy played a conciliatory and reactionary role at the very moment when the struggle was about to give forth its fruit, and both times it was delivered over into the hands of British imperialism.

In the 1950s, when Mossadegh was fighting to nationalize oil, Ayatollah Kashani pulled his support away and instead, sided with the Shah's forces and even approved the attempts to assassinate Mossadegh, labeling him an atheist. It is interesting to note that this same Ayatollah, on the anniversary of his death, was praised on Iranian radio and television and by the clergy for his "struggles against British imperialism", while Khomeini's comment was that "Mossadegh did not do anything"!

So far, the clergy in general and Khomeini in particular have remained intact from criticism by a majority of the Left. Only the Democratic National Front's leader, Matin Daftari, has dared to call Khomeini a dictator, and DNF, of course, is at its best nothing more than a bourgeois liberal organization, though full of Left elements.

It is enough to note that the most popular of the Left, the Fedayeen, far from comprehending Marxist philosophy, are being driven into an opportunistic pragmatism in their positions both on the Islamic Republic's constitution and on Russia being a "socialist country". In a word, they are opening the way for being swallowed up by the Tudeh Party. The other part of the Fedayeen, the group of Ashraf Dehghani -- a revolutionary woman who escaped from the Shah's jails in 1974 -- is still covered by the whole cloud of Debray's theory of guerrilla warfare, and by Stalinism.

However, the majority of the Left, including the Trotskyists, have shown how fast they want to become a part of the establishment, by participating in the elections for an "assembly of experts" to ratify the bourgeois-Islamic constitution, though they claim they are against the division of mental and manual labor!

Because the new revolutionary conditions in Iran are so challenging and will be determining the future, especially for the Left, we will have a chaotic period in this second phase of the Revolution. Being threatened by a new Islamic terror, many of the Leftists will become pacified and leave the stage of the struggle, and many will seek to compromise or give up their philosophy and bend under the pressure of Khomeini's regime.

But along with the spontaneous struggle of the masses to be free, a new Left must and will be born -- a new Left which unites theory and practice, philosophy and revolution, spontaneity and organization, and a Left which understands the totality of freedom and sees the struggle as a multidimensional reality that involves women as well as men, and workers as well as national minorities. The sprouts of this kind of Left could be seen in small groups such as the Freedom League, which published part of Chapter IV of Raya Dunayevskaya's Marxism and Freedom -- the Chapter that is very directly related to today's Iranian intellectuals.

Bazargan's government, and Khomeini, acting like a godfather there, like to say that the Left is "only one percent of the population". But they find it necessary to shut down 44 newspapers; to declare a Shah's Rastakhiz-type of one-party system, together with organizing the falangist "pustch" groups to attack demonstrations, bookstores and political groups; and to burn newspapers and pamphlets, tear down posters and search for leaflets as they do for weapons, only in order to silence that "one percent".

But this will not do them any good when they get to the workers in the Abadan refinery, who made oil-exporting Iran ask the U.S. (!) for kerosene and diesel fuel. The oil workers have been on a large-scale slowdown strike since May Day and before, in solidarity with both the unemployed workers and with the Arab minorities fighting for autonomy, and demanding more workers' control over production and management.

Nor will this repression do them any good when it concerns the national minorities waging an armed struggle against Khomeini to gain self-determination -- a bloody battle that has resulted in many deaths and executions of Kurdish revolutionaries as well as Arabs. But the Kurds have promised to continue fighting until all of Khomeini's guards are thrown out of Kurdistan and until their demands for autonomy have been met. They are determined to "make Kurdistan the graveyard of the Islamic Republic."

-4-

In recognizing Iran's strategic location on the top of the Hormuz Strip on the Persian Gulf, where more than 70 percent of the world's oil passes through, U.S. imperialism is using all possible ways to return to Iran and to regain its control over oil. And of course, the other world power, Russia, is waiting very patiently with its mouth open to swallow up Iran, in case any Iranian leaders come to its side.

This, which has contributed in part to a power struggle among the Iranian rulers, is a direct result of the global economic crises of capitalism, which are threatening not only economic growth but the whole of capitalism, in both its private and state-owned forms. The Middle East and its oil has now become the issue, the center of the contradictions and competitions, as well as collaborations, in and between the superpowers. The Iranian Revolution, which was felt "as an earthquake" in the region, has put the "shift in global conflicts" on the agenda of capitalism.

But Chapter 2 of the Iranian Revolution has already been opened, and with it, the splits that resulted from that first "earthquake". The class struggle, the women's liberation movement, the national minorities' fight for self-determination, are being intensified every moment. A new clergy riding in limousines now, and Khomeini's "holy alliance" with the bourgeoisie and his declaration of a "holy war" against the Kurds -- something he didn't dare to declare against the Shah -- are all aimed to exorcise those spectres that are haunting both the "Islamic Republic" and the whole of the Persian Gulf region.

Armed with the dialectic methodology that is the base of Marx's philosophy, the new generation of Iranian revolutionaries must recognize these "new passions and new forces" of the revolution. A theory of revolution must be developed from these movements, a theory that is able to unite with the masses for an ongoing revolution.

The question that arises now and must be answered by the Iranian revolutionaries is: under what form of organization is the movement from practice to theory, and from theory to practice, possible?

Through my little knowledge of history of revolutions, and through my participation in student movements abroad, I have come to the conclusion that an organization of serious revolutionaries, freely associated in shoras or corresponding committees and in opposition to any vanguard party, which would

have both the voice of all the members and provide conditions for their self-development, could be a new beginning.

Grounded in a Marxist philosophy of revolution, it must participate in all revolutionary movements and in the daily life of the masses, and do away with any division between activity and thought of the masses, between mental and manual labor, and provide no ground for elitism and authoritarianism. In a word, this organization must, to its best, appear as a unit, a form of a new society, and have its eyes and ears open for the voices from below.

With such an organization, we could raise the banner of total freedom and call for the overthrow of the counter-revolutionary regime of Khomeini, and continue the revolution until all capitalist production relations are uprooted and with that, all of inhuman bourgeois society. It is that, and the goal of a new society, that we are struggling for.

5942